TSG-RAN Working Group 3 meeting #7
Sophia Antipolis, France, 20-24 September 1999

TSGR3#6(99)a95

Agenda Item: 3

Source: Secretary

Title: Draft Minutes of Meeting #6

Document for: Approval

3GPP TSG RAN Working Group 3 Meeting #6
Sophia Antipolis, France (24-27 August 1999)

As usual, this report is structured according to the agenda, and not according to the order of the discussion. In some cases, the agenda item under which a contribution was discovered is not clear, so the structure of the report is non-unique. The body of the report covers decisions and discussions held in plenary sessions, with the SWG reports included in Annex A and Annex B (see agenda item 24 for the discussion on these reports, and ratification of the SWG decisions). *It should be noted that where an agenda item is marked as having been discussed in a SWG, this does not indicate whether or not the SWG had time to treat it, but that it is covered in a SWG report.*

1 Opening of the Meeting

The chairman, Per Willars (Ericsson) opened the meeting at 9:20.

2 Approval of the Agenda

TSGR3#6(99)823 'Draft Agenda' (Chairman) was presented by the chairman.

It was noted that the Hooks and Extensions Workshop was overfilling its meeting room, and it was proposed that we should have the Iub/r SWG (Wednesday & Thursday) and Plenary (if any on Thursday) in the Mediatel hotel. **This was agreed.**

The agenda was approved.

3 Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting

TSGR3#6(99)824 'Draft Minutes of RAN3 #6' (Secretary) was presented by the secretary, Richard Townend (BT). He noted that there was one marked change, reflecting a comment that he had received on the email reflector from T-Mobil. **With this change, the document was approved.**

4 Letters/Reports from Other Groups

TSGR3#6(99)841 'Response to N1 on CM-Service Request for Multicall' (R2). **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)842 'Response to LS on UE Requirement to Report OFF' (R2) was presented by Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson). The item had been discussed in the Sync Ad Hoc. **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)843 'Answer to LS on Separate delivery of Transport Blocks within a Transport Block Set by MAC-d to L1' (R2) was presented by Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson). **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)828 'LS on Separate delivery of Transport Blocks within a Transport Block Set by MAC-d to L1' (R1) was presented by the chairman. **The document was noted.** Ericsson commented that the reason for sending the LS had been that a possible streamlining of the Iub/r UP protocol had been discussed, but it had not been clear whether this fitted with R1/2's assumptions. **The Iub/r SWG will discuss this.**

TSGR3#6(99)844 'LS on chosen logical and transport channel for Cell Broadcast' (R2) was presented by the chairman. It was noted that if we could carry FACH over Iub/r then we could carry SMS-CB. **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)845 'LS to RAN3 on inclusion of TFI transmission without data' (R2) was presented by Fabio Longoni (Nokia). There is a related contribution from Nokia that will be discussed in the Iub/r SWG. **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)915 'LS answer to Overall Delay Budget within the AS Results and Requirements' (SA2) was presented by Massimo Dell'Acqua (Italtel). **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)916 'Clarification of RAB Sub Flows concept and associated definitions' (SA2) was presented by Alain Maupin (Ericsson). The R3 understanding is that the reliability class is currently the only difference between the sub-flows. We have defined the sub-flow concept for both fixed and variable SDU sizes, although they are handled differently on Iu**. Alain agreed to draft a response to SA2 stating these answers (tdoc a65).**

TSGR3#6(99)917 'Answer to the LS on time constraints on the execution of cryptographic algorithms' (SA2) was presented by the chairman. **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)918 'Answer to LS on Interactions between MM and Radio Mobility' (SA2) was presented by the vice-chairman. The statement that SRNC adds location information to the Location Update Request was queried. It was noted that the RANAP Initial UE Message already includes Location Information (which can be coded as LAI/RAI). **It was agreed that the Iu SWG should discuss this further and report back to plenary.**

TSGR3#6(99)919 'Answer to LS on paging co-ordination' (SA2) was presented by the secretary. It was noted that the preferred option was unclear, as it was not specified which domain sends the paging message. **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)920 'CN Domain Identifiers used over Iu and Iur interfaces' (SA2) was presented by the chairman. **It was agreed that 25.401, 25.413 and 25.423 should be updated to reflect this.**

TSGR3#6(99)972 'LS concerning Iu network layer services for packet domain' (SA2) was presented by David Comstock (Ericsson). **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)836 'LS on evolution of GTP for R99' (N2) was presented by David Comstock (Ericsson). **The Iu SWG will discuss and prepare a LS with any comments.**

TSGR3#6(99)837 'LS on response to GTP-U SAP and primitives' (N2) was presented by David Comstock (Ericsson). Ericsson commented that the plan had been to introduce a specified way of communicating with the transport layer irrespective of CN domain. It was also noted that R3 had a strong requirement from S2 to maintain separation of transport and radio network layers. **David agreed to prepare a LS with any comments (which should be copied to SA2) (tdoc a62).**

TSGR3#6(99)838 'LS on paging co-ordination over the Gs interface' (N2) was presented by Atte Länsisalmi (Nokia). Atte commented that this is one way of doing page co-ordination over Gs, and that it may have some problems with UMTS. **The document was noted, as it really concerns a core network issue.**

TSGR3#6(99)839 'LS to R3 on CN domain identifiers used over Iu and Iur' (N2) was presented by the chairman. **It was agreed that we should add a reference to 23.003 when we refer to LAC and RAC in our specifications (25.401, 25.413, 25.423); also that we would send an answer (also informing of the SA2 comment).** Göran Rune (Ericsson) will draft it (tdoc a27).

TSGR3#6(99)840 'LS to S2 and R3 on new SSN for RANAP' (N2) was presented by Alain Maupin (Ericsson). Ericsson commented that we would also need an SSN for RNSAP. **It was decided to request an SSN for RNSAP also; the document was noted.** Göran Rune (Ericsson) will draft it (tdoc a28).

TSGR3#6(99)871 'Reply to LS on Cell Configuration and Management Philosophy' (SA5) was presented by Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)902 'Node B O&M Functional Description' (SA5) was presented by Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). **The document was noted.**

TSGR3#6(99)826 'LS on CS data Services' (N3) was presented by Alain Maupin & David Comstock (Ericsson). It was noted that PIAFS is a PHS Internet service. **The Iu SWG will continue to discuss this (it was carried over from the last meeting).**

TSGR3#6(99)827 'Answer to LS from R3 on Timing Advance for TDD' (R1) was presented by Massimo Dell'Acqua (Italtel). **The document was noted.** The Iub/r SWG will discuss solutions to the TDD timing advance issues.

TSGR3#6(99)829 'LS on Power Control Issues' (R1) **was allocated to the Iub/r SWG.**

TSGR3#6(99)914 'LS on Length of SFN' (R1) was presented by the secretary. This should be considered following the report from the sync ad hoc group (agenda item 6.3).

TSGR3#6(99)857 'MExE support of Handover Notifications' (T2 MExE) was presented by Björn Ehrstedt (Ericsson). It was noted that MExE is in the NAS, and the chairman asked whether the occurrence of handover was relevant to the NAS; in particular, he felt that interruption in communication was more relevant to the NAS. **Björn agreed to draft a reply (tdoc a47).**

TSGR3#6(99)858 'MExE support of QoS negotiation' (T2 MExE) was presented by Björn Ehrstedt (Ericsson). **A response on this will be included in Björn's other response.**

5 Organisation of Work

5.1 Workplan and Organisation (30.531)

TSGR3#6(99)820 '30.531 RAN3 Workplan' (Editor) was presented by Björn Ehrstedt (Ericsson). **The document was approved.** Some changes to the workplan may be needed after the SWGs, but these can also be documented in the specifications.

~~1.2~~5.2 Appointment of representatives/editors

Due to the resignation of the current editor (because of other work commitments), a new editor is required for 25.420. Kiran Thakare (Telecom Modus) agreed to take over with immediate effect.

SA2 co-ordination groups have just been set up to identify the workplan for the whole of 3GPP. They are not intended to do technical work, as that will happen in TSGs and in WGs. The RAN3 representation will be discussed between the RAN3 chairmen. The output of the co-ordination groups will be reviewed in RAN3.

~~1.3~~5.3 Future Meeting Dates and Hosting

The dates were agreed at the last meeting. Companies wishing to host meetings should send an email to the chairman.

6 General UTRAN Architecture

6.1 UTRAN Architecture (25.401)

TSGR3#6(99)826 '25.401 UTRAN Overall Description' (Editor) was presented by Jean-Marie Calmel (Nortel Networks). It was noted that some strange things had become added to the change history – the editor agreed to tidy it up. The editor noted in his presentation that the definition of co-ordinated DCH should be added. **With these changes, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)850 'Addition of DSCH Protocol Stack to 25.401' (Alcatel) was presented by ~~Michael Jeschke~~Patrick Blanc (Alcatel).

It was agreed to remove the "(or AAL5)" from both this contribution and the FACH description. Also to show AAL2 and DSCH FP in the second figure. **With these changes, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)903 'Definition of Binding Id' (Mitsubishi Electric) was presented by Sophie Pautonnier (Mitsubishi). Lucent agreed that we should specify this, but felt that the information should be included in another (more detailed) document. Nortel agreed, and suggested 25.4x4 and 25.426. Ericsson suggested that the length should be included in the AP specifications. Lucent felt that specifying that the Binding ID must be 4 octets was too restrictive – Mitsubishi clarified that they had intended that it must not exceed 4 octets.

Ericsson commented that they felt that it should be specified that Binding Id should be carried in an IE of a message, rather than as a parameter of a primitive.

It was agreed that CRs should be prepared to 25.414, 25.424, 25.434, 25.426 including the sentence regarding the carrying of the Binding ID in SUGR. Mitsubishi will draft the four CRs (tdocs a32-a35).

Lucent stated that the length of the binding ID might depend on the transport technology, and Nortel suggested that the Binding ID could be transparent in the Radio Network Layer, as it is transparent to both layers everywhere except in the node that generates it.

It was agreed to add a note in NBAP, RNSAP and RANAP specifications that the Binding Id is a variable length parameter.

~~1.2~~6.2 Terminology (25.401)

No Contributions.

~~1.3~~6.3 Synchronisation (25.401)

TSGR3#6(99)901 'Sync Ad Hoc Minutes' (Sync Ad Hoc) was presented by the chairman of the Ad Hoc, Jean-Marie Calmel (Nortel Networks). It was noted that the heading of proposal 8 should be "Definitions" rather than "Iu User Plane". Nokia made a comment (proposal 8), that they felt that the contents of 875 should not be included in 25.401, but only in the user plane specifications. Ericsson felt that the chapter in 25.401 is needed to include these details.
Alcatel commented that the branches for AAL0 and High Priority VC (in the diagram) are the same branch – however, it was not felt to be relevant to the plenary. Ericsson believe them to be different.

Ericsson commented that a21 should not be listed as a deferred paper as it had been handled.

