

TSG-RAN Working Group 3 meeting #6
Sophia Antipolis, France, 24th - 27th August 1999

TSGR3#6(99)824

Agenda Item: 3

Source: Secretary

Title: Draft Minutes of Meeting #5

Document for: Approval

TSG RAN Working Group 3 Meeting #5
Helsinki, Finland (5-9 July 1999)

As usual, this report is structured according to the agenda, and not according to the order of the discussion. In some cases, the agenda item under which a contribution was discovered is not clear, so the structure of the report is non-unique. The body of the report covers decisions and discussions held in plenary sessions, with the SWG reports included in Annex A and Annex B (see agenda item 23 for the discussion on these reports, and ratification of the SWG decisions).

1 Opening of the meeting

The chairman, Per Willars (Ericsson) opened the meeting at 9:25.

2 Approval of the agenda

TSGR3#5(99)602 was the draft agenda for the meeting. Per had allocated documents to agenda items, but these were not shown in 602. The agenda was agreed, although it was commented that (as usual) we would not necessarily follow it in order. **The agenda was approved.**

3 Approval of minutes from last meeting

TSGR3#5(99)603 'Draft Minutes of Meeting #4' was presented by the secretary, Richard Townend (BT). He had received two comments from Italtel that were included in this document. CSELT added that documents 479-494 were from Siemens/Italtel/CSELT, not just Siemens/Italtel. **With these changes, the document was approved.**

4 Letters/Reports from other groups

TSG RAN (no document was submitted to the meeting) – The chairman reported that the plenary had chosen the third option for the Iur signalling bearer (CTP/IP and MTP3b as options under the SCCP layer). All our transport level specifications (except the implementation specific O&M transport) had been approved to version 3.0.0, so all changes must now be done by the change request procedure. Companies were asked to use the CR template, with the cover sheet, to speed progress. It was noted that WG3 could move documents to 1.0.0 and 2.0.0 without TSG RAN (at 50% and 80% stability). There had been some discussion concerning working assumptions

– the chairman summarised the outcome (see TSG RAN tdoc 405). A working assumption is automatically agreed at the following meeting (or at a later time, if explicitly stated) if there are no proposals challenging it at that meeting.

TSGR3#5(99)752 ‘LS on identification of Multicall Bearers’ (from CN1) was presented by the secretary. The chairman noted that the terminology in the figure on page 4 was incorrect in that it shows RANAP as Non-Access Stratum. The LS was delegated to the Iu SWG to draft a response, and for them to consider from the RANAP perspective (see tdoc 780).

TSGR3#5(99)767 ‘Support of Speech Service in RAN’ (from SA4) was presented by the chairman. Ericsson stated that we should respond with information about the work that we are doing to support AMR (e.g. RANAP QoS parameters, RAB sub-flows etc). Alain Maupin (Ericsson) volunteered to draft it – the Iu SWG will have a first review of it, but it should be presented to the closing plenary. *Note –due to lack of time, the response was not prepared.*

TSGR3#5(99)768 ‘Error resilience in real-time packet multimedia payloads’ (from SA4) was presented by the vice-chairman. The chairman asked whether SA4 were also considering the header compression, as he understood that this was done in UTRAN – this was unclear, but it was agreed that this should be done in UTRAN. It was noted that we should consider this LS when discussing the Iu UP protocol, as we have previously assumed fixed SDU sizes for RAB sub-flows, but MPEG4 is believed to use variable SDU size. The Iu SWG was asked to consider this LS when developing the protocols. The document was noted, and no answer is needed, unless the Iu SWG finds a reason.

TSGR3#5(99)769 ‘LS on use of Ciphering Mode Command as a CM Service Accept’ (from CN1) was presented by Brendan McWilliams (Vodafone). It was clarified that it is an open issue in RANAP whether the Cipher Mode Command can be used for this purpose. Ericsson asked whether this was actually a UE/CN NAS issue, rather than a UTRAN issue. Nortel suggested that it would make sense to de-correlate the CM Service Accept from the Cipher Mode Command, as the ciphering is applied to the RRC connection, rather than to the service. It was proposed that we should send a LS to CN1 stating that we see a need for this de-correlation, as there may already be a ciphered connection when a new service is negotiated. Also we should consider whether to include a NAS information in the Cipher Mode Command for sending a de-coupled CM Service Accept – Nokia suggested that the GSM mechanism already did this by using an implicit service accept. Nortel were concerned about the implications of the dual domain core network, as there should not be multiple RRC messages to the UE. Nokia agreed and suggested that the GSM implicit mechanism should be prohibited. Direct Transfer should be used for CM Service Accept, and RANAP/RRC mechanism should be used for the Cipher Mode Command. **Brendan agreed to draft a reply stating this solution.** Lucent suggested that the Iu SWG would need to work on this – it was clarified that the Iu SWG would develop a full set of procedures. Lucent clarified that they were concerned about the sequencing and synchronisation of ciphering and CM Service Accept messages; in particular, could the UE be sent a CM Service Accept before the ciphering is in place? Nokia felt that this was a CN issue; Ericsson agreed.

TSGR3#5(99)778 & 762 (on CS data services, and assymetric reconfiguration) were not presented, as they had been discussed in SWGs, and so are covered in the SWG reports.

TSGR3#5(99)791 'LS to RAN3 and RAN2 on R99 MSC issues with GSM04.08' (from CN1) was presented by Brendan McWilliams (Vodafone). The chairman commented that he thought that CN1 had raised a number of important issues, some of which we would need to address; many of the issues were in the scope of RAN2, and some would be discussed at the joint meeting in August. Some would have impacts on our procedures (e.g. SRNS relocation and hard handover via the core network). **Brendan agreed to draft a response** to state that we felt it to be mostly RAN2 issues, but we foresee a number of impacts on our procedures although we've not studied them in detail. It will be copied to RAN2. Contributions to RAN3 were invited on these issues.

TSGR3#5(99)792 'LS to R2 and R3 on CM-SERVICE-REQUEST for (from CN1) was presented by Mick Wilson (Fujitsu). The chairman could not see any need for subsequent CM-SERVICE-REQUEST from a UTRAN perspective, as it is seen as a NAS interaction. **Mick agreed to draft a brief response explaining this.**

TSGR3#5(99)793 'LS on the Paging Response Categorisation' (from CN1) was presented by Mick Wilson (Fujitsu). It was clarified that we (and RAN2) have been assuming that Paging Response is not carried by RRC (implying it is in MM). It was stated that we could not see any problems from the RAN3 perspective with the page response belonging to the NAS. **Mick agreed to draft a response stating this.**

5 Organisation of work

5.1 Work Plan and organisation

TSGR3#5(99)599 'RAN3 Work Plan' was presented by Ehrstedt (Ericsson). It was agreed to add September as the date for approval for 25.422, and that this should be treated in the Iub/r SWG. The third bullet in section 5.1 should be changed so that it does not state that all specifications referring to existing standards will be treated in the plenary.

The chairman proposed that the RANAP, NBAP and RNSAP specifications should be very stable by October so that we have time to check them before they go to TSG RAN for approval in December. The only real gaps could be in message coding. This means that all features and functions should be complete by August (although corrections must be handled subsequently). There will then be an ad hoc review of specifications before September. Nokia felt that this plan should be treated as a guideline, but felt that some coding contributions could be treated earlier (possibly with lower priority). A procedure by procedure consideration must be done in the SWGs. Siemens stated that we might need to make modifications to maintain alignment with the other groups (WG2 especially), particularly at the parameter level. Italtel agreed, as they had heard that the RRC protocol was lagging behind schedule, and we are dependent on that for some of our protocols. **With these changes, the document was approved.**

4.25.2 Appointment of representatives

No Discussion.

4.35.3 Future meeting dates and hosting

September – will be hosted by ETSI.

December – will be hosted jointly by France Telecom and Alcatel in Paris.

The first day (23rd August) of our next meeting will be held jointly with RAN2, N1, SA2 & SA3. The main subject will be GSM/UMTS handover, and it will be held at ETSI. Further details will follow by email.

The chairman proposed the following dates for next year (each is for one week commencing with the specified date):

24/1

28/2

10/4

22/5

26/6 – Nokia offered to host.

21/8

11/9

23/10

27/11 – Motorola offered to host.

6 General UTRAN Architecture

6.1 UTRAN Architecture

TSGR3#5(99)585 '25.401 v.1.1.1' (Editor) was presented by Jean-Marie Calmel (Nortel Networks). Ericsson commented that the output of tdoc 460 (on co-ordinated DCHs) had not been reflected in the document. Motorola and the chairman proposed removing figure 10, as it either contradicts the text or makes it more confusing. Ericsson proposed that the editor should reword section 6.1.2.3, as it still refers to the binding ID linking identifiers, rather than application instances (as was agreed). **With these changes, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)660 'Rationale for defining lossless relocation in UMTS R99' (Nokia) was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara (Nokia). Ericsson asked whether there was a requirement for lossless relocation – it was clarified that this would be discussed at the August joint meeting. Ericsson disagreed with the statement that the presence of common transport channels over Iur would have no impact on the requirements for SRNS relocation. There were two issues – do we need SRNS relocation at all, and if we do, does the presence of common transport channels on Iur alter the requirements for it? Siemens want it to be possible to perform a lossless relocation without setting up common channels on Iur; they think that you should not be forced to use Iur to make a relocation lossless. Ericsson clarified their proposal, stating that the SRNC could choose when to make the relocation, and so the requirements on the relocation could be different. Alcatel asked whether Ericsson intended to remove SRNS relocation altogether – they said that this was not so. Ericsson clarified that when the

UE is in URA connected state, this would be a good time to perform the relocation. Nokia stated that in general (from a Uu perspective), the Iur led to inefficiency; however, there may be times (e.g. ping-pong) when it is useful.

The chairman asked whether you could use the PS-MM-Idle mode, where there is no RRC connection – Nortel asked how this would be managed, as the bearer is normally released when an Iu-release is received from the last CN domain.

Returning to the proposal, Nokia clarified that if it was agreed that there was no requirement for lossless bearers, we would not need to define this. Alcatel asked why you needed Relocation for lossy bearers, but not for lossless bearers. Nokia were concerned by the trade-offs, but felt that the group should not specify the trade-offs, but merely the tools to manage them. Siemens commented that without the lossless procedure the balance of the trade-off would be changed. Ericsson asked about the complexity of the error cases – Nokia felt that there was not significant increase in complexity.

Ericsson asked whether the proposal meant that the same procedure must be used between GPRS and UMTS and within UMTS. It was clarified that the GPRS case was separate; however Siemens felt that the same mechanism would work for both cases. Contributions were encouraged for the UMTS-GSM (and vice versa) handover, especially for the PS-case. The chairman asked whether there were any objections to the Nokia proposal – Ericsson stated that the question would arise at the joint meeting, but did not object. **We agreed to continue to develop the lossless relocation, with a final resolution of the requirement issue (and hopefully on the mechanism) at the joint meeting.** Italtel asked whether the procedure would be independent of the common channels on Iur. It was stated that the technical solution has not been agreed yet. Alcatel were concerned about using TCP for the retransmission as the user would be charged twice for the transmission.

TSGR3#5(99)743 ‘CN domain identities used over Iu and Ericsson) was presented by Göran Rune (Ericsson). Siemens commented that it is strange that the LAC/RAC is used to identify the CN node – given that several LACs can be contained in an MSC. Ericsson could see no problem with this. Nokia asked how the RAC/LAC of the cell could be used in macrodiversity – it was clarified that this was out of scope, but the current cell would be used in common channel state, and the first cell in a DRNC would be used for soft handover. Siemens stated that the proposal is a complete contradiction with 03.03 – Ericsson could not see the contradiction, and felt that it was actually in line with GSM. Lucent asked how other core networks would be added in the future – new domain types could be added. Siemens then asked whether this idea would block the concept of a location area over multiple MSCs; Ericsson said that they thought that this was already the case. Lucent asked how this fitted with the Turbo-Charger concept – Nortel replied that they could see no impacts. **The principles in the contribution were accepted. It was further proposed that the identities should be documented in 25.401; detailed text to be provided. It was also agreed to send a LS to CN2 (cc SA2); Göran volunteered to draft it (772).**

TSGR3#5(99)638 & 759 were delegated to the Iu SWG.

TSGR3#5(99)757 ‘UTRAN Paging’ (Vodafone) was presented by Brendan McWilliams (Vodafone). The chairman gave the following answers:

Q1 – yes, as the paging message is sent on the dedicated control channel

Q3 – yes, but it is not a broadcast page, it is just a NAS transfer direct to the UE.

Q4 – no, as the UTRAN would become a NAS interworking function

Q5 – (ie section 3.3 proposal) – this considered as out of scope

Q6 – (3.4) – the DRNC would issue paging on the PCH. BT suggested sending a LS to SA2 explaining the limitations of the current solution (i.e. that UTRAN co-ordination did not remove all unnecessary paging). This was not accepted, but companies were encouraged to send contributions to SA2 on this if they were interested.

