

Agenda Item: -
Source: Secretary
Title: Revised minutes of WG1 #14 meeting
Document for: Approval

Revised Minutes for 3GPP TSG-RAN WG1 14th Meeting

Meeting start: July 4th, 2000, in Oulu, Finland

Day 1, started at 09.07

1. Opening of the meeting

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

2. Approval of agenda (R1-00-0805)

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

- The schedule for the physical Ad Hoc meeting is to be determined later in the afternoon after checking how many papers have been prepared for them.
- Release '99 issues are basically to be covered on Day1. On Day 4 we will discuss those CRs which were postponed or revised in Day1.

Agenda was approved with no comment. (09:18)

3. Report from TSG RAN #8 (R1-00-0887) (09:20- 09:50)

(Including Conclusions from the narrowband TDD Ad Hoc)

Chairman made a brief presentation of the report on the screen.

1. All Release -99 CRs were approved, except CR 25.211-059 which was put on hold to clarify few items related to it in WG1.

For release '99 we really will have CRs that are rather editorial or pure corrections (category "D" & "F") *New features or Functional modifications to the existing features* should not really exist unless they were previously discussed in RAN that something like that is needed.

2. Release -99, two open items reported (to be handled as corrections)

- 25.214 the power control for UE in SHO

As suggested by RAN WG4, the UE TPC behaviour in SHO needs to be specified a bit more exactly. CR to be produced from the next WG1 meeting

- 25.224 the TDD power control with multiple time slots

(more exactly with multiple CCTrChs expect the limits what UTRAN is allowed to do)

Power control in multi-slot cases might need some further work (based on the discussed in the narrow band TDD Ad Hoc)

3. RAN WG1 Technical reports (25.928)

TR 25.928 1.28 Mcps UTRA TDD Physical Layer proceeded a great deal.

Items that remained to be worked on were as concluded by the physical Ad Hoc:

- The benefits (motivation) of the specific features of narrowband TDD, including:
 - uplink synchronisation
 - fast TPC for uplink
 - beamforming
- GSM measurements (due different frame structure and slot length)

There are also less important details that can be covered in the specification work later.

The description (differences/similarities) side made big progress in the TR.

(Ref: Ad Hoc report: Tdoc R1-00-0842, TR 25.928 see RP-00-0280, = R1-00-0841)

How to proceed after the important items still to be covered for TR 25.928 are done ?

Should RAN WG1 create Separate specifications or CRs to the existing RAN WG1 specifications?

→ **RAN view was to use the existing specs with different sections when appropriate.**

RAN guidance:

- 25.201 : should cover also narrow band TDD (General Description)
- 25.221-25.225 : CR procedure, separate section when appropriate
- 25.944 TR on multiplexing and channel coding examples should also cover narrow band TDD

It should be noted that before approval all CRs should be available for all RAN TSG.

Milestone has been set for TSG RAN#10

4. Release 2000 Study Item Discussions

As for the following 2 items, leading WG was set to be RAN WG2.

- High Speed Downlink Packet Access
- Improved downlink common channel for cell RACH/FACH state

There is obvious need for coordination with RAN WG2 on how the issues are covered in the responsibility of WG1.

For the High Speed Downlink Packet Access, it is suggested to start the TR in WG1 with items like link level simulation assumptions (and later add results) and then to proceed to other areas after having the discussion with RAN WG2. RAN WG2 does not have intention to have papers like link level simulation assumptions in RAN WG2

In general the CRs for release 2000 specifications for any features should be available for RAN groups at the same time. The milestone for CRs approval was set to TSG RAN#10 but this does not remove the need from WG1 to have conclusions on several items as planned in the TSG RAN#9 to allow other WGs to proceed.

5. Release 2000 work/study item procedure

Work Item description sheet principles:

- Rapporteur of the work item is responsible for updating the list of affected specs in the work item sheet and the status of the work affected specifications. Responsible WG will provide the update to TSG RAN plenary. Reporting will be made by the Chairman of the responsible WG.
- The WI sheets would be put forward for endorsement at each future TSG-RAN plenary meeting and serve as the basis for all discussion on each Work Item.
- MCC will compile the documents with all work item sheets. One documents will contain all Work Item Description sheet per Features/Building blocks (or one document per leading WG to facilitate the discussion).
- To change the scope of the work item sheet, a separate proposal needs to be done to TSG RAN:

Technical Reports per Work Items principles:

- For all WIs approved by the TSG-RAN plenaries by default, it should result in the elaboration of a Technical Report under the responsibility of the leading WG. In particular cases, following advice from the responsible WG, the TSG-RAN plenary might take the decision of not requesting this report (e.g. because this report would be void).
- First the leading working group creates a TR which summarises the motivation (i.e. the gains compared to existing specifications), requirements on the solution and the overall concept.
- Once the leading WG reaches the stage that other WGs should be involved, they will inform other working groups to evaluate the impact of the proposed concept to their specifications
- The other WGs will capture the impact to their specification either on a TR maintained in that WG or in case of minor impact they may provide input to the TR maintained in the leading WG. The rapporteur will incorporate in the main report the part of the reports from the other WG.
- The TR should include an assessment of backward compatibility to earlier releases of the system.
- The TR in a WG can be used as *place holder* for decision on draft CRs. It is not recommended to incorporate them in the Technical Report because before presentation of the full pack of CRs time might had elapsed and therefore it might be necessary to revise the CR because the approved version of the referenced specification might have changed

Finalisation of Work Items

- When all CRs for a WI have been approved in all WG, they are brought for approval for the next TSG RAN as one package. In case several Work Items have direct dependency (i.e. one WI does not work in absence of completion of another WI), they need to be approved as one package.
- In case of a study item, TSG RAN shall first take a decisions on inclusions or exclusions of particular concepts in a given Release based on the results of the study item. If concluded positively, a Work Item may be created by TSG-RAN.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented.

- 1) Regarding the meeting schedule, we need to make sure that there is sufficient time in between RAN plenary and RAN WG1 meeting. (ex. 2 weeks before and after)

- 2) For release 2000 work/study item procedure, the work should be indicated by the leading WG. The leading WG needs to review the concepts and should contact the other WGs when it feels that it is necessary. The role of the rapporteur is extremely important. Rapporteur is responsible for quality. This can be a very large job but we should really aim at quality for release 2000.
- 3) The category of the CR is now very clearly specified. We have to make CRs that corresponds to editorial modifications or corrections. It should be noted that something that might have missed in the RAN WG1 specifications but are present in other specifications like in RAN WG2 or RAN WG3 is not to be seen as addition of the feature by RAN WG1. It is a correction. Because the feature was already present at RAN level so this is not addition of the feature but correction. Furthermore, it is very clearly specified in RAN that the editorial correction is a matter of false, index, commas. If you change one word, it is not editorial correction anymore and it would be a correction from now on.

It was questioned what is meant by "place holder" in the CR procedure for the release 2000 items. Does it mean that we only have sections where all the number of CRs are listed ?

Chairman answered.

It should be clear that the actual CRs should be created as separate documents. Though the report should capture the changes as well as it can, we need to understand that the actual CR then might have some further details and stuff like that. Basically speaking, the report should not have the text with revision marks like CRs and the report should be a kind of text so that when you read it you understand what changes are needed in various places in the specifications. CR text with revision marks are not necessary needed for the TR. CRs should be separated ones.

No matter what is the status of the report, anything will not be included in the specifications until the actual CRs are approved by the TSG RAN. If we have the technical report approved by RAN WG1, it means that we are in the agreement in the concept and the details of the principles, changes listed in this report. For example in September we can submit something for which we can say from RAN WG1 point of view we need to have detailed CRs. Doing those changes for specifications, RAN WG1 will think that the other WGs should do the changes that support those things. In that sense, the report should be as detailed as possible. The report should have all the details like the exact parameters needs to be seen from other WGs so that other WGs can proceed. We can do with the exact equations of stuff like that in the actual CRs. Ideally, CRs then should not cause anymore mismatch with the other WGs because the report has already allowed other WGs to produce their CRs based on that report. I am not sure whether RAN will approve the report so that it becomes a work item in case it is study item and so that WGs are supposed to go ahead with that. I guess we actually do not want our report to be approved formally because we do not necessary want the report to be put under the change request procedures.

We will know in detail when we have the actual reports to RAN from WGs but this is the guidance for the report so far. The kind of template for the report would be provided by MCC and of course this should be used.

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

| No. | Title | Source | To/Cc | Tdoc No. | Forwarded To | Notes |
|-----|--|--------|-------|---------------------------|--------------|------------|
| 1 | Response to LS (R1-000798) on'Neighbour Cell SFN detection for Handover' | R2 | TO | R1-00-0893 (R2-001284) | Plenary | Noted (*1) |
| 2 | LS on changes to TR 25.926 UE radio access capabilities for TDD | R2 | CC | R1-00-0894 (R2-001285) | Plenary | Noted (*2) |
| 3 | Response to LS on UMTS synchronisation channel detection | R4 | CC | R1-00-0895 (R4-000530) | Plenary | Noted (*3) |
| 4 | Response on LS on Neighbour Cell SFN Detection for Handover | R4 | TO | R1-00-0896 (R4-000537) | Plenary | Noted |
| 5 | Liaison Statement on measurements | R3 | TO | R1-00-0953 (R3-001878) | Plenary | Noted (*4) |

(*1) This was the answer LS to R1-00-0798 which had been sent out in the RAN WG1#13 meeting. RAN WG2 was informing us that though they share the view that UE has to be aware of SFN in the new cell, they feel that the signalling needed is in place to support also hard handover in release 99. (The release 99 RRC protocol supports transmission of the SFN of the neighbour cell to the UE.)

This LS was also presented to RAN #8 as well. No comment was raised.

(*2) This LS was sent to T1 and we received this as CC. This LS was informing that in order to minimise the complexity requirements for low bandwidth UEs in TDD mode, the requirement for the downlink capability "Maximum number of timeslots per frame" was reduced to 1 timeslot for the 32 kbps class, and to 2 for the 64 kbps class timeslots.

No comment was raised to this LS.

(*3) This LS was sent to SMG2. No immediate action was expected for us.

(*4) In this LS they are asking us to include (move) the appropriate definition of SIR_{error} measurement in our

specifications (TS 25.215/ TS 25.225) for release-99. The UL SIR_{error} measurement is defined as $SIR_{error}=SIR-SIR_{target}$. The measurement period for the SIR measurement is 80ms. This is currently defined only in TS 25.433 (NBAP specification)

Ericsson was already prepared CR for this change for FDD **R1-00-0899**. This was reviewed on Day2 and agreed with no comments. (See No. 38)

Chairman asked Mr. Dirk Gerstenberger (Ericsson) to produce an answer LS to WG3 on this issue.