The proposals of the Ad Hoc were reviewed:

1. The chairman asked where T0 is defined – the ad hoc chairman clarified that it is in Layer 1. **The proposal was accepted.**

2. DoCoMo asked why the superframe size was set equal to the CFN – the ad hoc chairman clarified that the two were decorrelated. This means that the superframe is never used by RAN3. DoCoMo were concerned about the impacts on TDD mode, where the superframe is used in some RAN1/2 procedures – they were not sure whether there it was acceptable for TDD. **The proposal was accepted, and the LS (to R1, R2, R4) should be drafted.** Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson) agreed to draft it (tdoc a42).
3. It was clarified that the DOFF parameter is included in RAN1 and 2, with a range of 0-80msec, with a granularity determined by Td. DoCoMo proposed that NBAP should talk about frame and chip offset, rather than Tm, Td and OFF. A proposal needs to be made to the Iur/b SWG. A clarification was also required to the "first RL" (is this since DCH state, or since RRC Connection Establishment?). **This was deferred to the Iub/r SWG.**
4. **The principle was agreed.** Ericsson will modify tdoc 873 to reflect the principles. **This will be discussed in Iub/r SWG.**
5. The implication of introducing the TDD sync port is that a new open and standardised interface is needed, and it will require a technical specification. The chairman was not certain that this could be included in R99. It was thus proposed that it should be included in 25.401, but that was not agreed. **It was agreed that the information could be held in an annex to 25.401, and the issue would be raised at the next RAN plenary.** Ericsson asked why two methods were being agreed – Italtel responded that the one method may not always work, but the other method is potentially expensive. **It was agreed to include the over-air method, the Iub/r SWG has to discuss the details.**
6.Ericsson asked why the existing common measurement procedure was not used. Italtel thought that it was used to measure traffic conditions – Ericsson felt that the requirements were very similar. Italtel commented that common measurement procedure is used for self measurement, rather than for measuring other Nodes B. Interdigital stated that additional information would be required in the setup. BT asked about the requirement for synchronisation – it is in a layer 1 specification, and is of the order of microseconds. Nokia thought that a similar requirement would exist for FDD mode, to develop the location services – Interdigital stated that it is not totally interlinked, but node synchronisation could not make location any more difficult! **Tdoc 882 was deferred to the Iub/r SWG.**
7. **The proposal was accepted.**
8. **The proposal was accepted.**
9.DoCoMo asked what the E in EFN stands for – Ericsson clarified that it doesn't stand for anything, but was just a spare significant letter. The chairman asked whether whenever we referred to CFN, it meant DCH and FACH – there was no disagreement. **The proposal was accepted.**
10. **It was agreed to include this in the other LS that we are already sending on Sync issues.**
11. **It was agreed to handle the deferred documents in the Iub/r SWG.**

The chairman thanked the Ad Hoc for the good progress, and encouraged delegates to draft text proposals to implement the agreed principles.

The other documents for this agenda item were discussed in the SWGs.

~~1.4~~6.4 Manifestations of Handover and SRNS Relocation (25.832)

TSGR3#6(99)819 ’25.832 Manifestations of Handover and SRNS Relocation’ (Editor) was presented by Richard Townend (BT). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)831 ‘GSM/BSS – UMTS Handover’ (Telecom Modus) was presented by Kiran Thakare (Telecom Modus). Nokia commented that there was an assumption in RAN3 that the source system should adapt to the target system which is contradicted in this proposal (e.g. in the message 3, it has GSM parameters). Ericsson agreed, and wondered whether anyone was aware of the status of the transfer of measurement reports to GSM. The chairman asked whether there were any impacts on our procedures – Telecom Modus clarified that there shouldn’t be any, but that this was an additional example of how they might be used.

Ericsson commented that step 3 should not mention Node B – Telecom Modus agreed. Lucent asked for clarification about the GSM bearer characteristics – there is currently only a channel type.

T-Mobil asked which entity would decide to go into macrodiversity – Telecom Modus stated that it would be the RNC, based on measurements passed from the MS/UE via the BSS.

The chairman asked what the capacity gain of doing this was. T-Mobil felt that there could be coverage gains, but were worried about the radio interface impacts. The chairman stated that there is already a mechanism to go into macrodiversity very soon after establishing a single radio link.

Nokia asked whether the relocation preparation procedure was different for the “from GSM” case. The current RNS-RNS hard handover is thought to be capable of support of immediate macrodiversity. If the transparent field is used in both cases, then our procedures can be capable of it.

Ericsson proposed sending an LS to SMG2, describing our transparent field.

Nokia felt that we did support the procedure, as long as the measurements can be performed. Ericsson were worried about the reporting of Tm (as it is relative to the existing link) – but Nokia thought that there was already a mechanism to do this for initial access. DoCoMo agreed, stating that Nokia’s understanding was in-line with R2.

It was agreed to include the scenario figure in section 5.7 of 25.832. A note is added to state that the support from the GSM side needs further study, but is out of scope for this document.

Nokia suggested that we should ask for advice from R2 on the contents of the transparent field.

It was agreed to send a LS to SMG2 & RAN2 stating our assumptions and asking advice on the length limitations for the various messages that would be impacted. Kalle agreed to draft it (tdoc a61).

~~1.5~~6.5 Delay Budget (Arc/3)

TSGR3#6(99)965 'Overall Delay Budget within the AS' (Siemens, Italtel) was presented by Massimo Dell'Acqua (Italtel). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)955 'AAL2 Packetisation and De-Packetisation Delay' (Siemens, Italtel) was presented by Steve Winstanley (Siemens). Nortel asked about the interpretation of the CU_timer. Siemens clarified that it would continue filling packets as long as there were cells in the queue – this implies that actually CU_timer is slightly greater than 0 (as CU_timer=0 implies cells are sent partially filled). Nortel asked why a load of 75% was chosen, as their simulations have shown that the impact of CU_timer is small at this load. Siemens stated that 75% was an arbritary value. Ericsson asked whether the delay in figure 2 was between source and destination – Siemens clarified that this was between the two AAL2 SAPs. Ericsson stated that TN1 applies to one link only, and this simulation result would seem to apply to multiple links. Siemens stated that the switch was not an AAL2 switch, and the contribution of the ATM switch was very small. Siemens had assumed 0msec media delay. Nokia asked for clarification on the simulation model, with regard to figure 4.2. Siemens stated that they had used a standard protocol simulation tool. Alcatel asked whether Siemens had investigated mixed traffic in the same ATM connection. Siemens stated that as described in the paper, they had only looked at homogeneous traffic. Alcatel stated that there were some problems with the lack of QoS in AAL2.
Nortel asked whether the periodic nature of Iub/r traffic was covered by the traffic model used. Siemens felt that MAC multiplexing might improve performance slightly.

TSGR3#6(99)999 'Delay Component TN1 (AAL1 Delay)' (Nokia) was presented by Sammi Kekki (Nokia). Italtel asked what the N*D/D/1 model is – Siemens explained that D meant Deterministic, so the notation meant that there were N deterministic sources served by a single deterministic server. Siemens added that these systems were very strange, as the behaviour depends on the phase shift. Nokia clarified that their work was based on the application of the model, rather than using directly. BT asked what link rate had been used for figure 1 – Nokia clarified that it had been normalised. Alcatel felt that 2msec was too small for a mixed data and speech link. Siemens agreed that this was an issue, but it depended on whether you had a single large VCC or a VP with smaller VCCs multiplexed.

When discussing both documents, Italtel wondered whether further discussion was needed. Nokia suggested that because of the effect shown in their paper, the number of users assumed to be multiplexed into the AAL connection should be smaller than the maximum.

It was planned to return to the discussion when the related Alcatel contribution is discussed.

~~1.6~~6.6 Others

TSGR3#6(99)929 'Addressing schemes for SCCP used for Iu and Iur' (Ericsson) was presented by Göran Rune (Ericsson). Motorola asked why the GT scheme allowed maximum separation of layers – Ericsson clarified that this was because it might be considered strange to use SPCs in an IP network. Nortel asked why you would need

GT translation on a point-to-point interface. Ericsson stated that the Iu did not have to be a point-to-point interface. Motorola asked what the benefit of introducing of GTT was on a point-to-point interface. Ericsson were unaware of the intention that Iu should be point-to-point, as this discussion is at the signalling transport layer, not the RANAP layer (where the assumption is valid). Nokia confirmed this view, and stated that operators should be allowed to route Iu over a signalling network. Ericsson also commented that their proposal was very similar to GSM A interface, where GT may be used. Ericsson also pointed out that we do not pass the addresses in the radio network layer, and so this is related to address handling within nodes. **The proposals in 4.1 and 4.2 of the document were approved.**

7 General Protocol Principles

7.1 Compatibility and Error Handling Principles

No contributions were discussed.

~~1.2~~7.2 ASN.1 Usage (Iu/7)

No contributions were discussed.

~~1.3~~7.3 Others

No contributions were discussed.

8 General Aspects and Principles of Iu Interface (25.410)

8.1 Actions

Treated in Iu SWG.

~~1.2~~8.2 Other Contributions

Treated in Iu SWG.

~~1.3~~8.3 Review Specification

Treated in Iu SWG.

9 Iu User-Plane Protocols (25.415)

9.1 Contributions

Treated in Iu SWG.

~~1.2~~9.2 Review Specification

Treated in Iu SWG.

10 Iu Signalling (RANAP)(25.413)

10.1 Study Items Report and Decision

Treated in Iu SWG.

~~1.2~~10.2 Actions

Treated in Iu SWG.

~~1.3~~10.3 Procedure Specifications

Treated in Iu SWG.

~~1.4~~10.4 Message Contents and Parameter Range

Treated in Iu SWG.

~~1.5~~10.5 Review Specification

Treated in Iu SWG.

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

The CRs were treated in 28.2.

12 Iu Signalling Transport (25.412)

Treated in Iu SWG.

13 Iur/Iub General Aspects

13.1 General Aspects and Principles of Iur Interface (25.420)

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.2~~13.2 General Aspects and Principles of Iub Interface (25.430)

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.3~~13.3 Review Specifications

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

14 Iur/Iub User Plane Protocols

14.1 Iur/Iub DCH Data Streams (25.427)

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.2~~14.2 Iub CCH Data Streams (25.435)

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.3~~14.3 Iur CCH Data Streams (25.425)

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.4~~14.4 Review Specifications

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

15 Iur Signalling (RNSAP)(25.423)

15.1 Contributions on the general sections

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.2~~15.2 Procedure Specifications

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.3~~15.3 Message Contents and Parameter Range

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.4~~15.4 Review Specification

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.5~~15.5 Other Issues

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

16 Iub Signalling (NBAP)(25.433)

16.1 Contributions on the General Sections

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.2~~16.2 Study Item Report

TSGR3#6(99)832 'NBAP Message Parameters for System Information Broadcast' (Rapporteur) was presented by Kiran Thakare (Telecom Modus). Ericsson stated that they would like to avoid copying parameters between RAN2 and RAN3 documents for the case where the Node B does not need to alter the parameters. Where Node B intervention is required, the parameters would need to be non-transparent to NBAP. Nokia agreed but felt that RAN2 would need to be informed, as the impact is that the RRC termination is split between Node B and CRNC. Ericsson agreed to bring a contribution to the next meeting with some technical detail.

