

Agenda Item: -
Source: Secretary
Title: Draft minutes of WG1 #12 meeting
Document for: Approval

Draft Minutes for 3GPP TSG-RAN WG1 12th Meeting

Meeting start: April 10th, 2000, in Seoul, Korea

1. 9.00 – 12.30 Joint Ad Hoc with TSG RAN WG1 and TSG RAN WG2 on UE capabilities

Day 1, started at 14.09

2. Opening of the meeting

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

3. Approval of agenda (R1-00-0528)

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

- 1) Agenda item 1. “9.00 – 12.30 Joint Ad Hoc with TSG RAN WG1 and TSG RAN WG2 on UE capabilities” had been held in the morning session.
- 2) The agenda item for the approval of the minutes had been removed from the agenda. Chairman stated that the minutes should be considered as approved by correspondence unless somebody raises some particle issues. He added that this is the practice used in the RAN and we would use this practice here as well.

Agenda was approved with no comment. (14:16)

4. Report from TSG RAN#7 (R1-00-0530)

This document was not distributed at the time of the presentation. Chairman presented this on the screen.

- 1) **All CRs that presented to TSG RAN were approved**
Discussion took place on 2 CRs but all were eventually approved (WG3 did not have support for 0-size transport block)
- 2) **The CPICH SIR CR pending from RAN#6 was not approved** based on the conclusion from TSG RAN WG4 discussions.
- 3) **Release 2000 work items**
Following work/study items were approved:
 - High speed downlink packet access
The focus is more for release 2001 rather than release 2000. We are supposed to do feasibility study on those issues during this year and then present that to the TSG RAN. Regarding how we should do with this report (practical form of the report), a possible joint technical report in RAN level has been already mentioned in RAN as one option which will be maybe maintained in RAN WG2 like the UE capabilities where RAN WG1 provide contents or vice versa.
 - Improvement of interfrequency and intersystem measurement → For us, this is “Compressed Mode”.
 - Node B Synchronisation for TDD
 - Radio link performance enhancements (Study Item)
(Example) Power control enhancement or Tx diversity requirements or something.
 - TDD Low Chip rate option
 - Hybrid ARQ II/III
 - Terminal power saving features
(Example) uplink control channel gating
 - Feasibility Study for Improved Common DL Channel for Cell FACH State (Study Item)
 - Uplink Synchronous Transmission (Study Item)
 - Support of Location Services in UTRA FDD

- Support of Location Services in UTRA TDD

Q. Which is the work item that corresponds to solution of FAUSCH ?

A. At this point, no such work item is existing in RAN

Q. Was the item "high speed downlink packet access" feasibility study ?

A. The work item that was proposed and approved was to do a feasibility study.

4) **Release '99 Open Items (WG1)**

Earlier open items were reported to be concluded.

- Compressed mode by puncturing with flexible positions. This was decided to be part of Release 2000 work.

- Out-of-synch parameters can be configured by higher layers. (default values valid otherwise)

5) **Release '99 Open Items (RAN)**

- Support of soft handover during active compressed mode pattern (WG3)

- CPCH (WG3)

- Completion of DL power control behaviour in Node B (WG1+ WG3)

- Support for cell- and RTT-based positioning on Iur/Iub (WG3)

- DSCH and USCH on Iur (WG3)

- Performance specifications (WG4)

- RRM performance specifications (WG4)

- Power Control (WG4)

6) **RAN WG1 Technical reports**

TR 25.944 Multiplexing and channel coding examples was approved by TSG RAN and now version is 3.0.0.

→ Under CR procedure

Regarding the production of release 2000 specifications, chairman stated as follows.

For any specifications, version 4 which is supposed to indicate release 2000, will not be created before the Change Requests for those specifications are provided by the respective WGs. It should be noted that on the event that there is any CR provided for version 4, all the correction and clarification type of CRs for release '99 specifications need to be provided separately also for release 2000 specifications. Therefore unless there is very strong needs for some particle issues, we would not submit release 2000 Change Request for WG1 specifications to RAN until September. In that case we avoid at this phase creating duplicate CRs for release '99 and release 2000. Only after June RAN, we would create double version of CRs for all these corrections and stuff like that for the RAN in September. We can of course consider things agreed in principle but it is not necessary the best use of time here or in RAN, too to have CRs for version 4 approved before September. This does not mean that the work should not start until September. The intention is that we would not send Change Request for RAN approval until September. We can have things agreed here or draft CRs but we would not send them for RAN approval. This is just an interface matter between RAN and us. It is not supposed to impact on our internal working milestones. How to handle this is up to us, but from the support team point of view it may well be considered desirable if we would not rush too early because this prevent them from duplicated work.

If there is a specification for which we do not produce CR at all during this year, we need to make separately decision that we inform RAN that this is the valid specification for release 2000 as well. If we do not indicate anything, RAN will not update the specifications to version 4.

5. TSG RAN WG1 work organisation (15:07-)

5.1 Year 2000 work plan

R1-00-0529 Revised TSG RAN WG1 time plan for Year 2000 / Source : RAN WG1 Chairman

This would be revised and presented in RANWG1 #13 and finally submitted to RAN #8 sourced as RAN WG1.

No.	Items	Work/ Study	Result/ Summary	CRs	Reference	Notes
1	TDD 1.28 Mchips functionality	Work Item		RAN #9	RP-000057 RP-000191	(*1)
2	Terminal power saving features	Work Item	RAN #8	RAN #9	RP-000189	(*2)
3	Improvement of interfrequency and intersystem measurement	Work Item	RAN #8	RAN #9	RP-000180	
4	High speed downlink packet access	Study Item	RAN #10		RP-000032	Release 2001
5	Hybrid ARQ II/III	Work Item	RAN #8	RAN # 9	RP-000054	
6	Radio link performance enhancements	Study Item		RAN #9	RP-000181	(*3)
7	Feasibility Study for Improved Common DL Channel for Cell FACH State	Study Item	RAN #8	RAN #10	RP-000190	
8	Support of Location Services in UTRA (FDD&TDD)	Work Item	RAN #9		RP-000053	
9	Node B Synchronisation for UTRA TDD	Work Item	RAN #9		RP-000055	
10	Uplink Synchronous Transmission	Study Item	RAN #8	RAN #10	RP-000139	(*4)

- (*1) It is RAN#8 decisions whether to reflect the issue in the existing TDD (Rel.00) specifications or to create 1.28 Mchips/s specific specifications. CRs for approval would be submitted in RAN #9 & RAN #10 with main part of the CRs in RAN#9. New specifications (if any) would go under CR procedure from RAN #9 onwards (i.e. version 4.0.0 after RAN #9)
- (*2) Techniques like DPCCCH gating & Paging channel configuration change indicator have been raised earlier in TSG RAN WG1.
- (*3) This includes TX diversity enhancements and power control improvements with DCH or DSCH.
- (*4) Q. Is the study item just some sort of study to provide RAN the recommendation from us whether the whole work item should go ahead or not ?
(Chairman answered)
In RAN level that is probably true. I guess *uplink synchronous transmission* is something that we had more or less covered in our specifications already but other WGs did nothing on that so far. Therefore other WGs should take a look on the issue and understand what it is. Basically we do not necessary do that much here new work but we need to be consistent and we can not send CRs before other WGs have done their part of the issues. In some sense we need to be able to motivate the other WGs to do their part as well. Some kind of results which we produce may be useful to motivate other WGs.

5.2 Ad Hocs for Release 2000 work

Current Ad Hocs numbers were cancelled and reorganized as follows mainly for the e-mail discussion purposes.

- AH21 : TDD 1.28 Mchips functionality (TR) (*1)
- AH22 : Terminal power saving features
- AH23 : Compressed mode (→ *Improvement of interfrequency and intersystem measurement*)
- AH24 : High-speed downlink packet access (*2)
- AH25 : Hybrid ARQ II/III (*2)
- AH26 : Tx-diversity (*3)
- AH27 : Radio link performance enhancements
- AH28 : Improved Common DL Channel for Cell FACH State
- AH29 : Positioning (→ *Support of Location Services in UTRA (FDD&TDD)*)
- AH30 : TDD Node B Synchronisation
- AH31 : Uplink Synchronous Transmission
- AH99 : Release 99 corrections

- (*1) This Ad Hoc focuses on the technical report for June (near term). This the reason of having separate AH number. Since it is quite clear that this Technical Report is supposed to describe the narrow band TDD and present the *differences* to the wide band TDD, those issues like Hybrid ARQ or Positioning or stuff like that which are not intended to go directly for this Technical Report should be treated in the separate Ad Hocs. The items, which should go on this report, should go on this AH21.
- (*2) AH24 and AH25 are partly overlapping. If there is something relating to both, AH24&AH25 should be put in the e-mail title.
- (*3) Tx-diversity issue is the part of *Radio link performance enhancements* but allocated separate AH number because quite a lot of e-mail discussions have been done so far on this topic.

Chairman stated regarding the physical Ad Hoc meetings.

If we are supposed to have physical Ad Hocs during the meeting, in order for the chairman to allocate the physical Ad Hocs beforehand and to inform about that, chairman needs to see whether there is sufficient number of contributions beforehand. If people have topics for which the physical Ad Hoc is considered to make sense, they need to make sure that all the contributions available in time.

As for the TS 25.215, only the measurement ranges are supposed to be moved from RAN WG1 to RAN WG4.

voice on IP

6. Identification of the incoming liaison statements and actions in the answering

	Title	Source	To/Cc	Tdoc No.	Forwarded To	Notes
1	Response (to TSG-RAN WG1, copy TSG-RAN WG4) to LS (R1-000189) on "Need for compressed mode" Capability	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0384	Plenary	Noted
2	Response (to TSG-RAN WG3, copy TSG-RAN WG1) to LS (R3-000396) on Service Mapping	RAN WG2	CC	R1-00-0385	Plenary	Noted
3	Response to LS (R1-000191) on Out-of-Synch and DTX	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0477	Plenary	Noted
4	LS on Information on the measurement filtering model	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0478	Plenary	Noted
5	Liaison Statement on STTD Indicator in RRC messages	RAN WG3	TO	R1-00-0479	Plenary	Pending (*1)
6	Liaison Statement on DL Power ramping	RAN WG3	TO	R1-00-0480	R1/R3 Joint Session	(*2)
7	Response Liaison to WG1 on radio link synchronisation	RAN WG3	TO	R1-00-0481	Plenary	To be revisited (*3)
8	Response to LS on SoLSA support on UTRAN	RAN WG4	CC	R1-00-0482	Plenary	Noted
9	Liaison Statement on Uplink BLER measurement	RAN WG4	CC	R1-00-0483	Plenary	Postponed (*4)
10	LS on the CPICH SIR measurement	RAN WG4	CC	R1-00-0484	Plenary	Noted
11	LS on UE/MS idle mode operation	SA WG1	CC	R1-00-0485	Plenary	Noted
12	Response to LS (R4-000322) on Uplink BLER measurement	RAN WG2	TO	R1-00-0615	Plenary	R2-000906 (*5)
13	LS on Usage of FDD SIR measurements in release 99 RAN2 specifications	RAN WG2	CC	R1-00-0616	Plenary	R2-000907 (*6)

(*1) In this LS, RAN WG3 asked following question.

Is it expected that there will be an unacceptable performance degradation if the UE is not provided with an indication of the STTD status for cells on which it has to perform neighbouring cell measurements or could providing this information be seen as an optimisation of the UE performance ?