5. Change Requests for WG1 Release –99 specifications

| No. | CR | rev. | TS | Tdoc | Title | Cat | Source | Conclusion | Notes |
|-----|-----------------|------|--------|------------|--|-----|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 6 | 064 | - | 25.211 | R1-00-0849 | Clarification on length of power control preambles | F | Philips | Noted | (*1) 10:35 |
| 7 | 086 | - | 25.212 | R1-00-0843 | Clarification on DL slot format for compressed mode by SF/2 | F | Lucent | To be revised | (*2) 10:43 |
| 8 | 112 | - | 25.214 | R1-00-0888 | Adding reference for power offset variation text in TS 25.214 | F | Nokia | Approved | (*3) 10:47 |
| 9 | 116 | - | 25.214 | R1-00-0855 | Corrections to 25.214 | F | Siemens | Approved | (*4) 10:52 |
| 10 | 113 | - | 25.214 | R1-00-0846 | Combining TPC commands in soft handover | F | Philips | Approved | (*5) 10:57 |
| 11 | 115 | - | 25.214 | R1-00-0850 | Corrections to power control | F | Philips | To be revised | (*6) 11:08 |
| 12 | 118 | - | 25.214 | R1-00-0859 | Clarification of power control at maximum and minimum power | F | Philips | To be revised | (*7) 11:36 |
| 13 | 119 | - | 25.214 | R1-00-0860 | Clarification of SSDT text | F | Panasonic | Approved | No (*8) comment 11:39 |
| 14 | 026 | - | 25.221 | R1-00-0874 | Some corrections for TS 25.221 | F | Siemens | To be revised | (*9) 11:55 |
| 15 | 022 | - | 25.221 | R1-00-0865 | Correction to midamble generation in UTRA TDD | F | Mitsubishi Siemens | To be revised | (*10) 12:00 |
| 16 | 024 | - | 25.224 | R1-00-0810 | Update to description of cell search procedure in UTRA TDD | F | Mitsubishi | Approved superseded | No (*11) comment 12:11 |
| 17 | 012 | - | 25.225 | R1-00-0884 | Alignment of TDD measurements with FDD: GPS related measurements | F | Siemens | To be revised | (*12) 12:20 |
| 18 | 013 | - | 25.225 | R1-00-0885 | Alignment of TDD measurements with FDD:SFN-CFN observed time difference | F | Siemens | To be revised | (*13) 12:25 |
| 19 | 014 | - | 25.225 | R1-00-0886 | Clarification of the Timeslot ISCP measurements | F | Siemens | Postponed | (*14) 12:35 |
| 20 | 065 | - | 25.211 | R1-00-0897 | Correction of reference | F | Ericsson | Approved | No comment 13:46 |
| 21 | 066 | - | 25.211 | R1-00-0898 | Clarification of paging indicator mapping | F | Ericsson | To be revised | (*15) 13:54 |
| 22 | 079 | - | 25.212 | R1-00-0698 | Clarification of compressed mode terminology | F | Ericsson | Approved | (*16) 14:04 |
| 23 | 068 | - | 25.215 | R1-00-0900 | Reporting of UTRAN Transmitted carrier power | F | Ericsson | Postponed | (*17) 14:16 |
| 24 | - | - | - | R1-00-0844 | Typical Radio Parameter Sets Version 1.2 | - | ISG NTT DoCOMo | Noted | (*18) 14:35 |
| 25 | 002 | 1 | 25.944 | R1-00-0908 | TDD related changes for TR25.944 | F | Siemens | To be revised | (*19) 14:44 |
| 26 | 117 | - | 25.214 | R1-00-0857 | Clarification to downlink power control | F | Nokia | Approved | (*20) 14:49 |
| 27 | UE Capabilities | | | R1-00-0892 | Proposed clarification to TR 25.926 | - | QUALCOMM | Not agreed | (*21) 16:00 |
| 28 | UE Capabilities | | | R1-00-0845 | Proposed change to UE capabilities relating to compressed mode by spreading factor reduction | - | Motorola | Agreed | (*22) 16:14 |
| 29 | 013 | 1 | 25.225 | R1-00-0911 | Alignment of TDD measurements with FDD:SFN-CFN observed time difference | F | Siemens | Approved | (*23) 16:18 |

(*1) Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) stated that the intention was just to clarify that the uplink and downlink power control preambles are the same length. He added that there were possibly other changes in section 7.7, and so that this CR needs not necessary to be approved here. He would provide another CR which incorporates this clarification and the other changes together. So this was just noted at the time of this presentation.

Mr. Alexander Lax (3G.com) pointed out that the word 'length' in the added sentence "*The uplink and downlink power control preambles are the same length*" should be more descriptive. Mr. Tim Mousley proposed this to be 'duration' and it was agreed.

(*2) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented.

1) Is it useful to refer to the *control bit* in section 4.2.12.2 ?

2) There are mistakes in the indexes in $N_{first+6}$ and $N_{first+7}$, that +6 and +7 should be out of index (normal font)

Chairman suggested if there is no need to address the control bits in this part, these comments should be reflected in the revision. The revision can be found in **R1-00-0918**. This was reviewed on Day4 and approved.

(See No. 66)

There was one another comment that CR should be based on the latest (v3.3.0) specification.

(*3) This CR intended to add the reference to TS 25.433 which contains the method for controlling the power offset and suggest it is a useful reference when clarifying what is meant with "The power offsets may vary in time" in TS 25.214.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that CR itself is of no problem as it is but the category should be changed from "D : Editorial modification" to "F : Correction" according to the criterion in RAN #8.

Chairman proposed this to be corrected by the secretary.

(*4) Mr. Takashi Mochizuki (NEC) made a comment which did not have direct relation to this CR itself that in section 7.2, antenna weighting factor for antenna 1 should be corrected as "1/sqr(2)" instead of current "1". (for normalization).

Chairman suggested there should be separate CR.

The title of this CR shall be changed by the secretary from "Editorial corrections to 25.214" to "Corrections to 25.214" because this is considered not to be *editorial* corrections according to the new criterion in RAN #8.

(*5) Is there any definition of what the "reliable" means in the framework ?

→ Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) answered that the condition is that signal is strong compared to noise. RAN WG4 would be responsible for the actual requirements.

(*6) This CR contains 2 modification. One is the clarification on power control in compressed mode recovery period and the other is clarification of transmission of TPC commands in uplink when downlink is not present.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented regarding recovery period part, that the modified sentence should be more elaborated and she suggested offline discussion. Regarding the clarification of TPC commands in uplink when downlink is not present, there were several comments including Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) himself that the following whole sentence should be removed.

"When TPC commands cannot be generated in the UE due to downlink out-of-synchronisation, the TPC command transmitted shall be set as "1" during the period of out-of-synchronisation."

The revision can be found in **R1-00-0919**. This was reviewed on Day4 and approved. (See No. 58)

(*7) There was a long discussion made concerning newly introduced section 5.1.2.6 "*Maximum and minimum power limits*" especially regarding the minimum power.

- The meaning of the second bullet point is not clear.

- What is the minimum power ? Does UTRAN set the minimum power like the maximum power ?

→ Chairman answered that UTRAN does not set any minimum power for UE though it can set the maximum.

There is no reason to set the minimum power from the network point of view.

- Is the minimum power referred here the minimum power set by the UE class ?

- Is the minimum power is the minimum level for the UE below which it can not go for some reason ?

- Is it unique to each UE ?

- etc.

Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) answered

1. If the transmit power of the UE goes down to the minimum power, the current specification stop saying anything on how the scaling should be done. This CR intends to clarify this.

2. Though UE is not required to be capable of reducing its total transmit power below the minimum level set by RAN WG4, if it goes down below the minimum after applying DPCC power adjustments and gain factors, the power ratio between control channel and data channel should be maintained.

If we do not say this, then we do not specify how the power should be balanced between control and data channel at the minimum power.

3. The minimum power referred here is not the minimum power of the particular UE. It is the requirement set by RAN WG4. All UE should be able to drop its power to the minimum requirement. The maximum power and the minimum power is something like a hard ceiling and soft floor. Though UE can not exceed the ceiling it can go below the floor.

Chairman concluded based on the discussion that the section 5.1.2.6 should be revised so that people should not have misunderstandings. Chairman suggested that the description should be a bit brief.

There was one more question regarding the *state information* in case of the additional scaling was applied. Is it clear in the current text that the additional scaling is also included in the state information to be applied in the next transmitted slot ?

Mr. Tim Mousley answered that it would be clarified in the revision.

This was revised into **R1-00-0920** and reviewed on Day4 (See No. 59) but was further revised into **R1-00-0973** and was approved. (See No. 78)

(*8) Category shall be changed to 'F' instead of 'D' by the secretary.

(*9) Mr. Marian Rudolf (Mitsubishi) commented that in section 5.5.1 "*Location of physical channels with beacon function*" whether the *note* should be removed ? Would it be good to keep this kind of note ? though some

- rewording might be needed.
Siemens suggested offline discussion for this.
Mr. Marian Rudolf asked the reason for adding the sentence in section 5.6.1 “*Midamble Allocation for DL Physical Channels*” for clarification and it was answered by Siemens.
There was one more comment from InterDigital that the figure 17 is somewhat misleading. Siemens answered that this figure would be more elaborated and suggested offline discussion.
This was revised into **R1-00-0939** and reviewed on Day4 and was approved with no comments. (See No. 67)
- (*10) There is one editorial comment regarding the reference to the equations. (9) should be (10). Therefore this was to be revised. The revision can be found in **R1-00-0921** and this was approved without comment on Day4. (See No. 61)
- /** R1-00-0877 (Siemens) was postponed because it had got comments. **/
(*11) The category shall be changed to ‘F’ instead of ‘D’ by the secretary.
This was superseded by **R1-00-0940** on Day 4. (See No. 70)
- (*12) This CR proposed adding new sections to TS 25.225 regarding LCS, and they are
5.1.11 *UE GPS Timing of Cell Frames for LCS*
5.2.10 *UTRAN GPS Timing of Cell Frames for LCS*
Mr. Frank Kowalewski (Siemens) stated in responding a comment from Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) on whether we can consider this as the measurement in release ’99 that will support the LCS function in release 2000 as follows;
Up to now there is only cell ID based method defined in TDD mode and the intention of this CR is just to align with FDD mode for release ’99 and there is no need for corresponding CR in RAN WG2.
Mr. Ian Corden (Lucent) commented that if the intention is to align with FDD mode then the ‘idle mode’ should not be inserted.
Mr. Frank Kowalewski agreed to this comment.
Chairman suggested that this should be revised to reflect the comment and at the same time the section number in UE part should be corrected as well. The revision can be found in **R1-00-0922**. This was reviewed on Day 4 and approved with no comments. (See No. 62)
- (*13) Mr. Stefan Oestreich (Siemens) presented this CR. There have been 2 corrections already done to this version.
1. Removal of “*for FDD neighbour cell*” description.
Mr. Stefan Oestreich stated that this part can be considered superfluous because if you measure FDD from TDD, it is always inter-frequency measurements and therefore the value for the parameter OFF is always reported to be 0.
2. The definition of “*SFN-CFN observed time difference for an FDD neighbour cell*” was changed to ‘ T_m ’ from ‘ $OFF \times 38400 + T_m$ ’
Mr. Stefan Oestreich asked for comments for the revision. There was one comment that the title ‘*time difference*’ is somewhat vague. Chairman answered the reason is to be consistent with other WGs and we should not touch the name at this point of time.
The revision can be found in **R1-00-0911**. This was reviewed in the afternoon of Day1 and approved with no comment. (See No. 29)
- (*14) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that this new definition seems to be quite different in effect from that of in RAN WG2 specification (TS 25.302 v3.5.0) and she asked whether there is any intention to be aligned with RAN WG2 specification.
Mr. Stefan Oestreich (Siemens) answered that RAN WG2 specification has also been changed to align with the definition in this CR.
It was questioned whether it is possible to derive the interference only by looking at midamble only.
Mr. Stefan Oestreich answered that the power in the midamble is the same as the power in the rest of the slot.
There are some other concerns were raised and chairman concluded this to be postponed.
- (*15) It was pointed out that in the title and first column of Table 22, there are still PI(s) used.
Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) raised concern that in reading the text, the wording of ‘paging indicator’, ‘PI’, ‘ P_p ’ are a bit confusing. There were no other comments. Chairman suggested that this was to be revised to correct Table 22 and invited Mr. Tim Mouldsley to offline discussion if he had some good suggestions. Chairman suggested also that the abbreviation section of the specification should be checked what was used in there.
The was revised into **R1-00-0927**. But since it got offline comment, it was further revised into **R1-00-0902**. R1-00-0902 was reviewed on Day4 (See No. 57) but this was further revised into **R1-00-0972** and approved. (See No.80).
- (*16) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that there are several (at least 2) misspellings in this CR.
They would be corrected by the secretary.
- (*17) In 25.215 the measurement of the UTRAN Transmitted carrier power is defined to be measured per branch, i.e. in case of Tx diversity 2 values will be measured, otherwise one value will be measured. Currently 25.433 supports reporting of only one value for the Transmitted carrier power. This CR proposed to report the maximum of the two values higher layers in case of Tx diversity.
Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that since this would definitely touch the RAN WG3 specification she would like to check with her RAN WG3 colleagues and people from implementation side though she realize the benefit of reporting the maximum value.
Chairman suggested this to be postponed to Day 4 to give the people time to check with their colleagues.
Siemens pointed out that the UE check box in the cover sheet should be unchecked.
This was reviewed again on Day 4 and approved with no comment. (See No. 60)

(*18) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented as follows.