~~1.3~~16.3 Procedure Specifications

TSGR3#6(99)967 'NBAP procedures for Communication Control Port management, Common Transport Channel Management' (Nortel) was presented by Jean-Marie Calmel (Nortel Networks).

Control Port Section

Mannesmann Mobilfunk asked how the transport bearer was assigned to the port in the control port setup. Nortel replied that this had to be configured in the UTRAN, but that if dynamically set-up signalling bearers were used in the future, the procedure would work with parameter modifications. Ericsson asked for clarification on the purpose of the procedures. Nortel stated that it was to allow the number of communication control ports to be altered by logical O&M, and for the RNC to be aware of the state of the ports. Ericsson found it strange to configure the ports and then not to use them. The chairman asked why this had to be done by logical O&M,

rather than from OMC. Nortel explained that the control ports were objects seen in the model of Node B at the RNC, and the best way to ensure consistency was to do this via NBAP. Ericsson asked for clarification concerning whether the ports (and associated transport) had been defined before this procedure. Nokia also had difficulty with understanding the procedure. Mitsubishi asked whether the procedure would be executed when a new traffic termination point was established or when a Node B was set up – Nortel clarified that it was at the setup of the Node B, or if the operator adds a new traffic termination point (to avoid complex co-ordination). Alcatel asked whether the purpose of the procedure was to ensure consistency between Node B and RNC. Nortel confirmed this. Ericsson thought that we couldn't build procedures just to check that the operators had correctly configured their network. The chairman was not sure whether the communication control port was really managed by the RNC, as it is more of a transport layer object; however, as it is in the logical model, this is not very clear. Alcatel supported the procedure of Nortel, however there was no consensus.

Common Transport Section

Mannesmann Mobilfunk suggested that other Node B failure procedures might remove the need for the state change messages. Nortel felt that Node B failure did not cover the case when the Node B becomes available again. Vodafone thought that the Node B Resource Notification procedure could be used in that case. Nortel believe that we must decide whether to work on states or "allowed" based principles – they would rather use states, meaning that the existing messages would not be needed. This implies that a message would be needed for each resource. Motorola supported the Nortel approach. Nokia asked about the difference between operationalState and availabilityStatus. They cover two aspects – the former determining if the application is working, and the latter if it is actually available for use. Vodafone felt that availablityStatus was used in X.731 as a finer grain indication of reason for the operationalState. Alcatel stated that the operational state triggered alarms, and was visible to the operator. This procedure makes alarm correlation simpler. Ericsson prefer the Mannesmann Mobilfunk suggestion of having only two messages, rather than a separate state change signal for each resource. The discussion continued after presentation of tdocs 994&5.

TSGR3#6(99)994 'NBAP: Node B Failure Indication' (GSM Association VPT, Mannesmann Mobilfunk, T-Mobil, Vodafone) was presented by Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). Motorola asked whether these two messages contradicted the X.731 state model, perhaps being improved by merging the message with the resource allocation procedure.
Nokia asked what it meant in practice that the Node B informed RNC that a certain transport channel was not available. Nortel gave the example of a hardware failure with the FACH channel, meaning that RNC should not send traffic to it; as the FACH has an ID, they can be withdrawn/restarted individually.

TSGR3#6(99)995 'NBAP: Node B Resource Notification Message' (Vodafone) was presented by Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone). Nortel asked why the number of objects was so much less than in the failure message – they could not see how the recovery of an object was signalled. Vodafone agreed, but felt that the Resource Notification might need some additional parameters, to signal the Node B configuration. Motorola could not see how a new FACH (e.g.) could be signalled.

The chairman stated that there were a number of options at the principle level:

- Vodafone suggestion (one failure and one notification messages)
- Nortel suggestion (one state change procedure per object)
- Two Vodafone messages merged together (one message)

Ericsson supported the Vodafone contributions, as it is a more flexible solution in the case of partial failures.

Nortel stated that they would be happy to discuss enriching their messages.

The documents were left for off-line discussion.

After the off-line discussion Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone) reported the conclusion – it is based on 994, with these changes:

- The message is renamed to *Resource Status Indication*
- Parameter *failure type* is changed to *indication type (inclusion FFS), and marked as optional*
- Parameters *Local cell id, cell id* were marked as optional
- A note is added to state that *objects identified are not exhaustive and may be added to after further study – this is only an initial list and adding/removing objects is FFS.*
- A note is added that *if a resource is marked as disabled, then its child resources are implicitly disabled.*

With these changes, the document was approved.

tdoc 995 remains mostly intact, but with the following changes:

- cell carrier id, cell carrier capacity are removed from the message
- the first resource operational state is removed from the message
- local cell ID is redefined as *the local cell ID represents resources in Node B that can be used for configuration of a cell.*
- max DL transmit power definition is changed so that *specific carrier* reads *local cell*
- max DL transmit power renamed to *max DL power capability*

It was discussed whether you can actually signal the number of channel elements; Ericsson felt that it was impossible, as it depends on the bandwidth. It was noted that this was already marked FFS. **With these changes, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)867 'Common Transport Channel Management' (Motorola) was presented by Elliot Stewart (Motorola). Ericsson asked whether it was possible for all the data (e.g. channelisation code number) to be changed without affecting the traffic. Motorola explained that there could be some service impacts, but they didn't want to restrict the possibility to change these things. Ericsson felt that for non-traffic-affecting changes, reconfiguration could be used, and for traffic-affecting procedures, deletion and setup would be more appropriate. Currently DSCH is setup with a radio link reconfiguration procedure – this proposal is to do it with a different procedure. Ericsson asked what problems doing it this way solved. T-Mobil felt that it was more flexible to do it with the DCH, as currently performed.

Nokia preferred not to merge the various UL and DL common transport channel setups – T-Mobil agreed. Motorola clarified that the message could only be used to setup one channel at a time, and so there was no possible confusion. Ericsson were not sure that it is possible to setup the case where two FACHs are multiplexed on a single physical channel, with either the existing or proposed scheme. It was suggested that all transport channels multiplexed on a single physical channel should be setup together, especially as the power is physical channel dependent.
Nokia asked whether this meant that two messages would be needed to set up a RACH (as the AICH should also be setup). There was no answer.
Nortel expressed confusion with our design principles, as in some cases we were merging messages and in others we were opting for many messages. The current approach seems to be that objects are setup one by one, but state notification seems to be done on in a merged procedure.
Ericsson proposed agreeing the Motorola proposal; Nokia disagreed, as they could not see the benefit of the merging. However, **it was agreed that the merging should be done. The changes to the parameters were also agreed (2.3.1 of the document), with the exception of the DSCH parameters. A note was added to state that the relation of parameters to physical and transport channels would be clarified. The reconfiguration message (2.3.4) was agreed, but only with the intention of keeping the non-traffic-affecting parameters. For now, we keep the first 4 parameters and the power for each transport channel. However, there are no DSCH parameters included.**

T-Mobil asked what the common transport channel setup response meant – it was clarified that it meant that the Node B was ready for service. T-Mobil said that they felt that there could be some issues with dynamic allocation between DCH and FACH – contributions were invited.

~~*1.4*~~*16.4 Message Contents and Parameter Range*

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~*1.5*~~*16.5 Review Specification*

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~*1.6*~~*16.6 Other Issues*

Mostly Treated in Iub/r SWG.

At the previous meeting, the NBAP logical O&M procedures had been accepted as working assumptions, for decision at this meeting. **As there were no objections, it was agreed to accept the procedures.**

17 Iur Signalling Transport (25.422)

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

18 Iub Signalling Transport (25.432)

TSGR3#6(99)921 ’25.432 CR – Iub NBAP Signalling Bearer’ was presented by Björn Ehrstedt (Ericsson). **The document was approved.** Björn will forward it to David Williams (3GPP Support).

19 Iur/Iub Data Transport & Transport Network Control Plane

19.1 Iur/Iub DCH Transport Layer (25.426)

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.2~~19.2 Iub CCH Transport Layer (25.434)

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.3~~19.3 Iur CCH Transport Layer (25.424)

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.4~~19.4 Review Specifications

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

20 Implementation Specific O&M Transport (25.422)

20.1 Contributions

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

~~1.2~~20.2 Review Specification

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

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

Treated in Iub/r SWG.

22 Layer 1 Specifications (25.4x1)

No contributions were discussed.

23 UTRAN Functions, Signalling Procedures (25.931)

No contributions were discussed.

24 Reporting from SWGs

24.1 Iu SWG

TSGR3#6(99)a64 'Summary of Iu SWG' (Iu SWG Chairman) was presented by the SWG Chairman, Atte Länsisalmi (Nokia). It was clarified that the second tdoc 978 should be 979, and in A09 BAR should read RAB. The second A10 should be A11.

Lucent commented that there had been a discussion (942) on how RAB linking worked, and it had been recognised that this was an area where contributions were needed.

NEC commented that their document 912 was not treated, and should be added to the list of untreated documents.

The decisions of the Iu SWG were approved.

~~1.2~~24.2 Iub/r SWG

TSGR3#6(99)a~~8~~40 'Summary of Iub/r SWG' (Iub/r SWG Chairman) was presented by the SWG Chairman, Per Willars (Ericsson). It was corrected (Tdocs a17 & 849 conclusions in section 14.1) that silent mode is *always* used on the UL as well as the DL (and not *never* as stated). It was clarified that the statements referred to in the 7th bullet are the two bullets underneath. The first of these requires clarification – it should state that text from 7.1.1 is moved to 8.1.

Nokia (a04, in 14.1) asked for clarification in the minutes that a04 proposed not sending a transport block with CRC failure to the RNC, and that it was not accepted.

Siemens (953) stated that parameter split was in 9.1 not 9.2 – the objective was for maximum commonality. Ericsson said that it was a temporary solution. Siemens asked for it to be noted that the description of TDD and FDD parameters in separate tables was a temporary solution, and the final description needs clarification. **This was agreed for inclusion in the RNSAP specification.** It was clarified that the message type would be common for FDD and TDD.

It was noted that Telecom Modus, NEC and Fujitsu had objected to the inclusion of SSDT to the study item for future releases (which should have been 25.831 (not 25.832)).

It was agreed that with the notes above, that the minutes were a report of the SWG meeting, with the understanding that tdoc 831 needs re-discussing in the plenary.

Telecom Modus objected to the treatment of SSDT, and asked that the following points be included in the meeting minutes:

- The Telecom Modus SSDT contribution has been submitted to wg3 meeting since March meeting and it was never treated until the last (Helsinki) meeting.
- Even in the present meeting, this document was treated superficially.
- Although SSDT was a study item, no contributions were received on the e-mail reflector.
- They understand that SSDT will still be considered in the next meeting and is still in the scope of release 99.
- Tdoc 830 is a complete working solution. Furthermore, the Iub/r SWG minutes do not reflect the technical issues that are supposedly still open and that were discussed in the meeting.