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that we should examine this issue well before we make an answer to RAN3. Partly because this problem has a relation to the WG1 CR which we agreed about 2 meetings ago in which the use of transmit diversity was set mandatory on any of the common channels when transmit diversity is used on one channel in order for the UE to determine whether the transmit diversity is used or not. (though it was for the measurement in idle mode and not necessary for the measurements for neighbor cells.)

Chairman agreed with this comment and set this conclusion as "pending". He added that he would check with his colleagues in RAN WG3 what the problem there is. Chairman encouraged people to propose answers if they have any ideas.

(*2) Some questions were made. Chairman proposed this to be discussed in the R1/R3 joint session on Day2.

(*3) We need to answer the suitable value ranges for the parameters T_RLFAILURE, N_OUTSYNC_IND, and N_INSYNC_IND. Chairman suggested to discuss this later in the out-of-synch related issues.

(After all the answer LS was drafted by Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö(Ericsson) **R1-00-0593** → **R1-00-0608**. See section 14)

(*4) Ms. Sarah Boumendil (Nortel) made a comment for clarification that the purpose of this liaison is to clarify how the transport channel BER should be understood. There is currently inconsistency between the specifications regarding the transport channel BLER. In TS 25.215, it is defined to be reported with certain resolution but this transport channel BLER does not appear in the NBAP specification. The only thing that exist is in the DCH frame protocol and the only thing that could correspond the transport channel BLER is CRC indication.

Discussion was made how we should treat this problem.

We had better remove the transport channel BLER measurements from Node B in our specification for FDD and TDD as well to avoid the inconsistency problem but then, are we going to be able to have any sort of minimum performance requirements on the CRC ? We need to have some sort of minimum requirements directly or indirectly on the CRC.

Chairman stated that taking the advantage of this co-located meeting, we should inquire RAN WG2 and RAN WG3 about their intention on removing this measurement and if this is the case, then we should consider where the minimum requirements should be in other specifications.

(*5) This LS arrived on Day3 afternoon and was reviewed on Day3 evening as **R2-000906**. What RAN WG2 was asking to RAN WG1 was not necessary clear and it was also pointed out a misunderstanding regarding RAN WG3 specification. (removal of UL transport channel BLER from the Node B). Chairman proposed offline discussion with RAN WG2 during the evening event. Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö was asked by the chairman to draft the answer

liaison statement. The answer liaison is in **R1-00-0590** and was approved with no comment as **R1-00-0611** on Day4.

(*6) This LS arrived on Day3 afternoon and was reviewed on Day3 evening as **R2-000907**.

In TS 25.215 there still remains DPCCH SIR measurements for the UE. Chairman asked Ms. Anu Virtanen (Nokia) to draft CR to remove this.

Ms. Anu Virtanen checked with RAN WG2 and it turned out on Day4 that they are still keeping the measurement. Therefore **SIR measurement should be kept in RAN WG1 because RAN WG2 still keeps it.**

7. Change Requests for WG1 Release –99 specifications Corrections & Clarifications.

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Conclusion	Notes
1	002	-	25.201	R1-00-0545	Corrections to align with TS 25.212 and TR 25.944	F	NEC	Approved	No Comment 17:22
2	051	-	25.211	R1-00-0537	Bit value notation change for PICH and CSICH	F	Siemens	To be revised	(*1) 17:34
3	049	-	25.211	R1-00-0520	PICH undefined bits and AICH, AP-ICH, CD/CA-ICH non-transmitted chips	C	Ericsson	To be revised	(*2) 17:47
4	092	-	25.214	R1-00-0520	PICH undefined bits	C			
5	053	-	25.211	R1-00-0546	Removal of a note in section 5.3.2	D	NEC	Approved Superseded	(*3) 17:53
6	052	-	25.211	R1-00-0544	Removal of slow power control from FACH	F	NEC	Rejected	(*4) 18:02
7	094	-	25.214	R1-00-0544	Removal of slow power control from PDSCH	F	NEC	to be revised	

(*1) There are several inconsistency between specifications on the bit value expression.

Power control command bits are still 0 and 1, AICH is written in +1, -1. We need to consider how to avoid inconsistency and misunderstandings. (PICH is continuous modulation and not OOK.)

This CR is anyhow to be revised from formality point of view. (section header needs to be included in the CR.)

The revision was presented on Day4 (**R1-00-0578**) and approved. (See No. 54)

(*2) One concern was raised on the AICH. Proposed text, the definition of the frame in “*The UE shall disregard the contents of the part of the frame with no transmission.*” is not clear. The revision in which different wording had been proposed was presented on Day 4 (**R1-00-0563**) and approved. (See No.55)

(*3) Some comments were made regarding the Notes below the Table 12 (how these notes should be, etc) but this CR which had intended to removed the redundant note itself was approved. This CR was superseded by **R1-00-0565** which reflected the comments made here on Day3 (See No.46)

(*4) These CRs intended to remove “slow power controls” on FACH and PDSCH on the basis that those slow power controls are to be defined in the higher layer instead of the physical layer.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) made a comment regarding TS 25.211 part of this CR that the text here is in fact very close to what is currently presented in TS 25.302 (RAN WG2 specification). In TS 25.302, it is still mentioned that the FACH, for example, can use the slow power control where it is very clear in that case that slow power control is not at all this frame base power control but is the power control possible because of some field in the frame protocol. At least in the RAN WG2 and RAN WG3 specifications there is no misunderstanding of what this slow power control is. If we are to approve the proposed change request then we are not using the same vocabulary as compared to other specifications. Considering that in the other groups, it is very clear that slow power control is not this frame basis power control at least on the FACH and we can not see that this proposed text will improve the consistency with other specifications neither improve the understanding of the specification, we should keep the text as it is in our current specification.

Ms. Anu Virtanen (Nokia) supported the Ms. Evelyne’s comment and added for TS 25.214 part that the proposed text is quite unclear and the previous text is considered better.

Chairman concluded that CR 25.211-052 is to be rejected for the time being and CR 25.214-094 is to be revised. (rewording is needed.) But after all the revision was not presented in this meeting.

Regarding the renaming of the “slow power control” in TR 25.833, which had been also proposed in this document, it was confirmed on Day2 session that this is not acceptable. (See No. 14)

Day 2 started at 09:05

8. Continuation of Agenda item 7

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Conclusion	Notes
8	047	1	25.211	R1-00-0535	Clarifications to power control preamble sections	F	Philips	To be revised	No (*1) Comments 09:14
9	033	-	25.213	R1-00-0535	Clarifications to power control preamble sections	F	Philips	Approved (R1-00-0559)	No Comments 09:14
10	050	-	25.211	R1-00-0536	Editorial correction to timing relations	F	Philips	Postponed → Withdrawn	(*2) 09:20
11	-	-	-	R1-00-0457	TrCH Eb/I balancing by power offset in DL, TrCH on	-	Mitsubishi	Discussed	(*3) 09:42
12	064	-	25.212	R1-00-0486	Simplification of Rate Matching Description and Optional Correction of Rate Matching Pattern Offset for Repetition	D	Siemens LGIC	Postponed	(*4) 09:51
13	032	-	25.222	R1-00-0486	Simplification of Rate Matching Description and Optional Correction of Rate Matching Pattern Offset for Repetition	F	Siemens LGIC	Postponed	(*4) 09:51
14	070	-	25.212	R1-00-0547	Editorial modifications	D	NEC	To be revised	(*5) 10:00
15	069	-	25.212	R1-00-0541	Removal of BTFD for flexible positions in Release 99	F	Ericsson	Approved	(*6) 10:14
16	091	-	25.214	R1-00-0523	Clarification of TX diversity power setting	F	Ericsson	To be revised	(*7) 10:29
17	084	-	25.214	R1-00-0499	Addition of CSICH Power Parameter	B	Philips	Approved	(*8) 10:36
18	085	-	25.214	R1-00-0500	Correction to Power Control in Compressed Mode Recovery Period	F	Philips	Approved	No Comments 11:05
19	086	-	25.214	R1-00-0501	Revisions to Power Control for CPCH	F	Philips	To be revised	(*9) 11:18
20	087	-	25.214	R1-00-0502	Corrections to uplink DCH power control sections	F	Philips	Approved	No Comments 11:20
21	049	-	25.215	R1-00-0490	Propagation delay for PCPCH	B	Nokia	Postponed	(*10) 11:45
22	048	-	25.211	R1-00-0490	Propagation delay for PCPCH	B	Nokia		(*10) 11:45
23	051	-	25.215	R1-00-0525	Clarification of Physical channel BER	F	Ericsson	To be revised	(*11) 11:52
24	052	-	25.215	R1-00-0526	Clarification of transmitted code power	F	Ericsson	Approved	No Comments 11:53
25	053	-	25.215	R1-00-0527	Editorial correction in TS 25.215	F	Ericsson	Approved	No Comments 11:54

(*1) This had been approved but there was one comment made in the discussion of R1-00-0536 that if R1-00-0536 is to be approved, then the notation of "preamble_length" here should be modified as N_{pcp} to be in line with R1-00-0536. So this was to be revised. The revision (R1-00-0559) was presented on Day3 and approved. (See No. 45)

(*2) There was one comment made by Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) that we should make sure what the activation time is meant from higher layer (TS 25.331) point of view. (Is it the time when the transmission start or power control preamble, if used, start ?)

Chairman agreed with this comment and postponed the approval for the moment. We will revisit this later after people check the TS 25.331. Finally this was withdrawn on Day3. Philips confirmed that the activation time is CFN number so there is no reason for initialization.

(*3) Mitsubishi presented a method that allows balancing TrCHs in the DL by power offsets, which could provide some benefit in the future. They stated that these schemes would impact mainly on the network complexity and seemed to have no impact on the UE complexity. They added that the only thing they would like to have is the hooks in release '99 in order for this kind of techniques to be included in the future release, especially they would like mandated that the UE shall make no such assumption as that the TrCH of a same CCTrCH have all the same power.

Big discussion was made mainly on the RAN WG4 issue. Because they are now in the performance requirement work and the have the assumption that TrCHs have the same power level. RAN WG4 has not had this kind of

requirements so far. It seems that it is too late for RAN WG4 to accept the addition to have this hook at this stage. It also seems that there is no problem in backward compatibility if we have this technique in release 2000. Chairman concluded no hooks for release '99.

- (*4) Siemens stated that these proposals are really editorial and simplification of the specification. They do not change specification at all.

There were some comments made that we need to check whether the modifications are purely editorial or not. Ericsson proposed to postpone the approval of this CR to the next meeting because it might be difficult to check these in detail during this meeting. Chairman agreed with this.

- (*5) In advance of this presentation, Mr. Takashi Mochizuki (NEC) questioned whether the renaming of the "slow power control" in TR 25.833 which had been proposed in R1-00-0544 was approved in Day1 or not. Actually this issue was not clearly discussed in Day1 but it was answered by the chairman that it had not been accepted considering the fact that TS 25.211 part of the R1-00-0544 was rejected in Day1

Regarding this CR, there was one comment made pointing out a couple of editorial errors(typos) and so this was to be revised. The revision (**R1-00-0560**) was presented on Day3 and approved. (See No. 49)

- (*6) One comment was made by Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) that for release 2000 we have to reconsider of the blind transport format detection and the requirement on the mobile stations. This should be an item for release 2000.

This could be part of work item for radio link enhancements or this could be made at separate work item but definitely we have to work on this for release 2000 as part of the harmonization with North American CDMA. Chairman concluded that for blind transport format detection with flexible positions, we do not have any requirements in release '99 but we keep in mind that something needs to be done eventually for the release 2000 to enhance the performance no matter with AMR or other Codecs.