I noticed that there has been a change in general on the way the transport format sets are described, which means that now there is a transport format provided for each transport format combination. For example, in p.19 section 5.4.1.4.1.1, you will see that for the second transport channel, the transport format 0 bit is repeated twice if you go to the transport format definition. In theory, we have only 2 transport format, they are, transport format for 0 bit and transport format for 103 bits. But here the way it is described shows that it could give the impression that we have 3 transport formats corresponding to 0, 0, and 103 bits. I understand the rationale behind this way of describing things because effectively it means you know the transport combination by looking at lines, you know that 0 for transport channel 1 is together with 0 for transport channel 2 together with 0. So you have transport format combination sets by looking at lines. But there are in effect fewer transport formats than provided here if we were to look at the RAN WG2 specifications. Is there any intention to increase the number of the transport formats over what is absolutely necessary ? This modification was applied on all combinations in the complete document. I do not think it is a major problem. I just want to be clear that for example the T-group when writing the test specifications, they will not consider there are as many transport formats as transport formats combinations in the transport format combination set.

In fact the TB size corresponds to what I understand as the transport format sets. The problem here is that there is an addition of the set of line and it says it is transport format sets. But I think it refers more to transport format combination sets. I do not know exactly how it is written in RRC specification but from the table, I am afraid that people may end up with defining 3 transport format when there are only 2 transport block size.

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) supported this comment.

Chairman encouraged the proponents who will provide the actual CR in the next RAN WG1 meeting that this kind of feedback should be taken into account. He added that it would be useful if the actual CR is provided on the reflector earlier before the next meeting so that people can have time to look into details through possibly long CR and it would save much time in the next meeting. He stated if we want to highlight this aspect (number of transport format) to T-group, then we can send CR in the liaison statement in the next meeting to avoid misunderstandings.

(*19) Siemens presented this documents on the screen. This CR includes the corrections for the TDD part to align with the document from ISG as already done in the FDD part. They had distributed the original version onto the reflector on Friday of the week before. There were a lot of comments from Mr. Takehiro Nakamura (NTT DoCoMo) and these comments have been taken into account in this presented revision.

Since this is quite large CR, Siemens proposed that this should be checked offline and we would come back to this on Day4. They added that there had been already some typos found in the table and so they would prepare the revision. Chairman agreed with this proposal and encouraged people to check the contents of this CR offline. The revision is in **R1-00-0928**. This revision was reviewed on Day4 and approved with no comments.

(See No. 72)

(*20) In the RAN WG1 #13 meeting, **R1-00-0726** CR-090r3, "*Level of specification of power control*", was approved. In that CR the Maximum_DL_power and Minimum_DL_power were defined as (dB). These power levels are relative to primary CPICH power, as defined in TS 25.433. For clarification, this CR proposed that the reference, primary CPICH power, should be mentioned also in TS 25.214.

Mr. Serge Willenegger (QUALCOMM) questioned about the reason why those values are relative to the primary CPICH power rather than relative to the absolute maximum base station power.

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) answered that that is according to the structure in the RAN WG4. They sent out the LS some meetings ago in which they proposed relative measurement in order to increase the accuracy of the measurements.

The category of this CR shall be corrected to 'F' instead of 'D' by the secretary.

(*21) Several comments were made.

Main concern was that there would be some conflict between physical channel capability and transport channel capability and this would add some limitation to the implementation.

Chairman concluded based on those comments that at this point of time we can not agree with this proposal.

But it would be useful if we had some example which explain what is the gain of this modification, with the explanation of the interleaver with/without this modification.

(*22) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that the operation in normal mode should be clarified.

"For parameter values up to and including 9600 bits, the UE shall also be able to support compressed mode by SF reduction when operating at any value up to the reported capability in normal mode."

Mr. Richard Burbidge (Motorola) agreed to this comment and said he would revise to reflect the comment.

Chairman asked Mr. Richard Burbidge to produce LS to RAN WG2.

The LS can be found in **R1-00-0929**. This LS was reviewed on Day 3 and approved with no comment.

(See section 13, No. 2)

(*23) This is the revision of **R1-00-0885**. No comment was raised except one pointing out the error in section numbering. This shall be corrected by the secretary when implementing this CR.

Day 2, started at 09.11

6. Release 2000 issues (to continue where stopped at WG1#13, may start at Day 1 already)

Ad Hoc configuration

- AH21 : TDD 1.28 Mchips functionality (TR)
- AH22 : Terminal power saving features
- AH23 : Compressed mode
- AH24 : High speed downlink packet access
- AH25 : Hybrid ARQ
- AH26 : TX-diversity
- AH27 : Radio link performance enhancements
- AH28 : Improved Common DL Channel for Cell FACH State
- AH29 : Positioning
- AH30 : TDD NodeB synchronisation
- AH31 : Uplink Synchronous Transmission

Before discussing individual papers, chairman stated in answering some procedural questions.

We are supposed to prepare the technical reports especially on those things for which we feel they are feasible and make sense to create them. We should figure out whether we want to prepare the technical report per topic or we want to prepare one per study item, e.g. radio link performance enhancement.

For this Radio link performance enhancement, I somehow feel that these topics may proceed with different speed, etc. They are a bit complicated and a lot of stuffs are not relevant to each other. Therefore I think we should aim to create technical report on individual topics if we would think that those topics make sense and should go ahead. Then even if one topic was rejected in the RAN, the others will be able to proceed.

Q. Do we have to create TR for each topic ?

If we do not have a primary responsibility on the topic, for example, RAN WG2 does have something that has very small impact on RAN WG1 then we might skip it and say OK we will provide our input if any to the TR in RAN WG2. But if we want to make some Study Item actually becoming Work Item, we do need to bring something to RAN where we justify it and explain what it is about, why we should make it Work Item. It would be very difficult if you did not make this kind of small technical report over the study item that has some background explanation why this needs to become work item from RAN WG1 point of view. It is not convenient for the other WGs if they have to start without referring to the technical report but by looking the individual contributions from individual companies. If there is anything that we expect to go to the specification, we need to have TR. It does not mean that TR is long. It can be only a couple of pages as long as it capture the essence in case it is very short topic.

| No. | AdHoc | Tdoc | Title | Source | Conclusion | Notes |
|-----|-------|---------------------|--|------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| 30 | 27 | R1-00-0854 | Improved Rate Matching Scheme for Convolutional Codes (Revision of R1-00-0649) | Siemens | Not agreed | (*1) 09:42 -10:00 |
| 31 | 27 | R1-00-0891 | DSCH power control | Nokia | Details to be provided | (*2) 10:34 -10:58 |
| 32 | 28 | R1-00-0847 | Offset CPCH (rev 1) | Philips | Noted | (*3) 11:01 -11:19 |
| 33 | 28 | R1-00-0890 | Remarks on the proposal for the improved cell RACH/FACH state | Nokia | Noted | (*4) 11:20 -11:33 |
| 34 | 28 | R1-00-0625 | Further Simulation Results on Performance Gains Associated with introduction of CLPC on FACH | GBT | Noted | (*5) 11:35 -12:45 |
| 35 | 28 | R1-00-0917 + slides | Forward Link CDMA Packet Data Capacity | GBT | | |
| 36 | 31 | R1-00-0903 | Uplink Synchronous Transmission Scheme (USTS) | SK Telecom | Noted | (*6) 14:31 -14:53 |
| 37 | 31 | R1-00-0904 | Performance study of Uplink Synchronous Transmission Scheme (USTS) | SK Telecom | Noted | (*7) 14:53 -15:05 |

(*1) There were several comments opposing to this scheme. Main concern was that the gain is 0.1dB whereas the complexity is not small.

After several comments were made, chairman concluded that at this point of time RAN WG1 would not proceed this study item to the actual work item. Based on the comments, it seems that people do not necessary want to explain to their implementation people that we need this and the gain is 0.1dB. The gain seems not to be enough to

justify the changes. Any supports from other companies have not been raised on this right now.
Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) stated.

I would like to point out that in the course of release 00 or release 01 we will have to make some announcement over rate matching block if, for example, we are going to apply Hybrid ARQ as such or together with High bit rate packet data transmission. In any case we will have to make some changes to the rate matchings. So my suggestion is that we should wait to know what we have in general to this rate matching block and have a solution that will benefit for more services. I think although there is small gain and in effect smaller than indicated here, we should target the bigger steps in modification of such block in order to encompass all the different services rather than to add just one announcement for which we will have to change again later.

Siemens agreed to the chairman's conclusion and comment from Ms. Evelyne Le Strat.

(*2) Some questions for clarifications were made.

Nokia explained that this is the first paper for discussion on this topic and the intention is just to raise the issue before the next meeting. More lengthy and elaborated explanation will be provided for the next meeting including the results of the e-mail discussion.

There were questions asking what the improvement of the performance or capacity of this proposal would be.

Chairman commented as a proponent that this is the first paper and it is not the intention to have conclusion in this meeting. I guess more details will be provide for the next meeting.

There was one question regarding hardware changes for release 2000. Is it really one of the goal for release 2000 that it does not impact on hardware ? Of course there is a wide goal that all release 99 terminals can be operated in release 2000 network and all release 2000 terminal can be operated in release 99 network.

Chairman answered that there is no such requirement set by the RAN but it could be more difficult to be approved if the proposal have impact on the hardware compared to the case in which no change is needed.

(*3) Before proceeding to AH28 related issues, chairman briefly stated as follows.

As for this study item, the leading WG is RAN WG2. So as RAN WG1, let's have a quick look of those papers and figure out what kind of issues we have on those papers, understanding the most papers have been submitted to RAN WG2 as well. I expect that we need to send some kind of LS to RAN WG2 to indicate what kind of topics we are expecting to discuss on those topics where the leading WG is RAN WG2 or some other WGs so that we can avoid repeating same discussions in different places.

R1-00-0847

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented;

- Whether there is a need to have additional signalling capability is definitely something needs to be checked.