Fujitsu objected to the removal of SSDT to the study items for future releases, and felt that we could discuss further before going to RAN plenary. NEC stated that in 830 there are two solutions to realise the functionality in Iub and Iur. Nokia felt that we could try to reach a decision in this meeting. Alcatel felt that the decision to include or exclude anything from R99 was not one for R3, but rather for RAN plenary.

Telecom Modus stated that they had presented two complete solutions for SSDT and that they felt that it was not a decision for RAN3 to remove it from R99, as the other WGs had been working on it. Ericsson reminded delegates of the timeplan and our decision not to include new functionality after this meeting. They felt that there had

not been a common understanding that there was a complete solution, and that this discussion was wasting time.

The chairman proposed that SSDT should be re-treated at the next meeting. **The chairman's proposal was agreed, and so the decisions on SSDT in the SWG were not endorsed by RAN3.**

The other decisions of the Iub/r SWG were approved.

25 Study Items for Future Releases (25.831)

No contributions were discussed.

26 Outgoing Liaisons

TSGR3#6(99)a38 'proposed LS to RAN1 on TFCI Transmission' was presented by Nicolas Drevon (Alcatel). It was commented that it should read "from all cells" rather than from "all Nodes B". **With this change, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a39 'LS on the usage of the Physical BER as UL Quality estimate in the UL DCH Frame Protocol on Iub/r' was presented by Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a42 'Draft LS concerning length of SFN' was presented by Anders Bergström (Ericsson). It was commented that the destinations should be *TSG RAN* WGx. **With these changes, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a36 'proposed LS on UTRAN Frame Synchronisation model' was presented by Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson). Motorola commented that it had been agreed to include a rule for converting Td to chip offset – Ericsson stated that a comment on this was already included. Formula 5.2 was modified to read *OFF[new]=(CFN-Cell_SFN[new])mod256* . **With this change, the document was approved; and the description text is to be included into 25.401.**

TSGR3#6(99)a43 'Draft LS about TDD Synchronisation Methods' was presented by Massimo Dell'Acqua (Italtel). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a47 'Draft answer on LS regarding MExE support of handover notifications and QoS negotiation' was presented by Björn Ehrstedt (Ericsson). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a61 'LS regarding Relocation and GSM-UMTS handover' was presented Kalle Ahmavaara (Nokia). **The document was approved, with the addition of SA2 as a Cc recipient.**

TSGR3#6(99)a48 'proposed LS on L1 Timing Issues' was presented by Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a49 'Proposed LS on the support of different RL DL_TX_power levels in case of soft handover' was presented by Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a27 ‘draft answer to N2 on CN domain identifiers used over the Iu and Iur interfaces’ was presented by Göran Rune (Ericsson). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a28 ‘Draft Answer to the LS from N2 on the allocation of SSN for RANAP’ was presented by Göran Rune (Ericsson). It was proposed to change the title to “LS on the allocation of SSN for RNSAP’. **With this change, the document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a75 ‘proposed ls to R2 about the support of asymmetric RL reconfiguration procedure in UTRAN release ‘99’ was presented by Fabio Longoni (Nokia). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a65 ‘Proposed response liaison statement to SA2 on Clarification of RAB Sub Flows concept and associated definitions’ was presented by Alain Maupin (Ericsson). **The document was approved.**

TSGR3#6(99)a76 ‘Proposed liaison statement to SA2, SA4, N3, (cc: R2) on the Iu User Plane specification status in RAN WG3’ was presented by Alain Maupin (Ericsson). **The document was approved.**

It was agreed to review the LS from David Comstock (**TSGR3#6(99)a62**) on the reflector, and if there are no objections within one week, it will be approved.

27 Next Meeting (agenda etc)

September – meeting at ETSI. The provisional plan is for Plenary on Monday & Friday; Tuesday-Thursday in SWG.

Left over submissions must be resubmitted with a new number.

For the October meeting – the Chairman will not be present, but the Vice-Chairman will be chairing the meeting.

The following study items were noted (with responsible people, where appointed):

Remaining NBAP contributions – Andrew DeLaTorre (Vodafone).
Incoming LSs from R2
DL Power Control – based on R1 LS and R2 response.
SSDT (ongoing) – Kiran Thakare (Telecom Modus)
Iur flow control – Michael Schopp (Siemens)
TDD parameters (NBAP) – Flavio Piolini (Italtel)
TDD parameters (RNSAP) – Flavio Piolini (Italtel)
TDD Parameters for Frame Protocols – Massimo Dell’Acqua (Italtel)
Interactions between RANAP procedures and SRNS relocation (based on 947)
RL failure/loss of UL sync (based on 984) – Nobutaka Ishikawa

28 Any Other Business

28.1 SA Co-ordination Issues

28.2 Binding ID Change Requests

TSGR3#6(99)a32, TSGR3#6(99)a33, TSGR3#6(99)a34 & TSGR3#6(99)a35 'CR to 25.4x4 [25.426]' (Mitsubishi Electric) were presented by Sophie Pautonnier (Mitsubishi) and discussed together.

It was commented by Ericsson that the new sentence should be modified to read that Binding ID *provided by the radio network layer* shall…. It was also commented that the CR should only include the modified chapters, rather than the whole target specification.
With these changes, the four documents were approved.

Annex A – Iu SWG report

Source: Iu SWG Chairman
Title: Summary of Iu SWG

Introduction

This document presents the report from Iu SWG held on August 24-26 1999 during TSG RAN WG3 meeting #6 in Sophia Antipolis, France (ETSI Headquarters, Iris 2-3). The meeting was chaired and the report prepared by Atte Länsisalmi. The report is in line with the agenda that was agreed in the opening plenary for the meeting (the incoming liaison handling is reported as the last item (without a number)).

8 Iu General Aspects

8.1 General Aspects and Principles of Iu interface (25.410), 807, A22

Tdoc 807 "UMTS 25.410 UTRAN Iu Interface, General Aspects and Principles" was presented by the editor Richard Townend of BT. It contains the modifications approved in the previous meeting. Richard pointed out that there were some comments from Alcatel about SCCP, but they have not been included. However, they are now in a contribution for the meeting, so it was decided to handle them later (see **Tdoc A22** below). The document was agreed.
Tdoc A22 "Iu Interface characteristics, Use of SCCP" was presented by Juliane Boccali of Alcatel. The proposals (clarifications to the text) in the document were handled as follows:
Minor comment 1: It was agreed to change the RNS to RNC throughout the document.
Minor comment 2: It was agreed to add "domain" after "CN" in the last sentence of 4.5.1.1.
Major comment 1: It was agreed to clarify the a1, and a2 in figures 1 and 2. The case I and case II initiation procedures were modified to refer to the SCCP connection request message, and not the specific RANAP messages. In case I, the RANAP message is always included in the user data field of SCCP CR, and in case II this is optional. The required modifications are shown in **Tdoc A58** (see handling of that below). It was also agreed that the editor will need to add references to correct ITU SCCP specifications.
Major comment 2: Section 4.5.1.2.2 of 25.410; it was agreed to remove the note and the paragraph following the note.
Tdoc A58 "SCCP Modifications" was reviewed shortly. This document includes the final text of the SCCP section modifications, and was approved without modification.

8.2 Actions:

contributions on Iu interface characteristics (Ericsson/BT) 941
Tdoc 941 "Iu Interface Characteristics" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. It was agreed with the following modifications:
The title of proposed section 4.5.3 was changed to "RNC Co-ordination functionality between two CN domains".
In the first bullet "SRNS" was changed to "SRNC".

in the second to last bullet words "Iu interfaces" was changed to "Iu connections", "CN nodes" was changed to "CN domains", and word "shall be" was changed to "are to be".

contributions on Iu specification objectives (BT) -974

Tdoc 974 "Iu Interface Characteristics" was presented by Richard Townend of BT. The proposed Iu Interface characteristics to be added to section 4.3 of 25.410 were agreed without questions or comments.

contributions on List of functions over Iu (Nokia) A00, ----A59

Tdoc A00 "Iu Interface functions" was presented by Jyrki Jussila of Nokia. The proposal is to add the presented functions to currently empty functions section of 25.410.

Tdoc A59 "Comments to A00" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. This document presents the functions in a little bit different fashion.

Handling of **Tdocs A00** and **A59**:

It was agreed that some things from both contributions could be included. There was no clear way to do this, and it was left for the two contributors to come up with a proposal, during this meeting if possible. No proposal was received during the meeting.

contributions on SCCP addressing schemes (Ericsson)

Contributions in this area had been addressed in the opening plenary.

8.3 Other contributions -973, -975

Tdoc 973 "Iu Interface Definitions" was presented by Richard Townend of BT. It clarifies some of the definitions. The following was decided:

Definitions of Source SRNC and Target SRNC were put aside for now. Kalle Ahmavaara of Nokia will try to make a new proposal during the meeting (see **Tdoc 060** below).

It was agreed to use "SRNC" consistently. The use of "CN" left for editorial/terminology checking exercise to be held in the September timeframe.

Tdoc A60 "UTRAN Definitions" was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara of Nokia. This is new proposal for the definitions that had been discussed offline among the delegates. The definitions were handled as follows:

Relocation of SRNS: The definition was agreed with modification that it is broken into two paragraphs, the main one for UMTS and to other for other systems. The last sentence was modified so that all mention about the messages and protocols removed (i.e. first part of the sentence removed) and the words: "may not" are removed.

Serving RNS (SRNS): After long discussion it was agreed to keep the current definition of SRNS from 25.401, i.e. none of the proposed clarifications/additions were approved.

Serving RNC (SRNC), Source RNS, Source RNC, and Target RNC: Agreed without modification.

Target RNS: Agreed with corrected spelling from "RNC" to "RNS".

It was also agreed that we include the list of definitions in RANAP (25.413) and not the General Description (25.410)

Tdoc 975 "Iu Interface Architecture" was presented by Richard Townend of BT. The proposed general architectural statements and the figure were approved with the modifications that

The words "Iu Instance" are replaced by "Iu Interface"

The four bullets in the end of the document are replaced by the following two bullets:

Each CN access point may be connected to one or more UTRAN access points.

Each UTRAN access point may be connected to no more than one CN access point per CN domain.

8.4 Review spec.

(Agree old working assumptions. Assessment of stability / completeness / version number of spec.)
Quick review on the status of different sections was made, and it was decided to raise the version to 1.0.0. The chairman pointed out that there is going to be the editors meeting for the reviewing and planning how to progress the documents, and that more detailed assessment on what is still missing should be done in that meeting (see **Tdoc A63** in annex B).