TSGR3#5(99)772 ‘PLMN, CN Domain RNC and Cell Identifiers Definitions’ (Ericsson) was presented by Alain Maupin (Ericsson). Nokia asked about the uniqueness of the PLMN-ID, but did not expect an answer as it is a CN and regulation issue, rather than a UTRAN one.

4-26.2 Terminology

TSGR3#5(99)661 ‘Cell Identification in UTRAN’ (Nokia) was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara (Nokia). Vodafone asked whether the proposed ID would be broadcast by the cell – Nokia stated that this was out of scope for the contribution, but it would not be broadcast, but was intended to be used on the UTRAN internal interfaces. It was clarified that the CRNC-ID would be the RNC-ID of the CRNC. Lucent asked whether the cell identifier would be unique outside the PLMN. It was clarified that the MCC and MNC would also be required for global uniqueness. Lucent stated that MCC/MNC could be shared between GSM and UMTS. Siemens stated that in GSM the cell ID is tied to the Location Area, and wondered what happened in the case of re-parenting (i.e. changing the geographical coverage of an RNC). Lucent noted that further contributions would be required for the inter-PLMN handover case. BT asked whether re-parenting would cause management problems – Nokia clarified that this would involve deletion of the cell, and re-creation with a new ID.

Ericsson proposed that we should include the RNC-ID definition as well as the cell identifier – they were asked to provide text.

It was agreed to include the cell identifier (with a number of editorial changes) into 6.1 of 25.401.

TSGR3#5(99)662 ‘Modification of RNTI Definitions’ (Nokia) was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara (Nokia). Alcatel asked did not understand how the d-RNTI was related to the Iur connections rather than the number of UE contexts; Nokia agreed that it referred to the number of UE contexts in the DRNC. Lucent suggested that the s-RNTI and c-RNTI is not used to identify the UE to itself, but rather to address messages to a specific UE. This change was agreed. The contribution is being discussed in WG2 this week, but only a small part (uniqueness of c-RNTI) is relevant to WG2. Ericsson asked how this is related to the Uplink Transfer message (where s-RNTI is used). It is not clear whether the d-RNTI is used on the Uplink Transfer – d-RNTI is used for Downlink Transfer. It was agreed that in general it would be more

efficient that the d-RNTI is used in DL Transfer, with s-RNTI used in the UL Transfer. For this reason, the first bullet in the d-RNTI was removed. Ericsson suggested that it would be sensible to add a note that d-RNTI is never sent over the air interface. The last word of the proposal was changed from PLMN to UTRAN, as was the other PLMN in the last paragraph. **With the changes summarised below, the document was approved.**

- note on d-RNTI not being transmitted on air interface was added
- s-RNTI also used to identify the UE to the SRNC
- s-RNTI & c-RNTI used to address the UE
- d-RNTI first bullet removed.
- PLMN changed to UTRAN twice in the last section

TSGR3#5(99)783 ‘Definition of Logical O&M’ (Mannesmann, Telia, T-Mobil, Vodafone) was presented by Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). Nokia asked whether the sentence concerning the control of logical resources could be interpreted in the wrong way – Vodafone could not understand how it could be mis-interpreted. The chairman wondered whether the RNC could use internal algorithms rather than the Mgt System. Vodafone proposed a modification of the text, but instead it was agreed to strike out everything in the second sentence after “the RNC controls these logical
With this change, the document was approved.

4-36.3 Synchronisation

TSGR3#5(99)663 ‘Clarification of UTRAN Synchronisation Model and Details required for Iur and Iub Specifications’ (Nokia) was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara (Nokia). Ericsson asked whether the window parameters would be set once per transport channel or could be changed at a reconfiguration. Nokia thought that it could be changed. Italtel commented that the times were all relative, so it would be better to define the times as windows – alternatively, a diagram could clarify the situation. Nokia clarified that you could define the times in many different ways. BT asked why the SRNC was communicating directly to the Node B in section 3.4 – it was answered that the DRNC was transparent in this case, but would not combine any UL control messages and would send DL control messages to all combined Node Bs. It was commented that OFF was an integer value, and so rounding was not necessary – Nokia agreed that this could be deleted. Ericsson asked whether a longer CFN would be needed for sleep mode in the UE – this is purely a radio interface issue. Telia asked why there was no input for the Iur common channel data streams – this is because the scheduling is done in the CRNC. Italtel asked whether the definitions would be included in 25.401 as well as the vocabulary document. It was clarified that it was. Ericsson were concerned that unless the maximum processing delay for a Node B is defined, this would not work as ToAWE is set by RNC to allow it to control the percentage of late arrivals. **The principles of the document were agreed, but the detailed text must be considered when the interface specifications are discussed.** Siemens commented that the RACH parameters should also apply to TDD USCH – this is open for contributions.

TSGR3#5(99)685, 698, 766, 687, 688 were all delegated to the Iub/r SWG, which discussed them in an Ad Hoc session on synchronisation (see tdoc 777 for the outcome).

1.46.4 Manifestations

TSGR3#5(99)598 '25.832 v.2.1.1' was presented by the Richard Townend (BT). He noted that section 5.1.2 still had a scenario number – this should be deleted. **With this change the document was approved**, and should now be sent to TSG RAN for approval, although we now have several more meetings before the next RAN plenary session.

1.56.5 Delay Budget

TSGR3#5(99)700 'Overall Delay Budget within the Access Stratum – Study Item Siemens/Italtel) was presented by Massimo Del'Acqua (Italtel). It was proposed to have an ad hoc discussion on the document. T-Mobil asked why 220µs was used in the fractional E1 calculation. Italtel clarified that this was the cell transmission time for an E1. **The changes were agreed.**

TSGR3#5(99)653 'Definition of performance parameters of AAL2 protocol within Nortel Networks) was presented by Jean-Marie Calmel (Nortel Networks). Siemens commented that the definition of PTD should always refer to packet transfer delays rather than cell transfer delays. Italtel asked whether there was a reference for the packing density definition – Nortel will check this. Furthermore it was clarified that the user byte excludes the ATM and CPS headers. Nortel stated that the graph in figure 2 assumes a CU_timer value of infinity – Ericsson commented that this should be explicitly stated. **It was initially agreed to include it in the temporary delay budget document, with the addition of the note.** Nokia and Ericsson both asked why the packing density was so low for the 5 octet case – they asked whether there was a statistical variation applied to PDU size; there was not. Nortel were asked to confirm that the CU_timer value was not 0, as this would explain the 10% figure. **This was not resolved, and the ad hoc on delay budgets will discuss it. However, it was agreed to include the PTD from section 2.**

TSGR3#5(99)779 'Summary of Ad Hoc Overall Delay Budget within the Access Rapporteur) was presented by Massimo Del'Acqua (Italtel). Alcatel commented that VP switches do not exist, and ATM cross-connect was ambiguous as there are VC-x-connect and VP-x-connect (a switch has signalling, and a cross-connect does not). Italtel commented that this had been approved in our Japan meeting, but maybe we had missed something. However, the delay through a switch and a cross-connect should be the same. They proposed replacing the switches and cross-connects with either ATM nodes or switch/cross-connect – **the latter was chosen.** Nortel mentioned that we had introduced PTD (packet delay transfer) which includes CPS scheduling, as a relevant delay, but there is no mention of it in the delay budget; they wondered which parameter it was included in – Italtel suggested TN1, in which case 1msec may be very short. **A note is added that the impacts of PDT will need to be added.** It was commented that it was a little confusing that the macrodiversity delay (U2) had been reduced to 0msec – **it was agreed to remove the parameter**, as it no longer applies.

The chairman remarked on the round-trip delay, which at 428ms was very long. Italtel agreed that it was not a good quality for the user, and proposed liaising the results out, to verify the requirements with the service groups. **Massimo agreed to write a LS**

indicating that these were preliminary figures (it will be sent to SA1, SA2 & R2). Siemens suggested that the transcoding in the UE could be combined with the interleaving to save a little time – Italtel explained that the transcoding delay in the UE had not been included.

6.6 Optionality on Iur

TSGR3#5(99)671 ‘Support of RACH/FACH data streams over the (Nokia) was presented by Fabio Longoni (Nokia). It was clarified in the presentation that the UTRAN should have some functionality to resolve the error cases in the multi-vendor case. The discussion focussed on the proposal, rather than on the optionality or not of the procedures. It was clarified that the statement about DCH scheduling referred to the case where the UE changes to a DCH state to send a burst of data, before dropping back to RACH/FACH state. Ericsson asked whether a similar statement could be added stating that UTRAN should work without SRNS relocation. Alcatel asked whether Nokia could prove that there would be no problem with ping-pong – Vodafone supported this. It was agreed that we will specify both RACH/FACH on Iur and SRNS relocation, and the market will decide. If there is a need to prioritise between the function, the operators must discuss this off line. Nokia commented that TSG RAN had noted that co-ordination between UTRAN equipment was an issue between the operators and vendors. Siemens commented that Nokia had not made the feature optional, but Ericsson noted that the implication was that it made the SRNS relocation mandatory. **The document was not approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)664 ‘RNC Classmark and Optionality on Iur Interface’ (Nokia) was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara (Nokia). Ericsson asked how the classmark avoided the notion of optional/mandatory – Nokia stated that this was to reduce the number of failure cases. Lucent could not understand why this was not done by O&M. Ericsson asked whether this was actually a vendor specific issue, as the classmark was not exchanged on any UTRAN interfaces. Vodafone stated that the ad hoc had supported a similar proposal, but had felt that the classmark would become too large. Italtel stated that they thought that this proposal made the interface modular. Nokia conceded that if it was not included on any interfaces, it would not be required in the specification; however, they did not want to preclude the use on the Iur interface. Lucent suggested that the O&M would allow many of the features to be turned on/off. Nortel supported the view that if the classmark was not to be exchanged on any interfaces, it was out of scope of the standards. **The document was not approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)756 ‘CTCH on Iur’ (Vodafone) was presented by Brendan McWilliams (Vodafone). **The document was noted.**

6.7 Compatibility and error handling

No contributions were discussed.

6.8 ASN1 Usage

TSGR3#5(99)667,8&9 ‘xxxAP ASN.1 structure’ (Nokia) were presented together by Atte Länsisalmi (Nokia). Lucent asked how we controlled versions of the specification – Nokia replied that they were intending to do this on a per-message basis. Lucent asked if there was a reason for abandoning the A-interface mechanism.

Nokia clarified that this was based on the guidelines in the RAN2 document, more than by adapting the A-interface mechanism, and did not know any reasons for discarding that mechanism. Lucent would like to see a reversion mechanism rather than having to build backward compatibility into the protocol. Nokia think that this mechanism does that; the alternative would be to specify the compatibility information in the specification. Siemens wondered what happened if the compatibility information is not understood – Nokia replied that there had to be a standard mechanism to cater for this case.

Lucent asked whether there was anything to preclude putting A-interface type mechanisms into the messages (e.g. reserving values). Nokia stated that what you can do within a version is a separate issue (and ASN.1 has some built in mechanisms related to this e.g. using ellipsis notation). Nokia think that the version number is increased whenever the release is increased – Siemens were worried about mid-release versions; they would prefer to see per protocol version control, to ensure that a whole release works together. Lucent noted that in some cases the version number does not help much (e.g. if the functional split changes); however, they liked the compatibility information, but wondered whether the CN could request a particular behaviour from an RNC (with respect to version number). They were concerned with a conflict between the standard and the compatibility information. Ericsson suggested separating the version and pdu-id fields.

The chairman proposed that delegates should read up on the ASN.1, and also we should specify the version of the ASN.1. BT asked whether common parameters between NBAP and RNSAP would have to be specified twice – Nokia replied that, without adding another specification for (e.g.) UTRAN Identifiers, this was unavoidable. It was felt that this was out of scope for R99. Nokia clarified that their proposal was intended as a starting point, rather than the result of a thorough study on the subject. They also clarified that reserved values and spare bits were not felt to be a good idea by the coding experts.

