

---

**Agenda item:**        **3**  
**Source:**             Nokia  
**Title:**               **Text proposals for TS 25.211 V2.4.1**  
**Document for:**     Approval

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this contribution several corrections are proposed to TS 25.211 V2.4.1. The intention is to make the specification more clear and remove some ambiguities. The proposed changes are summarized in chapter 2 and the detailed text proposals are presented in chapter 3.

## 2. SUMMARY OF THE CORRECTIONS

Page	Chapter/ paragraph	Item	Contents in the text proposal
8,10	5.2.1/Figure 1 and Table 2	It is not clear whether figure 1 or table 2 defines the correct field order.	Table 2 updated, so that TPC field is in the last column.
19, 26	5.3.2, 5.3.3.3/ Table 10, Tables 14 and 15	The star * and the note under table 10, 14 and 15 says: "If no TFCI, then the TFCI field is blank." => not very clear what this means.	The note revised: the word DTX used instead of the word blank and sentence slightly modified.
20	5.3.2/ 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph after table 12	In the case of "different CCTrCH" => should be replaced by "several CCTrCH". The possibility that different spreading factors can be used for each CCTrCH is now said a bit unclearly	"different CCTrCH" replaced by "several CCTrCHs"  The sentence also modified to include that "different spreading factors can be used for each CCTrCH".
23	5.3.3.1/ text under figure 14	The 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence just under figure 14 is ambiguous.	The word: "additionally" deleted to make the text more clear
25	5.3.3.3/ 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph under figure 17	Sentence: "The FACH and PCH can be mapped to the same or to separate Secondary CCPCHs".  => It is not clear from this sentence that they can be mapped to the same frame also.	A sentence added so that it is understood that if FACH and PCH are mapped to the same SCCPCH, they can be mapped to the same frame.
27	5.3.3.3/ paragraph under table 16.	The text says: "this correspondence is renegotiated at each FACH/PCH removal".  => What does this renegotiation mean? Does it mean information on BCH?	The sentence modified to include that the transport formats are informed on BCH.
28	5.3.3.4/2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph under Figure 18.	There should be 64 code groups + 8 long codes per each group. This is not yet updated to the text.	Text updated: -> 32 code groups changed to 64 code groups -> 16 long codes per group changed to 8 long codes per group
29	5.3.3.5.1/last paragraph	Sentence: "DSCH may consist of multiple parallel codes as well as negotiated at higher layer prior to starting data transmission."  => Sentence not clear	"as well" deleted and sentence slightly modified

3. DETAILED TEXT PROPOSALS

Following text proposal proposes to change only the column order. The contents of the table are not proposed to be changed.

-----Start text proposal-----

**Table 1: DPCCH fields**

Slot Format #I	Channel Bit Rate (kbps)	Channel Symbol Rate (ksps)	SF	Bits/ Frame	Bits/ Slot	N <sub>pilot</sub>	N <sub>TFCI</sub>	N <sub>FBI</sub>	N <sub>TP</sub> c
0	15	15	256	150	10	6	2	0	2
1	15	15	256	150	10	8	0	0	2
2	15	15	256	150	10	5	2	1	2
3	15	15	256	150	10	7	0	1	2
4	15	15	256	150	10	6	0	2	2
5	15	15	256	150	10	5	2	2	1

-----End text proposal-----

Following text proposal is valid for text below tables 10, 14 and 15.

-----Start text proposal-----

~~\* If no TFCI, then the TFCI field is blank.~~

\* If TFCI bits are not used, then DTX shall be used in TFCI field

-----End text proposal-----

Following text proposal is for text in chapter 5.3.2 (3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph below the Table 12.).

-----Start text proposal-----

In the case of ~~different~~ several CCTrCHs of dedicated type for one UE different spreading factors ~~could~~ can be used for each CCTrCH and only one DPCCH would be transmitted for them in the downlink.

-----End text proposal-----

Following text proposal is for text in chapter 5.3.3.1 (just below the Figure 14).

-----Start text proposal-----

~~Additionally~~ There are two types of Common pilot channels, the primary and secondary, they differ in their use and there are some limitations placed on their physical features.

-----End text proposal-----

Following text proposal is for text in chapter 5.3.3.3 (beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph below the Figure 17).

-----**Start text proposal**-----

The FACH and PCH can be mapped to the same or to separate Secondary CCPCHs. If FACH and PCH are mapped to the same Secondary CCPCH, they can be mapped to the same frame.

The main difference between a CCPCH and a downlink dedicated physical channel is that a CCPCH is not inner-loop power controlled. ...

-----**End text proposal**-----

Following text proposal is for text in chapter 5.3.3.4 (last sentence in second paragraph below the Figure 18).

-----**Start text proposal**-----

~~32~~ 64 sequences are used to encode the ~~32~~ 64 different code groups each containing ~~168~~ scrambling codes.

-----**End text proposal**-----

Following text proposal is for text in chapter 5.3.3.3 (second sentence in paragraph below the Table 16).

-----**Start text proposal**-----

For slot formats using TFCI, the TFCI value in each radio frame corresponds to a certain transport format combination of the FACHs and/or PCHs currently in use. This correspondence is (re-)negotiated at each FACH/PCH addition/removal.

For slot formats using TFCI, the TFCI value in each radio frame corresponds to a certain transport format combination of the FACHs and/or PCHs currently in use. This broadcast information (transport format combination) is updated by BCH at each FACH/PCH addition/removal.

-----**End text proposal**-----

Following text proposal is for text in chapter 5.3.3.5.1 (second sentence in last paragraph).

-----**Start text proposal**-----

DSCH may consist of multiple parallel codes ~~as well as~~ negotiated at higher layer prior to starting of the data transmission.

-----**End text proposal**-----