- How this fit into the study item (Improved Common DL Channel for Cell FACH State) that is led by RAN WG2 is not clear.

- How does the Node B decode the offset ? How can the Node B get the offset since we are in the state where there is no reference, we do not know where the mobile is ? If the offset is so large that they correspond to extremely large cell, we can not understand what it the exact value of the offset. Would not this mean that we have higher detection error ?

- In any case there would be large significant increase of complexity of the Node B receiver.

Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) agreed with comment regarding the problem in large cell case. The assumption here is the medium cells where the offset < 256 chips are enough and these cells are considered very likely. He agreed also with the Node B complexity and welcomed the comments on this. He added that this proposal may have more general interest in RAN WG1 than just within this particular Ad Hoc and he wanted to suggest that this proposal should not be discussed only in relation with the Ad Hoc but in more general in RAN WG1.

Chairman summarized.

In the LS to RAN WG2, let's say that this kind of proposal has been raised and RAN WG1 would like to check from RAN WG2 if this is dealt in the scope of this study item and if RAN WG1 is expected to provide further comments on the feasibility and the benefit of the proposal. We put as result of brief discussion that there was a strong concern with respect to the complexity of the Node B receiver.

For release 2000 if we are to discuss the topic, of course we need to have a place of work item or study item where it will fit because otherwise we have to discuss everything. So we would like to check that RAN WG2 whether they do expect feed back from us with that topic for release 2000 and if 'yes' then we will have more detailed discussion on this one.

(*4) Mr. Kourosh Parsa (GBT) questioned about over all calculation assumptions.

Nokia proposed offline discussion.

Chairman concluded that it would not make sense to go into very detailed calculations now here on line. The points should be noted in this paper were

- As discussed in the reflector, for the downlink simulations TX power should be used instead of RX power and preferably similar assumptions should be used with TX diversity.

- Delay was raised with respect to the current scheme compared to the delay with respect to just setting up the DCH on this purpose

These 2 points were raised for consideration. Details should be discussed offline or on the e-mail reflector.

(*5) There were a lot of comments & questions for clarification made.

- Figures are definitely needed than tables.

- Questions on simulation assumptions

- Power control dynamic range has no role in the simulations.

- Is the imperfect open loop power control included in the simulation ?

- Are this result still function of Tx power or Rx power in the tables ?

Chairman concluded,

The simulation results should be easy to approach. And ideally speaking, more or less similar simulation assumptions, for example, as Tx diversity should be used so that people can have some possibility to reproduce the results if it is desired. Now it is extremely difficult to reproduce the results since different normalization were used here and there.

What is the cost of this feature from the physical layer point of view ? When we have some kind of consensus with the view of what actually the gain is, we really should have some kind of view of what the actually the pain is at least from RAN WG1 perspective.

Chairman will draft the LS asking RAN WG2 as the steering WG what they would like to get from us.

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) commented that how the longer TTI on common channels affects the simulations and complexity is very relevant issues to be noted.

Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) opposed to this because this (longer TTI on common channel) is not really our agreement.

(*6) This is the USTS overview paper and performance of USTS is provided another paper (R1-00-0904).

Several comments were made.

- Would this scheme be mandatory or optional for the mobile end?
 - If this is approved then this scheme will be optional both in UE and UTRAN
- It is not clear how the T_{ref} can be got. Is it calculated over time average of all UEs in the synchronized cell ?
 - It is not calculated. It is the average of RTPD of all of the UEs in the cell.
- In USTS if you will also have network doing timing alignment, this would have some relation with closed loop power control. We need to have more information.
- Even in indoor environment, there is a possibility of softhandover and in USTS it is not supposed to be operated in softhandover. Then how does the NodeB know which UE is in soft handover and which is not in soft handover ?
- What is the gain of this scheme ?
- Regarding the Initial Synchronization section, measurement of the RTPD, is this a measurement or calculation ? What is the relation to the already existing measurement for the propagation delay.
- etc

Chairman stated that not all the question necessary need not answered online. Let's move on to the performance paper (R1-00-0904).

(*7) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented;

I believe only the intra cell interference is taken into account and there is no consideration of the inter-cell interference. Another very important aspect when we are to consider the gain improved by such a new feature is that, we need to consider the co-existence with the existing system, users. We need to take into account of mixed users.

Chairman concluded as follows.

In the next meeting we should aim to reach conclusions on what should we do with this item in together with another document which proponents have provided for the outline of the technical report which we should create in that form or another form if we decide to proceed with the item. There some clarification would be needed and also some updates to the contributions would be needed. Further elaboration like co-existence services, inter-cell interference calculation would be needed as well assuming in different environments and considering TPC or stuff like that.

So in the next meeting I hope we can decide whether we go ahead with this or not. If it is yes, then we should keep the schedule and inform the other WGs that they should proceed with this. So I guess proponents will do some updates for the papers then we will try this kind of discussion in the next meeting where we hope to get the conclusions on what the RN WG1 view is about this and should inform that to the other WGs. I encourage the other companies to study the documents. The comments over e-mail is also encouraged. I think very detailed proposal like R1-00-0905 does not make sense. This kind of proposal would be needed after we decided to go ahead.

6.1

| No. | CR | rev. | TS | Tdoc | Title | Cat | Source | Conclusion | Notes |
|-----|-----|------|--------|------------|--|-----|----------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 38 | 067 | - | 25.215 | R1-00-0899 | Insertion of UTRAN SIR_{error} measurement in 25.215 | F | Ericsson | Approved on condition | (*1) 14:23 |

(*1) This CR was reviewed on Day 2 afternoon and this was proposed in response to the incoming LS from RAN WG3 (See section 4, No. 5) The new section for SIR_{error} has been created.

There was no comment made. Chairman concluded we should approved this on the condition that other WG agree on this as well.

Chairman asked Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) to draft the small LS informing that in RAN WG1, the definition of the SIR_{error} measurement can be included. Since Ericsson had already prepared the LS, it was reviewed in succession.

R1-00-0901 *Response Liaison to WG3 on measurements / Source : Ericsson*

TO : RAN WG3, CC: RAN WG4, RAN WG2

Chairman commented that the following sentence and the R1-00-0889 (CR 25.215-069) should be attached.

“This is done under the assumption that the proposed change is acceptable by RAN WG2 and RAN WG4 as well.”

Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) pointed out that *“SIR_{error} measurement is now included in the WG1 specifications”* maybe slightly misleading and so this should be modified as *“SIR_{error} measurement **can be included in the WG1 specifications”***.

It was questioned whether it is logical to create similar CR for TDD mode (TS 25.225) by Mr. Stephen Dick (InterDigital). Chairman answered that it should be created and it should be mentioned in the LS.

Since the draft LS was not distributed, the same T-doc number R1-00-0950 is used for approved version.

**7. Ad Hoc 26 :TX diversity &
Ad Hoc 30 : Node B synchronization**

15:00-evening

Day 3 , started at 09.03

8. Ad Hoc 21 Narrow band TDD

| No. | AdHoc | Tdoc | Title | Source | Conclusion | Notes |
|-----|-------|------------|--|--------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 39 | 21 | R1-00-0934 | The performance improvement from power control | CWTS | Noted | No comment 09:15 |
| 40 | 21 | R1-00-0935 | The performance improvement from Smart Antenna | CWTS | Noted | (*1) 09:26 |
| 41 | 21 | R1-00-0933 | The benefit of uplink synchronization | CWTS | Noted | No comment 09:35 |
| 42 | 21 | R1-00-0955 | Monitoring GSM from low chip rate TDD | CWTS | Approved for TR | (*2) 09:43 |
| 43 | 21 | R1-00-0937 | Frame structure for low chip rate TDD option | CWTS | Agreed in principle | (*3) 10:50 |
| 44 | 21 | R1-00-0938 | Transmission of TFCI in low chip rate TDD option | CWTS | Noted | (*4) 11:00 |

(*1) There was one comment that system needs to work without smart antennas (especially 8 antenna elements) as well, It should be considered that this kind of smart antenna concept is one option and as another option, we should be able to have the different kind of smart antenna concept with less antenna elements. Chairman answered that of course we can not decided system which will not work without smart antennas. But it is also hoped that in other modes, FDD and TDD, they do support smart antennas as such as well. Of course the smart cannot be only one solution.

What inter-element spacing and what adaptation algorithm are used in the simulation ?

→ for the spacing, between the half λ and λ , algorithm

→ for the algorithm, power combined (??)

What is meant by the L1 control signals in the simulation parameters ?

→ power control, etc

(*2) This is the revision of **R1-00-0936**.

There was one comment made regarding section A.1.1 on whether the equation is exactly same with that of wide band TDD apart from 5ms ? → Yes, it is.

There were no other comments and this change proposal was agreed. Since this was the only one change proposal to TR this time, editor was asked to incorporate this by the chairman.

Chairman stated about how we should proceed the narrow band TDD.

There had been very lengthy discussion in the RAN. After all, the requirement from RAN was that we should continue with the CR procedure for the existing specifications which means of course release 2000 version of the specifications. I guess one of the main reasons came from other WGs point of view. First of all RAN WG2 has the RRC specification, length of 500 pages and so they would be very reluctant to update all the references in that specification. We should then work with the CR procedure. It should be noted that before these CRs are actually to be approved in RAN (the milestone is set now at December) all the CRs need to be reviewed by all of RAN WGs.

In the RAN it was also discussed that there should be one single CR per specification because otherwise it gets difficult to follow with a pile of CRs per specifications. (That is the reason why we discussed in the RAN as the first option that we should have separated specifications.) Anyway it was clarified that we should produce the single CR per specification. How should we do that in practice before having the actual CRs. There would be a couple of alternatives. Do we work with having kind of technical report per CR that captures agreed details or do we work with having kind of *working CR* which will be maintained by the proponents ? In working CR case, if everybody thinks that the contents agreeable then it will become the actual CR. So it might be perhaps the wisest way. If we have technical report, anyway we have to convert that to the CR in the end whereas in case of working CR, we can get the actual CR only by approving.

So what should we do with the technical report we have now ? I think that this will now serve as a baseline of what we have now and from which we will start though it has not been developed in CR level but in descriptive level. So there a lot of smaller details need to be done for the working CRs. Of course it is highly recommended that we should do easy comparisons and use whatever we can use. For example, if you take TS 25.221, for the section introducing physical channels for narrow band TDD, that would take the same structure for the wide band TDD, we can use it. In case there are something that are equal to both mode, then they can be used. In TS 25.221 case, there will not be many of this kind of things because all the numbers should be different in any case with the different chip rate. But for the specifications where there are less differences like TS 25.225, separate section can be rather small because we do not need to duplicate things that are identical. Of course if there is something like this GSM measurement that has difference then we have to have new section for GSM measurement in the case of narrow band TDD. But let's not have things that are not necessary.

We have a lot of work in advance but having and maintaining this kind of working CRs, it is easy for me to report the situation in the RAN in September if I have one document that I can refer per specification. It is not necessary the approved status. It is easier for other WGs as well than to have 20 or 30 pending CRs for individual specifications. RAN WG2 and WG3 people would have to read through a big pile of documents to find whatever they want.

(*3) Chairman commented.