It was clarified that each of the proposals should state that 2.4 should be included, rather than 2.3, and that section 2.2 of 669 should be the same as 2.2 in the other two documents. It is proposed to include it as a template for further work. The chairman asked whether the first module forced us to use a particular mechanism for version handling. It was noted that version and compatibility handling is for further study. Ericsson asked where the PDUType was defined – Nokia replied that there was no syntax error in this, but suggested that it was tied up in the class definition. Lucent proposed removing the compatibility information until there was a concrete proposal; Siemens supported this. **It was agreed to include the from ASN.1 as a working assumption (decision at the next meeting), but without the compatibility information, and to include a GLOBAL module into the RNSAP logical procedure specification.** Nortel reminded delegates that we must also agree a version number for the ASN.1 – **a note to this affect should be added to all affected documents.**

TSGR3#5(99)639 ‘ASN.1 Usage – Working Assumptions on Encoding Rules’ (Siemens) was presented by Wolfgang Hultsch (Siemens). Ericsson asked about the status of the radio interface encoding rules, but it was considered to be not important. Ericsson pointed out that the extensibility of PER came about by using BER, and so

the proposal implied that the future releases would need to use BER as well. Nokia stated that this had been discussed at length on the RAN2 reflector. Lucent suggested that this could be cured by raising the version number! Nokia stated that they thought that the value range should be contained in the abstract syntax rather than just in the encoding, and the new abstract syntax can be encoded OK with PER. It was noted that this is connected with backward compatibility. **It was decided to use either PER or BER, with the final choice to be made at a later date.**

7 UTRAN Functions, signalling procedures (25.931)

TSGR3#5(99)597 '25.931 v.1.1.1' (Editor) was presented by Enrico Scarrone (CSELT). He apologised for the lack of the history entry for this version. The chairman asked Enrico to alter the stability assessment into the tabular format. **As there were no other comments, the document was considered to be approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)665 'Lossless Relocation Operation and Requirements for Protocols' (Nokia) was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara (Nokia). The chairman asked for confirmation that data forwarding shall not be used for real time bearers. This was confirmed. It was then discussed how to identify which bearers used this – it was agreed that it was related to the RLC mode (acknowledged/unacknowledged). Alcatel suggested that it was related to the QoS parameters. It was agreed that it would be under the control of the Source RNC. Ericsson asked whether the tunnel mentioned at step 2 on page 2 was really needed. The chairman pointed out the contradiction between 3.7 and 2 as it was then unclear whether the L2SN should be included in the partially transmitted case. Nokia clarified that it should be included if any of the GTP-PDU had been sent (i.e. 3.7 was incorrect). Siemens asked whether the Relocation Detect was the best time to switch in the CN irrespective of the bearer type. Nokia clarified that it was because it made it easier to guarantee the lossless bearer if the switch was done later. Ericsson asked about the impacts on rollback of SRNS relocation – Nokia stated that this could be handled with the normal procedures.

Ericsson asked about the purpose of the RRC Status message in figure 1 (on page 2) – Nokia stated that at the last RAN2 meeting the name had changed to something else, but the purpose was to re-allocate the RNTI.

There was an extensive explanation of the mechanism to avoid duplication of GTP-PDUs from Nokia and Alcatel.

Nortel commented the implication of the proposed mechanism is that if a 64kbyte PDU had been transmitted except for the final 300 bit transport block, the whole 64kbyte would need to be re-sent.

Alcatel asked whether you could receive data from the GGSN at the same time as from the old SRNC. Nokia stated that there was now a mechanism in GPRS to cope with this using timers, and they would be happy to keep this.

Nortel asked how service migration worked with this? In the case of lossless bearers in the CS-CN. Nokia answered that CS data uses RLP protocol, so does not use the lossless mode of the UTRAN.

The Chairman asked what would happen if we moved from using GTP-U to AAL2 – Nokia stated that this would not provide a problem. The Chairman noted that there was no PDU numbering in AAL2. Nokia stated that it would be needed anyway if we were to provide this sort of bearer; they also suggested that an alternative would be to use the sequence number of the UP protocol for this purpose.

TSGR3#5(99)776 ‘Revised Sequence Charts for lossless relocation’ (Alcatel) was presented by Nicolas Drevon (Alcatel). He clarified that he proposed a single GTP tunnel from SRNC to Target RNC (rather than 3 concatenated tunnels). Also that the RLC sequence number is restarted after the relocation (to aid the handover to GPRS).

TSGR3#5(99)684 ‘Study Item [SRNS Relocation] Status Report’ was presented by Nicolas Drevon (Alcatel). **The document was noted.**

The chairman mentioned that this whole topic would be discussed at the joint meeting, and the email discussion will continue until then.

TSGR3#5(99)787 ‘Iur/b ad hoc meeting on signalling examples’ (Chairman) was presented by the chairman. Fujitsu and Nortel commented that RRC connection re-establishment was not the same as the cell update. Ericsson stated that from a UTRAN perspective they were the same, and the differences were on the radio protocols. **It was decided not to accept the chairman’s proposal on 682. It was clarified that 696 must be aligned with existing terminology. On cell update, it was agreed to keep the existing procedure.**

TSGR3#5(99)692 ‘Physical Channel Reconfiguration’ (Italtel, Siemens, CSELT) was presented by Flavio Piolini (Italtel). The chairman clarified that this document makes no changes to the NBAP and RNSAP protocols – Ericsson commented that the “mode” parameter was not included in the specification, but it was implicit. **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)693 ‘Physical Channel Reconfiguration (CRNC controlled)’ (Italtel, Siemens, CSELT) was presented by Flavio Piolini (Italtel). DoCoMo asked why the bearer ID was included as a parameter. It was agreed to remove the Bearer ID and mode parameters. Message 3&4 were moved before message 1. The name of the example was changed from “controlled” to “initiated”. **With these changes, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)694 ‘Synchronised Transport Channel Reconfiguration’ (Italtel, Siemens, CSELT) was presented by Flavio Piolini (Italtel). Nortel stated that this was really an example of radio resource management strategies, and were concerned that the title did not make it clear that message 1 is not needed for all reconfigurations – this was agreed. Nokia stated that the text was misleading and proposed that the sentence starting “this message is optional...” should be shortened to “this message is

It was agreed to do this, and to insert the procedure as an additional procedure.

TSGR3#5(99)695 ‘Unsynchronised Transport Channel Reconfiguration’ (Italtel, Siemens, CSELT) was presented by Flavio Piolini (Italtel). **It was accepted with changes in line with the previous three documents.**

8 Iu General Aspects (25.410)

Handled in Iu SWG.

9 Iu User Plane Protocols (25.415)

Handled in Iu SWG.

10 Iu Signalling (RANAP) (25.413)

Handled in Iu SWG.

11 Iu Data Transport & Transport Network Control Plane (25.414)

Not treated.

12 Iu Signalling Transport (25.412)

Not treated.

13 Iur/Iub General Aspects

13.1 General Aspects and Principles of Iur Interface

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

~~4.2~~13.2 General Aspects and Principles of Iur Interface

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

~~4.3~~13.3 Common Channels on Iur – overall concept

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

~~4.4~~13.4 New Features

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

14 Iur/Iub User-Plane Protocols

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

15 Iur Signalling (RNSAP) (25.423)

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

16 Iub Signalling (NBAP) (25.433)

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

17 Iur Signalling Transport (25.422)

TSGR3#5(99)618 ‘Iur ALCAP Signalling Bearer’ (Motorola) was presented by Kethees Ketheesan (Motorola). During the presentation it was suggested that by using the signalling adaptation layer for MTP3b (Q.2150.1) over the IETF Adaptation Layer (included in CTP, as we’ve defined it), this would not need a special IETF Q.AAL2 converter.

TSGR3#5(99)616 ‘3G CR for 25.426 – Iur ALCAP Signalling Bearer’ (Motorola) was presented by Kethees Ketheesan (Motorola).

They were discussed together:

The chairman clarified that the stack would be Q2150.1 over CTP/IP. Siemens asked Motorola to check the version numbers of the CTP specification – it was clarified that it was being discussed in the IETF in Oslo this week.

The principle was approved, but Motorola agreed to re-submit the CR with the figures updated to show the clarified stack.

TSGR3#5(99)798 ‘Revised CR for 25.426 – Iur ALCAP Signalling Bearer’ (Motorola) was presented by Kethees Ketheesan (Motorola). Siemens asked for a note to be added, stating that the CTP/IP option must be reviewed in September in accordance with the RNSAP decision. Motorola pointed out that if it is not available, then the option effectively disappears anyway. It was agreed that the decision would be re-evaluated in RAN3 #7 (September) along with the signalling bearers. Also it was noted that the document would not be discussed at RAN level until after the re-evaluation. The CR will be changed/removed if CTP is removed in September. Motorola will be responsible for looking after the CR until then!

18 Iub Signalling Transport (25.432)

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

19 Iur/Iub Data Transport and Transport Network Control Plane

19.1 Iur/Iub DCH, transport layer & ALCAP

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

~~4.219.2~~ Iub CCH, transport layer

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

~~4.319.3~~ Iur CCH, transport layer

Handled in Iub/r SWG.

20 Implementation Specific O&M Transport (25.442)

21 Node B O&M Functional Descriptions (I3.05)

This had been discussed in the Iub/r SWG, but there was some plenary discussion, which is reported here.

TSGR3#5(99)601 'I3.05 v.2.0.1' (Editor) was presented by Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). He stated that there were a couple of editorial tasks outstanding, for which he would produce a proposal at the next meeting. It was noted that the version should be 0.1.1. **The document was approved as v.0.2.0.**

TSGR3#5(99)704 'Proposal for I3.05' (O&M Ad Hoc) was presented by the Ad Hoc Rapporteur, Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). Alcatel asked whether the procedures are compatible with X.731. Andrew responded that this was an informative document containing examples only for RAN3 internal use, and so this was not required. Alcatel stated that it should conform to X.731 anyway – Andrew invited contributions. Motorola noted that some of the NBAP messages did not exist yet, and a note should be added to this effect – Andrew stated that this whole issue was part of the editorial outstanding action. Alcatel objected to the contribution as it is not compatible with X.731, so **the document was accepted as a working assumption (deadline at next meeting)**. Andrew proposed sending the document to SA5 for information/comment – **this was agreed.**

TSGR3#5(99)775 'Meeting report from Ad Hoc #4' (Ad Hoc Rapporteur) was presented by the Ad Hoc Rapporteur, Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). Nortel asked whether 708 used existing procedures or proposed new ones – Andrew clarified that this used existing procedures.

TSGR3#5(99)630 'Requirement of customised O&M functions in UTRAN' (NTT DoCoMo) was presented by Kazuhiko Hara (NTT DoCoMo). Nortel asked whether the intention was for this IE to be included in every message – it was responded that it was an optional parameter. Vodafone asked whether it was sensible to do this across all messages, or whether it should be done on a per-case basis. NTT DoCoMo responded that they did not propose to include this in all parameters. The chairman asked whether they would bring a contribution detailing which messages should include the parameter. NTT DoCoMo believe that the messages in which the IE is required would be operator specific. Nokia suggested that it could be better for operators to ask their vendors to provide such functionality as a vendor specific implementation. Nortel supported this view, and were not sure where the RNC's behaviour with respect to these fields would be defined. NTT DoCoMo did not see that this would introduce additional complexity for vendors and operators who do not implement it.

After a break, the discussions continued. NTT DoCoMo clarified that there are two simple alternatives – one is to use implementation specific O&M and the other is to use vendor-specific extensions to the protocol. As a result, **NTT DoCoMo withdrew the contribution.**

TSGR3#5(99)606 ‘Network Element ownership of logical cell parameters’ (Motorola) was presented by Elliot Stewart (Motorola). The chairman asked whether this is in line with our assumption that a cell is owned by the CRNC. Motorola stated that they intended to change the assumption. Vodafone pointed out that many of these parameters would not be carried over NBAP. Ericsson asked why, if some of these parameters are implementation specific, they have to be transferred over Iub. Motorola stated that there was some overlap between the two classifications – for example frequency allocation. Nortel commented that this would need network co-ordination (using cell configuration request/response/failure). Motorola asked whether the Node B gain could be discussed, due to PA trunking between cells – Nortel suggested that having this owned by Node B would prevent the dynamic adjustment of gain; they would rather see parameter limits signalled to the RNC. Motorola provided a clarification that the gain could be shared between cells within a Node B. The chairman commented that having a list of cell parameters was very useful. Nortel agreed and suggested that such a table should have columns to show the owner of the parameters and also the node that sets any limits on such a parameter. **The document was noted.**

22 Layer 1 Specifications (25.411, 25.421, 25.431)

No contributions.

23 Reporting from SWGs

23.1 Iu SWG

TSGR3#5(99)786 ‘Summary of Iu SWG’ (Iu SWG Chairman) was presented by the SWG Chairman, Atte Länsisalmi (Nokia). Telia asked about the progress of merging the Iu UP protocols. Atte confirmed that the progress in this area had been very good.

BT pointed out that the Ad Hoc had recommended an email discussion on partial relocation towards GSM – interested companies were urged to participate.

It was noted that tdoc 778 (LS on CS data) would need to be discussed at the next meeting.

The Iu SWG chairman proposed that an email discussion should be started on the late contributions – **NTT DoCoMo agreed to act as Rapporteur.**

The proposals of the Iu SWG were approved.

~~4.223.2~~ Iub/r SWG

TSGR3#5(99)785 ‘Summary of Iub/r SWG’ (Iub/r SWG Chairman) was presented by the SWG Chairman, Per Willars (Ericsson).

The following comments were made:

Section 16.4: There had been some discussion on the DCH priority parameter and more discussion is needed.

Section 14.2: It was commented that in tdoc 633, in addition to the main proposal, it was agreed to include the UL synchronisation to the DCH data streams. Nokia will provide text to the editor.