9 Iu User-plane protocols (25.415) 814; 939

Tdoc 814 "Updated version 0.2.1 of TS 25.415" was presented by the editor Alain Maupin of Ericsson. It contains the modifications approved in the previous meeting. The document was approved as presented without questions or comments.
Tdoc 939 "Editors proposal of TS 25.415: V0.2.2" was presented by the editor Alain Maupin of Ericsson. The document proposes quite large re-organisation of the document, which is mostly editorial in the nature.
It was pointed out that the definition of RAB Sub-flow needs to be clarified, both in our and S2 documentation (Alain's proposal is copying text that we have previously sent to S2). It was agreed that a RAB is always at least one sub-flow, and it can be many sub-flows (no limit set, and the limit is according to the different protection classes).
It was agreed to modify the text in section 3.1 definitions, and to propose the same modification to S2. Alain will include this to the liaison statement to S2 he is already writing on this issue. The modifications are:
The definition was modified to read (addition underlined): "A RAB as defined in [9] can be realised by UTRAN through <u>one to</u> several sub-flows.
It was also agreed that the word "RAB" needs to be inserted in front of the word "SAP" in bullet 4, of the RAB-Sub flow definition.
The difference of terminology "RAB" and "Iu bearer" was discussed. No modification was approved at this time, but the editor was asked to consider this for the next editors proposal.
The document was approved with the modifications shown above. It was also agreed to set the version to 1.0.0.

9.1 Contributions 935, 936, -978, -979, -980, 869

Tdoc 869 "Iu Data frames" was resented by Tim Jeanes of Motorola. After having some clarification on the proposal, it was noted that the frame number (4bits) is already included in the Iu-U Plane protocol (that is where frames are applied at all). Therefore no modification is required to the document.
Tdoc 935 "Downlink Rate Control over Iu" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. It is a proposal to accept the principle that the DL rate control is done over the Iu using Iu U-Plane protocol. It is proposed that the technical contribution to 25.415 will be presented later, if the principle is accepted.
The principle was approved. Alain will remove the FFS statement from the rate control part of the current document. The technical details will be provided by a contribution to the next meeting.

Tdoc 936 "Frame coding for PDU type 0 for Support Mode for predefined SDU size" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson.
There was a lengthy discussion on using formal/abstract method for defining the U-Plane protocol. Several pros and cons of each method (formal and tabular) were identified, and it was understood that the issue could be studied further.
Due to the lack of other complete and written proposals for the usage of formal definition method, the contribution with tabular format was accepted with the following modifications: It was agreed that the way on how the receiving entity knows how to hop over unknown procedure control fields must be specified, as well as the error situations. The editor also needs to check that the frame header is specified somewhere (everything else but the payload).
Tdoc 978 "Iu UP framing" was presented by Hidenori Asaba of NTT DoCoMo. The two proposals were handled as follows:
The first proposal to include the mapping table: It was clarified that UDI and MMT are not sent over the Iu in "one bit" interval, but rather on 10 or 20 ms interval. It was agreed that this issue needs to be assured, but it was the groups understanding that this is defined in S2 QoS AdHoc.
For the second proposal it was clarified that it is implicitly clear that this assembly and segmentation takes place in the SRNC because both radio protocols and Iu protocols terminate in the SRNC.
Tdoc 978 "Time alignment procedure without user data transmission" was presented by Hidenori Asaba of NTT DoCoMo. This contribution proposes that it should be possible to send a timing alignment control header without user data payload. It was clarified that it is possible to send just the header with any control information and the payload length can be 0.
It was agreed to include a more general sentence as a new section "6.5.1 General" to 25.415 v1.0.0. The sentence reads:
"It shall be possible to perform any of the control procedures regardless of the user data transmission"
Tdoc 980 "Correspondence of mode in Iu UP protocol layer to services" was presented by Hidenori Asaba of NTT DoCoMo.
It was clarified that the U-Plane protocol mode should be indicated in the RAB Attributes. It was agreed that this type of mapping is done in the S2 QoS AdHoc group. The proposal to include the mapping table to 25.415 was not agreed.
It was agreed that Alain will draft with the help of Richard a liaison to S2, N3, S4 summarising the current status of the Iu U-Plane protocol.

9.2 Review spec.

(Agree old working assumptions. Assessment of stability / completeness / version number of spec.)
It has already been agreed that the version is raised to 1.0.0. There were no working assumptions that we could have decided (WA on GTP SAP is depending correspondence with other groups).

10 Iu signalling (RANAP) (25.413) 811; 940

Tdoc 811 "UMTS 25.413: RANAP Signalling, v.1.1.2" was presented by Jyrki Jussila. It contains the modifications approved in the previous meeting. Jyrki pointed out that the ASN.1 module for PDU descriptions still includes the compatibility information, but it should be removed (as shown in the intermediate version 1.1.1 that was sent to the reflector after meeting #5 without a Tdoc number).

It was agreed to include another column to table in section 8.1.3 with the request message name for the elementary procedures. With this modification the document was approved.
Tdoc 940 "Comments to RANAP V1.1.1" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson. The following was agreed:
NAS bit string issue. It was agreed by the group in the previous meeting that this is one of the possible ways. It was now agreed to include in corresponding RANAP section a statement indicating: In case the ending of the broadcasting hasn't been indicated when setting the broadcasting, an empty bit string will be used to turn off the broadcasting.
Temporary UE Id, should replace the TMSI as indicated.
Paging are Id (can take whole RNS area), the transparent fields, and user plane mode including their definitions (to be created by the editor) needs to be specified in section 9.2
target RNC Identification needs to be defined in section 9.2.
additional comments:
General: The editor will indicate whether each procedure is CO or CL.
8.2.1 Approved
8.2.2.1: First part approved with words "hard handover or SRNS relocation" removed, and all appearances of "CN node(s)" changed to "CN". Source Id (instead of Serving Id) and Target Id parameters included to Relocation Required. Timer should indeed be stopped instead of resetting it. The sentence "Depending on the case...." is replaced with the proposed sentence.
8.2.4: The text modified as proposed. It was agreed to remove the box from figure 9 to clear the inconsistency between text and figure.
8.2.5: Accepted to use SRNC Id and SRNTI as proposed.
8.2.6: Relocation Cancel operation left for further contributions.
8.3: Abbreviation RAB should be used instead of Radio Access Bearer and no need to specify RANAP in front of the message names.
8.4: Outside of the scope of the specification.
8.5.1: Remove Iu Release Request from Iu Release procedure specification (separate initial procedures).
8.5.2, 8.5.3 and 8.5.4: Comments agreed, section 8.5.2 used and modified as proposed.
8.8: permanent NAS UE identity used instead of IMSI as proposed.
8.9: approved to use paging area.
8.10: Accepted to rename the procedure to CN Invoke Trace as proposed.
8.11.1:The editor to clear this section for not to include cipher response mode. It was also agreed that the 6th (not 5th) paragraph should be modified in the spirit that when the radio interface is operating according to the Cipher Mode Command, the UTRAN shall send the CIPHER MODE COMPLETE message to the CN.
8.11.2: Agreed
8.12: Withdrawn (other contributions in this area)
8.13: Input from joint work of R2 and N1 is expected to provide some information in this area.
8.14: modifications done as proposed.
8.15.2.1: Comment withdrawn, because It was clarified that the abnormal condition is that the CN would send this type of message.
8.16.3.1: Withdrawn

Categorisation of Messages & IEs. The editor was mandated to do this. The categories for the messages need to be considered by the editor. The agreed categories for the IEs are NAS related, transport network layer related, radio network layer related and other. The editor will also make a proposal for the re-ordering the procedures, but this will be in an editors proposal.

10.1 Study Items report and decision:

Bearer renegotiation and partial relocation for UMTS/GSM handover (Richard)
Richard Townend of BT reported verbally that a number of e-mails had been exchanged. One conclusion appears to be that most of the responsibility for deciding the partial relocation acceptance is in the CN. There may be some impact on the transparent field also.
The status of current documentation regarding partial relocation was reviewed, and it was understood that currently it is not supported as a distinguished functionality. It was clarified that whatever is specified in RAB attributes needs to be supported in relocation, and if RAB attributes allow some modification, then that kind of partial relocation is possible. However all RABs need to be handed over.
It seems difficult to have this feature in release 99 if no clear conclusion is achieved soon. The decision should be in this meeting, but if the feature can be accomplished with minor changes, it can be considered also later, when the parameters are discussed.
It was also agreed to keep the e-mail discussion in this item alive.
RAB assignment (Kalle) A09, --- 942
Tdoc A09 "Radio Access Bearer Assignment Procedure" was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara of Nokia.
Tdoc 942 "Principles and text proposal for RANAP RAB Assignment" was resented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson.
Agreements on **Tdocs A09** and **942**:
It was agreed that it must be possible to send an indication to the CN that the Release of a BAR has failed, e.g. due to some problems in the radio interface.
The principle in **Tdoc 942** was accepted, and principle 3 now has the release reject case also. The paragraph right after the 5 bullets was modified to read (addition underlined):
If none of the RABs have been queued, the CN shall stop timer $T_{RABAssgt.}$ and the RAB Assignment procedure terminates successfuly, unless all RABs have failed to establish or modify. In that case the procedure also terminates in the UTRAN.
A new version of **Tdoc 942** (**Tdoc A74** below) was provided by Ericsson, so that it is easier to agree text for RANAP.
Tdoc A74 "Modified Principles and text proposal for RANAP RAB Assignment" was presented by Alain Maupin of Ericsson.
Agreements on **Tdocs A09** and **A74**:
The class three elementary procedure definition needs to be added by the editor (can be developed from the text in **A74**).
Following the sentence right after the 4th bullet list it was added: "In the first RAB Assignment response message the UTRAN shall report about all RABs." This was done because it simplifies the operation of the CN. This explanation was not acceptable to Alcatel, but they presented no objection to the agreement.
The RAB Release request approved from **A09** (section 2.2)
It was noted that Queuing procedure and message contents need to be removed, because they are in the new RAB Assignment response.

– Tdocs 750, 751, 763, 764 (Asaba) --A16

Tdoc A16 "E-mail discussion report for study items [Tdocs 750, 751, 763 and 764]" was presented by Hidenori Asaba of NTT DoCoMo.

Items in the report were noted as follows: Charging is waiting for S2 answer before it can be progressed, and for all others revised contributions are provided by DoCoMo (discussed in agenda item 10.3, **Tdocs 988**, **989** and **990**).

SRNS relocation transparent field (Jörgen) 952

Tdoc 952 "Transparent field in Relocation Required and Relocation Request" from Alcatel was discussed shortly. Neither Jörgen Van Parys or Nicola Drevon of Alcatel were available to present the document, so only the proposals were reviewed shortly. Based on the firs proposal it was agreed to rename the transparent "field" to transparent "container". The second proposal not discussed, because neither Jörgen nor Nicola were present. We will return to this if either joins the meeting later (we didn't return to this).

RANAP functions: A01

Tdoc A01 "RANAP functions" was presented by Jyrki Jussila of Nokia.

Accepted with the following notes:

Release of Iu resources: "Instance of Iu" should be "corresponding Iu connection"

Requesting the release of Iu resources: end of the statement is appended with "from the corresponding Iu connection"

General note is added stating that the section needs to be checked after the Iu functions have been specified.