- (*7) From the current specification it is not clear that the downlink power setting values from higher layers (TS 25.433, NBAP Specification) correspond to the total power for both antennas in case of transmit diversity. In order to avoid misunderstandings to take this as the power per antenna, this CR proposed to clarify this in the downlink power control section of TS 25.214.

Ericsson made a comment that after having submitted this CR they found that this is applicable not only for the downlink dedicated channels but also for the downlink common channels and they would provide a revision of this CR in which they would move the proposed sentence to one section up, that is, to section 5.2 for the general downlink power control.

Q1. Is it guaranteed, if we look at one signal from one antenna, the offset is the same on each antenna relative to DPDCH ?

A. There comes only one parameter in the NBAP signalling. It will be so.

Q2. In Tx diversity mode 2, each antenna will have different power weight(0.2 and 0.8). In this case, will there any conflict occur with this CR ?

A. No. This CR is just clarifying that the power setting values from higher layers are the total power for both antenna. This has nothing to do with the ratio.

The revision (**R1-00-0564**) was presented on Day4 and approved with no comments. (See No. 58)

R1-00-0561 had been allocated for the revision but the revision was finally contained in R1-00-0564.

- (*8) Currently there is no requirement in the higher layer specification which support this CR.

Chairman proposed as one of decisions that we should approve this CR here and send it to RAN on the condition that there are respective CRs in layer 2 and layer3 specification and if there are no respective CRs in higher layers then this CR should be rejected in RAN level.

Philips agreed with this and it was decided that they would draft a small liaison statement with this CR attached to RAN WG2 and RAN WG3 requesting them to provide the appropriate higher layer support and submit relating CRs to the next RAN. This LS (**R1-00-0562**) was reviewed on Day4 and approved. (See section 14)

- (*9) There were a couple of comments regarding the UE specific higher layer parameter which is described in this CR.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that if we are to allow multiple types of power control scheme for CPCH we have to check whether they are something channel specific. Though it is not clear that there is any benefit in power control modes that could be CPCH set or PCPCH channel specific, anyhow it can not be UE specific. UE should not select a particular CPCH or PCPCH set on the basis of particular algorithm that is associated with that CPCH. We do not have UE specific signalling even with the channel allocation mode, because in the channel allocation mode, we just indicate channel number by the use of signalling. There is no room for other type of signalling. And of course this will impact on RAN WG2 and RAN WG3 specifications. Chairman concluded that this CR should be revised so that the UE specific power control algorithms are taken away. The revision (**R1-00-0566**) was presented on Day3 and approved. (See No. 50)

- (*10) Discussion was made on the topic of the periodicity of the measurement. Should it be measured in every TTI or should it be measured only once in the beginning and use the same value for the remaining frames ? Should this periodicity be up to Node B implementation ? Who determine how often it shall be measured ? RAN WG4 or RAN WG3 or RAN WG1?

Chairman stated that if there is no extra requirements compared to what it is in the PRACH, then it can be considered that Node B (in a standard implementation) would report just the same value without any updates. But if there would be some CPCH specific accuracy requirements (CPCH packets are longer than what is the kind of searcher update rate in the Node B) in RAN WG4, then Node B would updated this measurement. As such, if there is such a requirement, it should be in RAN WG4 and not in RAN WG1. Since probably RAN WG4 is not aware of this measurement, if we agree with this CR, we should inform RAN WG4 what we have done and inform about the longer CPCH transmission. Then the requirement is up to RAN WG4 to set.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) pointed out the proposed definition is not clear whether we are assuming this is

measured on the first of the access preamble of the first frame of the message or subsequent frames of the message up to the maximum frame or this is a reference to the AICH only to have consistent measure even for the frame that does not correspond to the first frame of the PCPCH message. The fact is that for the RACH, the time between the ICH and the message transmission is fixed but for the CPCH, it is not fixed. So those values would be dependent on the configuration.

Chairman suggested offline discussion and this was to be revised.

The revision (**R1-00-0577**) was presented on Day4 and approved with no comments. (See No. 59)

(*11) Ms. Sarah Boumendil (Nortel) made a comment that in case that the several transport channels are multiplexed, it is not clear over which TTI of which transport channel measurement should be performed.

Chairman suggested offline discussion.

The revision (**R1-00-0568**) was presented on Day4 and approved with no comments. (See No. 61)

9. Joint session with TSG RAN WG1 & TSG RAN WG3 on downlink power control (1.30 PM onwards)

9-1. Opening of the meeting.

The chairman, Mr. Per Willars (TSG RAN WG3 chairman, Ericsson) opened the meeting.

9-2. Approval of the agenda (R1-00-0531, R3-000988)

2 comments were made by Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel)

- 1) According to the RAN #7 discussion, we are not supposed to have a discussion on uplink power control issues (Agenda item5).

Chairman answered that the reason for this meeting was to clarify the down link power control issues however chairmen agreed that agenda item 5 should be added in case there is something to be clarified for the uplink power control that concerns both groups

- 2) The LS which was sent from WG3 (R3-000973, R1-00-0480) should be added to the agenda.

The agenda was approved with one addition of the item for the discussion of the above liaison statement.

9-3. DL Power Control: Definition of the problem

The problem (background) described in the agenda was introduced by the chairman.

No comments were made.

9-4. DL Power Control: Solutions (including proposed changes to WG1 and WG3 specifications)

9-4.1 Reaction to TPC commands from UE

R1-00-0522 CR 25.214-090: *Level of specification of downlink power control / Source : Ericsson*

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö(Ericsson) presented R1-00-0522.

Node B behaviour needs to be specified to ensure interoperability. This is done by specifying Node B's response to TPC commands. That is the key issue here. Following changes to TS 25.214 were introduced:

- How DL power shall be updated is specified in 5.2.1.2. The calculation includes both inner loop and power balancing loop behaviour.
- The power control step size is defined to be 0.5 or 1 dB (no longer minimum step size).
- In case of congestion the TPC commands from the UE may be ignored.
- The UE shall not make any assumption about the downlink power.
- For compressed mode similar changes in 5.2.1.3 (through referencing).
- Clarifications to Annex B.3(adjustment loop for the radio link power balancing). Change has been made to be more in line with what is written in the normative part of the specification. Description of "Parameter r is signalled by higher layers" was incorrect and parameter r was removed.

Nokia made following 3 comments on this proposal.

A. We should have 2 modes

- mode 1 --- described in this CR (we do define everything exactly)
- mode 2 --- described in the specification as it is. (we do not define everything in detail.)

B. Multiple (actual) step sizes should be allowed.

- Increase the range of the actual step size signalling
- Define the rule how to do in compressed mode

C. The same kind of procedures should be defined for the compressed mode as in the uplink power control. (ex. increase of the step size during the compressed frame.)

Alcatel expressed their support for B and C.

Ericsson agreed with C and stated this could be described in more elaborated way.

Discussion :

- The meaning of "in case of congestion" is not clear. Ericsson agreed with this comment but stated it is difficult to express it clearer.
- What would be the corresponding minimum performance requirements in the RAN WG4 for this change request ? Ericsson answered we could have the similar test as in the case of uplink but how important to have such a test to be considered in RAN WG4 is not sure. A lot of the specifications are regarding functionality of the Node B and not specified in test specifications. We do not have such kind of specification for the Iub interface neither for the functional requirement from NBAP protocol.

The functional behaviour of the Node B should be documented in RAN WG1 and/or RAN WG3 specifications in some kind of split.

Big discussion was made on the Nokia's proposal A. (having 2 power control modes).

Alternatives are

- 1) We have only normative algorithm
- 2) We have normative algorithm and secondary one included in WG1 spec
- 3) We have normative algorithm and secondary one included in WG1 spec and signalling

WG1 chairman stated some WG1 background.

In WG1 we have not paid that much attention toward the details of Node B power control behaviour because we have always had the understanding that this is going to be specified rather in liberal way. Now we have new requirements from above layers to specify everything exactly and we have got only one CR that is proposing the

exact way of the physical layer behaviour for the power control for the Node B as compared with the fact we had 10 Ad Hoc meetings and more than 50 simulation results for the UE specification work. In that sense, it is easy to understand that all the WG1 members do not necessary feel that this is the optimum work, the best we can have for the Node B behaviour. If we have only this thing possible from the interfaces point of view, then in the next meeting we are going to have ten contributions optimising this mandatory power control behaviour with bringing the certain amount of improvements, but this is the only way of getting this kind of improvements in still complying with the open interfaces. So from RAN WG1 point of view, we would be more assured that things will close sooner if you have the possibility (secondary algorithm) and every vendor will not rush to try to do make their specific optimised solution as an input to RAN WG1 saying because there is only one possible solution.

- In case that one Node B operates in one mode and the other Node B operates in different mode, is the soft-hand over possible ? → It is possible. It would be radio link set-up procedure that would actually refer to the text in the WG1 spec stating that the Node B shall follow this and this algorithm.
- As for the step sizes, currently RAN WG4 only considers 0.5dB(optional) and 1dB(mandatory). There are no tolerances for 2dB.

Conclusion:

- 1) We standardise normative algorithm (described in R1-00-0522) in TS 25.214. This will be referred by WG3 specification.
 - 2) Ericsson would update their CR and add clarification
 “ UE shall not make any assumption on how the downlink power control is set by UTRAN, for example other algorithm than the one described above could be used.” (by adding e.g. another algorithm maybe introduced in UTRAN)
 - 3) We will include the limited power increase in normative part of the UTRAN behaviour in TS 25.214.
 - 4) Actual step size range is increased to 0.5, 1, 1.5 and 2 dB and this should be applied to normal mode. In case this is not supported by the Node B, we will get failure message back. The mandatory step size will be documented in RAN WG1 specification.
 - 5) The step sizes for compressed mode is left to WG1 to discuss and the selection should be made if possible so as to minimise the impact on WG3 specification, e.g. similar solution to uplink power control.
- R1-00-0522** is to be revised to incorporate above conclusion. The revision is in **R1-00-0575**. It was reviewed and approved on Day4 (See No. 71)

R3-001090 *More stringent power control behaviour specification in NBAP/ RNSAP* Source :Ericsson
 - RL-Setup and RL-Addition should be clarified.
 - WG1 chairman commented,
 There are some slight differences in power control in TDD. WG1 will review the TDD section for power control and will provide the necessary update. Basically we apply the same principle as FDD but that will be revised separately.
Agreed in principle. Details will be discussed in RAN WG3.

9-4.2 Setting of initial power in a Node B at RL SETUP / ADDITION

R3-001092 *Initial Downlink Power in TDD during Handover* / Source : InterDigital
Agreed in principle. Details will be discussed in RAN WG3.

R1-00-0480 (R3-000973) *Liaison Statement on DL Power ramping* / Source : RAN WG3
 Under which basis Node B start this ramping ? Does Node B know that this is the first or the second radio link? It might be advantageous if Node B would know that the radio link is the first one or not. If Node B does not know it then this would be some problem.
 → if some kind of flag can be used then Node B could know the first radio link. But currently such flag does not exist in RAN WG3 specification.
 Chairman concluded that this would not be in release '99 and postponed to something that could be discussed as the release 2000 issue.

9-4.3 DL power balancing issues

R3-001143 *DL power control algorithm in NBAP/ RNSAP* Source : NEC , Telecom MODUS
 Long discussion was made among RANWG3 delegates.
 Chairman concluded that this should be discussed further in RAN WG3.

R1-000522 The revision in Annex B.3 was accepted unless WG3 agrees that changes are needed.

9-5. UL Power Control

R3-001091 *Uplink Power in TDD* / Source : InterDigital
 This was not related RAN WG1. This will be discussed in RAN WG3.