Section 18: Alcatel commented (about tdoc 742) that SSCOP in assured mode was only agreed as a working assumption, as Alcatel had suggested that assured mode was a requirement on the NBAP signalling bearer (whatever it could be). It was clarified that the document had only proposed a modification of the current working assumption. Alcatel suggested that the agreed text from 742 should be included in the minutes; it was:

“the SSCOP assured data transport service shall be used”.

Section 15/6: Nokia commented that in the RL Addition, the indication of multiplexing co-ordinated DCHs was removed.

Section 16.1: T-Mobil commented that they had proposed that RAN3 should consider CORBA as an option for Iub Logical O&M. It was agreed in the SWG that this is an issue relevant to study for Release 2000, but not for Release 99. T-Mobil was invited to contribute to the Technical Report TR25.831:UTRAN Study Items for Future Releases.

With the comments noted above, the proposals of the Iub/r SWG were approved.

24 Study Items for Future Releases (25.831)

TSGR3#5(99)600 ‘Study Items for future releases’ was presented by the Chairman. **The document was approved.**

25 Outgoing Liaisons

TSGR3#5(99)788 ‘LS to SA5 including 25.422’ (Mannesmann, Vodafone) was presented by Stephan Recker (Mannesmann). It was noted that 25.422 should read 25.442, and that there should be a comma after the word UTRAN on the first line. **With these changes the document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)789 ‘Proposed LS on Turbo Charger Feasibility Study’ (Nortel) was presented by Pierre Lescuyer (Nortel). It was commented that tdoc 650 should be included to aid understanding. **With this change, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)780 ‘Draft Answer to LS on Identification of Multicall Bearers’ (Telecom Modus) was presented by Josep Casals (Telecom Modus). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)781 ‘Proposed LS for N1 regarding Cipher Mode Command over Iu interface’ (Nokia) was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara (Nokia). It was commented that a copy should be sent to RAN2. **With this change, the document was approved.**

Nortel) was presented by Pierre Lescuyer (Nortel). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)802 ‘Draft LS to RAN2 on Assymetric reconfiguration procedure – feasibility over Iub/r’ (Nortel) was presented by Jean-Marie Calmel (Nortel Networks). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)801 ‘Draft LS on Timing Advance for TDD’ (Siemens) was presented by Achim Brandt (Siemens). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)795 ‘Proposed response to the LS on CM-SERVICE-REQUEST for multicall’ (Fujitsu) was presented by Mick Wilson (Fujitsu). Nokia commented that the first CM-SERVICE-REQUEST can be carried by the RANAP INITIAL-UE message, while subsequent messages use RANAP DIRECT TRANSFER message. It was agreed to change the LS to reflect this. **With this change, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)796 ‘Proposed response to the LS on Paging Response’ (Fujitsu) was presented by Mick Wilson (Fujitsu). The word “with” on line 1 was changed to “will”. Also “Direct Transfer procedure” was changed to “Initial UE Message”. **With these changes, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)799 ‘Draft LS on GTP-U SAP and primitives’ (Ericsson) was presented by Alain Maupin (Ericsson). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)794 ‘Proposed LS for N1 regarding MSC issues with GSM04.08’ (Vodafone) was presented by Brendan McWilliams (Vodafone). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)784 ‘Draft LS on CN domain identifiers used over the Iu and Iur interfaces’ (Ericsson) was presented by Göran Rune (Ericsson). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)782 ‘Draft LS to CN1 on the Use of the Cipherring Mode Command as a CM Service Accept’ (Vodafone) was presented by Brendan McWilliams (Vodafone). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#5(99)800 & 797 ‘Updated Delay Budget’ (Ad Hoc Rapporteur) was presented by Massimo Del’Acqua (Italtel). The changes were intended to reflect the comments of the plenary. Nokia stated that they had some concerns about the estimation of round-trip delay, as they thought that the delay should be computed between the start of coding/decoding, rather than including the coding delay. Italtel replied that this was true because of the loop-back, but the exact amount to be removed would need discussion (Nokia claimed 80msec, Italtel 60msec) – this was to be discussed on the email reflector. Nokia expressed some concern about sending this LS, given that we had identified errors in the document. Italtel stated that the concern was in the magnitude of the delay.

After some off-line discussion, some errors have been found in the template. Italtel will provide technical detail on the reflector and the figures will be changed in the LS. (a) is now 134msec, and (b) is now 348msec. U3 has been reduced from 40msec to 20msec. It was noted that the lettering of the bullets of the annex had been corrupted, and the references had disappeared. Italtel will send this updated version on the reflector. **Comments must be received by July 19, otherwise it will be accepted.**

TSGR3#5(99)803 'I3.05 Node B O&M functional description' (Vodafone) was presented by Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). The version number referred to was corrected. **With this change, the document was approved.** It was noted that the version showing changes from this meeting should be attached rather than the approved one.

TSGR3#5(99)804 'Definition for Logical O&M to be included in 25.945' (Vodafone) was presented by Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). **The document was not needed,** as our editors should keep the vocabulary editor (from Motorola) up to date.

26 Next Meeting

The chairman stated that in future new messages would need to be well motivated, and required to make existing features work, rather than being for new features and functions. All parameters must be defined by the next meeting, otherwise, they should start to be removed. Signalling examples will take a lower priority. At the next meeting, we will try to finalise the descriptions of all procedures, features and functions. We should start to describe the ranges of parameters. Version numbering of all specifications will be reviewed.

27 Any Other Business

TSGR3#5(99)770 'Draft overview text of the FDD DS-CDMA radio interface to be inserted in ITU-R IMT.RSPC' (TSG RAN ITU Ad Hoc) was presented by Enrico Scarrone (CSELT). It was noted that the TDD parts were not yet written. Comments need to be sent to Nicola Magnani (CSELT) by the end of July. It was commented that the UTRAN architecture should not be in a mode-dependent section. **The document was noted.**

28 Closing

The chairman closed the meeting by thanking Nokia for their hosting, organisation and social event.

Annex A – Iu SWG report

Source: Iu SWG Chairman
Title: Summary of Iu SWG

Introduction

This document presents the report from Iu SWG held on July 5-9 1999 during TSG RAN WG3 meeting #5 in Helsinki, Finland. The meeting was chaired and the report prepared by Atte Lämsäsalmi. The report is in line with the agenda used in the meeting (the incoming liaison handling is reported as the last item (without a number)).

8 Iu General Aspects

28.1 8.1 General Aspects and Principles of Iu interface (25.410), 586;

Tdoc 586 "UMTS 25.410 UTRAN Iu Interface, General Aspects and Principles" was presented by the editor Richard Townend of BT. In addition to changes in the previous meeting some minor editorial changes, like in the scope section, are included. Richard noted that the U-Plane protocol part has not been modified to being independent of the CN domain.

The document was approved with the understanding that the U-Plane protocol needs to be updated. It was also noted that a name for the generic U-Plane protocol needs to be invented.

Priority of work: -729

Tdoc 729 "Set of proposals for the Iu SWG work prioritisation for release 99" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. It was clarified that this is a plan on which order to proceed, and it is not aiming to restrict input on other areas.

It was commented that in every technical area, the input provided by the companies should cover the impacts of the proposal to the whole interface, i.e. the interoperation with other procedures and the error cases should be included.

The proposed work areas from **Tdoc 729** were accepted, and the following companies were assigned to provide input in them (provide own contributions, and co-ordinate contributions from other companies):

List of Contributions items for Iu SWG for R99

Proposal #	Slogan	Deadline	Comments	Responsible Companies
1	Iu Interface Characteristics	August	25.410 deadline: September	Ericsson/BT
2	Iu Specification Objectives	August		BT
3	List of Functions over Iu	August		Nokia
4	Definition of Functions o. Iu	September		Nokia
5	Function Distribution o. Iu	September		Nokia
6	Relocation/Handover	September		All
7	Protocol principles	September		Lucent
8	Error handling principles	September		Lucent
9	Use of SCCP	July		Ericsson
10	SCCP Addressing schemes	August		Ericsson
11	Freezing of Procedures list	July	25.413 deadline: December	All

12	RANAP Error handling	August		Lucent
13	Timers, O&M param.	October		NEC
14	RAB attributes/def.	September		Ericsson
15	Restructuring of Iu UP	July	25.415 deadline: September	Ericsson
16	CS Data impacts	September		input coming from CN WG3
17	Iu UP procedures final.	September		All
18	RANAP ASN.1	Ad-hoc October		All/Nokia

SCCP: -725

Tdoc 725 "Description of usage of SCCP as signalling bearer for RANAP" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson.

The contribution was approved with the following modifications:

- . Section 2.4: First bullet deleted and third bullet modified to read that "The UTRAN resources allocated to the connection are released."
- . Section 2.2, The release case: Exactly the same wording as in RNS initiated release should be applied for CN initiated release.

The successful and unsuccessful outcome should be modified to be more clear and generic. The contributor and the editor will modify the text so that reference is not made to any specific message. It should also be worded so that the SCCP messages indicate the successful and unsuccessful operation, and not the RANAP messages they may or may not contain. The text will be sent to the e-mail reflector as soon as it is available.

- . Section 2.3: The two bullet points were removed, as well as the statement above referring to them. The last sentence of this section is removed. It was understood that we need to return to the issue of whether the Iu release procedure is always used to release the SCCP connection, or whether implicit release is possible.

It was also pointed out that the relation of the Reset to the release of SCCP connection will need to be discussed further with the definition of the Reset procedure.

Turbocharger; 650

Tdoc 650 "Turbo Charger Impacts on UTRAN" was presented by Pierre Lescuyer of Nortel Networks. It was clarified that Nortel position has changed, and they are now proposing the routing function is to be placed in the NAS part of CN. Therefore there is no impact on UTRAN Architecture or Iu. It was agreed that with that new condition the independence can be achieved.

Pierre will draft a liaison to CN WG1 indicating that:

- We have reviewed the modified concept as presented in **Tdoc 650**, where TRF is in the NAS part of CN
- We agree that there is no impact on UTRAN Architecture and Iu with the new concept.

RAB Subflows: ---758 (moved to agenda item 9)

CN Distribution function -638, ----759 (moved to agenda item 10.5)

9 Iu User-plane protocols (25.415) 593;

-717, -718, -719, -724

Tdoc 593 "UMTS 25.415 UTRAN Iu Interface UTRAN CN User Plane Protocols" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. It was agreed to modify the chapter structure in 5.6 and 5.6.1 slightly by adding headings "General" in front of the text after the main headings. With this, the document was approved.

Tdoc 717 "Concept Proposal of Mode of Operation of the Iu User Plane protocol" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. Alain clarified that the mode is not proposed to be included the mode in the U-Plane protocol.

The proposal to include concept of Iu UP mode of operation with PDU types was agreed.

It was agreed as proposed to draft the liaison statement to CN WG2 and to CN WG3 (cc: SA2), to inform about this concept, and the basic structure that the U-Plane protocol is domain independent. Alain will do the drafting of this. (see also discussion for **Tdocs 724** and **758**)

Tdoc 718 "Introduction of mode concept in TS 25.415" was presented by Fredrick Åberg of Ericsson. He clarified that section 5.7 should refer to PDU Type 0 instead of PDU Type 1, and the figure title in figure 5 should be TM instead of SM.

The PDU Type was agreed with the understanding that only one type is used for now (see subsequent agreements in this area with **Tdocs 724** and **758**).

Tdoc 719 "Modelling of primitives for the Iu UP Protocol Layer" was presented by Vesa Lehtovirta of Ericsson.

The first proposal to include the new text was agreed with the following modifications:

- . L2 SAP is removed from the figure 3 and 5.
- . Sections 3.1.3.2 and 3.2.3.2 removed for now
- . The title of sections 3.1.1 and 3.2.1 have the words "at the RNL SAP" at the end.
- . The PDU names are Iu-UP-Unit-data-request and Iu-UP-Unit-data-Indication for TM and Iu-UP-data-request and Iu-UP-data-Indication for SM.

Second proposal: Vesa will write the liaison statement to CN WG2 as proposed. It asks them to define a GTP-SAP and suggests the primitives as in tables that were removed for now (sections 3.1.3.2 and 3.2.3.2)

RAB Subflows:

Tdoc 724 "Principles related to Radio Access Bearer Sub-Flows" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. Alain clarified that it is agreed by Ericsson that the individual SDU sizes should be exchanged at the initialisation, and not just the total size.

The related contribution **Tdoc 758** was discussed before taking decisions.

Tdoc 758 "Concept proposal for transporting RAB Subflows" was presented by Patrick Johnson of Nortel. It was clarified that this proposal could be specified as a different PDU type in addition to what is proposed in **Tdoc 724**.

Discussion and decisions on Tdocs 758 and 724:

The variable length and pre defined length schemes were discussed at length.

The agreement is that we divide the Support Mode to two, the "Support Mode for variable SDU sizes", and the "Support Mode for pre-defined SDU sizes".