Transport of NAS information: "two" changed to "three"

10.2 Actions

contribution on RANAP Error handling (Lucent)

10.3 Procedure specifications *988, 989, 990, 970, A10, A11, 909, note 903*

Tdoc 988 "Overload Control Procedure" was presented by Hidenori Asaba of NTT DoCoMo. It proposes that requested traffic level is indicated in overload messages, and also that a response message is added to the procedure.

It was commented that for this to work properly in multivendor environment, it is required that the absolute levels in terms of e.g. signalling messages per hour or bits per second are specified in the standards. Therefore the absolute values for levels are not an easy solution. It was discussed that to indicate the number of steps to reduce the traffic would be better. Even if the size of the step is unknown, it is possible to learn how many steps is appropriate.

The proposal was accepted in modified form:

It was agreed that in overload message it should be possible to set the number of steps to reduce the traffic. The proposed Traffic Control Level parameter is replaced with that.

It was not agreed to include the response message, because the SCCP layer will inform the RANAP entity if it was not able to convey the Overload message. If the peer RANAP entity is not working, it will be indicated by reset procedure.

The editor will propose the new text for the next meeting.

Tdoc 989 "Health Check (Layer 3)" was presented by Hidenori Asaba of NTT DoCoMo. It was clarified that in the proposal the intervals of sending the Health Check message are constant, but the setting of the constant is left outside the specifications for O&M.

The benefit of this procedure was questioned. RANAP level already has recovery mechanism (reset) and the SCCP level also has some indication if it is e.g. congested. Therefore the proposal was not accepted
Tdoc 990 "Restriction for active calls" was presented by Hidenori Asaba of NTT DoCoMo. It was clarified that it is operator decision to use this either for disaster cases only or for other congestion situations also. The main application is for the disaster cases though, which is an exceptional situation in general.
The group agreed that there is a need for this type of functionality. Instead of including a completely new procedure, it was agreed to specify a new trigger for location report procedure from the RNC. The trigger is that when a user enters or leaves a classified area set by O&M, a location report message will be sent to the CN. Cause information is included in the message.
The editor was mandated to propose text in the document. It was noted that a NEC contribution that will be handled later (no time was left to handle the parameters agenda item) also addresses the parameters for location report, and maybe one of those can be used for this purpose.
Tdoc 970 "Clarification on the "CN information broadcast" RANAP procedure" from Nortel was discussed shortly. There was no-one from Nortel to present the document. It was noted that the document is for clarification only, and there is no proposal for modification of any document. The document was noted, and the chair advised the delegates to read the document by themselves.
Tdoc A10 "Coordination of Relocation in multiple Iu signalling connections" was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara of Nokia. During the discussion it was once more clarified that if the UE is active in two logical CN domains, it will always have two separate SCCP connections regardless of the CN architecture scenario (single or dual CN entity scenario).
The proposal was agreed with the following modifications to proposed section 8.2.7:
Third paragraph is modified to read: Source RNC has to indicate in each RELOCATION REQUIRED message the amount of Iu signalling connections between source RNC and CN involved into the relocation of serving RNC.
Fourth paragraph removed.
Fifth paragraph modified to read: Source RNC shall proceed in execution of the relocation of SRNC only once Relocation Preparation procedure is successfully terminated on all Iu signalling connections existing for the UE.
Globally: Co-ordination should have a hyphen.
Tdoc A10 "Interaction of Relocation Related and Other RANAP Procedures" was presented by Kalle Ahmavaara of Nokia.
The proposal was not approved, because many delegates viewed that it unnecessarily ties other elementary procedures to the Relocation procedure.
Tdoc 909 "Crossing of Reset Message" was presented by Chen Hock Ng of NEC. It was agreed with the modification that "f" in the timer names should be "t".

10.4 Message contents and parameter range *910, 912, 937,-982, 911, note 903*

There was no time to handle this agenda item

10.5 Review spec.

(Agree old working assumptions. Assessment of stability / completeness / version number of spec.)
There was no time to handle this agenda item

10.6 Other issues

There was no time to handle this agenda item

11 Iu Data Transport + Transport network control plane (25.414) ; 938

There was no time to handle this agenda item

12 Iu signalling transport (25.412) ;

There was no time to handle this agenda item

Incoming Liaison Statements;

Tdoc 920 "CN Domain identifiers used over the Iu & Iur Interfaces" from SA2 was discussed. Noted and will be considered while RANAP is discussed.
Tdoc 839 "Liaison Statement to RAN WG3 on CN Domain Identifiers used over the Iu and Iur interfaces" from N2 was noted. This clarifies the coding of the LAC and RAC, and will be considered when those are discussed in more detail.
Tdoc 918 "Answer to LS on Interactions between Mobility Management and Radio Mobility" from SA2 was discussed. The detail of how this works was clarified in the discussions. The document was noted.
Tdoc 836 "Liaison Statement on the evolution of GTP for release '99" from N2 was presented by David Comstock of Ericsson. It presents the GTP release '99 working assumptions taken by N2, and is send for our group to comment. It was agreed that David will draft a liaison back including the following points:
A question for clarification whether the tunnel endpoint needs to be unique within the node or whether it is enough that it is unique within an IP address.
To point out that there is no SNDCP PDU number in UMTS, and the number that we need to use may be of different format. Is that a problem for N2?
It was also discussed that there is no retransmission scheme for the GTP-U. This in turn complicates the in-order delivery requirement if one packet is lost. It is difficult for the receiving entity to know how long to wait until determining that a packet is lost.
Tdoc 826 "(no title)" from N3 was discussed. This is informing us about the current status of work on CS data services in N3. They provide us with a number of documents from their last meeting. In particular N3 Tdoc 152 which shows the rough architecture and requirements for Iu U-Plane protocol was reviewed.
It was discussed that the alignment for octets and frames means that the U-Plane protocol should be sending by octets and RLP frames. The document is noted for now (no problems seen), and we will return to the issue of whether an answer is required after the Iu U-Plane discussions. No other points were raised after the Iu U-Plane discussions, and therefore no specific liaison in response to this is sent (note: the general Iu U-Plane status Liaison Statement will be sent)

Report from the Editors Meeting.

Tdoc A63 "Summary of Iu SWG Editors Meeting" was shortly presented by the chairman (The report is attached to Annex B). It was presented for information, and pointed out that the decisions taken in the meeting will be realised by contributions to the following meetings.

ANNEX A (to Iu SWG Report): summary of action items and their current status.

#	Slogan	Deadline	Comments	Responsible Companies	Status
1	Iu Interface Characterstics	August	25.410 deadline: Sept.	Ericsson/BT	done
2	Iu Specification Objectives	August		BT	done
3	List of Functions over Iu	August		Nokia	pending
4	Definition of Functions o. Iu	September		Nokia	pending
5	Function Distribution o. Iu	September		Nokia	pending
6	Relocation/Handover	September		All	open
7	Protocol principles	September		Lucent	open
8	Error handling principles	September		Lucent	open
9	Use of SCCP	July		Ericsson	done
10	SCCP Addressing schemes	August		Ericsson	done
11	Freezing of Procedures list	July	25.413 deadline: Dec.	All	pending
12	RANAP Error handling	August		Lucent	open
13	Timers, O&M param.	October		NEC	open
14	RAB attributes/def.	September		Ericsson	open
15	Restructuring of Iu UP	July	25.415 deadline: September	Ericsson	done
16	CS Data impacts	September		input coming from CN WG3	open
17	Iu UP procedures final.	September		All	pending
18	RANAP ASN.1	Ad-hoc October		All/Nokia	open

ANNEX B (to Iu SWG report): Summary of Iu SWG Editors Meeting

TSG-RAN Working Group 3, meeting #6 ***TSGR3#6(99)A63***

Sophia Antipolis, France, 24-26 August 1999

Source: Iu SWG Chairman

Title: Summary of Iu SWG editors meeting

Introduction

This document presents the report from Iu SWG editors meeting held on August 25 1999 in Sophia Antipolis, France (ETSI Headquarters, Iris 2-3). The meeting was chaired and the report prepared by Atte Länsisalmi of Nokia. Richard Townend of BT (editor of 25.410), Jyrki Jussila of Nokia (editor of 25.413), David Comstock of Ericsson (editor of 25.414) and Alain Maupin of Ericsson (editor of 25.415) participated the meeting.

The chair and the editors reviewed all of the Iu specifications, and discussed how to best progress them. It was agreed that the items noted (reported below) will be covered in various editors proposals and company contributions, which are to be reviewed and accepted by the Iu SWG and RAN WG3.

25.410 UTRAN Iu Interface General Aspects and Pinciples

In addition to some minor editorial corrections the editor will complete the following tasks for the next meeting:

References need to be corrected, e.g. SCCP references added.

Abbreviations section need to be filled based on all used abbreviations.

General Aspects section: remove the first editors note.

Iu Interface Capabilities: Editors note should be removed and those capabilities should be listed based on requirements from section 4.2 of 23.930 Iu Principles

In addition it was noted that:

Discussion on section 5 functions of the Iu Interface protocols is already ongoing based on Nokia and Ericsson input.

Definitions for Source and Target SRNC are being developed, but they should be placed in RANAP specification.

25.411 UTRAN Iu Interface Layer 1

No missing items were identified

25.412 UTRAN Iu Interface Signalling Transport

In September the group is supposed to assess whether IETF work on CTP is mature enough that we can keep that type of signalling bearer in release 99.

25.413 UTRAN Iu Interface RANAP Signalling

The following was noted:

The whole document should be checked for the terminology point of view in an AdHoc activity in September time frame.

Section 1, Scope: Editor will provide to the next meeting (can be partially copied from RNSAP).

Section 2 References: References to 23.930 (Richard considers whether appropriate and necessary), 25.410, and 25.415 and the transport layer specifications need to be added
Section 3.1 Definitions: Source and Target RNC should be added (already being developed). Definition of Elementary procedures from 8.1.1 can be moved here.
Symbols section removed because it is empty (can be done in other documents too.
Section 4 General: Error handling already allocated to Lucent. Ericsson will have contribution on forward and backwards compatibility (will be posted as early as possible).
Sections 5 and 6: Nokia will provide information on these to the next meeting.
Section 7 Functions of RANAP: contribution for this meeting from Nokia.
Section 8 RANAP Procedures: Grouping and reordering of procedures should be done (contribution for this meeting, but the proposal is that the editor works on this) A number of procedures are being worked on for this meeting.
Sections 8.2.7 and 8.2.8 should be removed due to the lack of input.
Section 8.7.4.3 Crossing of Reset messages are FFS. The need to mention this item should be decided in this meeting.
Nokia will check if SOLSA needs some changes to RANAP (as done in GSM A).
Nokia also checks how Integrity Checking is to operated in Iu, is it in conjunction with Ciphering or independently.
Section 9.1 should be called simply "Message Contents". It needs a sanity check, and Nokia will do that. Grouping and order of Messages should be done (contribution for this meeting, but the proposal is that the editor works on this)
Section 9.2 should be called "Information element definitions". Everything else except the information element definitions should be removed.
Section 9.3 Nokia will provide ASN.1 information to the AdHoc on ASN.1 in October timeframe.
Section 9.4 Message Transfer Syntax: Decision on PER or BER should be done in October.
Section 9.5 Timers, contribution from NEC to this meeting.
Section 10. Error handling allocated to Lucent.