10. Ad Hoc 21 session : Inputs to TR on 1.28 Mcps TDD.

09:00-12:15

10.1 R1-00-0492 *Smart Antenna technology for low chip rate TDD option* / Source : CWTS (09:03 -09:16)

This is an update of the paper we had at the last meeting. This has been distributed 2 weeks prior to this meeting on the reflector. The comments have been incorporated. There have been no technical changes of the contents.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) made 2 comments.

- 1) It should be made clear that this is one possible approach and there could be other approaches. Though this effectively indicated in the introduction, this clarification does not appear in the text itself, and what we are now discussing is what will go in the text of the technical report.

Conclusion :

The sentence in the introduction "It should be noted that this is a preferred approach to beam-forming, other high performance techniques may also be applicable." or something like this clarification should be added in the text.

- 2) In the explanation difference, what is the benefit to have different mid-ambles on the same codes on the codes allocated to the same UE ?

→ The main benefit is in the signalling because it will be easier if there is one to one relationship between channelization codes and mid-ambles.

Then this has nothing to do joint detection (from the processing point of view.) And such simplification could well be used in the release 2000 wide band option.

Conclusion :

Text should be revised to clarify that the benefit is in the signalling and not in joint detection.

Furthermore that this is not only for low chip option but also for the release 2000 wide band option should be clarified in the text.

This text proposal was approved with above 2 modifications.

10.2 R1-00-0491 *Frame Structure for low chip rate TDD option* / Source : CWTS (09:17 - 09:43)

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia, the editor of the TR) and Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that the service mapping examples for switching point explanation should be provided as soon as possible. Ms. Evelyne Le Strat commented that until such kind of examples are provided, the first sentence in the last paragraph before *explanation difference* in the 7.2.2 *Burst Types* should be removed.

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic added that

- More descriptive explanations are needed for TFCI and TPC field
- Explanation for the structure of the RACH burst similar to DPCH is needed.

Conclusion :

- 1) Service mapping examples should be provided by the next meeting.
- 2) Following sentence in section 7.2.2 should be removed and be replaced by some detailed service mapping examples later on. Removal should be done on the Day4 version of Technical Report.
"The proposed frame structure and the related burst structure for low chip rate option can fulfill the requirements for 3rd generation services and can provide the data services up to 2Mbps in a single 1.6MHz carrier."
- 3) More descriptive explanations should be added for TFCI and TPC field on the Day4 version.
- 4) Explanation for the structure of the RACH burst same as DPCH should be added on the Day4 version.

This text proposal was approved with above modifications.

10.3 R1-00-0493 *Mapping of BCH, PCH and FACH onto physical channels* / Source : CWTS (09:43 - 10:01)

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented on the description section that there should be clarification about BCH / PCH /FACH mapping whether they are to be mapped on several codes or one. Current wording is very misleading and should be revised.

(We can see that a physical channel can encompass multiple codes. This is very different way of describing things compared to the FDD and the wide band TDD. It seems that a term has completely different meaning. Physical channel was a code but now we can see P-CCPCH encompasses 2 codes. Where is now BCH, is it on code 0 or code 1, is that clear how the transport channels are split between these 2 codes?)

CWTS answered the question but still current descriptions were considered to be quite misleading.

There was one more comment about the naming(relation) of FACH and P-FACH but this would be discussed in the next paper. (R1-00-0494) .

Conclusion : Approved with above clarification. CWTS and Ms. Evelyne Le Strat would have an offline discussion for the better wording and CWTS should provided the revision on the Day4 version.

10.4 R1-00-0494 *Mapping of RACH onto physical channels* / Source : CWTS (10:02 - 10:09)

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia) questioned whether the association (what is the association) in the following sentence could be explained in the future input paper ?

"The uplink sync codes (SYNC1 sequences) used by the UEs for UL synchronisation have a well known association to the P-RACHs, as broadcast by the BCH."

CWTS answered that they would provide the explanation in the next meeting.

Approved with above comment.

Chairman proposed that the wording problem discussed in the previous paper should be discussed offline.

10.5 R1-00-0497 *Cell search procedures for low chip rate TDD option* / Source : CWTS (10: 09 - 10: 35)

This paper was new. CWTS presented in detail.

There were 2 comments made about first sentence of “*Explanation difference*” that this cell search procedure is really related to the structure of the channel (frame) we have to decode and not to the uplink synchronization. This frame structure might be related to the uplink synchronization but it is indirect. Therefore the first sentence in “*Explanation difference*” should be modified so that the relation to the frame structure should be clarified. (Why the particular structure of uplink synchronization are anything to do with the reception of the mobile ?)

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia) commented that in step2, the associations between codes, how these codes are associated to each other should be clarified in more detailed manner.

Conclusion :

1)The first sentence of “*Explanation difference*” should be modified like following.

“*The initial cell search procedure is optimized considering the **frame structure** which is needed in order to enable the specific features and properties of the low chip rate option (e.g. UL synchronization).*”

2) The detailed code relations (ex. which scrambling code belongs to which) should be provided in the table format later on.

This text proposal was approved with above modifications.

10.6 R1-00-0496 *Uplink synchronization for low chip rate TDD option* / Source : CWTS (10: 56 – 11: 07)

One comment was made about the uplink synchronization step size and it was answered that step size is re-configurable. The step size can be re-configured during the connection and the very initial step size can be broadcast or given as a default value.

Conclusion :

1) The sentence concerning the uplink synchronization step size should be revised to add the “re-configurable”.

“*The step size in uplink synchronization is configurable and **re-configurable** can be adapted from 1/8 chip to 1 chip duration.*”

2) Details of the position of the synchronization shift bit will be provided with the detailed service mapping examples (See 10.2) later on.

This text proposal was approved with above modifications.

10.7 R1-00-0495 *Random Access procedures for low chip rate TDD option* / Source : CWTS (11: 07 – 11: 23)

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia) made a comment that in the middle of the section 10.7.1 (below),

10.7.1 From the cell broadcast information, the UE will get to know the used SYNC1 sequences within the code set to be used; the description of the P-RACH channels, the description of the P-FACH channels, and other information related to random access.

it is not clear with what the *descriptions* are and what the other information related to Random Access is not clear, either.

CWTS answered that there are fixe relations between SYNC1 and P-RACH, P-FACH. They said that would provide the detailed table to describe these relation ships more clearly. And they would also provide the other information related to Random Access, if needed.

As for the contents of the *description*, CWTS explained that they are codes, location of the channel, spreading factor, mid-ambles, time slot.

Conclusion :

1) The detailed table for the relation between SYNC1 and channels should be provided later on.

2) Descriptions should be detailed in the text.

This text proposal was approved with above modifications.

10.7 R1-00-0524 *Operating scenarios for the unpaired TDD spectrum* (11: 23 – 12: 15)

/ Source : Ericsson, Nortel, NTT DoCoMo, Telia, Vodafone

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia) commented that the judge on the impact of this interference without any kind of proper simulations and drawing conclusion is quite inappropriate. Drawing a conclusion without any background is a little bit unfair. In spite that it was also said at the beginning of the presentation that the purpose of this contribution is not to draw any conclusions, it seems that there are conclusions throughout the paper. He added that it is beneficial for the technical report to have these diagrams as long as they are descriptive and not conclusive. Chairman stated that when we go through the scenarios we should check which part of the text are the descriptions of the scenarios we can take.

Ericsson agreed with this comment.

Scenario 1 *NB TDD vs. coordinated NB TDD in adjacent bands*

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) supplemented that the term “*coordinated*” here means the same operator or operators cooperated and “*uncoordinated*” means the different operators.

Mr. Antti Toskala (Nokia) stated that then it should be clearly defined here.

CWTS commented that the last paragraph below the figure is conclusive(like solution) and so it should be removed. Nokia supported this comment.

Conclusion :

- 1) The explanation of the term “coordinate” and “uncoordinated” should be explicitly defined in the text.
- 2) The last paragraph should be removed.

Scenario 1 was approved with above modifications.

Scenario 2 *NB TDD vs. uncoordinated NB TDD in adjacent bands*

CWTS commented that whole paragraph should be removed except first 2 sentences because this is rather conclusive. Ericsson agreed.

Conclusion : Approved with above modification.

Scenario 3 *NB TDD vs. uncoordinated NB TDD in same band*

Conclusion: The last sentence should be removed. It is conclusive.

Scenario 4 *NB TDD vs. WB TDD in uncoordinated operation in adjacent bands*

Conclusion: The last paragraph should be removed. It is conclusive.

Scenario 5 *NB TDD vs. WB TDD in uncoordinated operation in same band*

Conclusion: The last sentence should be removed. It is conclusive.

Scenario 6 and scenario 7 should be removed for the time being. These are wide band scenarios. If needed we would include also FDD scenario in the future.

Day 3 started at 13:38

11. Contributions on issues where CRs are still needed for Release –99 specifications

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Conclusion	Notes
26	054	-	25.215	R1-00-0555	Proposed CR for Measurements of RACH and CPCH	A	Samsung	To be revised	(*1) 14:03
27	050	1	25.215	R1-00-0548	Maximum number of simultaneous compressed mode pattern sequences	C	Nokia	Approved	No (*2) comment 14:05
28	020		25.221	R1-00-0510	TPC transmission for TDD	F	Siemens	Approved but to be revised	(*3) 14:17
29	-	-	-	R1-00-0476	Code signaling in UTRA TDD downlink for the common midamble case	-	Mitsubishi	needs to be discussed	(*4) 14:27
30	018	-	25.221	R1-00-0462	Removal of the reference to ODMA	D	InterDigital	Approved	No comment 14:28
31	019	-	25.221	R1-00-0463	Editorial changes in Transport Channels section	D	InterDigital	Approved	No comment 14:29
32	030	-	25.222	R1-00-0464	Parity bit attachment to 0 size transport block	B	InterDigital	Approved	No comment 14:31
33	031	-	25.222	R1-00-0465	Correction of the mapping formula	F	InterDigital	Approved	No comment 14:32
34	034	-	25.222	R1-00-0513	Alignment of Multiplexing for TDD	F	Siemens	Approved	No (*5) comment 14:35
35	008	-	25.223	R1-00-0512	Editorial Modifications for 25.223	D	Siemens	Approved	(*6) 14:40
36	018	-	25.224	R1-00-0518	Power Control for Dummy Burst and PDSCH	F	Siemens	To be revised	(*7) 14:50
37	016	-	25.224	R1-00-0466	Editorial correction for the power control section in 25.224	D	InterDigital	Approved	No comment 14:53
38	066	-	25.212	R1-00-0503	Corrections to table 9	F	Nokia	To be revised	(*8) 15:07
39	068	-	25.212	R1-00-0539	Editorial modifications of 25.212	D	Nortel Networks	Postponed	(*9) 15:20
40	035	-	25.213	R1-00-0549	DPDCH/DPCCH gain factors	F	Nokia	Approved	No comment 15:25
41	095	-	25.214	R1-00-0549	DPDCH/DPCCH gain factors	F	Nokia	Approved	No comment 15:25
42	034	-	25.213	R1-00-0540	Numbering of the PCPCH access preamble and collision detection preamble scrambling codes	D	Nortel	To be revised	(*10) 16:13
43	096	-	25.214	R1-00-0551	Correction to RACH subchannel definition	F	Nokia	To be revised	(*11) 16:28
44	097	-	25.214	R1-00-0554	The power setting of the CCC field of DL DPCCH for CPCH	F	LGIC	To be revised	(*12) 16:39
45	047	2	25.211	R1-00-0559	Clarifications to power control preamble sections	F	Philips	Approved	No (*13) comment 16:43
46	053	1	25.211	R1-00-0565	Revision of notes in sections 5.3.2 and 5.3.2.1	D	NEC	Approved	No (*14) comment 16:48
47	072	-	25.212	R1-00-0579	Minor corrections to 25.212 (Rate Matching, p-bit insertion, PhCH segmentation)	C	Mitsubishi	To be revised	(*15) 17:17
48	071	1	25.212	R1-00-0572	Corrections and editorial modifications of 25.212 for 2 nd insertion of DTX bits for CM	F	Nortel	Approved	No comment 17:22
49	070	1	25.212	R1-00-0560	Editorial modifications	D	NEC	Approved	No (*16) comment 17:27
50	086	1	25.214	R1-00-0566	Revisions to Power Control for CPCH	F	Philips	Approved	No (*17) comment 17:29

- (*1) A lot of comments were made.
- New measurement should first be introduced to 25.302.
 - Are these physical layer measurement or MAC layer measurement ?
 - What does the range for the RACH[0..240] correspond to ?
 - Does the total number of acknowledged access tries correspond to positive acknowledgement of the AICH ?
 - We need to have time to check other WG specification on what was agreed in RAN WG2 and WG3.
 - Why is this measurement useful ?
 - How are you going to actually determine the level of the congestion by counting the number of access preambles + CDs ?
 - The names of the measurement or the term used in the definition are not proper. More strict definition is needed.
 - Now the measurement ranges are supposed to be treated in RAN WG4. In the next RAN we will see the CR which takes away the measurement ranges away from RAN WG1 specifications.
 - etc.

