Delay implications of different PCM packetization times for AoIP 3GPP TSG GERAN #39 Florence, Italy, 25-29 Aug 2008 GP-081240



Assumptions

- Only the case of G.711 on the AoIP interface is considered (i.e. only the "Transcoder in BSS" scenario)
- Transcoders need to wait for "20 ms of speech" before transcoding (in both A <-> Abis directions)
- Only additional delays due to different packetizations and IP/TDM transport solutions are considered, and not those which do not depend on PCM packetization time on the AoIP interface
 - No coding/decoding delays are considered
 - No *processing/switching delays* are considered (since they basically depend on implementation only)
 - No *propagation delays* are considered (since they only depend on physics)
 - No *serialization delays* for IP transport are considered (since they basically depend on the link speed, and are typically negligible for high speed trunks)
 - No *buffering/de-jittering delays* are considered
- In 20ms -> 5ms re-packetization, shaping is assumed (packets are transmitted every 5 ms, and not in a burst)



Scenario 1: MS to MS call. Reference delay: to convey "20 ms of speech" from one TRAU to the other

Reference case: "All-TDM"



Delay in the TDM case: **20ms** (time needed by the receiving TRAU to collect "20 ms of speech") 20



Scenario 2: MS -> PSTN call. Reference delay: to convey the first voice sample from TRAU to the PSTN user



Conclusions

- Since transcoders essentially work on samples of "20 ms of speech", there is no disadvantage in using a 20ms PCM Packetization time on the AoIP interface (vs lower PCM packetization times)
- If shaping is applied in 20ms -> 5ms re-packetization, in some scenarios a 20ms PCM packetization time could be even better than a 5ms PCM Packetization time
- If shaping is not applied in 20ms -> 5ms re-packetization (i.e. 4 packets are sent in a burst), 5ms and 20ms PCM packetization times lead to equivalent results in terms of delay budget