25.414 UTRAN Iu Interface Data Transport and Transport Signalling

The only thing missing is the correct reference to GTP U (UMTS TS number). The editor will provide the CR correcting that for this or the next meeting.

25.415 UTRAN Iu Interface CN RAN User Plane Protocols

The following was noted:
The whole area of CS data is open, it could mean no effect, or a lot of changes.
Description method for the protocol needs to be decided, i.e. formal method or tabular format.
Support Mode for variable SDU sizes:
All information about applicable procedures and elements of communication (i.e. frame format, coding and primitives) is missing, and should be provided by interested companies in the next meeting.
Support Mode for predefined SDU sizes:
Rate Control contributions already coming in from Ericsson.

Time Alignment needs to be specified. Time alignment has already been addressed by Motorola and DoCoMo, so they could provide more input.
Abnormal events needs to be specified. Ericsson will work on this area time permitting.
Frame classification contributions coming in from Ericsson.
Coding of initialisation procedure messages coming in from Ericsson.
Protocol states contribution coming in from Ericsson.
In section 6.5.2 the first and last editors notes can be deleted.
Need for Acknowledge frame needs to be clarified by next meeting. All interested companies invited to input.
Section 7.2.4 Ericsson will clarify for the next meeting.
Section 7.2.5 first part of the note can be removed already, and also second part is covered.
Section 7.3.3 Note 1 and the note at the bottom will be clarified by Ericsson for the next meeting.
Section 7.3.4 The GTP-U SAP needs to be clarified in the next meeting.

Annex B – Iub/r SWG report

Source: **Iub/Iur SWG Chairman**
Title: **Summary Iur / Iub SWG**

GENERAL

The Iur/Iub SWG meeting was held 24-26 August and chaired by Per Willars. The meeting trusted the chairman to take correct notes. The conclusions are fully reported (except all editorial modifications agreed). Only limited discussion is reported.

CONCLUSIONS

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

4 Letters / reports from other groups

The following incoming LSs were discussed in the SWG.

829 Not treated.

914 LS from R1on SFN length. Reply proposed in 879.

6 General UTRAN Architecture

6.3 Synchronisation

877 - not treated

977 DL timing adjustment in Iur/Iub UP. **Not agreed.** (Current sync procedure enough.)

879 Agreed to send this LS response to 914 including first two paragraphs. Also include this info in 25.401. Ericsson drafts the LS.

A05 - not treated

Ericsson will draft the text proposal basedon proposal 4 from sync ad hoc and send to the reflector. If no objections within a week it is incorporated in the specs.

A44 Proposal on text based on proposal 3 from sync ad hoc (901). **Agreed** with modifications:

DOFF must be sent to the UE. UE calculates frame_offset based on DOFF.

add 4th case to include handover from other radio access network. copied from case 2 with some modifciation that the UE selects the reference cell.

A24 Text proposal. **Agreed** with modifications:

change OFF to Frame_Offset. (OFF is the parameter reported by the UE)

include italics into 25.401

editor will modify / remove text that is already covered by A44 decsription.

Conclusions also to let the editor include text on the following in 25.401**:**

a rule must be defined for rounding chip_offset to Td in Node B

OFF is defined as the difference between targetcell SFN and CFN, where these frame numbers refer to the frames used in the Tm calculation (in DCH state).

882 (901-proposal 6): Agreed as proposed by sync ad hoc, with following modifications:

Message discriminator is removed from the RNSAP messages.

In RNSAP Neighbor cell measurement request: ‘Master’ is changed to ‘Measured’.

RNSAP procedure included in Global module with TDD tag

Agreed to send the LS to WG1+4 to ask about the feasibility in Tdoc 905.

Add note to all procedures that they are included on the assumption that WG1+WG4 finds them

feasible.

NODE B OUT OF SYNC and SYNC RESTART REQUEST are split into separate procedures.

13 Iur / Iub General Aspects

13.1 General Aspects and principles of Iur interface (25.420)

808 v0.1.5 including changes from last meeting. **Approved**.

908 v0.1.6, editors proposal. **Approved** with modifications:

- sec 4.1: change 'abstract' to 'logical' and strike out'currently'.
- sec 6.3.1: remove 'simple, commonly agreed'.

930 Usage of SCCP. **Approved.** Text to be incloude in chapter 4.5.1 "Usage of SCCP".

929 Adressing schemes. Proposals in 4.3 **approved.** Remove note in 930 and add text to general section of 930.

-958, -957 Not treated.

13.2 General Aspects and Principles of Iub interface (25.430)

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

A05 Propagation delay for the UL synch. **Approved** with clarifications:

- PD in RACH frames is mandatory and always included.
- Include the same mechanism over Iur.
- Add note: Range and resolution of PD need further studies.

846 logical model for DSCH. **Not agreed.** Current principle remains.

13.3 Review specs. (Agree old working assumptions. Assessment of stability / completeness / version number of spec.)

14 Iur/Iub User-plane protocols

14.1 Iur/Iub DCH data streams (25.427)

817 v0.3.1 including changes from last meeting. **Approved**. with modifications**:**

- Streamline mode removed from Rel99 (questionnable benefits and some open issues).

A17: Study item report, Silent mode (Fabio)
849 Propose removal of silent mode.

Conclusions on A17 and 849: Silent mode is always used on the DL and never used on the UL. Thus transition between modes and control procedures are not included.
Text from 849 is **agreed** with following modifications:

- The additional sentence in DL sync frame is moved to 8.2, and 'radio link' is replaced with 'Iur/Iub transport bearer'.
- Proposal to 7.2.1 is not agreed (no UL keepalive frame)
- Sec 8.1,, add sentence between 1st and 2nd paragraph: If the NodeB does not receive a valid FP frame in a TTI it assumes that there is no data to be transmnitted in that TTI for this transport chanel.
- 2nd paragraph: remove 'does not have any data to transmit, or'.
- remove 3rd, 4th and 5th paragraph.
- split 8.1 into separate sections for UL and DL.
- new subchapter for UL data transfer. Add statements:

- When Node B loosees UL synchronisation for move text from 7.1.1 to 8.1.
- When Node B receives zero bits for all DCHs in a coordinated set of DCHs, Node B shall not send an UL data frame to the RNC for this coordinated set of DCHs.

- send LS to R1 to inform we may transmit DPCCH without TFCI from one cell in the AS in abnormal situations.

830– Study item report, SSDT (Kiran). **Decision** on SSDT:

- Cannot agree to include the proposed solution in release 99 Iub/Iur since there are a number of open issues (and last meeting it was decided to exclude if no complete solution existed). Objections from Ericsson and Nokia against including in Rel99, although supported by TelecomModus, NEC, Fujitsu, Vodafone. The chairman will report this to TSG RAN for comment and final decision.
- Include SSDT as a study item for future releases 25.832.

969 Asymmetric RL reconfiguration. **Not approved.** This function could be considered for future releases but is not included in Rel99. Send a LS to R2 with the following statements (Fabio drafts):

- refer to 969 solution
- R3 could not see any benefit over the existing procedures
- R3 identified some technical issues, such as Node Bs using different configurations between the Detect and Commit signals.

922 UL quality estimate. **Agreed.**

A06 Quality estimate. **Not agreed.**

- send LS to R1, R2 and R4 asking them to consider our requirements (used often, simple, used for outerloop PCand for MDC, 6 bits) when defining the measurements (Gert Jan will draft the LS).

-981, split checksum. **Agreed** as working assumption.

923 FP structure. **Agreed** with modifications:

- checksum as in 981.
- add a note that the handling of 8-bit CFN is for further study.

848 FPstructure. Optimisation of CRC indication not agreed. Other aspects: see 923.

A04. CRC failures. **Not agreed.**

847, A02 DSCH TFI in DCH FP. Text from 847 **agreed.**

--984 Not treated.

14.2 Iub CCH data streams (25.435),

816 v0.3.1, including modifications from last meeting, **approved** with modification:

- add a note stating that the presence of PCH info, FACH info or both is indicated at setup of the common channel in NBAP.

934 FACH/PCH FP. **Partly agreed.**
Conclusions:

- Clarified that each FACH or PCH transport channel uses its own transport bearer on Iub. Logical model in 25.430 should be updated by adding an Iub PCH data port.
- Split into FACH/PCH data frame into separate PCH data frame and FACH data frame.
- Proposal 3 and 4 accepted. Proposal 5 not agreed.

848, RACH proposal. **Concluded** to copy the UL DCH data frame from 923 but remove QE octet to the description of the RACH data frame.

-960, -963 Not treated.

14.3 Iur CCH data streams (25.425),

815 v0.2.1, including changes since last meeting. **Approved** with modifications:

- change CRNTI to DRNTI.
- move checksum to the Tail part.

851 Flow control over Iur. **Not agreed.** An ad hoc group was initiated to find a solution. Michael from Siemens is reporting.

14.4 Review specs. (Agree old working assumptions. Assessment of stability / completeness / version number of spec.)

15 Iur signalling (RNSAP) (25.423)

812 v1.1.0 including changes from last meeting. **Approved** with modifications:

8.1.4: add 'or in a cell' to first sentence.

8.2.1+8.2.2+8.2.4+8.2.5: change 'DCH' to coordinated set of DCHs at the assignment of binding id and transmission adress.

A29, RNSAP message names, editors proposal. **Agreed** with addition:

- NBAP DL POWER CONTROL is also renamed to NBAP DL POWER CONTROL REQUEST

A31, RNSAP+NBAP message names, editors proposal. **Not agreed.**

15.1 Contributions on the general sections

--987 Not treated..

15.2 Procedure specifications

856, A03 Overload. **No conclusion.** Need unified solution on how loadis represented and how measurements are controlled (request/response, onlyrequest 'please' or distribution set by o&m.)

-854 Not treated..

15.3 Message contents and parameter range

976 UL interference level parameter. **Agreed.** Docomo will add proposed text describing the parameter.

947 SRNS Relocation commit. **Not concluded.**

- This case occurs when using URAs overlapping RNC borders and neither DCH nor CCH is used over Iur
- The interaction of RAB assignment with SRNS relocation required need to be discussed with Iu SWG

932 CRNTI Release. **Agreed.** The text for 25.931 will be sent to the editor.

933 UE identification. **Agreed**.

A07 Priorities for DCH. **Agreed** with modifications:

- Add 'DCH' before parameter names.
- Traffic handling priority is renamed to DCH frame handling priority.