After Samsung made answers for these comments, chairman concluded as follows

- 1) We need to have cross WG checking in order to see what the intention in the other WGs were.
- 2) These measurements need to be more precisely described.
- 3) After we have agreed these measurements, the ranges should go to RAN WG4.
- 4) These CRs should be divided into 2 CRs (RACH and CPCH) because topics are quite different.
- 5) These CRs should be more elaborated in CR itself and background as well because it is difficult for people to understand what the use of these measurements are from this contribution. The backgrounds should be described in the introduction a bit more in detail.
- 6) The interested people should check other WGs while the revisions are being done.
- 7) Samsung should provide the information of the reference number of the relevant document in RAN WG2 and WG3.

The revision will be found in **R1-00-0581** (RACH), **R1-00-0582**(CPCH). These were reviewed and approved on Day4 (See No. 62 & 63)

/*** category should not be A ***/

- (*2) This is a kind of the follow up CR to another CR which has been already approved in RAN WG2.
- (*3) It is only possible to send one TPC per frame and this TPC will affect all the downlink channels.
 → If we have multiple CCTrCH in the downlink, we still have only one control in the uplink. We cannot control differently different CCTrCH.
- Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia) commented that there had been one typo in the table 4b (in the slot format #99) and asked Siemens to include this correction. Siemens accepted this proposal. Revision is in **R1-00-0583** and approved in Day4 (See No. 64)
- (*4) InterDigital supported this proposal while Nokia and Nortel opposed.
 Chairman commented that now RAN WG4 has done the performance simulation based on the assumption that mid-amble stays in its place. Now if it starts moving, do we have a problem or not with the simulations ?
 Chairman concluded this should be discussed in the Ad Hoc reflector until next meeting. We also need to check RAN WG4 situation. If this will impact on their simulation results, they will not be happy for their release '99 work. According to the status of RAN WG4 and the responses on the reflector (positive or negative), the CR should be produced for the next meeting. The liaison statement was produced (**R1-00-0595**) and approved as **R1-00-0612** on Day4.
- (*5) This CR supersedes **R1-00-0543** (CR 25.222-035, Panasonic).
- (*6) There was one comment apart from the CR itself that the description for the generation of the synchronization codes in TDD is different from that of FDD. In FDD, that part had been revised by Ericsson but in TDD it still remained old stage. Although the result sequences are correct, description is much less readable.
 Chairman suggested that if it is needed then we can make the revision of this CR in the next meeting still before the next RAN.
- (*7) Several comments were made on the dummy burst.
 The dummy burst is only sent in the uplink. The dummy burst has the regular burst format but it has no data currently defined. It is never transmitted instead of the data of the physical channel. It is only sent just to avoid the out-of-sync detection by the Node B. It will not replace any data and it is not visible to higher layers.
 Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that then there is no reason for adding the dummy burst in the header because it is not separate physical channel.
Conclusion : Dummy burst should be removed from the header.
 The revision is in **R1-00-0584** and approved on Day4. (See No. 65)
- (*8) This CR proposed to split the original table 9 into 3 separated tables (table 9, 10, 11) with some error corrections. After some discussion, it was decided that these tables should go to the annex of TS 25.212 because the information on the table can be considered as informative. (Every one calculate this based on the description in the specification.) It was also decided that the last column (Idle frame Combining) should go to the TS 25.215 section 6.1.1.3 *Parameterization limitations*.
 The revision is in **R1-00-0585** and this was approved on Day4 (See No. 67 & 68).
- (*9) This file was probably corrupted. Not a few computers of the delegates were killed when they scanned the file.
 This contribution was postponed to Day4 and approved with no comments. (See No. 52) Nortel would provide PDF file of this contribution for the presentation.
- (*10) A couple of editorial comments were made. "32 768" should be "32768", "40 960" should be "40960" "x" should be "X". This was approved in principle but to be revised to include above editorial corrections.

The revision is in **R1-00-0586** and was approved on Day4 (See No. 57).

- (*11) The problems in the specification (ambiguity) for which this CR intends to make corrections were agreed but there were several comments made saying that this CR is somewhat unclear.

Chairman proposed offline discussion by the interested people to make it clearer.

The revision is in **R1-00-0587**. This was reviewed on Day4 but it was not approved. (See No. 72) Further revision will be provided in the next RAN WG1 meeting in **R1-00-0609**.

- (*12) Several comments were made on the sentence “power offset between CCC field and pilot field is determined by higher layer signalling.” Finally it was concluded that for the release '99, fixed offset would be used. (if there is no problem with lub interface.)

The revision is in **R1-00-0588** and was approved on Day4. (See No.70)

- (*13) This is the revision of **R1-00-535** which was discussed on Day2 (See. No 8). Only CR 25.211-047 was revised to revision 2. CR 25.213-033 had been already approved on Day2 (No.8). Philips announced that they would withdraw **R1-00-0536** (See No.10).

- (*14) This is the revision of **R1-00-0546**. This CR was approved on Day1 (See No.5) but NEC reflected the comments made in the presentation of R1-00-0546 which did not have direct relation to the CR itself. Consequently **R1-00-0546** (CR25.211-053) was superseded.

- (*15) There were a few corrections which had been pointed out before the presentation. Chairman stated that if there are some remarks, they should be discussed offline and if needed, they should be reflected on the revision.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that some part of the corrections, there were not revision marks appeared. These should be corrected. The revision will be found in **R1-00-0589**.

- (*16) This is the revision of **R1-00-0547** which was discussed on Day2 (See No. 14). Some typos had been corrected.

- (*17) This is the revision of **R1-00-0501** which was discussed on Day2 (See No. 19). “UE-specific” designation was replaced by “CPCH channel specific”.

In conjunction with this CR, the liaison statement **R1-00-0562** (File name was “LS-cpch-parameters.zip”) was reviewed.

R1-00-0562 *Liaison Statement on CPCH Parameters / Source : Philips*

This was approved with no comments. Tdoc number **R1-00-0562** was used as approved version.

558→572

Day 4 started at 08:40

12. Contributions on issues where CRs are still needed for Release –99 specifications

(Continuance of agenda item 11)

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Conclusion	Notes
51	067	1	25.212	R1-00-0553	TFCI mapping in Uplink Compressed Mode	F	Siemens	Approved	No comment 08:42
52	068	-	25.212	R1-00-0539	Editorial modifications of 25.212	D	Nortel	Approved	No comment 08:50
53	-	-	-	R1-00-0519	TR 25.833 V1.0.1	-	Bosch	To be revised	(*1) 09:03
54	051	1	25.211	R1-00-0578	Bit value notation change for PICH and CSICH	F	Siemens	Approved	(*2) 11:04
55	049	1	25.211	R1-00-0563	PICH undefined bits and AICH, AP-ICH, CD/CA-ICH non-transmitted chips	C	Ericsson	Approved	No (*3) comment 11:08
56	092	-	25.214	R1-00-0563	PICH undefined bits	C	Ericsson	Approved	No comment 11:08
57	034	1	25.213	R1-00-0586	Numbering of the PCPCH access preamble and collision detection preamble scrambling codes	D	Nortel	Approved	No (*4) comment 11:12
58	091	1	25.214	R1-00-0564	Clarification of TX diversity power setting	F	Ericsson	Approved	No (*5) comment 11:15
59	049	1	25.215	R1-00-0577	Propagation delay for PCPCH	B	Nokia	Approved	No (*6) comment 11:21
60	048	-	25.211	R1-00-0577	Propagation delay for PCPCH	B	Nokia	Approved	No comment 11:21
61	051	1	25.215	R1-00-0568	Clarification of Physical channel BER	F	Ericsson	Approved	No (*7) comment 11:29
62	056	-	25.215	R1-00-0582	Proposed CR for Measurements of CPCH in FDD	B	Samsung	Approved	(*8) 11:42
63	055	-	25.215	R1-00-0581	Proposed CR for Measurements of RACH in FDD	B	Samsung	Approved (**)	No (*8) comment 11:48
64	020	1	25.221	R1-00-0583	TPC transmission for TDD	F	Siemens	Approved	No (*9) comment 11:52
65	018	1	25.224	R1-00-0584	Power Control for PDSCH	F	Siemens	Approved	No (*10) comment 11:52
66	058	-	25.215	R1-00-0599	Correction to CM parameter list	F	Nokia	Approved	No comment 11:56
67	066	1	25.212	R1-00-0585	Section 4.4.5 and table 9 is moved to informative annex	F	Nokia	Approved	No (*11) comment 11:59
68	057	-	25.215	R1-00-0585	Transfer of information from TS 25.212 table 9 to TS 25.215	F	Nokia	Approved	No (*11) comment 11:59
69	-	-	-	R1-00-0576	Downlink inner-loop power control in compressed mode	-	Alcatel Philips	Approved	No (*12) comment 13:23
70	097	1	25.214	R1-00-0588	The power setting of the CCC field of DL DPCCCH for CPCH	F	LGIC	Approved	No (*13) comment 13:25
71	090	1	25.214	R1-00-0575	Level of specification of downlink power control	C	Ericsson	Approved	(*14) 14:10
72	096	1	25.214	R1-00-0587	Correction to RACH subchannel definition	F	Nokia	To be revised	(*15) 14:10
73	099	-	25.214	R1-00-0607	Downlink inner-loop power control in compressed mode	C	Alcatel	Approved	(*16) 16:38

(**) After this CR had been approved, one comment was made by Lucent that the term “access frame” is considered to be inappropriate. The rewording and revision shall be done in the next meeting.