This will be reflected on the Liaison Statement to N2 N3 and S2 that Alain is drafting. Due to large document, and the importance of the decisions, it was agreed that the liaison will be discussed in the e-mail reflector. Ericsson will base the Liaison Statement on modified version of **Tdoc 717**.

the proposals in **Tdoc 724** are applicable to the "Support Mode for pre-defined SDU sizes" section, and were handled as follows:

First text box:

- 1) Approved
- 2) Approved with the statement parenthesis removed
- 3) Approved

A note is added after these items stating "It is FFS whether the numbering of sub-flows can be based on something else than reliability classes"

Second text box:

- 1) Removed
- 2) Approved with adding 'SDU' after 'sub-flow'
- 3) Approved with adding 'Iu' after 'every'

Inclusion of Informative annex was accepted, with the title of table 2 modified to read "Example Allocation of RAB sub-flows combination indicator".

Tdoc 758 does not provide ready text to be included to 25.415, but it rather explains the principle. The principle had been approved to be applicable for the new section "Support Mode for variable SDU sizes", and contributions for detailed text are invited.

10 Iu signalling (RANAP) (25.413) 590;

Tdoc 590 "UMTS 25.413: RANAP Signalling, v.1.0.2" was presented by Jyrki Jussila. It contains the modifications approved in the previous meeting. It was agreed with the following modifications (not all of these are in relation to recent changes):

- . Transport Network Control Plane boxes are removed from all figures. The editor will make sure that the text part will include a clear description on when the U-Plane setup takes place if that is required.

- . It was agreed to remove section 8.4.4.
- . In section 8.14.1 "Location request" should be replaced by "Location reporting control".
- . In section 9.1.1.13, the CN indicator needs to be added to the Paging message.
- . It was agreed to use "RAB Assignment Response" instead of "RAB Assignment Complete".

10.1 Study Items report and decision:

10.2 List of messages

677

Tdoc 677 "List of RANAP Procedures and Messages" was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara of Nokia. The need to include queuing as part of RAB Assignment and Relocation procedures, and not as separate elementary procedure was discussed, Kalle clarified that the difference for the Queuing for the RAB assignment to Queuing for the Relocation is that the first is applied to individual RABs, and the latter is for the whole procedure.

The general principle of limiting the number of messages was discussed at length. Many companies favoured having as small number of messages as possible, e.g. the Queuing should be a separate elementary procedure, as currently defined. There was no agreement to change the current documentation.

Queuing for Relocation (Hard Handover) was discussed, but there was no agreement that it is needed. (later it was decided that the issue can be further discussed in an AdHoc session).

The document was not approved at this time, and the chairman urged Nokia to make comments based on this contribution to the procedure descriptions to be discussed in the next agenda item.

10.3 Procedure specifications

651, 666, (667), -721, -726, -727, --745, --746, ----750, ----751, ----763, ----764

Tdoc 651 "Multiple RAB Relocation procedure failure" was presented by Pierre Lescuyier of Nortel Networks.

The different cases were discussed for quite long. It was in particular debated whether the partial acceptance of Handover Request should be supported or not.

The contribution was not approved at this time. It was agreed to have an AdHoc session on this during the evening to continue the discussion on partial acceptance of the relocation request, and the possibility to queue handover in an AdHoc session during the evening. Richard Townend will act as the rapporteur for that discussion. See the outcome of that in **Tdoc 774** and the discussion reported in the end of this report.

Tdoc 666 "RAB Assignment RANAP procedure" from Nokia was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara. It was clarified that the proposal is to replace totally the existing procedure.

It was clarified that the RAB subflows would be supported, and that the descriptions of subflows are included in the RAB description.

The timers in the procedure were discussed at length. It was commented that the definition of these timers may be very essential for the implementation, but it was commented by many (especially Lucent and Alcatel) that defining those in the standard is not needed. It was agreed not to specify the timers at this level of detail.

Even though the contribution contains many other proposals as well, it was viewed that it is better to modify the text so that the timers are not included before continuing the discussion on the other proposals. The contribution was not approved.

Tdoc 721 "Bearer Cleared Indication RANAP Procedure" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. It was agreed that the RAB Release Request message should be used for this purpose, and not the proposed Bearer Cleared Indication. Consequently it was approved to replace the Bearer Cleared Indication message in section 8.2 with RAB Release Request message, and a possible value "RAB pre-empted" is added to the description of RAB Release Request message in section 8.2.

Tdoc 726 "Description of usage of Radio Access Bearer Assignment for modification of Iu userplane" was presented by David Comstock of Ericsson.

It was decided that the proposed text is not clear and mature enough. The proposal in the contribution was not approved.

It was agreed that further discussion in the e-mail reflector is needed. Nokia's Kalle Ahmavaara will act as a rapporteur for this e-mail discussion for clarifying the RAB Assignment procedure.

Tdoc 727 "Elementary Procedures" was by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. This contribution presents a proposal for definition of Elementary Procedure with two classes: class 1 with response, and class 2 without response message. The following was agreed:

- . First proposal to include sections 2.3, and 4 in 25.413 was agreed with modifications that Bearer Cleared is removed, and the Timer column is left empty.
- . The second proposal to create new elementary procedures from existing messages was approved as follows:
 - . Bearer Cleared is removed
 - . Kalle Ahmavaara's s e-mail discussion group (see above for **Tdoc 726**) will also extract RAB Release Request and Queuing as from RAB Assignment to separate elementary procedures.
 - . The editor of 25.413, Jyrki Jussila of Nokia works on separating the Iu Release Request to a separate elementary procedure.
- . It was further agreed that the elementary procedures should be distinct from the other messages. The editor was tasked to find a way to document this, e.g. by looking at the editing guidelines from the support team.

Tdoc 745 "Relocation Cancel Procedure" was presented by Chenghock Ng of NEC.

It was agreed with the definition now reading: "When the Source RNC has decided to cancel the relocation, it sends RELOCATION CANCEL message to the CN. If the CN Receives Relocation Cancel message, the CN terminates the ongoing Relocation Preparation procedure (if any) and sends RELOCATION CANCEL ACKNOWLEDGE message to the Source RNC"

The parameters for RELOCATION CANCEL message were approved as proposed, and it was noted that the RELOCATION CANCEL ACKNOWLEDGE message does not have any parameters.

Tdoc 746 "Relocation Failure Procedure" was presented by Chenghock Ng of NEC. It was agreed to include these messages, but not a separate elementary procedures, but as part of Relocation Preparation and Relocation Resource allocation elementary procedures:

- . It was agreed to include the relocation preparation failure to new section 8.1.2.2 Unsuccessful operation. The message name was changed to Relocation Preparation Failure. The description of the operation is as in the first proposed sentence, and the accompanying figure.
- . The failure for Relocation Resource allocation approved to a new section 8.1.3.2 Unsuccessful Operation. The description of the operation is as in the second proposed sentence, and the accompanying figure. The existing text is placed in new section 8.1.3.1 Successful Operation.

Tdocs 750, 751, 763 and 764 were not discussed because of running out of time. The contributors were advised to present them early for the next meeting.

10.4 Message contents

670, -678, -720, -722, -723, --747, --748, ----754

Tdoc 747 "Parameter Radio Access Bearer ID and NAS Binding Information in RAB Assignment message" was presented by Chenghock Ng of NEC.

It was discussed whether the NAS Id could be used as the RAB Id was discussed. It was agreed that they should be kept separate to allow separation of the protocol layers.

It was agreed to include the proposed parameters. It was also agreed that Alain will help the editor to get the definitions of RAB Id and NAS Binding Id from 23.10.

Tdoc 670 "Message Contents for the remaining RANAP procedures" was presented by Jyrki Jussila of Nokia. A message by message review was done and the following was agreed:

- . General comment that the "Bearer Id" is changed to "RAB Id"
- . 3.1 RAB Release request; approved as proposed
- . 3.2 Queuing; approved as proposed
- . 3.3 Iu Release; approved as proposed
- . 3.4 Overload; approved without any parameters (i.e. the proposed parameters removed)
- . 3.5 Reset; approved as proposed
- . 3.6 Common Id; approved as proposed
- . 3.7 Page; approved with modifications that TMSI is changed to Temporary UE Id, Location Identifier is changed to Paging Area Id and EMLPP Priority parameter is removed.
- . 3.8 CN Invoke Trace; There is a different proposal in **Tdoc 754**, which was discussed, but not approved. The procedure from **Tdoc 670** was approved with the modification that the Bearer Id parameter is removed (no use for it has been specified in the procedure description).
- . 3.9 Cipher Mode Control procedure; The possibility to Cipher only some of the RABs was discussed. Pierre will draft a liaison statement to S3, cc R2 and S2 to ask the question whether this

functionality is required. A note is added to cipher mode command stating that ciphering per RAB is FFS.

A general agreement was made that the NAS information should be indicated with NAS in the beginning of the parameter name.

Kalle Ahmavaara will draft a liaison statement to N1 on whether NAS information should or should not be attached to the RANAP ciphering mode messages. The Cipher response mode is removed for now, but a note is added to both cipher mode command and cipher mode response that the piggybacking NAS information is FFS. The optionality or mandatoryness of Chosen Encryption Algorithm was discussed, but it was decided to leave it optional.

3.10 CN Information Broadcast; Michael Roberts of Lucent commented that to turn off the broadcasting an empty bit string could be used. There are also other parameters for turning off the broadcast, and Lucent will clarify how this is done. Nortel will clarify the function of the procedure. Also recovery from error situations need to be covered in the study.

3.11 Direct Transfer; It was decided to call the only parameter in this message "NAS PDU". It was also discussed for length whether the downlink message should include some prioritisation information for the message transfer. It was understood that this is required from the CN to send the messages in already prioritised order. It was left for interested companies to make sure that the CN WGs address this issue.

3.12 Initial UE Message; Approved with modifications that "Layer 3 Information" is changed to "NAS Layer 3 Information", and Chosen Channel was removed.

3.13 Location report; not discussed, see **Tdoc 748**.

4, The list of parameters; They have not been reviewed in detail, but have been discussed in the presentation. They were approved as the starting point, and further contributions were asked on this area. It was clarified that if no contributions are received then these definitions will remain.

Tdoc 748 "The contents of Location Reporting Control and Location Report Message" was presented shortly by Chenghock Ng of NEC. The parameters were approved. The contributor, editor and Alain Maupin will work on the definition of Location Information and Request Type parameters based on text in 23.10. The proposals should be viewed before the end of the Iu SWG (there was no time to return to this).

Tdoc 722 "Comments to R3-99503, Message contents for the RANAP procedures" from Ericsson was discussed. Alain Maupin addressed the remaining issues from this contribution. The contribution proposed to remove the Bearer parameters from the RAB Assignment Response, because their usage has not been documented well. This was not agreed, and some usage examples were given. The companies supporting them and having the understanding on how it works were requested to provide clarifying text on this issue for 25.413.

Tdoc 678 "Parameters for Relocation Required and Relocation Request messages" was presented by Jürgen Van Parys of Alcatel. The following decisions were made:

- . The cause parameter is included in both messages as proposed.
- . It was agreed that the transparent field is included as mandatory parameter in both messages. No position was taken on whether the content of both should be the same or different.
- . The content of the transparent field was left for further study (nothing documented in 25.413). We start a new e-mail discussion on this issue. It is co-ordinated by Jürgen Van Parys of Alcatel.

Tdoc 720 "Changes to RANAP protocol due to Mode Concept" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. User Plane Mode parameter is proposed for RAB Assignment and Relocation Request messages. Accepted as proposed.

10.5 Other issues,

-638, (-743), ----759

Tdocs 638 and 759 were handled together.

Tdoc 638 "CN Domain Distribution Function" was presented by Wolfgang Hultsch of Siemens

Tdoc 759 "CN domain discriminator in UTRAN" was presented very shortly by Patrick Johnson

It was agreed that the information on which logical domain the NAS message is to be transported to should be included in the Access Stratum message carrying it.

One or two SCCP connections was discussed. Nortel pointed out that they support one connection, but many other companies pointed out that they support two.

The proposed text from **Tdoc 638** was agreed with the following modifications:

All occurrences of 'CN Discriminator' are replaced by 'CN domain indicator'

First paragraph: 'NAS' changed to 'AS' and 'header' removed

Second paragraph: 'is' changed to 'shall be', 'by the SRNC' added after 'provided', 'of' changed to 'for' and everything starting from 'via' is removed.

Third paragraph: 'NAS' changed to 'AS' in the proposed new text (not elsewhere), all occurrences of 'header' removed, and the word 'individual' removed.

11 Iu Data Transport + Transport network control plane (25.414);

(Including requirements on GTP-U)

-728

There was no time to address this contribution. The contributor was advised to provide the information in the form of a CR since the document is already in CR control (version 3.0.0).

12 Iu signalling transport (25.412) ;

Incoming Liaison Statements;

752, 767, (768)

Tdoc 752 "Proposed Liaison Statement on Identification of Multicall Bearers" from CN WG1 was presented by Atte Länsisalmi of Nokia. The requirement is that the SI and This issue is addressed in **Tdoc 747**, and it was agreed to present it at this time (see agenda item 10.4).