If you do this CR like this then eventually you will have much more bigger re-writing work for the RAN meeting in December because the wide band TDD physical channel sections is still under development as well. If you have a separate section so that you remain this section 5, physical channels with high chip rate TDD option, then you will have separate section which would contain the things for the low chip rate TDD option and then even if there would be developments in the high chip rate TDD option, the working CR would remain more or less unchanged. But now, for example, if you mix up the sections in this way, you might end up doing a lot of changes. Even in the last meeting we had some changes for the high chip rate TDD option.

But that is my personal opinion and of course you can do it if you do like this with certain risk. This is one way we can do it. The other way is that we would have clear one section for physical channels for low chip rate option and the other one for the physical channel for high chip rate option. Of course they can have the same structure. But in that sense, the CR itself would be shorter and maybe more independently required if the structure was changed for the high chip rate TDD for release 2000 version. But as I said it can be done in 2 ways

There were several comments

- This CR is based on the v.3.2.0 (old version)

Chairman answered that if we approve CR formally it must be based on the latest version of the specification and thus this must be revised.

- In section 5.1.2 "In each sub-frame of 5ms for low chip rate option, there are two switching points (uplink to downlink and vice versa)" but the last time slot is always downlink timeslot in low chip rate TDD option ?

→ In the sub-frame period, the directions of uplink and downlink patterns, uplink to downlink or downlink to uplink will be given by the switching point. Figure 5 is showing that the first time slot TS0 is always downlink and TS1 is always uplink by having switching point in between.

- Everywhere in the existing specifications, are we going to call the existing figures with this high chip rate TDD option extension ? Are we basically going to be renaming every figure that we have there with high chip rate and low chip rate ?

- Are we going to decide to call *wide band* as *high chip rate TDD*

Chairman suggested to use the actual chip rate for the naming taking into account of some cases where the other new chip rate will be introduced in the feature.

Let's call them like 3.84Mchip TDD 1.28Mcps TDD.

- Notations should be kept in line with 3.84Mcps TDD (TS0, TS1, ...)

- One sentence has been deleted beneath the figure 2, but these low chip rate CRs should not erase any texts or sentences from the existing 3.84Mcps TDD specifications. That is not the purpose of the CR This CR should not touch the 3.84Mcps TDD as it is.

- At the RAN meeting there was no clear guidance for which specifications we should have separate sections and for which not. We should have clear view as fast as possible on which specification and on which sections we can have separate sections. Before the next meeting we should make a proposal for this so that CWTS is able to start with that structure agreed in RAN WG1.

Chairman answered that that was good solution. His comment regarding this specification was just referring this specification and not generic. There is of course no need to create separate sections for all specifications. Chairman encouraged CWTS to make some proposal even for tomorrow if it is possible or submit it on the reflector before the next meeting.

Chairman concluded that for the technical things, we could consider this is agreed in principle.

(*4) Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia) commented that in section 5.2.2.1 and 5.2.2.1.1 what is new because it seems that sentences has been simply moved up and down, changed their location. Definitely we should not change anything in the wide band specifications with these CRs.

It was commented that in 5.2.2.1.2, the word 'also' should be removed.

It was commented that there is a contradiction in 5.2.2.1.2 "*directly adjacent to the midamble, possibly after the SS and TPC symbols.*".

It was pointed out that terminology should be aligned with 3.84 Mcps TDD and if the new terminology is introduced then some explanation is needed. (this comment is regarding 5.2.2.1.2 'normal time slot'.)

Chairman concluded that for the technical things, we could consider this is agreed in principle.

8.1 R1-00-0956 *Draft LS to WG2, WG3, and WG4: Status Report of the WI 'Low Chip Rate TDD, physical layer' and request for support* (11:01 – 11:42)

Chairman commented the following sentence should be added according to the previous discussion.

"TSG RAN WG1 intends to refer to the low chip rate TDD in WG1 specifications as 1.28Mcps TDD and also where separation to the existing UTRA TDD is needed, that will be denoted as 3.84Mcps TDD"

Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) commented that following should be added right after the above sentence in order to clarify the meaning when we say 'TDD'.

“ The intention is that for release 2000 the term UTRA TDD would cover both TDD chip rates. ”

Chairman agreed to this comment.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that there is a problem in the title of the liaison statement *“Status Report ”*. There could be some confusion because the contents are not status report. Therefore the title should be changed as something like *“ Progress ”*.

Chairman agreed to this comment.

It was pointed out that the last paragraph should be removed because it can read we are asking something. What are we actually asking to other groups ? What should we have from them on the beginning of our next meeting ? What kind of support ?

“ In order to proceed with the work item according to the time schedule decided in RAN#8, TSG RAN WG1 would appreciate an answer regarding the support at the beginning of the next TSG RAN WG1 meeting, 22-25 august. ”

Chairman agreed to this comment. If other WGs have questions or comments then they would ask us.

Instead of this paragraph, chairman suggested to CWTS to put the following sentence.

“ TSG RAN WG1 encourages other WGs to take the necessary action for timely completion of the feature. ”

We are not asking any particular response. We want them to take actions and that's it.

Chairman added in response to the question raised by CWTS regarding the technical report that we could note about the technical report that RAN WG1 has completed the work on it and now RAN WG1 continues with the drafting of the *working CRs* that would be made available to the other WGs. The new version of this technical report should be mentioned with T-doc number **(R1-00-0960)**. He drafted on the screen as follows.

“ There is updated version of the TR25.928 to be made available in Tdoc R1-00-0960, which contains additional information regarding GSM measurement. TSG RAN WG1 will proceed now for the drafting of the CRs for the WG1 specifications. TSG RAN WG1 intends to maintain "working CRs" and will inform the other WGs when such CRs are available (first version of those). ”

Concerning the attached table, chairman commented that baton handover has nothing to do with beamforming and we have already discussed that we should not cover baton handover in the technical report. Therefore this should be removed from the table.

Mr. Tim Mouldsley commented that the name of the attached document (Impacts to WG2_3_4) is slightly misleading and thus the attachment should be attached as a table as annex instead of attached file.

Mr. Alexander Lax (3G.com) pointed out that the last sentence in the first paragraph should be reworded because the word *“impact”* is considered not to be proper here. Mr. Tim Mouldsley suggested this to be modified into

*“This LS intends to inform the other groups about the current situation in TSG RAN WG1 **which may have impacts to the specifications in other RAN WGs.**”*

The LS was approved as amended in **R1-00-0961**.

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

| No. | AdHoc | Tdoc | Title | Source | Conclusion | Notes |
|-----|-------|------------|---|----------|------------|------------------|
| 45 | 22 | R1-00-0856 | UE battery life improvement with DPCCH gating | Nokia | Noted | (*1) 12:12 |
| 46 | 22 | R1-00-0907 | Uplink Interference Reduction Gain of Gated DPCCH Transmission | Samsung | Noted | (*2) 12:33 |
| 47 | 22 | R1-00-0948 | Power Control Parameters in Gated DPCCH Transmission | Samsung | Noted | (*3) 13:54 |
| 48 | 22 | R1-00-0906 | Procedure of Gated DPCCH transmission associated with DSCH | Samsung | Noted | (*4) 14:03 |
| 49 | 22 | R1-00-0883 | TR for terminal power saving feature | Samsung | Noted | (*5) 14:18 |
| 50 | 24 | R1-00-0868 | Considerations on High-Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) | Nokia | Noted | (*6) 15:10 |
| 51 | 24 | R1-00-0881 | High Speed Downlink Packet Access simulation assumptions | Nokia | Noted | (*7, 8) 15:43 |
| 52 | 24 | R1-00-0910 | Link Evaluation Methods for High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) | Motorola | Noted | (*7) 16:10 |
| 53 | 24 | R1-00-0909 | Evaluation Methods for High Speed Downlink Packet Access (HSDPA) | Motorola | Noted | (*8) 16:35 |
| 54 | 25 | R1-00-0514 | Signaling methods for Hybrid ARQ Type II/III | Siemens | Noted | (*9) 16:40 |
| 55 | 25 | R1-00-0869 | Hybrid ARQ methods for FDD in Release 2000 | Nokia | Noted | (*10) 17:17 |
| 56 | 25 | R1-00-0754 | Initial Evaluation of Hybrid ARQ Type II/III for Packet Coding | Samsung | Noted | (*11) 17:30 |

(*1) There were comments regarding the UE battery life improvement calculations on their assumptions.

Nokia answered that these are estimate made by their RAN WG4 people. They will bring more detailed assumptions in the next meeting.

Regarding the model, Nokia's estimate can be found in **R1-00-0686**.

(*2) Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) commented that the simulation assumptions are not considered to be proper and as a result, the simulation results might be slightly misleading.

He pointed out the problem on following 2 assumptions.

- Channel estimation : ideal

- DPCCH/DPDCH [dB] : -2.69dB (← This is very strong DPCCH. This maybe lower to -5dB or -6dB)

Samsung answered that the current ratio of DPCCH/DPDCH came from RAN WG4 specification though they forget to show the reference or reference No. They agreed that if the data rate was changed then the power ratio should have been changed. They stated that they would provide new performance simulation results with other parameters at the next meeting or on the e-mail reflector before the next meeting.

Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) pointed out that there is the description of DPCCH/DPDCH power ratio in RAN WG4 specification to be sure, but this high data rate transmission is not supposed.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that she would check the calculation of uplink interference reduction with her RAN WG2 colleagues whether the assumptions (mode of operation) are something realistic.

Chairman encouraged both proponents (Nokia and Samsung) to provide some further details reflecting the comments made here for the next meeting. We aim to have conclusion on whether we will go ahead with this or not in the next meeting based on the further clarification presented. In case we go ahead we will need to have technical report to show in the RAN in September.

(*3) This is a kind of answer document for **R1-00-0691**(Philips) which was discussed in RAN WG1#13 meeting.

Samsung summarized their comment on that document in the paper.

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) expressed his strong support on the conclusion which says that the redundant and unnecessary parameters should be minimized. He added that further additional gain should be raised with the minimum cost.

Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) agreed with comments mentioned in this document.

(*4) Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) questioned whether there is a difference on how the UE operates in DCH only mode and DCH + DSCH mode ?

Samsung answered that the operation of UE will not be changed. But there is a difference in the efficiency of gating between DCH-DCH gating and DSCH-DCH gating. In case of DCH-DCH mode, the channel should be released as fast as possible to use the channelization code efficiently. In case of DCH-DSCH the spreading factor of DPCCH is very low and there is no need for quick release. The only change is the environmental and not

specific signaling. (??)

- (*5) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented regarding the title of the section 5.2 *Expected Gains over Current Specification* that 'Specification' should be set plural or title should be changed as 'Expected gain with respect to the current set of functions in release 99'. She added that since the title reads *Expected gain*, this section should contain some target performance figures knowing that in section 8 the result will be provided. Chairman agreed to this comment and suggested renaming.

Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) raised the concern regarding section 8 where the results would be provided, on whether we as RAN WG1 can provide and endorse the simulation results or simulation details with the name of individual companies.

Chairman answered we can of course discuss that particular issue because we are having such results in not only this TR but also in other TRs as well. But I think we can discuss it when we come to the point.

Siemens questioned what is intended to be covered actually in detail in the *Backward Compatibility* in the current section.

Chairman commented that the backward compatibility should not be put in section 5 *Requirements to the Solution*. In section 5, for instance, *level of changes in Node B and UE* or something like that should be put.

Backward compatibility should have its own section. Chairman added that there should be a section in section 5 called *Complexity* and under that section, UE and Node B should be addressed separately.