- (*1) It was commented that section 5.3.2 in section 4.5, there are a lot of “Error ! Reference source not found”.
Chairman stated that we can consider that the work on this technical report as such was done after above corrections had been done. The version will be raised v1.1.0 without revision marks. Chairman will provide this for the next RAN for information. Chairman thanked the editor for the effort.
The revision will be found in **R1-00-0592**.
- (*2) This is the revision of **R1-00-0537** which was discussed on Day1 (See No.2). The section header was added.
Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö questioned that whether we are going to do the stepwise updates to 25.211 to move from 0/1 notation to 1/-1 notation or we going to do this with one big step.
Chairman and Mr. Peter Chambers (Siemens) answered if somebody would provide one big step then we can forget about it but at the same time there is the maximum ratio which group can accept changes and check carefully. Therefore in that sense, having incremental CRs and to agree the revisions after revisions along with careful cross check on the reflector could be the best way.
- (*3) This is the revision of **R1-00-0520** which was discussed on Day1 (See No.3). CR 25.214-092 had not been changed.
- (*4) This is the revision of **R1-00-0540** which was discussed on Day3 (See No.42).
- (*5) This is the revision of **R1-00-0523** which was discussed on Day2 (See No.16)
- (*6) This is the revision or **R1-00-0490** which was discussed on Day2 (See No.21) CR 25.211-048 had not been changed. In conjunction with these CRs, the liaison statement **R1-00-0567** was reviewed.
R1-00-0567 Draft Liaison Statement on PCPCH Propagation delay measurement / Source : Nokia
Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that the measurement point described in the following sentence is ambiguous.
“*The measurement for PCPCH is now defined so that it is not restricted to only one possible measurement reference point...*”
From this context, the meaning of the reference point in this particular text is considered as the measurement time that corresponds to the beginning of the message, but in some other cases, the measurement point could be considered to correspond to antenna or something like that. Therefore we should be probably more specific, for instance, “*measurement reference point in time...*”.
This LS was approved with above modification. The CR should be attached. The approved version will be in **R1-00-0601**.
- (*7) This is the revision of **R1-00-0525** which was discussed on Day2 (See No.23).
- (*8) This is the revision of **R1-00-0555** which was discussed on Day3 (See No.26)
Category should be changed “B” instead of “A”.
Liaison statement should be sent to RAN WG4 to indicate this new addition of the measurement. This would be reviewed in the afternoon (Draft : **R1-00-0604**, Approved **R1-00-0613**, See section 14)
In addition to sending LS to RAN WG4, chairman recommended Samsung to make sure Samsung will make an input (CR) to RAN WG4 in the next meeting for the ranges of these measurement.
- (*9) This is the revision of **R1-00-0510** which was discussed on Day3 (See No.28).
CR top sheet should be corrected so as to submit this to RAN #8 instead of RAN #7.
- (*10) This is the revision of **R1-00-0518** which was discussed on Day3 (See No.36). “Dummy burst” had been removed from the header.
- (*11) This is the revision of **R1-00-0503** which was discussed on Day3 (See No. 38). Table 9 was moved to Annex of TS 25.212 and *Idle frame Combining* was copied to TS 25.215.
- (*12) CR is to be produced based on this later on. → **R1-00-0607** (See No. 73)
- (*13) This is the revision of **R1-00-0554** which was discussed on Day3 (See No.44).
- (*14) This is the revision of **R1-00-0522** which was discussed on Day2 in the Joint Ad Hoc between RAN WG1 and RAN WG3. The modifications were done along with the conclusion of the joint meeting. (See section **9-4.1**)
Some discussions were made regarding the step size and the limited power.
Chairman suggested that if nobody has problem with this, let’s approve this now. But at the same time let’s reserve the possibility to revise this in the next meeting if it is necessary especially for the limited power parameters checking what is specified in RAN WG3.
- (*15) This is the revision of **R1-00-0551** which was discussed on Day3 (See No.43).
It was commented by Lucent that in section 6.1 point 2, the meaning of the 3rd sentence is not clear. Though Ms. Anu Virtanen (Nokia) explained the meaning, finally it was concluded that it should be reworded more clearly. The revision will be found in **R1-00-0609**. This will be presented in the next meeting.
- (*16) There was one comment pointing out a problem of the font colour but this was not revision of revision.
Chairman commented that here the step size is set to 3dB but 2dB might be better for the Node B considering that the power control dynamics in the Node B is more limited from the mobile. If necessary we can change this in the next meeting.
Chairman stated that if the discussion on this step size or any other refinements are needed, it would be discuss in the compressed mode Ad Hoc or via e-mail before next meeting.

13. Contributions on Release –2000 issues according to the work/study items

Chairman stated that here we would briefly review the release 2000 issues and encouraged those who would present the documents the quick presentation. We are not going to approve CRs at this stage. The purpose of this presentation is to give the people the indication what you are going to propose for release 2000. We do not have enough time to have long discussions. He added.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) stated that we have to keep in mind the conclusion in the previous RAN plenary. In the previous RAN plenary, we did agreed a number of so-called **Building Blocks** and **Work Items**. Those which are listed here are not exactly the names of the Work Items. I would like those who are going to present papers to first state which is the Work Item and corresponding Building Blocks that were approved at the RAN.

At the RAN we did not agree work items corresponding to techniques but to features and I am afraid that in some of the topics here, people jump directly onto the solution. This is not the good way. We have first to agree on the requirements, we have to agree on what is needed and then we can review the techniques and see how it meets the requirements knowing that there can be other techniques to come.

It is up to the group to decide which are the most relevant techniques. We are not going to approve every single bit that improve the performance otherwise the release 2000 is going to be even more difficult to understand compared to release '99.

No.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
1	-	R1-00-0556	Feasibility study of Advanced techniques for High Speed Downlink Packet Access	Motorola	Noted	(*1)
2	-	R1-00-0538	Optimization of the Cell-FACH state by providing closed loop power control over FACH	GBT	Noted	(*2)
3	-	R1-00-0505	Gated DPCH Transmission Scheme	Samsung	Noted	(*3)
4	-	R1-00-0506	Proposal for the use of closed loop Tx diversity with more than 2 Tx Antennas	Samsung and Seoul National University	Noted	(*4)
5	-	R1-00-0574	Softest Hand over Design Using Iterative Decoding(Turbo Coding)	LGIC	Noted	(*5)
6	-	R1-00-0517	LAS CDMA	CWTS	Noted	(*6)
7		R1-00-0571			Not reviewed	
8		R1-00-0570				
9		R1-00-0487				
10		R1-00-0467				
11		R1-00-0468				
12		R1-00-0469				
13		R1-00-0470				
14		R1-00-0471				
15		R1-00-0472				
16		R1-00-0473				
17		R1-00-0514				
18		R1-00-0444				

- (*1) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) stated that at first we should have the discussion about the requirements before studying the details of such particular techniques. What are the requirements of the introduction of such new higher bit rate data in terms of service and in terms of operational requirements.

Some discussions on how this issue should be treated were made. On which group this should be placed and how the leadership can be managed. The clear delineation between sections of the report and which group manages which part, was requested.

Chairman suggested to propose the outline of this report on the e-mail reflector and making it available for those WGs and then stress the focus on what the goals of this work are. Then hopefully we can proceed the discussion between the WGs as well.

- (*2) There was one comment on the simulation assumption on the power control dynamic range. GBT answered that they took 60dB or more.
- (*3) Chairman suggested that he would like people to study this topic by the next meeting.
There was one comment that before RAN takes the decision on this scheme it should be evaluated against other already existing means for the battery saving whether the same benefit can be obtained using such existing techniques.
- (*4) It was assumed in the simulation that all antennas are independent. As the number of antennas increases, the analysis with the assumption of the correlation among antennas should be taken into account. Samsung already started that kind of analysis but at this stage the result was not available. Although in this new scheme some new parameters are used compared to the 3GPP ones, Samsung considers that the problem of backward compatibility can be solved. Actually they said they already had some ideas on this backward compatibility issue.
Chairman stated that we do not have any fundamental problem with this proposal and conclusion here. It is useful if we have simulation results from different companies and so it is desirable if the information of simulation parameters are exchanged on the e-mail reflector. (AH26)
This corresponds to the work item of "Radio link performance enhancements". Any other techniques are not excluded.
- (*5) Chairman stated that we would follow up the discussion on this via e-mail and would take this in the next meeting because indeed it is good to have these topics for the RAN meeting in June with some kind of WG1 view that what we would like to proceed with them and what not.
Some discussions were made regarding how we should treat this kind of new features.
Chairman stated
This is one of the study items we have been given in the radio link performance enhancements. Therefore we need to have 'go ahead' from RAN before we can start accepting any CRs under this item. We are to just study them. We would report to RAN that these kind of proposals were brought in RAN WG1 and see what the feeling in RAN whether we can go ahead with these topics or not. I know we are specially mentioned Tx-diversity and certain power control improvements but I think RAN also has understanding that this study work is not limited to those topics. Of course we should act as a filter from the layer 1 expert perspective and have rough assessment whether the features certainly bring something to the system.
- (*6) There were some comments
- It seems that this can only be used in the synchronized network. What is the applicability of such code in non-synchronized network such as we currently have for FDD ?
 - There is certain backward compatibility problem if you try to apply this to release '99 network or at least '99 terminals because you cannot change the existing spreading and scrambling codes in the base station to say nothing of the uplink.
 - Have you evaluated the impact on the EMC ?

After some discussion, chairman stated that if you need to specify the separate physical layer, then that is something we are not expected to do in RAN WG1. That kind of requirements needs to come from higher TSG groups before RAN WG1 can decide something like that.

14. Approval of the liaison statements as output from WG1

No	Discussed Tdoc	Source	To	Title	Approved Tdoc	Notes
1	R1-00-0562	Philips	R2 R3	Liaison Statement on CPCH Parameters	R1-00-0562	(*1)
2	R1-00-0567	Nokia	R2, R4 C: R3	Liaison Statement on PCPCH Propagation delay measurement	R1-00-0601	(*2)
3	R1-00-0594	Nortel Nokia	R3 C:R2,R4	Response to liaison on STTD indication in the RRC message	R1-00-0605	(*3)
4	R1-00-0591	Siemens InterDigital	R4	Accuracy Requirements for NodeB synchronisation	R1-00-0606	
5	R1-00-0593	Ericsson	R3	Liaison statement on radio link synchronisation parameter values	R1-00-0608	(*4)
6	R1-00-0590	Ericsson	R2	Liaison statement on Transport channel BLER	R1-00-0611	(*5)
7	R1-00-0595	Mitsubishi	R4	Code signalling in UTRA TDD Downlink for the common midamble case	R1-00-0612	(*6)
8	R1-00-0604	Samsung	R4 C:R2,R3	Liaison Statement on RACH and CPCH measurements for TS 25.215	R1-00-0613	(*7)
9	---	Siemens Ericsson Nokia	R4 C: RAN	LS on low chip rate TDD interference/deployment scenarios	R1-00-0614	(*8)

(*1) This was reviewed on Day3 (See No. 17)

(*2) This was reviewed on Day4 (See No. 59)

(*3) "SSDT" in the first sentence should be corrected as "STTD"

(*4) This was the answer liaison to **R1-00-0481**(R3-00-0980). (See section 6 No.7)

(*5) This is the answer liaison to R2-000906 (See section 6 No.12)

(*6) R1-00-0476 (See No. 29)

It was commented that the first sentence in the fourth paragraph should be revised as

"The knowledge of *the number of* the employed channelisation codes"

(*7) R1-00-0581 and R1-00-0582 (See No. 62 & 63) The relevant specification is not TS 25.215 and so the reference to TS 25.215 should be removed because it is our specification.

(*8) See section 15

15. Any other business

R1-00-0600 TR 25.928 V0.0.4 *1.28Mcps functionality for UTRA TDD Physical Layer*

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia, the editor of the TR) presented TR 25.928 on the screen.

- The title was changed in accordance with the decision in the RAN #7.

- Text proposals agreed in Ad Hoc 21 (Day3) had been incorporated.

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic raised one proposal as a Nokia delegate rather than the editor regarding the newly introduced section 4.3.1 which had been proposed in R1-00-0524 (Ericsson, Nortel, NTT DoCoMo, Telia, Vodafone) and approved in Ad Hoc21.