Telecom Modus and NEC with the help of Ericsson will draft a liaison back indicating that we have considered the issue, and also correcting the NAS RANAP.

Tdoc 767 "Support of Speech Services in RAN" from S4 was discussed shortly. The answering to this had been allocated to Alain Maupin during the plenary session. A copy will be made available after the U-Plane discussions.

Tdoc 768 "Error resilience in real-time packet multimedia payloads" was presented by Pierre Lescuyer of Nortel. This information is noted, and if anything arises during the Iu U-Plane discussions, we will return to the issue.

Tdoc 778 is a Liaison statement from N3 on CS Data services. It was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. There is a problem with the N3 schedule. They would like to provide the Iu UP requirements, but their meeting is at the same time (end of September) when we are supposed to have the UP protocol ready. However, we could acknowledge the requirements they have given us so far. No liaison statement is sent back (no volunteer to write it) and it would not help much either. We can still return to this in the next meeting.

Report from the Ad Hoc

Tdoc 774 "proposal from Relocation Ad Hoc" was presented by the rapporteur Richard Townend of BT.

The recommendations from the Ad Hoc group were reviewed:

1. Endorsed that the Source controlled Target queuing is allowed, but the technical details are FFS. It was also not solved whether the CN could queue Relocation.
2. Endorsed.
3. Endorsed. This indication may be needed for directed retry. Lucent is checking on that.
4. Endorsed.
5. Identifies an issue that needs to be considered.

Annex B – Iub/r SWG report

Source: Iub/lur SWG Chairman
Title: Summary lur / Iub SWG

GENERAL

The lur/Iub SWG meeting was held 6-8 July and chaired by Per Willars. The meeting trusted the chairman to take correct notes. The conclusions are fully reported (except all editorial modifications agreed). Only limited discussion is reported.

CONCLUSIONS

The document numbers given below in bold were presented and discussed at the SWG meeting.

4 Letters / reports from other groups

The following incoming LSs were discussed in the SWG.

762 LS from WG2 on Asymmetric reconfiguration.

- Discussed generally. Some questions relating to existence of multiple channel configurations in Node B.
- Ad hoc group with JeanMarie to discuss Thursday night 8 July.

6 General UTRAN Architecture

6.3 Synchronisation

685 Modifications. Presented. Items 1-6 are primarily WG1/2. It was noted on item 1 that we should send a question to WG1 on the necessity of adjustment of Td. Item 7+8 are primarily for WG3. Sent to Sync ad hoc group.

698 Revisions to 25.401. Presented. Sent to Sync ad hoc group.

766 Proposed revisions of Tdoc 698. Presented. Sent to Sync ad hoc group.

687 Presented. Sent to Sync ad hoc group.

688 Presented. Sent to Sync ad hoc group.

777, Report from sync ad hoc group. The report was **accepted** with the note that there was no agreement on benefit of Node Synchronisation. **Decision:** Recommendations 1,2 3, 4 and 7 on changes to 25.401 were accepted.

Conclusion on the sync issue is to proceed as follows:

A study item on SYNC issues is initiated. Björn Ehrstedt is the rapporteur. Focus shall be on agreeing key technical issues for the overall UTRAN synchronisation scheme:

- Node sync: not fully clear whether there is a need to standardise this or not.
- CFN range: Currently 72. Need to be confirmed it is large enough.
- UE measurement of OFF: Network can order this measurement from UE. The broadcasted cell SFN need to have a range corresponding to delay/sync performance of UTRAN procedures.
- Definition of OFF relative to Tm: unclear.
- Initialisation of CFN: open when and how this is done.
- TDD synchronisation issues: open
- HFN knowledge in CRNC for long sleepmode paging: open

There will be a synch ad hoc in parallel to joint meeting 23 august if possible.

13 Iur / Iub General Aspects

13.1 General Aspects and principles of Iur interface (25.420)

587 v0.1.4 including changes from last meeting. **Approved.**

642 Editors proposals. **Approved** with following changes:

- all references to procedure modules being optional or mandatory in 4.2.2 is removed
- change to state that the RNSAP common procedures are between two peer CRNCs.
- Remove note in 4.3.2 that “connectionless RNSAP is FFS”.

13.2 General Aspects and Principles of Iub interface (25.430)

588 Updated 25.430, v 0.1.3. **Approved.**

The chairman requested all editors to include a table in the stability annex of their documents similar to the one in 25.401.

765 Editors proposal. **Approved** with following changes

- Section 5.1: Radio link setup moved to “Traffic management on dedicated channels”.
- Section 6.2.1: Add an “e.g.” before “when a cell site and/or RF carrier....” in second bullet.

13.3 Common channels on Iur – overall concept (Arc/1)

734 RACH/FACH over Iur. **Approved** with following modifications:

- It should be clarified that “RACH/FACH *Iur* data stream” corresponds to the data stream of one UE (and not related to a certain cell or physical channel). The transport bearer used is bidirectional.
- The new DRNTI is introduced at relevant places.
- In step 8, add “, if not using an existing transport bearer.”
- Rename message 11 to Common Transport Channel Release.
- Table in sec 5.1: Move Length indicator to the header. Clarify that Data is one MAC-c SDU.
- Flow control not agreed and is FFS.

699 FACH & DSCH over Iur. **Conclusion:** FACH: see agreement on Tdoc 734. DSCH: not agreed. Which principle to apply for DSCH (capacity reservation vs FACH-like solution) is still open. Decision will depend on QoS requirement of DSCH. Full solution shall be agreed at next meeting, otherwise DSCH over Iur will not be in Release 99.

13.4 New system features

686, CPCH handover. Noone present to present the document.

14 Iur/Iub User-plane protocols

14.1 Iur/Iub DCH data streams (25.427)

596 25.427 v0.2.1 **Revisions approved** with following changes:

Section 7.2, first paragraph: Clarify text by splitting into two sentences. “On the uplink, these frames are not combined - all frames are passed transparently from Node B to the SRNC. On the downlink, the same control frame is copied and sent transparently to all Node Bs from the SRNC.”

672 Frame protocol multiplexing. **Not approved.**

673 Silence detection. **Not approved.** The silence detection needs to be fully clarified at latest next meeting. Otherwise it will be moved to Study items for Future Releases. A **study item** SILENT MODE for this issue is created to study the issue before the next meeting, handled by Fabio Longoni.

634 DL Tx power information **Not approved.**

636 Timing adjustment. **Approved.** Note 1+2 in section 2.2 removed. (Decisions on synchronisation issue may lead to necessary adjustments of text to be included by the editor.)

623 .SSDT **Not approved.**

- Several questions and open issues. Study item SSDT created to continue the discussion. Kiran Thakare is the rapporteur. Complete proposal expected to next meeting. If not agreed this is moved to Study Item for Future Releases.
- Agreed that the Qth would be set by O&M.

604 TDD timing advance. Proposal in section 6.3 **agreed** with removal of “within RRC messages”. WG3 will send a LS to WG1+2 asking whether it is expected from WG3 to support

this on UTRAN protocols (needed if solved on RRC but not if solved on L1 over Uu).

760 Additional measurements for downlink power control. **Agree** to include UL RL quality estimate in addition to used DL power as an example in Dedicated Measurement Initiation Request messages.

14.2 Iub CCH data streams (25.435)

595 25.435 v0.2.1. **Changes approved.** Not stable for raising to 1.0.0.

674 Frame structure of RACH/FACH data streams.

632 Control frame formats for FACH, PCH.

633 Data frame formats for RACH, PCH, FACH.

735 Common channel frame protocols.

Conclusion on 674, 632, 633, 735:

- when a FACH and PCH are multiplexed onto one physical channel on Uu, they are multiplexed onto one transport bearer in the same data frame on Iub.
- There should be complete descriptions in 25.435 of the frame formats, not refer to 25.427.
- Content of FACH/PCH data frame:
 - Frame type: Data frame
 - Cell system frame number
 - TFI for transport block set of FACH and/or TFI for TBS for PCH
 - Transmission power level
 - Payload with FACH TBS and/or PCH TBS
 - Paging Indication Information is included in FACH/PCH data frame payload part in front of the PCH TBS. It is only included in case the TFI indicates there is PCH data to be transmitted.
 - Tail with data frame checksum
- RACH data frame: as in 735 proposal.
- Control frame structure: as Tdoc 632, section 2.2, but change frame type to "Control frame"
- Include Timing adjustment, DL synchronisation and UL synchronisation from section 2.3 of Tdoc 674. Include note from 632 that range of timing adjustment report is frame period*max CFN value; resolution is 1 ms.
- Ericsson, Nokia, Motorola and editor provides exact specification text.

14.3 Iur CCH data streams (25.425)

594 25.425. Not available/not treated. Not updated since last meeting.

15 Iur signalling (RNSAP) (25.423)

591 25.423,v1.1.1 **revisions agreed.** Noted that the use of transaction id should be aligned with RANAP. Agreed to change "RNSAP Common Procedures" to "RNSAP Global Procedures" (also applies to 25.420).

771 stability assessment table **agreed.**

15.1 List of messages

736 Measurements on dedicated resources. **Approved** with modifications:

- rename messages as follows for the dedicated measurement procedure on both NBAP and

RNSAP:

- Dedicated Measurement Initiation Request
- Dedicated Measurement Initiation Response
- Dedicated Measurement Initiation Failure
- Dedicated Measurement Termination Request
- Dedicated Measurement Failure Indication
- Dedicated Measurement Measurement Report
- Also rename messages as follows for the existing common measurement procedure on NBAP:
 - Common Measurement Initiation Request
 - Common Measurement Initiation Response
 - Common Measurement Initiation Failure
 - Common Measurement Termination Request
 - Common Measurement Failure Indication

15.2 Procedure specifications.

744 Node Id. Approved with modifications:

- The identifiers for the CRNC and the PS/CS domain identities, as well as DRNTI, is included in Uplink signalling transfer only when the CRNC does not already have a UE context. These parameters are thus optional.

The editors are in general requested to move condition description (for presence of parameters) from chapter 9.1 to the procedure text, for the cases where the condition is on the logic of the procedure rather than just the presence of other parameters.

680 Paging. The following is agreed:

- Current URA paging request in 25.423 is renamed to "Paging request". Either UCID or URA ID is included. The way to identify the UE (SRNTI and/or DRNTI) is FFS dependent on RRC protocol. The CRNC does not use a possibly existing UE context for the paging procedure.

697 Channel reconfiguration. Approved.

- The editor is asked to change RNS to RNC and to propose text to minimise dependencies to other interfaces, e.g. RRC.

679 Channel reconfiguration. Not approved. Current procedures are enough to handle also unsuccessful cases.

652 DSCH. Approved with modifications:

- DRNTI is included in the RL setup response (instead of current CRNTI).
- No RNTI is included in RL reconfiguration response.
- All proposed DSCH modifications are accepted as Working Assumptions.
- Modifications to both RL reconfiguration (unsynchronised) and RL reconfiguration (synchronised) are accepted as working assumptions.
- Add a note that it is FFS what the restrictions are to add/delete a DSCH.

675 RNSAP parameters for DSCH. Proposal agreed as working assumption with modifications:

- Removal of RAB parameters and DCH-id.
- Also agreed to use separate transport bearers are used over Iur for DCH and DSCH.

737 Coordinated DCHs. Approved.

749 RL setup. Noted. Already covered by Tdoc 744.

15.3 Message contents

654 UARFCN parameter. **Not approved.** WG3 waits for LS response from WG1/2 on multiple carriers per cell.

655 Neighbour cell information. **Approved** with modification:

- Replace Cell Id and CRNC id with UCID (UTRAN cell id).

656 Paging request. **Approved** with modifications:

- Remove Message Discriminator
- Change URA ID to Conditional and add UCID (conditional). Either of URA ID or UCID is included in the message.

659 DL power control. **Not approved.** Further clarifications needed on DL power control.

644 SRNTI removal. **Not approved.** Both SRNTI and DRNTI are needed.

645 Multiple codes. **Noted** that multiple codes, each with its own length, is already supported.

646 Perch Ec/I0. **Not approved.** Noted that initial DL power setting need to be clarified in text.

Generally noted that the meaning of parameters should be unambiguously defined in the procedure text.

647 SRNC relocation commit. **Approved** with changes:

- Include DRNTI instead of CRNTI as optional parameter. Note in procedure text that when a signalling connection does not exist, then the message is sent connectionless and the DRNTI must be included.

15.4 Other issues

649 Message names. **Agreed** that editors of NBAP and RNSAP propose message names to be aligned with the pinciple “XXX Request” , “XXX Response”, “XXX Indication” etc.

16 Iub signalling (NBAP) (25.433)

592 25.433 v1.0.2 **changes agreed** with modifications:

- update UL Eb/N0 parameters modified according to last meetings decisions

657 Editors proposal, 25.423 **agreed.**

658 Power control agreement clarifications. **Approved** with modifications:

- Change “setpoint” to “target”.