- (*6) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented though she agree in general with the list of items for which we need to make further investigation, she does not agree with the conclusions. Regarding how to proceed, we should take into account that we are not leading WG of this work item. The text proposal to RAN WG2 seems to go much beyond the scope of RAN WG1.

Mr. Serge Willenegger (QUALCOMM) commented for the text proposal that it is good to consider the list of issues to be studied to preclude different options. He added that he is much more open to the other parameters than those listed in this contribution. He raised concern about the rationale for submitting this text proposal to RAN WG2 understanding that RAN WG2 has the leadership of the report. He stated RAN WG2 does not have expertise on physical layer issues and this text proposal is really related to very detailed physical layer issues. They may ask us to consider the inclusion of the text proposal but they definitely can not decide to include it.

Chairman commented we need to have good coordination with RAN WG2 and we should consider what is the role of each WG. The situation is like UE capability technical report.

There was one comment that it is not much addressed about the issues about how to support new features on top of the existing services, mostly voice service. Interoperability with existing services. Interference to voice service.

How to handle voice and data service are missing.

Chairman commented.

I think that ideally perhaps RAN WG2 manages to have proper discussion on their part of issue and I hope in our next meeting we will get their technical report in the shape they have it. Perhaps we could provide them the inputs on what needs to be studied for the technical report and also more detailed inputs to RAN WG2 on what we feel that we should study on this feature. Regarding the link level simulation assumptions or parameters, I think we need to produce the technical report of our own because when I discussed with RAN WG2 chairman, he was not eager to have 10 pages of link level simulation assumptions or all link level simulation results for their technical report. They would rather like to have a conclusion on the results for their report. So we would have TR of our own on those aspect. For the other aspect, if the report is to be done like UE capability report then I think it would be useful if the concept could be described in one technical report which would cover the architecture impacts and physical layer impacts on that proposal.

There is a possibility that RAN WG1 and RAN WG2 have the joint physical Ad Hoc meeting after the RAN in September, that is in October time frame to coordinate issues more exactly.

- (*7) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that when you set the parameters, you should try as much as possible to use the existing terminology (packet size, etc).

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) commented that it is important to have clear view on how to simulate exact concept before having detailed link level simulation assumptions. The most important things here is to understand the basic concepts.

Mr. Kari Pehkonen (Nokia) answered that he understands the points but unfortunately in practice we have to make some choices otherwise we cannot do simulations.

Chairman suggested the one obvious way also taking into account the comments is to merge these 2 papers together and produce 2 tables, one would be generic simulation parameters. In the best case they are more or less independent from what the proposals are. The other would contain the parameters that are eventually specific for the proposal, actual frame length or stuff like that. And if there were another proposal then the second table would be modified to meet the need to simulate it.

Chairman suggested that it is useful and we should have our simulation assumption be checked by RAN WG4 after we have gone into more details.

- (*8) Chairman commented.

Here we can do this in a similar way as in link level simulations. 2 proponents are encouraged to try to put together the joint set of parameters which are applicable to both simulations and then present the results. You have your simulator and your concept. With the basic parameters we are simulating, I guess there are no big differences.

What shall we do with this issue in practice in the next meeting ? I think we should note what kind of feed back we will have from RAN WG2 as well. But as some kind of outline for the technical report which we are planing to have in RAN WG1, I think it should contain this link level simulation assumptions and results. Of course what

RAN WG2 is expecting to us will be clear once we got the feedback from them but I guess some kind of proposal in RAN WG1 that gives the outline makes the discussion easier on further progress in the next meeting.

(*9) Siemens briefly explained the background.

Some time ago they listed in this paper (**R1-00-0514**) some working assumptions for Hybrid ARQ which are listed in section 3 . According to the information they got from their RAN WG2 colleague, these assumptions are taken into account by RAN WG2 in their setting up of their report. There is one topic remaining for RAN WG1 to discuss and that is the multiplexing for Hybrid ARQ. Siemens tried to coordinate with RAN WG2 but at this point of time, no decision has been taken in RAN WG2 on this issue. They prepared a document regarding layer 1 multiplexing for Hybrid ARQ. It will be available on the Day4 CD-ROM in **R1-00-0962**. Siemens invited people to have a look at that document so that it can be possible to discuss it in the next RAN WG1 meeting.

(*10) There were several comments made.

(*11) Siemens made a generic comment that having these 2 contributions we can see that performance gains are depending on what coding schemes are used, which channel models are assumed. Siemens can not agree to the Nokia's conclusion which says that the expected gains are little. From Siemens point of view, for instance, if we use the turbo coding, we can see the additional gains. Since there is a lot of room for enhancement, Siemens will support to go on Hybrid ARQ stuff.

Chairman commented in general RAN WG1 still can not have a conclusion at this point of time. We will continue discussion this in the next meeting. I guess the RAN WG2 is working on the technical report on this issue. It is not clear whether they request us some inputs or we should have a technical report of our own. In any case we should discuss more on this issue in the next meeting.

10. Reports from the Ad Hocs (when available)

10.1 AH26 R1-00-0949 AH26 report to RAN WG1 meeting #14 (17: 30 – 17: 42)

Mr. Bernhard Raaf (Siemens) commented that in the last paragraph in section 2,

“ *It was noted that the new concept based on **beamforming** will require some changes to channel models.* ” ,

beamforming should be replaced by the *eigenbeamforming* to clarify that it is not same as ordinary (currently used) beamforming technique though there is no need to revise the report.

There was no other comment and report was approved.

10.1.1 R1-00-0954 Proposed draft outline of the Tx diversity technical report

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) commented that there should be one section for *System level performance*.

It may not necessarily contain simulations.

10.2 AH30 R1-00-0942 Report from Ad Hoc #30: TDD Node B synchronisation (17: 44 - 17: 56)

Mr. Mirko Aksentijevic (Nokia) commented that in RAN WG3 specification TS25.402), there is a section of “ *TDD Inter Node B Node Synchronisation procedure* ”. He stated that we have not got any clarification from leading WG for this item on what the level of the synchronization should be but at least what we are going to discuss in the Technical Report is cell level synchronization procedure. So it is rather strange to have name of Node B synchronization, this could be a confusion. There is a CR in RAN WG3 changing this into cell synchronization but I do not know whether this CR has been approved or not.

Mr. Stefan Oestreich (Siemens) commented that the CR has been approved in RAN WG3 but that CR does not remove the Node B synchronization from release 99. Since they prepared a LS to RAN WG3 including this clarification, chairman suggested to review the LS first before having discussion on this issue.

10.2.1 R1-00-0958 Draft LS to WG3: Open issues for work item on Node B synchronisation (17: 56 - 18: 15)

Chairman commented that we should avoid changing the WI name. We need very strong reason from RAN WG1 point of view to change work item title. This has been agreed as work item title. So I would rather suggest to drop the last sentence of the first bullet point.

It is currently not clear in WG 1, whether a standardised solution should provide synchronisation at Node Bs or cell level. In the latter case it could be appropriate to rename the WI description.

If we are to change the title of the work item, there would be endless discussion. I do not see any value to change the title. If we specify cell synchronization it eventually means also the Node B is synchronized so there is not necessary contradiction.

There was some discussion regarding cell synchronization and Node B synchronization. As a conclusion chairman suggested to add following sentence after deleting the last sentence taking into account the comment from Mr. Stephen Dick (InterDigital).

“ *From WG1 perspective it is anyway going to be the same piece of hardware doing the measurement. The unclear issue in WG1 seems to be whether the timing correction from RNC is sent for each cell or for each Node B.*”

This LS was approved as **R1-00-0964**. Approved version will contain the proposed TR as an attachment.

10.2.2 R1-00-0957 Proposed TR on " NodeB Synchronisation for TDD" (18: 15-18: 34)

Chairman asked Mr. Stefan Oestreich (Siemens) to be an editor of this TR.

Mr. Stephen Dick (InterDigital) pointed out that regarding following sentence in section 7.3

“All measurement results are processed within the RNC and timing update commands are then sent to the individual cells”
should be modified as

“All measurement results are processed within the RNC and timing update commands are then sent to the individual cells or Node Bs”
based on the previous discussion.

Chairman suggest that in section 10 *Performance Analysis*, something like “to be described” or “to be completed” or whatever should be put.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that there are references to RAN WG1 document (ex. section 7.2). But in the final version we should not put RAN WG1 references.

Chairman agreed to this comment and proposed to put “*RAN WG1 Note* ” before the references for the time being.

Day 4 , started at 09.04

11. Approval of postponed/revised Release –99 CRs

| No. | CR | rev. | TS | Tdoc | Title | Cat | Source | Conclusion | Notes |
|-----|-----|------|--------|------------|---|-----|--------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| 57 | 066 | 2 | 25.211 | R1-00-0902 | Clarification of paging indicator mapping | F | Ericsson | To be revised | (*1) 09:09 |
| 58 | 115 | 1 | 25.214 | R1-00-0919 | Corrections to power control | F | Philips | Approved | (*2) 09:18 |
| 59 | 118 | 1 | 25.214 | R1-00-0920 | Clarification of power control at maximum and minimum power | F | Philips | To be revised | (*3) 09:36 |
| 60 | 068 | - | 25.215 | R1-00-0900 | Reporting of UTRAN Transmitted carrier power | F | Ericsson | Approved | No (*4) comment 09:37 |
| 61 | 022 | 1 | 25.221 | R1-00-0921 | Correction to midamble generation in UTRA TDD | F | Mitsubishi Siemens | Approved | No (*5) comment 09:40 |
| 62 | 012 | 1 | 25.225 | R1-00-0922 | Alignment of TDD measurements with FDD: GPS related measurements | F | Siemens | Approved | No (*6) comment 09:44 |
| 63 | 068 | - | 25.211 | R1-00-0924 | Editorial modification of the 25.211 about the CD/CA-ICH | D | Samsung | Approved | No comment 09:48 |
| 64 | 067 | - | 25.211 | R1-00-0923 | Timing offset of DPCH when SF=512 | F | Samsung | Rejected | (*7) 10:04 |
| 65 | 069 | - | 25.211 | R1-00-0925 | DPCH timing offset in CPCH | F | Samsung | Rejected | (*8) 10:22 |
| 66 | 086 | 1 | 25.212 | R1-00-0918 | Clarification on DL slot format for compressed mode by SF/2 | F | Lucent | Approved | (*9) 10:49 |
| 67 | 026 | 1 | 25.221 | R1-00-0939 | Some corrections for TS25.221 | F | Siemens | Approved | No (*10) comment 10:56 |
| 68 | 042 | - | 25.222 | R1-00-0943 | Paging Indicator Terminology | F | Siemens | Approved | No comment 10:58 |
| 69 | 028 | - | 25.221 | R1-00-0940 | Terminology regarding the beacon function | F | Siemens Mitsubishi | Approved | No comment 11:08 |
| 70 | 025 | - | 25.224 | R1-00-0940 | Terminology regarding the beacon function | F | Siemens | Approved | (*11) 11:11 |
| 71 | 015 | - | 25.225 | R1-00-0940 | Terminology regarding the beacon function | F | Siemens | Approved | No comment 11:13 |
| 72 | 002 | 2 | 25.944 | R1-00-0928 | TDD related changes for TR25.944 | F | Siemens | Approved | No (*12) comment 11:16 |
| 73 | 120 | - | 25.214 | R1-00-0947 | Corrections to CL transmit diversity mode 1 | F | NEC | Approved | No (*13) comment 11:22 |
| 74 | 069 | - | 25.215 | R1-00-0951 | Support of parallel compressed mode patterns | F | Ericsson | Postponed | (*14) 11:38 |
| 75 | - | - | - | R1-00-0877 | Gain Factors for TDD Mode | - | - | | (*15) 11:41 |
| 76 | 026 | - | 25.224 | R1-00-0963 | Synchronisation of Timing Advance adjustment and Timing Deviation measurement | F | InterDigital | To be revised | (*16) 12:02 |
| 77 | 118 | 2 | 25.214 | R1-00-0973 | Clarification of power control at maximum and minimum power | F | Philips | Approved | No (*17) comment 12:06 |
| 78 | - | - | 25.928 | R1-00-0959 | TR 25.928, 1.28Mcps functionality for UTRA TDD Physical Layer (v1.0.1) | - | Nokia | Approved | No (*18) comment 12:11 |
| 79 | 066 | 3 | 25.211 | R1-00-0972 | Clarification of paging indicator mapping | F | Ericsson | Approved | No (*19) comment 12:16 |

(*1) This is the revision of **R1-00-0927** which was revised from **R1-00-0898** which was review on Day1. (See No.21).