1) RAN WG4 had created the similar technical report. (it was reported at RAN #7.)

2) The scenarios presented here are in fact interference scenarios and not deployment scenarios in spite they are placed in the section of Deployment scenarios. And as such it can be considered that it should belong to RAN WG4 document.

Taking into account above 2 things, he proposed to move this to RAN WG4 technical report. He stated that since these are interference scenario they do not offer any benefit to this heading and to this technical report. He questioned whether the description of “coordinated” and “uncoordinated” operation for which we had big discussion, should be placed here considering that “coordinated” and “uncoordinated” operation could be applied to wide band TDD and FDD as well.

Siemens and CWTS supported this proposal and Ericsson and Nortel opposed.

Opinion of Ericsson and Nortel

Maybe this belongs in the end to the RAN WG4 technical report but since we do not know the status of that technical report, for instance we do not know what their intended contents, Ericsson and Nortel would propose to keep this in our technical report until the interrelation between RAN WG1 and RAN WG4 has been clarified.

We all agreed that this is the useful information and useful for the development of the narrow band option.

We do not understand the reason why we would like to just take this away and expect the further discussions in other WG. It will cause delay of the technical report. RAN WG4 still has a lot of simulation work for release '99 and this might have lower priority. To have this here could be the pressure on them.

Opinion of Nokia and Siemens

We are not discussing here whether this is useful or not. The point is where this should be. Maybe we are not aware of what the contents of RAN WG4 technical report is at the moment but whatever it is, it should have something like this at the end of the day in any case. We do not see the reason to have something here temporary. If somebody can say that these are deployment scenarios, it is fine but these are interference scenarios and they are under the header of deployment scenarios for the moment and as such there is no place in this technical report.

During the first year RAN WG4 did great deal of this kind of work , simulations, and the define the scenarios for those works. They also have the interference scenarios between FDD and FDD, FDD and TDD and so on. We should not redefine those scenarios here. The progress on that area would certainly be faster in RAN WG4 because they have existing scenarios already there. They must have detailed parameters. They only have to modify them to narrow band TDD.

CWTS indicated that the draft technical report would be available on the e-mail reflector on the week next.

Conclusion : LS should be sent to RAN WG4, CC to RAN with this scenario attached.

We will not put this scenarios here.

This LS was produced and reviewed at the end of the meeting. It was approved as **R1-00-0614**.

This technical report was approved as version 0.1.0 with the removal of the scenario.

Earlier in June physical ad hoc meeting dealing this report can take place to make sure we have satisfactory report to present to next RAN.

Tentative dates for TDD Ad Hoc physical meeting

June 14 (Wednesday) – 15 (Thursday)

Host Nokia (Tentatively)

This needs to be confirmed 3 weeks in advance if the meeting is held.

WG1 meeting schedule in year 2000 (Tentative)

Meeting	Month	Date	Location	Notes
RAN WG1 #10	January	18-21	China	Host Nokia
RAN WG1 #11	February	29 – March 3	USA	Host TIP1
RAN #7	March	13-15	Madrid, Spain	
RAN WG1 #12	April	10-13	Korea	Host TTA
RAN WG1 #13	May	22-25	Tokyo, Japan	NTT DoCoMo
RAN #8	June	21-23	Dusseldorf, Germany	
RAN WG1 #14	July	4-7	Finland	Host Nokia
RAN WG1 #15	August	22-25	Germany	Host Siemens
RAN #9	September	20-22	Hawaii	
RAN WG1 #16	October	9-13	Korea	Host TTA
RAN WG1 #17	November	20-24	T.B.D.	
RAN #10	December	6-8	Bangkok	

Annex A : List of approved CRs

A.1 TS 25.201

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	002	-	25.201	R1-00-0545	Corrections to align with TS 25.212 and TR 25.944	F	NEC	1

A.2 TS 25.211

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	047	2	25.211	R1-00-0559	Clarifications to power control preamble sections	F	Philips	45
2	048	-	25.211	R1-00-0577	Propagation delay for PCPCH	B	Nokia	60
3	049	1	25.211	R1-00-0563	PICH undefined bits and AICH, AP-ICH, CD/CA-ICH non-transmitted chips	C	Ericsson	55
4	051	1	25.211	R1-00-0578	Bit value notation change for PICH and CSICH	F	Siemens	54
5	053	1	25.211	R1-00-0565	Revision of notes in sections 5.3.2 and 5.3.2.1	D	NEC	46

A.3 TS 25.212

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	066	1	25.212	R1-00-0585	Section 4.4.5 and table 9 is moved to informative annex	F	Nokia	67
2	067	1	25.212	R1-00-0553	TFCI mapping in Uplink Compressed Mode	F	Siemens	51
3	068	-	25.212	R1-00-0539	Editorial modifications of 25.212	D	Nortel	52
4	069	-	25.212	R1-00-0541	Removal of BTFD for flexible positions in Release 99	F	Ericsson	15
5	070	1	25.212	R1-00-0560	Editorial modifications	D	NEC	49
6	071	1	25.212	R1-00-0572	Corrections and editorial modifications of 25.212 for 2 nd insertion of DTX bits for CM	F	Nortel	48

A.4 TS 25.213

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	033	-	25.213	R1-00-0559	Clarifications to power control preamble sections	F	Philips	9
2	034	1	25.213	R1-00-0586	Numbering of the PCPCH access preamble and collision detection preamble scrambling codes	D	Nortel	57
3	035	-	25.213	R1-00-0549	DPDCH/DPCCH gain factors	F	Nokia	40

A.5 TS 25.214

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	084	-	25.214	R1-00-0499	Addition of CSICH Power Parameter	B	Philips	17
2	085	-	25.214	R1-00-0500	Correction to Power Control in Compressed Mode Recovery Period	F	Philips	18
3	086	1	25.214	R1-00-0566	Revisions to Power Control for CPCH	F	Philips	50
4	087	-	25.214	R1-00-0502	Corrections to uplink DCH power control sections	F	Philips	20
5	090	1	25.214	R1-00-0575	Level of specification of downlink power control	C	Ericsson	71
6	091	1	25.214	R1-00-0564	Clarification of TX diversity power setting	F	Ericsson	58
7	092	-	25.214	R1-00-0563	PICH undefined bits	C	Ericsson	56
8	095	-	25.214	R1-00-0549	DPDCH/DPCCH gain factors	F	Nokia	41
9	097	1	25.214	R1-00-0588	The power setting of the CCC field of DL DPCCH for CPCH	F	LGIC	70
10	099	-	25.214	R1-00-0607	Downlink inner-loop power control in compressed mode	C	Alcatel	73

A.6 TS 25.215

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	049	1	25.215	R1-00-0577	Propagation delay for PCPCH	B	Nokia	59
2	050	1	25.215	R1-00-0548	Maximum number of simultaneous compressed mode pattern sequences	C	Nokia	27
3	051	1	25.215	R1-00-0568	Clarification of Physical channel BER	F	Ericsson	61
4	052	-	25.215	R1-00-0526	Clarification of transmitted code power	F	Ericsson	24
5	053	-	25.215	R1-00-0527	Editorial correction in TS 25.215	F	Ericsson	25
6	055	-	25.215	R1-00-0581	Proposed CR for Measurements of RACH in FDD	B	Samsung	63
7	056	-	25.215	R1-00-0582	Proposed CR for Measurements of CPCH in FDD	B	Samsung	62
8	057	-	25.215	R1-00-0585	Transfer of information from TS 25.212 table 9 to TS 25.215	F	Nokia	68
9	058	-	25.215	R1-00-0599	Correction to CM parameter list	F	Nokia	66

A.7 TS 25.221

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	018	-	25.221	R1-00-0462	Removal of the reference to ODMA	D	InterDigital	30
2	019	-	25.221	R1-00-0463	Editorial changes in Transport Channels section	D	InterDigital	31
3	020	1	25.221	R1-00-0583	TPC transmission for TDD	F	Siemens	64

A.8 TS 25.222

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	030	-	25.222	R1-00-0464	Parity bit attachment to 0 size transport block	B	InterDigital	32
2	031	-	25.222	R1-00-0465	Correction of the mapping formula	F	InterDigital	33
3	034	-	25.222	R1-00-0513	Alignment of Multiplexing for TDD	F	Siemens	34

A.9 TS 25.223

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	008	-	25.223	R1-00-0512	Editorial Modifications for 25.223	D	Siemens	35

A.10 TS 25.224

No.	CR	rev.	TS	Tdoc	Title	Cat	Source	Ref.No.
1	016	-	25.224	R1-00-0466	Editorial correction for the power control section in 25.224	D	InterDigital	37
2	018	1	25.224	R1-00-0584	Power Control for PDSCH	F	Siemens	65

Annex B The Participants List

Family Name	Forename	Title	Membership	Company	E-mail
Agin	Pascal	Mr.	ETSI	Alcatel	Pascal.agin@alcatel.fr
Ahn	Heejune	Dr.	TTA	LGIC	cityboy@lgic.co.kr
Ahn	Wonick			Samsung Electronics	
Aksentijevic	Mirko	Mr.	ETSI	Nokia	Mirko.aksentijevic@nokia.com
Asaba	Hidenori			NTTDoCoMo	
Asanuma	Yutaka	Mr.	ARIB	Toshiba Corporation	asanuma@yrp.toshiba.co.jp
Bahrenburg	Stefan	Dr.	ETSI	Siemens	stefan.bahrenburg@pek1siemens.com.cn
Bar	Siegfried	Mr.	ETSI	Bosch	Siegfried.Baer@de.bosch.com
Barberis	Sergio	Dr.	ETSI	CSELT	sergio.barberis@cse.lt.it
Batz	Gerhard	Mr.	ETSI	Motorola	Gerhard.Batz@motorola.com
Belaiche	Vincent	Mr.		MITSUBISCH ELECTRIC	Vincent.belaiche@mef-rd.com
Berens	Friedbert			STMicroelectronics NV	
Blanz	Josef	Mr.	ETSI	Qualcomm	Jblanz@qualcomm.com
Boumendil	Sarah	Ms.	ETSI	Nortel Networks	
Burbidge	Richard	Mr.	ETSI	Motorola	Richard.Burbidge@motorola.com
Cha	Inhyok	Dr.		Lucent Technologies	icha@lucent.com
Chambers	Peter	Mr.	ETSI	Roke Manor Research	peter.chambers@roke.co.uk
Chang	Hyokang	Mr.	T1	Combasis Technology,INC.	hkchang@combasis.com
Chang	Yun-Seok			LGIC	
Chen	Dong	Mr.	ETSI	Siemens	dong.chen@pek1.semens.com.cn
Chen	Jinyue	Dr.	CWTS	Beijing Pacific Linkair Inc.	jimmy@linkair.com
Cho	Young Ik			Samsung Electronics	
Choi	Hokyu	Dr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	choihk@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Choi	Hyung-Nam	Mr.	ETSI	Bosch Telecom GmbH	hyung-nam.choi@de.bosch.com
Choi	Jihyuk			ETRI	
Corden	IAN	Dr.	ETSI	Lucent Technologies	icorden@lucent.com
Czapla	Liliana	Mrs.	ETSI	Inter Digital	Liliana.czapla@interdigital.com
Da Rocha	Alexandre			Alcatel	
Davidovici	Sorin	Mr.	T1	Golden Bridge Technologies	sdavidovici@gbtwirell.com
De Benedittis	Rosella	Mrs.	ETSI	Siemens Icn	rosella.debenedittis@icn.siemens.it
Dennean	Charles	Mr.	ETSI	Inter Digital	charles.dennean
Eunjung	Kwon			Dacom	