16.1 Report from O&M ad hoc group on NBAP procedures

712 Report. Conclusions on recommendations:

- No general LS sent to WG1. Coordination by each company.
- Contributions invited to clarify Transaction Id.
- Currently no capability info is introduced over Iu and Iur. Decision on capability info on Iur and Iu should consider the feature set for Iub.
- T-Mobil proposal has been discussed (see below).
- Remaining Tdocs are to be treated in plenary.

16.2 List of messages

16.3 Procedure specifications

705 Changes from O&M ad hoc.

- The document was modified as follows:

- 8.1.4.1: Remove Performance Thresholds. Add “e.g. performance threshold crossing” to the item on Event-triggered reporting.
- 8.1.9: Capability indication:
 - Included as Working Assumption. Add note: FFS whether in release 99

dependent on the definition of the feature set at the August meeting.

- Remove Protocol version.
- Remove reference to CRNC capabilities in the text and the figure on CRNC initiated Capability indication.
- Add note “There may be a need for initiation of this procedure from the RNC.”
- **Study item** created for Feature set definitions for the Capability indication procedure. Andrew responsible.
- Noted: comments related the lack of use of X731 but no contributions.
- Alcatel objected to approve the document with these changes.
- The document with above changes was agreed as working assumption which will be automatically agreed at next meeting if no counterproposal appears.

739 System information update. **Approved** with modifications:

- Use System Information Update Failure in unsuccessful case.

738 Parallell procedures. **Approved** with modifications:

- Node B can initiate a report at any time fulfilling the reporting criteria given by the measurement request.

610, 676 Radio link failure. **Approved 610** with modifications:

- Remove text about actions in CRNC (“At reception of...”).
- It was noted that the editor should include the message into section 9.1, including also the CRNC communication context id parameter.
- Also 25.423 is updated to remove description of SRNC actions in corresponding procedure.
- RL failure due to loss of synchronisation may need consideration. Contributions invited.

635 Common transport channel measurements. **Approved** as follows:

- Include three bullets under Measurement Type in 8.1.4.1: RACH Load (with text from 635), Downlink cell power load and Uplink interference.
- The proposal on FACH/PCH Overload is not agreed.

16.4 Message contents

740 RL-reconfiguration messages. **Approved** with modifications:

- Keep DCH Type but rename to DCH Priority (also on RNSAP).
- Keep the list of RLs (and RL ID) in Radio Link Reconfiguration Response

741 DL power control. **Approved** with modification:

- Remove Direction information in 9.1 (for other messages as well). Editor is asked to update format of message tables.

648 RL reconfiguration. **Approved** with modifications:

- “Amount of DL channelisation code” and “length of DL channelisation code” removed

Discussion on removal of Message Discriminator: it is not removed, contributions would be needed to remove it.

715 System info update. **Not approved.** Discussion related to termination of RRC in Node B for BCH. A **study item** SYSTEM INFO is started, Kiran responsible. Starting point should be the RRC message contents.

755 Measurements. **Approved.** Note: additional parameters are probably needed (e.g. type of event, threshold parameters, periodicity...). Contributions invited.

16.5 Other issues

711: handled by O&M ad hoc group and reported on agenda item 21.

17 Iur Signalling transport (25.422) ;

No contributions.

18 Iub Signalling transport (25.432)

640, 761 IP based Iub signalling bearer. **Not approved.** Noted that many details are missing.

742 SSCOP service **Agreed** as follows:

- Remove “For all NBAP signalling, “.
- Ericsson will provide a full Change Request

19 Iur/Iub Data transport + Transport network control plane

19.1 Iur/Iub DCH, transport layer (25.426)

616, 618 Not treated in SWG.

19.2 Iub CCH, transport layer (25.434)

19.3 Iur CCH, transport layer (25.424),

20 Implementation specific O&M transport (25.442)

589 v0.0.2. **Approved** with modifications: strike out “at application level” in first paragraph of 4.3.

- Decided to send a LS to SA5 with 25.442. Stephan Recker drafts the LS.

Annex C – Registered Delegates

	First name: Surname: (Initials)	Company:	e-mail: phone: fax:
1.	Juliane	Alcatel	juliane.boccali@alcatel.fr
	Boccali		+33 130773018
2.	Nicolas	Alcatel	nicolas.drevon@alcatel.fr
	Drevon		+33 1 3077 3077
			+33 1 3077 9430
3.	Jörgen	Alcatel	parÿsj@mcd.alcatel.be
	Van Parys		+32 3 450 3682
4.	Richard	BT	richard.townend@bt.com
	Townend		+44 1473 605 429
			+44 1473 623 683
5.	Enrico	CSELT	enrico.scarrone@cse.lt.it
	Scarrone		+39 011 228 7084
			+39 011 228 5520
6.	Anders	Ericsson	anders.bergstrom@emw.ericsson.se
	Bergström		+46 31 747 65 22
			+46 31 706 75 72
7.	David	Ericsson	david.comstock@era.ericsson.se
	Comstock		+46 8 585 31226
			+46 8 404 3597
8.	Björn	Ericsson	bjorn.ehrstedt@wcs.eraj.ericsson.se
	Ehrstedt		+46 8 404 8303
			+46 8 404 3597
9.	Gert-Jan	Ericsson	emngrli@emn.ericsson.se
	van Lieshout		+31 53 4505 406
			+31 53 4505 148
10.	Göran	Ericsson	goran.rune@era.ericsson.se
	Rune		+46 13 284 200
			+46 13 287 373
11.	Per	Ericsson	per.willars@era.ericsson.se
	Willars		+46 87573448
			+46 706521192
12.	Alain G	Ericsson	Alain.maupin@era.ericsson.se
	Maupin	Radio Systems	+46 70 661 6238
13.	Cecile	France Telecom	cecile.appert@cnet.francetelecom.fr
	Appert	CNET	+33 1 45 29 5170
			+33 1 45 29 4399
14.	Akinori	Fujitsu	shima@hcs.ts.fujitsu.co.jp
	Shimamura		+81 44 740 8152
			+81 44 740 8182

	First name: Surname: (Initials)	Company:	e-mail: phone: fax:
15.	Mick	Fujitsu Europe	m.wilson@fujitsu.co.uk
	Wilson	Telecom R&D	+44 181 606 4801
			+44 181 573 3602
16.	Jim	Interdigital	Jim.miller@interdigital.com
	Miller		+ 1 516 622 4071
17.	Massimo	Italtel	massimo.dellacqua@italtel.it
	Dell'Acqua		+39 02 4388 6584
			+39 02 4388 6550
18.	Flavio	Italtel	flavio.piolini@italtel.it
	Piolini		+39 02 43 88 6527
			+39 02 43 88 6550
19.	Takayuki	Japan Telecom	yosi@japan-telecom.co.jp
	Yoshimura		+81 3 5540 2807
			+81 3 5540 2730
20.	Kevin	Lucent	Khegerty@lucent.com
	Hegerty		+44 1793 883163
21.	Stawros	Mannesmann	stawros.orkopoulos@d2privat.de
	Orkopoulos	Mobilfunk	+49 211 533 3783
			+49 211 533 2834
22.	Stephan	Mannesmann	stephan.recker@d2privat.de
	Recker		+49 211 533 3973
			+49 211 533 3948
23.	Sophie	Mitsubishi ITE	Pautonnier@tcl.ite.mee.com
	Pautonnier		+33 2 99 84 26 36
			+33 2 99 84 21 15
24.	Beena	Motorola	connorsb@cig.mot.com
	Connors		+1 847 632 7866
			+1 847 435 5120
25.	Kethees	Motorola	Ketheesan@mot.com
	Ketheesan		+1 847 632 3585
26.	Elliot	Motorola	Stewrtem@cig.mot.com
	Stewart		+ 1 847 632 7590
27.	Cheng Hock	NEC	ngcheng@mcs.abk.nec.co.jp
	Ng		+81 471 85 7171
			+81 471 85 6863
28.	Kalle	Nokia – Japan	kalle.ahmavaara@nokia.com
	Ahmavaara		+81 3 5510 0803
			+81 3 5510 0801
29.	Jyrki	Nokia	jyrki.jussila@nokia.com
	Jussila		+358 9 51138436

	First name: Surname: (Initials)	Company:	e-mail: phone: fax:
			+358 9 51138452
30.	Sami	Nokia	sami.kekki@nokia.com
	Kekki		+358 40 570 2350
			+358 9 5112 3600
31.	Pekka	Nokia	pekka.konja@nokia.com
	Konja		+358 9 511 38396
			+358 9 511 38452
32.	Fabio	Nokia	fabio.longoni@nokia.com
	Longoni		+358 40 568 9884
			+358 9 5113 8452
33.	Atte	Nokia	atte.lansisalmi@nokia.com
	Länsisalmi		+358 9 4376 6587
			+358 9 4376 6850
34.	Terhi	Nokia	terhi.virtanen@nokia.com
	Virtanen		+358 8 565 4354
			+358 8 565 5140
35.	Jean-Marie	Nortel Networks	calmel@nortelnetworks.com
	Calmel		+33 1 39 44 52 82
			+33 1 39 44 50 12
36.	Patrick	Nortel Networks	pjohnson@nortelnetworks.com
	Johnson		+ 1 972 684 7376
			+ 1 972 684 3775
37.	Pierre	Nortel Networks	lescuyer@nortelnetworks.com
	Lescuyer		+33 1 39 44 44 86
			+33 1 39 44 50 02
38.	Hidenori	NTT DoCoMo	asaba@nw.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
	Asaba		+81 468 40 3332
39.	Hazuhibo	NTT DoCoMo	Hara@opdev.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
	Hara		+81 468 40 3262
			+81 468 40 3765
40.	Masafumi	NTT DoCoMo	Hata@wsp.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
	Hata		+81 468 40 3220
			+81 468 40 3840
41.	Nobutaka	NTT DoCoMo	Nobu@wsp.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
	Ishikawa		+81 468 40 3220
			+81 468 40 3840
42.	Fumitoshi	NTT DoCoMo	Yamada@opdev.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
	Yamada		+81 468 40 3261
			+81 468 40 3765
43.	Achim V.	Siemens	Achim.brandt@icn.siemens.de
	Brandt		+49 89 722 41981
			+49 89 722 24450
44.	Wolfgang	Siemens	wolfgang.hultsch@icn.siemens.de

	First name: Surname: (Initials)	Company:	e-mail: phone: fax:
	Hultsch		+49 89 722 43717
			+49 89 722 21882
45.	Ian Phillips	Siemens	Ian.phillips@roke.co.uk
		Roke Manor	+44 1794 833 652
			+44 1794 833 434
46.	Michael Schopp	Siemens	michael.schopp@icn.siemens.de
			+49 89722 43039
47.	Steve Winstanley	Siemens Roke Manor	
			+44 1794 833 106
			+44 1794 833 434
48.	Frances Thomson	Symbionics	frances@cadence.com
			+44 1506 595 196
			+44 1506 595 959
49.	Zhongrong Liu	T-Mobil	zhongrong.liu@t-mobil.de
			+49 228 936 1406
			+49 228 936 1245
50.	Josep Casals	Telecom Modus	josep.casals@t-modus.nec.co.uk
			+44 1372 804 827
			+44 1372 804 804
51.	Kiran Thakare	Telecom Modus	+44 1372 804 826
			+44 1372 804 804
			kiran.thakare@t-modus.nec.co.uk
52.	Magnus Aldén	Telia	magnus.x.alden@telia.se
			+46 8 713 8108
			+46 8 713 8199
53.	Monica Avattaneo	TIM	mavattaneo@tim.it
			+39 06 3900 9095
			+39 06 3900 9315
54.	Andrew De La Torre	Vodafone	andrew.delatorre@vf.vodafone.co.uk
			+44 1635 503128
			+44 1635 503969
55.	Brendan Mc Williams	Vodafone	brendan.mcwilliams@vf.vodafone.co.uk
			+44 1635 506264
			+44 1635 523615