Parameter N was renamed as Np but there were 2 places found where N remains unchanged.

Therefore this was to be revised. The revision was made into **R1-00-0972** and was approve with no comments.

(See No. 79)

(*2) This was the revision of **R1-00-0850** (See No.11). Ms. Sarah Boumendil (Nortel) commented that the meaning of

the modified paragraph is not clear.

“ For RPP mode 1, during RPL slots after each transmission gap, power control algorithm 1 is applied with a step size D_{RP-TPC} instead of D_{TPC} , regardless of the value of PCA. Therefore, the change in uplink DPCCCH transmit power at the start of each of the RPL+1 slots immediately following the transmission gap (except for the first slot after the transmission gap) is given by:”

Mr. Tim Mousley (Philips) explained but it was not agreed by her. Chairman concluded that this should be approved now and if the modification is needed we can revise it in the next meeting.

(*3) This was the revision of **R1-00-0859**. (See No.12)

There was some discussion regarding minimum power level and additional scaling. Finally it was agreed to add the following sentence beneath the second bullet point in section 5.1.2.6 to clarify that nominal step size shall be applied in case that UE is required to increase the power.

“ In the case that the total UE transmit power in the previously transmitted slot is at or below the required minimum power specified in [7] and the DPCCCH power adjustment and gain factors for the current slot would result in an increase in total power, then no additional scaling shall be used (i.e. power control shall operate as normal). ”

The revision is in **R1-00-0973** and was approved without comments. (See No. 77)

Mr. Bernhard Raaf (Siemens) pointed out there could be power up in spite of power down command in some case due to the inaccuracy and gain factor change.

(*4) This was postponed in Day1 (See No. 23). Ericsson had not received any comment and therefore this was approved. Cover sheet shall be corrected by the secretary to uncheck the ME box.

(*5) This is the revision of **R1-00-0865**. (See No. 15). An editorial error was corrected.

(*6) This is the revision of **R1-00-0884**. (See No. 17)

(*7) Chairman commented that there is a special restriction regarding spreading factor 512 in TS 25.213 Section 5.2.1. He added that proponents should read those restriction first before proposing these kind of conflicting change in TS 25.211. Though this restriction is for soft hand over, it is a question whether this kind of new restriction needed for the normal mode. Based on that no other companies expressed their support for this change, chairman concluded this to be rejected.

(*8) Chairman and Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that this is not correction but introduction of the new feature, new requirement for UE. We have to be very careful at this point of time in introducing this kind of new feature. We need to have very strong motivation when we submit to RAN the CR which has functional modification of the feature for release 99. Even if we approved this CR here it will be rejected in RAN because there is no fundamental problem without this modification. We are clearly indicated in RAN that no CR that corresponds to the additional feature would be accepted to release 99 unless there is really complete consensus in the work community and we do not think that this is the case in RAN WG1. This was rejected.

(*9) This is the revision of **R1-00-0843**. (See No. 7)

Mr. Takashi Mochizuki (NEC) commented that first 2 lines in the ‘else’ branch can be merged.

Mr. Ian Corden (Lucent) answered it can be done if it is necessary but there is no functional change.

Mr. Takashi Mochizuki agreed to this answer.

(*10) This is the revision of **R1-00-0874** (See No. 14).

(*11) This CR supersedes the **R1-00-0810** which was approved on Day1 (See No. 16).

Mr. Marian Rudolf (Mitsubishi) agreed to this supersession.

(*12) This is the revision of **R1-00-0908**. (See No. 25)

(*13) This CR is based on the comment from Mr. Takashi Mochizuki (NEC) made to **R1-00-0855**. (See No. 9)

(*14) This CR proposed a change to the number of simultaneous compressed mode patterns the UE needs to support which had been originally proposed by Nokia in **R1-00-0548** CR 25.215-050r1 with a reason that the current number includes one additional count for “other measurements” of which meaning is not clear. There was long discussion in relation with RAN WG2 specification (TS 25.302) in which there is a similar kind of table with same values as in our current specifications. There was some rewording suggested. Chairman commented that though there was no particular concern raised this CR at this point, it seems that some checking is still needed until the next meeting. He added that let’s have this ‘on-hold’ for the time being and give people some time to check. There is also need to have same kind of change in RAN WG2 specification.

(*15) Siemens would like to finalize this issue (CR 25.223-007 and CR 25.224-019) in the next meeting. Interdigital expressed their support for this in principle though they had requested some rewordings and clarifications in detailed points.

Chairman commented we would check this at the beginning of the next meeting.

(*16) Interdigital added that this proposal has been approved in RAN WG2.

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that this must have impact on RRC specification but if it has been approved in RAN WG2, then is this already applied in RAN WG3 ? Interdigital answered it is sure that the RAN WG3 should be involved but if RAN WG1 and RAN WG2 is consistent with this proposal then this would be applied in RAN WG3 specifications.

Siemens commented that though they do not see any principle problem in this proposal they thought that there is a room for discussion. They are not fully sure that this is really necessary.

There was some discussion and it was proposed to remove the last part of the last sentence.

Chairman concluded that we agree with this in principle but revision is needed. We will approve this in the next meeting on condition that this kind of CR is be produced for RAN WG2 and RAN WG3 as well.

Siemens proposed to change wording from “TA adjustment will take place” to “TA adjustment might take place”. The revision will be found in **R1-00-0974**.

(*17) This is the revision of **R1-00-0920**. (See No. 59)

(*18) **R1-00-0955** was incorporated to the new version. (See No. 42) Since this was approved, now the version became v.1.1.0. This can be found in **R1-00-0960**.

(*19) This is the revision of **R1-00-0902**. (See No. 57)

12. Reviewal of Working CRs

| No. | CR | rev. | TS | Tdoc | Title | Cat | Source | Conclusion | Notes |
|-----|-----|------|--------|------------|---|-----|--------|------------|---------------------|
| 80 | XXX | - | 25.221 | R1-00-0967 | CR for TS25.221 regarding the 1.28 Mcps TDD | B | CWTS | Noted | (*1) 12:24 |
| 81 | XXX | - | 25.222 | R1-00-0968 | CR for TS25.222 regarding the 1.28 Mcps TDD | B | CWTS | Noted | No comment 12:27 |
| 82 | XXX | - | 25.223 | R1-00-0969 | CR for TS25.223 regarding 1.28 Mcps TDD | B | CWTS | Noted | No comment 12:28 |
| 83 | XXX | - | 25.224 | R1-00-0970 | CR for TS25.224 regarding 1.28 Mcps TDD | B | CWTS | Noted | (*2) 12:38 |
| 84 | XXX | - | 25.225 | R1-00-0971 | CR for TS25.225 regarding 1.28 Mcps TDD | B | CWTS | Noted | No comment 12:39 |

(*1) Ms. Evelyne Le Strat (Nortel) commented that the structure looks good. She added 2 points.

- As for the uplink/downlink synch channel, the same way is used for slots and channels. We will probably have to find better wording so that one side we have slots and the other side we have channels.
- There are 3 types of slots (normal, uplink synch, downlink synch). They had better be defined, for instance, in the frame structure.

(*2) There was a question on whether we need word 'option' after each mode (ex. 3.84Mcps option) ?

Chairman suggested that if we name them as '3.84Mcps TDD' and '1.28Mcps TDD' then the 'option' would not be needed anymore.

13 Approval of the liaison statements as output from WG1

| No | Discussed Tdoc | Source | To | Title | Approved Tdoc | Notes |
|----|----------------|----------|----------------|--|---------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | R1-00-0950 | Chairman | R2 | LS on the study/work items with RAN WG2 having the primary responsibility | R1-00-0950 | (*1) 14:09 |
| 2 | R1-00-0929 | Motorola | R2 | Liaison statement on UE capability parameter definitions | R1-00-0929 | No (*2) comment 14:13 |
| 3 | R1-00-0901 | Ericsson | R3 C: R4,R2 | Response Liaison to WG3 on measurements | R1-00-0901 | (*3) 14:28 |
| 4 | R1-00-0956 | CWTS | R2,R3,R4 | LS to WG2, WG3, and WG4: Progress Report of the WI 'Low Chip Rate TDD, physical layer' and request for support | R1-00-0961 | (*4) 14:14 |
| 5 | R1-00-0958 | Siemens | R3 | Draft LS to WG3: Open issues for work item on Node B synchronisation | R1-00-0964 | (*5) |
| 6 | - | Samsung | R2,R3,R4 | LS on some study/work items with RAN WG1 having the primary responsibility | R1-00-0975 | |

(*1) This was reviewed on Day2 afternoon.

1. Improved common downlink channel for cell FACH state.

Mr. Tim Mouldsley (Philips) requested that the description regarding Node B complexity should be modified because it is not agreed.

Chairmen agreed to this comment and proposed to skip the statement about the complexity and just to ask whether they want our feedback or not.

The sentence " *in the brief discussion, strong concern on the Node B complexity was raised* " was deleted.

Mr. Fredrik Ovesjö (Ericsson) questioned what the *absolute level* in the first bullet point means.

Chairman deleted the adjective 'absolute'.

4. TDD Positioning

Mr. Ian Corden (Lucent) made a comment that following sentence should be added in the last.

" *TSG RAN WG1 would like to ensure that there is alignment with this topic between FDD and TDD modes.* "

Since the draft LS was not distributed, the same T-doc number R1-00-0950 is used for approved version.

(*2) This was reviewed on Day2 afternoon.

This LS was based on the UE capability discussion on Day1. (See No. 28)

As it had been discussed, operation *in normal mode* was clarified.

Since the draft LS was not distributed, the same T-doc number R1-00-0950 is used for approved version.