Family Name	Forename	Title	Membership	Company	E-mail
Fabien	Jean-Aicard	Mr.	T1	Motorola	p28842@email.mot.com
Futakata	Toshiyuki	Mr.	ETSI	NTT DoCoMo	futakata@wsp.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Gao	Haiyang	Dr.	CWTS	Beijing Pacific Linkair Inc.	david@linkair/com
Gerstenberger	Dirk	Mr.	ETSI	Ericssom LM	dirk.gerstenberger@era.ericsson.se
Ghosa	Amitabha	Dr.	T1	Motorola	QA0047@email.mot.com
Grieco	Donald	Mr.	ETSI	Inter Digital	donald.grieco@interdigital.com
Guo	Y. Jay	Dr.	ETSI	Fujitsu	Y.Guo@fujitsu.co.uk
Hiramatsu	Katsuhiko	Mr.		Panasonic	Katsuhiko.Hiramatsu@yrp.mci.mei.co.jp
Horino	Haruko	Ms.	ARIB	NTT DoCoMo	
Hoyneck	Andreas	Mr.	ETSI	Siemens AG Germany	
Hunt	Bernard	Mr.	ETSI	Philips	Bernard.hunt@philips.com
Hwang	Seung-hoon			LGIC	
Hwang	Sungoh	Mr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	sungoh@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Hwang	Yusun	Dr.	TTA	ETRI	yshwang@etri.re.kr
Ihm	Youngoo	Miss.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	yjim@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Iida	Masao	Mr.	ARIB	IDO Corporation	m-iida@ido.co.jp
Ikeda	Shinobu	Mr.		ETSI	Shinobu.Ikeda@etsi.fr
Iochi	Hitoshi	Mr.	ARIB	Panasonic	Hitoshi@yrp.mci.mei.co.jp
Itoh	Katsutoshi	Mr.	ARIB	sony Corporation	kitoh@wtlab.sony.co.jp
JECHOUX	BRUNO	Mr.	ARIB	MITSUBISCH ELECTRIC ITE	jechoux@tcl.ite.mee.com
Jeong	Suk jin			Shinsegi Telecomm,Inc	
Jeong-hoon	Park			Samsung Electronics	
Jeong-Ran	Lee			LGIC	
Joung	Hwayoung			Samsung Electronics	
Jung	Kwang-ryul			ETRI	
Kahtava	Jussi	Mr.	ARIB	Nokia	jussi.kahtava@nokia.com
Kang	Young-Hwan	Mr.	TTA	LGCIT	Kangyh@lgcit.com
Kasapidis	Makis	Dr.		European Liaison Offices	
Kawamura	Mashshi			DDI Corporation	
Kim	Beongjo	Dr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	bjkim@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Kim	Bonghoe	Mr.	TTA	LGIC	bong@lgic.co.kr
Kim	Byeong-gwan	Dr.		Samsung Electronics	
Kim	Hyung-gi			LGIC	
Kim	Hyun-Jeung			LGIC	

Family Name	Forename	Title	Membership	Company	E-mail
Kim	Jeong	Mr.	TTA	SK Telecom	jeikim@sktelecom.com
Kim	Jeongho			LGIC	
Kim	Jinyoung	Dr.	TTA	SK Telecom	jinyoung@sktelecom.com
Kim	Jun Sik			ETRI	
Kim	Junggon	Mr.	TTA	LG TeleCom	jgkim@lgtel.co.kr
Kim	Min Goo	Dr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	Kimmingoo@samsung.co.kr
Kim	Myung-Hoon	Mr.	TTA	Korea Telecom	myhoon@kt.co.kr
Kim	Seok ho	Mr.	T1	Combasis Technology,INC.	sshkim@combasis.com
Kim	Young jae	Mr.	TTA	LGIC	gigantic@lgic.co.kr
Kim	Young Lak			SK telecom	
Kim	Young Shin			Samsung Electronics	
Kim	Youngkun	Mr.	TTA	ETRI	ykkim@etri.re.kr
Kim	Yunsik			Korea Telecom	
Kistowski	Dirk	Mr.	ETSI	T-Mobil	dirk.kistowski@t_mobil.de
Klein	Anja	Dr.	ETSI	Siemens AG Germany	
Komatsu	Hiroshi	Mr.	ARIB	Japan telecom Co.,Ltd.	hkomatsu@japan-telecom.co.jp
Koulakiotis	Dimitris	Mr.	ETSI	SERI	Dimitriskl@AOL.COM
Kowalewski	Frank	Dr.	ETSI	Bosch	Frank.kowalewski@fr.bosch.de
KowlMann	Michael	Mr.	ETSI	Philips Semiconductor	michael.kowlmann@philips.com
Kwak	Byung Jae	Dr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	
Kwon	Dongsung	Dr.	TTA	ETRI	dskwon@etri.re.kr
Kwon	Hyuk Joon	Mr.	TTA	LGIC	alexkwon@lgic.co.kr
Kwon	Sung Lark	Dr.	TTA	LGIC	Slkwon@lgic.co.kr
Laukkanen	Mika	Mr.	ARIB	Nokia Mobile Communications	Mika.laukkanen@nokia.com
Lax	Alexander	Mr.	ETSI	3G.COM Ltd	alxander.lax@3g.com
Le Strat	Evelyne	Ms.	ETSI	Nortel Networks	
Lee	Chang-Bum	Mr.	TTA	LG TeleCom	joachim@ieee.org
Lee	Chong won			LGIC	
Lee	Dong-Hahk	Dr.	TTA	SK Telecom	dhlee@sktelecom.com
Lee	Hans-Sup	Dr.	TTA	Korea Telecom	hansup@kt.co.kr
Lee	Hyeonwoo	Mr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	woojaa@samsung.co.kr
LEE	Jae yong			LGIC	
Lee	Jinsock	Mr.	ETSI	Telecom Modus Ltd	jjinsock.lee@t-modus.net.co.uk
Lee	Young D	Mr.	TTA	LGIC	leego@lgic.co.kr

Family Name	Forename	Title	Membership	Company	E-mail
Li	Chenguang	Mr.	CWTS	CWTS/CATT	licg@pub.tdscdme.com
Li	Feng	Mr.	CWTS	CWTS/CATT	lifeng@pub.tdscdme.com
Lim	Chaiman	Mr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	cmlim@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Lim	Jae Hong			Samsung Electronics	
Lim	Seau Sian	Dr.		Lucent Technologies	
Lyu	Dugin	Dr.	TTA	LGIC	lyu@lgic.co.kr
Makihira	Tsuneichi	Dr.	ARIB	Mitsubishi Electric Corp.	makihira@cew.melco.co.jp
Michel	Juergen	Dr.	Siemens	Siemens AG	juergen.michel@mch.siemens.de
Mochizuki	Takashi	Dr.	ARIB	NEC	mochizuki@ptl.yh.nec.co.jp
Moon	Hyun-chul			LGIC	
Nakamura	Takehiro	Mr.	ARIB	NTT DoCoMo	takehiro@wsp.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Niva	Ilkka	Mr.	ETSI	Nokia	ilkka.niva@nokia.com
Nystrom	Johan	Dr.	ETSI	Ericsson Radio Systems	johan.nystrom@era.ericsson.se
Oestreich	Stefan	Dr.	ETSI	Siemens	
Okumura	Yukihiko	Mr.	ARIB	NTT DoCoMo	okumura@mlab.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Onozawa	Hisashi	Dr.	ARIB	Texas Instruments	onozawa@ti.com
Ovesjö	Fredrik	Mr.	ETSI	Ericsson L.M	fredrik.ovesjo@era.ericsson.se
Park	Changsoo	Mr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	chang@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Park	Dongil			Shinsegi Telecomm,Inc	
Park	Sangwhan	Mr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	xhpark@samsung.co.kr
Park	Seong ILL	Dr.	TTA	Samsung Electronics	sipark@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Parsa	Kourosh	Dr.	T1	Golden Bridge Technologies	kpgbt@aol.com
Pautonnier	Sophie			Mitsubishi Electric ITE	pautonnier@tcl.ite.mee.com
Pehkonen	Kari	Dr.	ARIB	Nokia	kari.pehkonen@nokia.com
Prelorentzos	Nikos		MCI	Europe Liaison Office	
Roh	Dong Wook	Mr.	TTA	LGIC	dwroh@lgic.co.kr
Rudolf	Marian	Mr.	ARIB	MITSUBISCH ELECTRIC ITE	rudolf@tcl.ite.mee.com
Sangoh	Oh			Qualcomm	
Schuffenecker	Bruno	Mr.	ETSI	France Telecom	bruno.schuffenecker@net.francetelecom.fr
Seol	Jeewoong	Mr.	TTA	LGCIT	bluecopy@lgcit.com
Shin	Jaewook			ETRI	
Sohn	Insoo	Dr.	TTA	ETRI	isohn@etri.re.kr
Sommer	Vloker	Dr.	ETSI	Siemens AG Germany	
Song	Pyeong-Jung			ETRI	

Family Name	Forename	Title	Membership	Company	E-mail
Song	Young-Joon	Dr.	TTA	LGIC	
Spaling	Gerke	Mr.	ETSI	Ericsson Bussiness mobile Networks	Gerke.Spaling@enn.ericsson.se
Stephen	Dick	Dr.	ETSI	Inter Digital	sdick@interdigital.com
Steudle	Ville	Mr.	ETSI	Nokia Ltd.	ville.steudle@nokia.com
Sung-hee	Koo			LGIC	
Suzuki	Hidetoshi	Mr.	ARIB	Panasonic	Hidetoshi.suzuki@yrp.mci.mei.co.jp
Taffin	Arnauld	Mr.	ETSI	Motorola	taffin@crm.mot.com
Taffin	Arnauld	Mr.	ETSI	Motorola	taffin@crm.mot.com
Tanaka	Schunichi	Mr.	ARIB	Lucent Technologies Japan	stanaka@lucent.com
Tanaka	Yoshinori	Mr.	ARIB	Fujitsu Laboratories LTD.	yoshi@flab.fujitsu.co.jp
Tanaka	Yoshinori	Mr.	ARIB	Fujitsu Laboratories	yoshi@flab.fujitsu.co.jp
Tanno	Motohiro	Mr.	TTC	NTT DoCoMo	tanno@wsp.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Tatesh	Said	Dr.	ETSI	Lucent Technologies	statesh@lucent.com
Toskala	Antti	Mr.	ETSI	Nokia	antti.toskala@nokia.com
ULRICH	Thomas	Mr.	ETSI	Siemens AG Germany	
Umari	Maher	Mr.	ARIB	Motorola	Maher.Umari@motorola.com
Venot	Caroline	Miss	ETSI	Philipse, Sophia, France	caroline.venot@vlsi.com
Virtanen	Anu	Miss	ETSI	Nokia	anu.ha.virtanen@nokia.com
Wilde	Andreas	Dr.	ARIB	Nippon Ericsson	andreas.wilde@erj.ericsson.se
Willenegger	Serge			Qualcomm	
Yang	Guiliang	Mr.	CWTS	CWTS/CATT	yanggl@pub.tdscdme.com
You	Cheol_woo	Dr.	TTA	LG-CIT	cwyoun@lgcit.com
Youngkwon	Ryu			Dacom	
Yuen	Elmer	Mr.	T1	Golden Bridge Technologies	eyuen@gbtwireless.com
Yun	Young Woo		TTA	LGIC	
Zelmer	Donald	Mr.	T1	Bellsouth	don_zelmer@bscc.bls.com