Annex D – Document List

Number	Document	Source
R3-99585	25.401	Editor
R3-99586	25.410	Editor
R3-99587	25.420	Editor
R3-99588	25.430	Editor
R3-99589	25.442	Editor
R3-99590	25.413	Editor
R3-99591	25.423	Editor
R3-99592	25.433	Editor
R3-99593	25.415	Editor
R3-99594	25.425	Editor
R3-99595	25.435	Editor
R3-99596	25.427	Editor
R3-99597	25.931	Editor
R3-99598	25.832	Editor
R3-99599	30.531	Editor
R3-99600	25.831	Editor
R3-99601	I3.05	Editor
R3-99602	Draft Agenda #5	Chairman
R3-99603	Draft Minutes #4	Secretary
R3-99604	Timing advance for TDD	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99605	1st Draft Agenda for O&M Ad Hoc Meeting #3	Rapporteur
R3-99606	XXXX	Chairman
R3-99607		Motorola
R3-99608		Motorola
R3-99609		Motorola
R3-99610	NBAP Procedure for Radio Link Failure	Motorola
R3-99611		Motorola
R3-99612	Proposed Example Procedure of RRC Connection Re-establishment on RACH/FACH	Sugiyama
R3-99613		Motorola
R3-99614		Motorola
R3-99615		Motorola
R3-99616		Motorola
R3-99617		Motorola
R3-99618	Iur ALCAP Signalling Bearer (Agenda Item 13.1/19.1)	Motorola
R3-99619	Required NBAP Procedures for Cellular Network Configuration' - Vodafone and Mannesmann, Agenda item 4& 8	Vodafone
R3-99620	Required NBAP Procedures for Remote Node B Upgrade' - Vodafone and Mannesmann, Agenda item 4& 8	Vodafone
R3-99621	Proposal for NBAP Procedures' - Vodafone, Agenda item 4	Vodafone
R3-99622	GSM to UMTS Handover	Telecom Modus
R3-99623	SSDT	Telecom Modus
R3-99624	WITHDRAWN	Fujitsu
R3-99625	Proposed Example Procedure of DL Physical Channel Reconfiguration	Fujitsu
R3-99626	Proposed Example Procedure of Channel Type Switching from RACH/FACH to RACH/PCH	Fujitsu

Number	Document	Source
R3-99627		Kita
R3-99628		Nokia
R3-99629		NTT DoCoMo
R3-99630		Kita
R3-99631	Message type definition	Lucent Technologies
R3-99632	Iub Control Frames for FACH, PCH - (AI - 14.2)	Motorola
R3-99633	Iub Data Frames for RACH, PCH, FACH - (AI - 14.2)	Motorola
R3-99634	Node B DL TX Power Information over the Iub - (AI - 14.1)	Motorola
R3-99635	Measurements on Common Transport Channels - (AI - 16.3)	Motorola
R3-99636	Procedure for Sending Timing Adjustment DCH Control frames (AI - 14.1)	Motorola
R3-99637		Motorola
R3-99638	CN Distribution Function	Siemens
R3-99639	Working Assumptions for Encoding Rules	Siemens
R3-99640		Telia
R3-99641		Telia
R3-99642	TS 25.420 'UTRAN Iur Interface: General Aspects & Principles'	Lucent
R3-99643	Separating RRC and MM specific parts of the MS classmark for Compatibility to the 2nd Generation System such as GSM or PDC	Fujitsu
R3-99644	Deletion of S-RNTI for RL setup message	Fujitsu
R3-99645	Necessity of the specific parameter on the amount of Channelization Code	Fujitsu
R3-99646	Deletion of Perch Ec/Io for RL setup, RL reconf etc	Fujitsu
R3-99647	Proposed modification for parameters of SRNC Relocation Commit	Fujitsu
R3-99648	Proposed parameters for RL reconfiguratiuon messages	Fujitsu
R3-99649	Editorial Modifications for RNSAP message names	Fujitsu
R3-99650	Turbo Charger impacts on UTRAN	Nortel networks
R3-99651	Multiple RAB Relocation procedure failure	Nortel networks
R3-99652	DSCH Handling over Iub and Iur	Nortel networks
R3-99653	Definition of performance parameters of AAL2 protocol within UTRAN	Nortel networks
R3-99654		NTT DoCoMo
R3-99655		NTT DoCoMo
R3-99656		NTT DoCoMo
R3-99657		NTT DoCoMo
R3-99658		NTT DoCoMo
R3-99659		NTT DoCoMo
R3-99660	Rational for Defining Lossless Relocation in UMTS Release 99 (Agenda item 6.1)	Nokia
R3-99661	Cell Identificaton in UTRAN (Agenda item 6.2)	Nokia
R3-99662	Modification of RNTI Definitions (Agenda item 6.2)	Nokia
R3-99663	Clarification of UTRAN Synchronisation Model and Details Required for Iur and Iub Specifications(Agenda item 6.3)	Nokia
R3-99664	RNC Classmark and Optionality of Iur Interface (Agenda item 6.6)	Nokia
R3-99665	Lossless Relocation operation and requirements for protocols (Agenda item 7)	Nokia
R3-99666	RAB Assignment RANAP procedure (Agenda item 10.3)	Nokia

Number	Document	Source
R3-99667	RANAP ASN.1 structure (agenda items 6.8 and 10.5)	Nokia
R3-99668	RNSAP ASN.1 structure (agenda items 6.8 and 15.4)	Nokia
R3-99669	NBAP ASN.1 structure (agenda items 6.8 and 16.5)	Nokia
R3-99670	Message contents for the remaining RANAP procedures (Agenda item 10.4)	Nokia
R3-99671	Support of RACH/FACH data streams over the Iur interface (Agenda item 6.6)	Nokia
R3-99672	Frame protocol multiplexing (Agenda item 14.1)	Nokia
R3-99673	Signaling for silence detection procedure (Agenda item 14.1)	Nokia
R3-99674	Frame structure of RACH/FACH data streams (Agenda item 14.2)	Nokia
R3-99675	RNSAP parameters for the support of DSCH (Agenda item 15.3)	Nokia
R3-99676	NBAP RL Failure Procedure (Agenda item 16.3)	Nokia
R3-99677	List of RANAP Procedures and Messages (Agenda item 10.2)	Nokia
R3-99678	CN or RNC reset when connection to two CN domains	Alcatel
R3-99679	Physical channel reconfiguration failure in DRNC	Alcatel
R3-99680	Removal of unsynchronised RL reconfiguration procedure	Alcatel
R3-99681	Cell Update procedure over Iur	Alcatel
R3-99682	Radio Connection concept	Alcatel
R3-99683	Data Retrieve sequence charts for SRNS relocation	Alcatel
R3-99684	Report of the e-mail discussion on Data Retrieve procedure	Alcatel
R3-99685	Radio Interface Synchronisation	Alcatel
R3-99686	Firm Handover over CPCH	Golden Bridge Tech.
R3-99687		Nobutaka ISHIKAWA NTT DoCoMo
R3-99688		Nobutaka ISHIKAWA NTT DoCoMo
R3-99689		Nobutaka ISHIKAWA NTT DoCoMo
R3-99690	Inter-Node B (Intra-RNS) Hard Handover	Inter Digital
R3-99691	Inter-Node B Hard Handover	Inter Digital
R3-99692	Physical Channel Reconfiguration (Agenda Item: 7)	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99693	Physical Channel Reconfiguration (CRNC Controlled) (Agenda Item: 7)	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99694	Synchronised Transport Channel Reconfiguration (Agenda Item: 7)	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99695	Unsynchronised Transport Channel Reconfiguration (Agenda Item: 7)	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99696	RRC Connection Re-establishment with SRNC Relocation (Agenda Item: 7)	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99697	Text for Physical Channel Configuration (Agenda Item: 7)	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99698	Proposed revision of TS 25.401 (Agenda Item: 6.1)	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99699	Mechanisms for the support of Common Transport Channels on Iur (Agenda Item: 19.3)	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99700	Study Item (ARC/3) Overall Delay Budget within the Access Stratum - Status Report (Agenda Item: 6.5)	Siemens/Italtel
R3-99701		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99702		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc

Number	Document	Source
R3-99703		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99704		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99705		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99706		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99707		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99708		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99709		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99710		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99711		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99712		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99713		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99714		RAN-WG3 O&M Ad Hoc
R3-99715	broadcast info	Telecom Modus
R3-99716	srnc relocation	Telecom Modus
R3-99717		Ericsson
R3-99718		Ericsson
R3-99719		Ericsson
R3-99720		Ericsson
R3-99721		Ericsson
R3-99722		Ericsson
R3-99723		Ericsson
R3-99724		Ericsson
R3-99725		Ericsson
R3-99726		Ericsson
R3-99727		Ericsson
R3-99728		Ericsson
R3-99729		Ericsson
R3-99730		Ericsson
R3-99731		Ericsson
R3-99732		Ericsson
R3-99733		Ericsson
R3-99734		Ericsson
R3-99735		Ericsson
R3-99736		Ericsson
R3-99737		Ericsson
R3-99738		Ericsson
R3-99739		Ericsson
R3-99740		Ericsson
R3-99741		Ericsson
R3-99742		Ericsson
R3-99743		Ericsson

Number	Document	Source
R3-99744		Ericsson
R3-99745	Reloaction Cancel Procedure Agenda Item: 10.3	NEC
R3-99746	Relocation Failure Procedure Agenda Item: 10.3	NEC
R3-99747	Parameters Radio Access Bearer ID and NAS Binding Information in RAB Assignment message Agenda Item:10.4	NEC
R3-99748	The contents of the Location Reporting Control and Location Report Message Agenda Item: 10.4	NEC
R3-99749	LAI and RAI in the RANAP:RL Setup / Addition Response message Agenda Item: 15.2	NEC
R3-99750	New Procedure and Messages for RANAP	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99751	Overload Control Procedure	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99752	Liaison Statement on Identification of Multicall Bearers	TSG N1
R3-99753	RNSAP Signalling	Telecom Modus
R3-99754	RANAP Signalling	Telecom Modus
R3-99755	NBAP Signalling	Telecom Modus
R3-99756	CTCH on the Iur	Vodafone Ltd
R3-99757	UTRAN Paging	Vodafone Ltd
R3-99758		Nortel networks
R3-99759		Nortel networks
R3-99760		Nortel networks
R3-99761		Nortel networks
R3-99762		Nortel networks
R3-99763	Health check on Iu I/F	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99764	Traffic control for active calls	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99765	Proposed changes to 25.430 UTRAN Iub General Aspects and Principles V0.1.3	Editor (Fujitsu)
R3-99766	Proposed revision of R3-99698	Nokia
R3-99767	LS to R1, R2, R3 on Support of Speech Service in RAN	TSG-S4
R3-99768	Liaison statement to S2, S2 QoS SWG, R3, Cc: R1, R2, on Error resilience in real-time packet multimedia payloads	TSG-S4
R3-99769	Draft LS on use of Ciphering Mode Command as a CM Service Accept	TSG CN1
R3-99770	draft overview text of the FDD DS-CDMA radio I/f to be inserted in ITU-R IMT.RSPEC	TSG RAN ITU Ad Hoc
R3-99771	RNSAP Stability Assessment	Editor
R3-99772	PLMN, RNC and Cell ID definitions	Ericsson
R3-99773	draft LS to S4 on support of speech service service in UTRAN	RAN3
R3-99774	Proposal from Relocation Ad Hoc	Rapporteur (BT)
R3-99775	Report from the Helsinki O&M Ad Hoc	Rapporteur (Vodafone)
R3-99776	Revised Sequence charts of user data retrieve at SRNS relocation for IP domain	Alcatel
R3-99777	Draft Report from Synch Ad Hoc	Rapporteur (Siemens)
R3-99778	LS from CN3 on CS data	N3
R3-99779	Ad Hoc Overall Delay Budget in AS	Rapporteur (Italtel)
R3-99780	Draft Answer to LS Statement on ID of Multicall Bearers	Telecom Modus
R3-99781	Draft LS to CN1 regarding Cipher Mode Command	Nokia
R3-99782	Draft Response to LS on use of Ciphering Mode Command as CM Service Accept	Vodafone Ltd
R3-99783	Definition of Logical O&M	Mannesmann
R3-99784	Draft LS on CN Domain Identifiers used over the Iu & Iur	Ericsson

Number	Document	Source
	interfaces	
R3-99785	Summary lur/b SWG	lur/b SWG Chairman
R3-99786	Summary lu SWG	lu SWG Chairman
R3-99787	Ad Hoc on Examples of Signalling Procedures (for lur/lub)	Rapporteur
R3-99788	Draft LS to SA5	Mannesmann
R3-99789	Draft LS to N2 on Turbo charger feasibility	Nortel networks
R3-99790	Proposed LS on ciphering mechanisms in case of multiple RABs (to S3)	Nortel networks
R3-99791	LS to R2&3 on R99 MSC issues with 04.08	N1
R3-99792	LS on CM SERVICE REQUEST for multi-call	N1
R3-99793	LS on paging response classification	N1
R3-99794	Draft Reply to CN1 on MSC Interworking issues	Vodafone Ltd
R3-99795	Draft Reply to CN1 on CM-SERVICE-REQUEST	Fujitsu
R3-99796	Draft Reply to CN1 on Paging Response	Fujitsu
R3-99797	Draft LS to SA1, SA2 and R2 on UTRAN Delay Budget	Italtel
R3-99798	Updated CR	Motorola
R3-99799	Draft LS on GTP SAP and primitives	ran3
R3-99800	Revised report of delay budget ad hoc	Rapporteur (Italtel)
R3-99801	Draft LS on Timing Advance for TDD	Siemens
R3-99802	Draft LS assymmetric reconfiguration procedure - feasibility on lub/lur	Nortel networks
R3-99803	I3.05 to SA5	Vodafone Ltd
R3-99804	Definition of Logical O&M	Vodafone Ltd
R3-99805	Revised report of delay budget ad hoc	Rapporteur (Italtel)