(*3) This was reviewed on Day2 afternoon. See section 6.1

(*4) See section 8.1

(*5) See section 10.2.1

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 T1P1 |
| 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 | 10-13 | Korea | Host TTA |
| RAN WG1 #17 | November | 20-24 | Sweden | Ericsson |
| RAN #10 | December | 6-8 | Bangkok | |
| RAN WG1 #18 | January | 16-19 | U.S.A. (with R4) | T1P1 |
| RAN WG1 #19 | February | around end | T.B.D. | |
| RAN #11 | March- | 14-16 | U.S.A. | |
| Physical Ad Hoc | April | Tentative | | |
| RAN WG1 #20 | May | middle (5days?) | T.B.D | |
| RAN #12 | June | 13-15 | Europe | |

Annex A : List of approved CRs

A.1 TS 25.211

| No. | Spec | CR | R | R1 T-doc | Subject | C | Source | Ref. |
|-----|--------|-----|---|------------|--|---|----------|------|
| 1 | 25.211 | 065 | - | R1-00-0897 | Correction of reference | F | Ericsson | 20 |
| 2 | 25.211 | 066 | 3 | R1-00-0972 | Clarification of paging indicator mapping | F | Ericsson | 79 |
| 3 | 25.211 | 068 | - | R1-00-0924 | Editorial modification of the 25.211 about the CD/CA-ICH | D | Samsung | 63 |

A.2 TS 25.212

| No. | Spec | CR | R | R1 T-doc | Subject | C | Source | Ref. |
|-----|--------|-----|---|------------|---|---|----------|------|
| 1 | 25.212 | 079 | - | R1-00-0698 | Clarification of compressed mode terminology | F | Ericsson | 22 |
| 2 | 25.212 | 086 | 1 | R1-00-0918 | Clarification on DL slot format for compressed mode by SF/2 | F | Lucent | 66 |

A.3 TS 25.214

| No. | Spec | CR | R | R1 T-doc | Subject | C | Source | Ref. |
|-----|--------|-----|---|------------|---|---|-----------|------|
| 1 | 25.214 | 112 | - | R1-00-0888 | Adding reference for power offset variation text in TS 25.214 | F | Nokia | 8 |
| 2 | 25.214 | 113 | - | R1-00-0846 | Combining TPC commands in soft handover | F | Philips | 10 |
| 3 | 25.214 | 115 | 1 | R1-00-0919 | Corrections to power control | F | Philips | 58 |
| 4 | 25.214 | 116 | - | R1-00-0855 | Corrections to 25.214 | F | Siemens | 9 |
| 5 | 25.214 | 117 | - | R1-00-0857 | Clarification to downlink power control | F | Nokia | 26 |
| 6 | 25.214 | 118 | 2 | R1-00-0973 | Clarification of power control at maximum and minimum power | F | Philips | 77 |
| 7 | 25.214 | 119 | - | R1-00-0860 | Clarification of SSDT text | F | Panasonic | 13 |
| 8 | 25.214 | 120 | - | R1-00-0947 | Corrections to CL transmit diversity mode 1 | F | NEC | 73 |

A.4 TS 25.215

| No. | Spec | CR | R | R1 T-doc | Subject | C | Source | Ref. |
|-----|--------|-----|---|------------|--|---|----------|------|
| 1 | 25.215 | 067 | - | R1-00-0899 | Insertion of UTRAN SIRerro measurement in 25.215 | F | Ericsson | 38 |
| 2 | 25.215 | 068 | - | R1-00-0900 | Reporting of UTRAN Transmitted carrier power | F | Ericsson | 60 |

A.5 TS 25.221

| No. | Spec | CR | R | R1 T-doc | Subject | C | Source | Ref. |
|-----|--------|-----|---|------------|---|---|--------------------|------|
| 1 | 25.221 | 022 | 1 | R1-00-0921 | Correction to midamble generation in UTRA TDD | F | Mitsubishi Siemens | 61 |
| 2 | 25.221 | 026 | 1 | R1-00-0939 | Some corrections for TS25.221 | F | Siemens | 67 |
| 3 | 25.221 | 028 | - | R1-00-0940 | Terminology regarding the beacon function | F | Siemens Mitsubishi | 69 |

A.6 TS 25.222

| No. | Spec | CR | R | R1 T-doc | Subject | C | Source | Ref. |
|-----|--------|-----|---|------------|------------------------------|---|---------|------|
| 1 | 25.222 | 042 | - | R1-00-0943 | Paging Indicator Terminology | F | Siemens | 68 |

A.7 TS 25.224

| No. | Spec | CR | R | R1 T-doc | Subject | C | Source | Ref. |
|-----|--------|-----|---|------------|---|---|---------|------|
| 1 | 25.224 | 025 | - | R1-00-0940 | Terminology regarding the beacon function | F | Siemens | 70 |

A.8 TS 25.225

| No. | Spec | CR | R | R1 T-doc | Subject | C | Source | Ref. |
|------------|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|--|----------|---------------|-------------|
| 1 | 25.225 | 012 | 1 | R1-00-0922 | Alignment of TDD measurements with FDD: GPS related measurements | F | Siemens | 62 |
| 2 | 25.225 | 013 | 1 | R1-00-0911 | Alignment of TDD measurements with FDD:SFN-CFN observed time difference | F | Siemens | 29 |
| 3 | 25.225 | 015 | - | R1-00-0940 | Terminology regarding the beacon function | F | Siemens | 71 |

A.9 TR 25.2944

| No. | Spec | CR | R | R1 T-doc | Subject | C | Source | Ref. |
|------------|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| 1 | 25.944 | 002 | 2 | R1-00-0928 | TDD related changes for TR25.944 | F | Siemens | 72 |

(Total 24 CRs were approved in RAN WG1 #14 meeting.)

Annex B Participants List

| FAMILY NAME | FORENAME | COMPANY |
|---------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| AKSENTIJEVIC | Mirko | Nokia |
| ALMERS | Peter | Telia |
| BAHRENBURG | Stefan | Siemens |
| BÄR | Siegfried | Siemens AG |
| BARBERIS | Sergio | CSELT |
| BATZ | Gerhard | Motorola GmbH |
| BLANZ | Josef | Qualcomm |
| BOUMENDIL | Sarah | Nortel Networks |
| BULJORE | Soodesh | Motorola |
| BURBIDGE | Richard | Motorola |
| BURKERT | Frank | Siemens AG |
| CHAMBERS | Peter | Roke Manor Research |
| CHEN | Dong | Siemens |
| CHOI | Hokyu | Samsung Electronics Co.Ltd |
| CHOI | Hyung-Nam | Siemens AG |
| CHUNG | Young Hak | Hyundai Electronics |
| CONTI | Lidia | Siemens ICN Spa |
| CORDEN | Ian | Lucent Technologies |
| COSIMINI | Peter | Vodafone Airtouch |
| CZAPLA | Liliana | Interdigital Comm.Corp |
| Da ROCHA | Alexandre | Alcatel |
| De BENEDITTIS | Rosella | Siemens ICN Spa |
| DENNEAN | Charles | Interdigital Communications Corp |
| DICK | Stephen | Interdigital Communications Corp |
| FABIEN | Jean-Aicard | Motorola |
| FALAKI | Hamid | Lucent Technologies |
| FUTAKA | Toshiyuki | NTT DoCoMo |
| GERSTERBERGER | Dirk | Ericsson Radio Systems |
| GHOSH | Amitasa | Motorola |
| GOUDARD | Nathalie | Wavecom |
| GUO | Y. Jay | Fujitsu |
| HILLIER | Adrian | TTP Communications Ltd |
| HIRAMATSU | Katsuhiko | Panasonic |
| HOTTINEN | Ari | Nokia |
| HÖYNECK | Andreas | Siemens AG |
| HU | Jinling | CWTS/CATT |
| HWANG | Seung-Hoon | LGIC |
| HWANG | Sungoh | Samsung Electronics Co.Ltd |
| IKEDA | Shinobu | ETSI |
| ITO | Kenji | Siemens K.K. |
| ITOH | Katsutoshi | Sony Corporation |
| JECHOUX | Bruno | Mitsubishi Electricite |
| JUNG Yoon | Seok | SK Telecom |
| KAHTAVA | Jussi | Nokia |
| KAWABATA | Hisashi | NEC Corporation |
| KIM | Duk Kyung | SK Telecom |
| KIM | Min-Goo | Samsung Electronics Co.Ltd |
| KISTOWSKI | Dirk | T-Mobil |
| KOULAKIOTIS | Dimitris | Samsung Electronics Research Insitute |
| KOURTIS | Stamatis | Motorola |
| KOWALEWSKI | Frank | Siemens AG |
| KWAK | Byungjae | Samsung Electronics Co.Ltd |
| KWAK | Yongjun | Samsung Electronics Co.Ltd |
| KWON | Hyuk Joon | LGIC |
| KWON | Sung Lark | LGIC |
| LAX | Alexander | 3G.com (UK) Ltd |
| LEE | Hyeonwoo | Samsung Electronics Co.Ltd |
| LEE | Jinsock | Telecom Modus Ltd |

| FAMILY NAME | FORENAME | COMPANY |
|---------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| LEE | Yuro | Hyundai Electronics |
| LE STRAT | Evelyne | Nortel Networks |
| LI | Chenguang | CWTS/CATT |
| LI | Feng | CWTS/CATT |
| LIU | Tie | OKJ Techno Centre |
| LYU | Dugin | LGIC |
| MAKIHIRA | Tsuneichi | Mitsubishi Electric Corporation |
| MESECHER | Dave | Interdigital Communications Corp |
| MICHEL | Jürgen | Siemens AG |
| MIYOSHI | Kenichi | Panasonic |
| MOCHIZUKI | Takashi | NEC |
| MOULSLEY | Tim | Philips Ps Research Labs |
| NAITO | Kosuke | NEC |
| NIVA | Ilkka | Nokia |
| OESTREICH | Stefan | Siemens |
| OKUMURA | Yukihiko | NTT DoCoMo |
| ONOZAWA | Hisash | Texas Instruments |
| OSHIGA | Olufemi | British telecommunications |
| OVESJÖ | Fredrik | Ericsson L.M. |
| PACE | Alessandro | Telecom Italia, Mobile |
| PARK | Sangwhan | Samsung Electronics Co.Ltd |
| PARK | Seongill | Samsung Electronics Co.Ltd |
| PARSA | Kourosh | GBT |
| PEHKONEN | Kari | Nokia Mobile Communications |
| PRELORENTZOS | Nikos | Panasonic |
| PURAT | Marcus | Siemens AG |
| RAAF | Bernhard | Siemens |
| RAO | Roopa | Cadence Design Systems Inc. |
| ROBION | Wilfrid | Bouygues Telecom |
| RUDOLF | Marian | Mitsubishi Electricite |
| SAPIENZA | Marzia | St Microelectronics |
| SCHMIDT | Malte | Siemens AG |
| SCHUFFENECKER | Bruno | France Telecom |
| SHAH | Govind | National Semiconductor |
| SPALING | Gerke | LM Ericsson |
| STEUDLE | Ville | Nokia |
| SUZUKI | Hidetoshi | Panasonic |
| TAFFIN | Arnauld | Motorola |
| TANAKA | Yoshinori | Fujitsu Ltd |
| TANNO | Motohiro | NTT DoCoMo |
| TARKIAINEN | Markku | Nokia |
| TATESH | Said | Lucent Technologies |
| TOMATIS | Fabrizio | Philips Semiconductor |
| TOSKALA | Antti | Nokia |
| UEBEL | Udo | Philips Semiconductor |
| UEBEL | Thomas | Siemens AG |
| UMARI | Maher | Motorola |
| VERZEGNASSI | Rodolfo | Philips Semiconductors |
| WHINNETT | Nick | Motorola |
| WIEDMANN | Ralf | Siemens AG |
| WILLENEGGER | Serge | Qualcomm Europe |
| YANG | Guiliang | CWTS/CATT |
| ZACK | Rafael | Intel |
| ZAVADSKIS | Giedrius | Nokia |
| ZELMER | Don | Bellsouth |