A08 RL parameters for RRM. Conclusions:

- Available bit rate not agreed.
- Queuing is not mandated in DRNC but is allowed. **Accepted.**
- DL reference power is made optional in RNSAP

- Max and min Eb/N0 setpoint is not removed.

924 Power control parameters. **Agreed** with modifications:

- No modifications of DL reference power in the messages
- DL reference power parameter descriptions added to RNSAP+NBAP with note that the usage is FFS.
- NBAP RL addition request: initial transmission power, max and min DL power are made optional
- Major study item: DL power control. (Consider use of DL reference power, power drifting and usage of different DL power in different cells.) Responsible: Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson).
- Decided to send LS to R1 to ask about the need to consider both the handling of different DL power from different cells and power drifting.

-982 Not treated.

--983 Not treated

953 TDD parameters.

- Split parameters in chapter 9.2 into three subsections: common, FDD, TDD.
- Proposed new parameters in section included in the TDD-specific subsecdtion of chapter 9.2.
- Introduce new message tables for TDD contents of the proposed messages.
- In general, the RL information group shall not be repeated in TDD tables.
- remove parameters not applicable for TDD in the TDD contents table. move these parameters to FDD specific subsection of 9.2
- DL POWER CONTROL message shall be marked as FDD only.
- TDD contents of RADIO LINK SETUP REQUEST agreed:
- TDD contents of RADIO LINK SETUP RESPONSE agreed:
  - make neighbouring cell info optional also for TDD
- TDD contents of RADIO LINK SETUP FAILURE agreed.
  - CN xS domain identifiers NA for TDD
- TDD contents of RADIO LINK RECONFIGURATION PREPARE agreed.
- TDD contents of RADIO LINK RECONFIGURATION REQUEST agreed.
- TDD contents of PHYSICAL CHANNEL RECONFIGURATION REQUEST agreed.
- Siemens/Italtel will provide a proposal for TDD contents of RL ADDITION messages to be included as editors proposal in thenext RNSAP version.

15.4 Review spec. (Agree old working assumptions. Assessment of stability / completeness / version number of spec.)

15.5 Other issues

945 Timers. **Not agreed.** Some conclusions regarding error handling:

Error handing needs further considerations

Timers may be included in node behaviour description in case of complicated error handling, but not in simple request-response procedures.

Values for any timers should be set by O&M and not standardised

16 Iub signalling (NBAP) (25.433)

A41 v1.1.2. including changes from last meeting. **Approved** with modifications:

- 8.1.2.1: change direction of BLOCK RESOURCE REQUEST/RESPONSE in the figure.
- 8.1.9: capability indication is from Node B to CRNC. Note that this is FFS whether in Rel99 depending on definition of feature set.

16.1 Contributions on the general sections

16.2 Study item reports

System Info No report?

996, Capability exchange. Concluded to not include in release 99. Move current NBAP text to 25.831.

16.3 Procedure specifications

865 Capability exchange. This is not included this in release 99, see above.

962 NBAP procedures for object oriented logical O&M. **Not accepted** for release 99**.** Create study item for object oriented logical O&M in 25.831. Contributions invited.

862, 926, 928. Conclusions Cell configuration:

bullet to 2.1 added from 862.

text from 926 added, but bullet list of parameters tobe updated by editor.

cell setup request: as proposed in 862+926 but with one DL scrambling code, SCH1 power, SCH2 power, common pilot channel power

cell setup response: only include message discriminator, message type and transaction id

cell setup failure: no Cell ID, no transportlayer adresses,no carrier information

cell delete: text and parameters from 928

cell delete response: from 862

Not treated: **967, 867, 968, 925, 927, 861, -906, -907, 860, 864, --989, --971, 956, -A12, -A13, -A14, -A15, ---A30**

16.4 Message contents and parameter range

Not treated: 951,966, 954, 931,950, 859, ---A15, 866, -964, --991, --992, --993, --994, --995, --997

16.5 Review spec. (Agree old working assumptions. Assessment of stability / completeness / version number of spec.)

16.6 Other issues

Not treated: **946**

17 Iur Signalling transport (25.422) ;

18 Iub Signalling transport (25.432) ;

921 Not treated.

19 Iur/Iub Data transport + Transport network control plane

19.1 Iur/Iub DCH, transport layer (25.426). ;

949 Not treated.

19.2 Iub CCH, transport layer (25.434)

19.3 Iur CCH, transport layer (25.424), ;

19.4 Review specs. (Agree old working assumptions. Assessment of stability / completeness / version number of spec.)

20 Implementation specific O&M Transport (25.442)

810 Not treated.

20.1 Contributions

20.2 Review spec. (Agree old working assumptions. Assessment of stability / completeness / version number of spec.)

Annex C – List of Registered Delegates

Mr. Kalle Ahmavaara	Nokia Japan	+81 3 5510 0803	kalle.ahmavaara@nokia.com
Ms. Cécile Appert	France Telecom	+33 1 45 29 51 70	cecile.appert@cnet.francetelecom.fr
Mr. Hidenori Asaba	Nippon Telecommunications	+81 44 900 7313	asaba@mob.ntc.co.jp
Mrs. Monica Avattaneo	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.	+39 06 3900 9095	mavattaneo@tim.it
Mr. Anders Bergström	ERICSSON L.M.	+46 31 747 65 22	anders.bergstrom@emw.ericsson.se
Mr. Alessandro Betti	ITALTEL S.p.A.	+39 02 43 88 8547	alessandro.betti@italtel.it
Mrs. Juliane Boccali	ALCATEL France	+33 1 30 77 30 18	juliane.boccali@alcatel.fr
Mr. Anthony Bowden	INTERDIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS	+1 516 622 4062	anthony.bowden@interdigital.com
Jean-Marie Calmel	NORTEL NETWORKS (EUROPE)	+33 1 39 44 52 82	calmel@nortel.com
Mr. Josep Casals	Telecom Modus Ltd.	+441 372 804827	josep.casals@t-modus.nec.co.uk
Mr. David Comstock	ERICSSON L.M.	+46 8 585 31226	david.comstock@era.ericsson.se
Mrs. Beena Connors	Motorola Inc.	+1 847 632 7866	connorsb@cig.mot.com
Andrew Delatorre	VODAFONE Group Plc	+44 1635 503128	andrew.delatorre@vf.vodafone.co.uk
Mr. Massimo Dell'Acqua	ITALTEL S.p.A.	+39 02 95259 584	massimo.dell'acqua@italtel.it
Mr. Steve Dick	INTERDIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS	+1 516 622 4001	steve.dick@interdigital.com
Mr. Nicolas Drevon	ALCATEL France	+33 1 30 77 30 77	nicolas.drevon@alcatel.fr
Mr. Bjorn Ehrstedt	ERICSSON L.M.	+358 9 299 2775	lmfbeh@lmf.ericsson.se
Ms. Marlène Forina	ETSI	+33 4 92 94 42 29	marlene.forina@etsi.fr
Mr. Pteong Jung Gong	ETRI	+82 42 860 5841	pjgong@amadeus.etri.re.kr
Mr. Takashi Harano	NTT DoCoMo	+81 468 40 3261	harano@opdev.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Mr. Nobutaka Ishikawa	NTT DoCoMo	+81468403220	nobu@wsp.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Mr. Tim Jeanes	Motorola Inc.	+1 847 632 5112	comx54@email.mot.com
Mr. Michael Jeschke	ALCATEL SEL AG	+49 711 821 30339	michael.jeschke@mc.alcatel.de
Mr. Jyrki Jussila	NOKIA Corporation	+358 9 511 38436	jyrki.jussila@ntc.nokia.com
Mr. Sami Kekki	NOKIA Corporation	+358 405702350	sami.kekki@ntc.nokia.com
Mr. Kethees Ketheesan	Motorola Inc.	+ 847 878 3813	ckk017@email.mot.com
Mr. Kwang Sik Kim	ETRI	+82 42 860 4914	kskims@etri.re.kr
Mrs. Dirk Kistowski	Deutsche Telekom AG	+49 251 977 3932	dirk.kistowski@t-mobil.de
Mr. Joe Kwak	Golden Bridge Technology Inc.	+1 732 728 9615	joekwak@mcs.net
Ms. Claire Laloe	NORTEL NETWORKS (EUROPE)	+44 1628 43 4285	claloe@nortelnetworks.com

Mr. Runar Langnes	TELENOR AS	+47 37 25 49 46	runar.langnes@telenor.com
Mr. Atte Lansisalmi	NOKIA Corporation	+358 9 43761	atte.lansisalmi@nokia.com
Mr. Johannes Lenhart	SIEMENS AG	+49 89 722 63697	johannes.lenhart@icn.siemens.de
Mr. Andrea Leonardi	Hewlett-Packard	+1 509 921 3415	anleonar@spk.hp.com
Mr. Pierre Lescuyer	NORTEL NETWORKS (EUROPE)	+33 1 39 44 44 86	lescuyer@nortelnetworks.com
Mr. Gert-Jan Lieshout	ERICSSON L.M.	+31 534 505 406	emngvli@emn.ericsson.se
Mr. Zhongrong Liu	Deutsche Telekom MobilNet	+49 228 936 1406	zhongrong.liu@t-mobil.de
Mr. Fabio Longoni	NOKIA Corporation	+358405689884	fabio.longoni@ntc.nokia.com
Mr. Peter Lundh	ERICSSON L.M.	+46 8 404 6974	peter.lundh@era.ericsson.se
Mr. Mitsuru Masuda	NTT DoCoMo	+81 468 40 3261	masuda@opdev.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Mr. Alain Maupin	ERICSSON L.M.	+1 972 583 3540	alain.maupin@met.fr
Mr. Brendan McWilliams	VODAFONE Group Plc	+44 1635 506264	brendan.mcwilliams@vf.vodafone.co.uk
Mr. Jim Miller	INTERDIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS	+1 610 878 5627	jim.miller@interdigital.com
Ms. Tomoko Mine	NTT DoCoMo	+81 3 5687 1397	mine@comf.com
Ms. Antonella Napolitano	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.	+39 011 228 5040	antonella.napolitano@cselt.it
Mr. Cheng Hock Ng	NEC Corporation	+81 471 85 7171	ngcheng@mcs.abk.nec.co.jp
Mr. Stawros Orkopoulos	MANNESMANN Mobilfunk GmbH	+49 211 533 3783	stawros.orkopoulos@d2privat.de
Mr. Johnson Oyama	Nippon Ericsson	+81 3 5216 9056	johnson.oyama@nrj.ericsson.se
Mr. Kyutae Park	ETRI	+82 42 860 1276	ktpark@etri.re.kr
Mr. Kourosh Parsa	GOLDEN BRIDGE TECHNOLOGY INC	+1 732 870 8088	kpgbt@aol.com
Mr. Robert Petersen	ERICSSON L.M.	+46 13 28 46 01	robert.petersen@epk.ericsson.se
Flavio Piolini	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.	+39 011 228 7423	flavio.piolini@cselt.it
Mr. Stephan Recker	MANNESMANN Mobilfunk GmbH	+49 211 533 3973	stephan.recker@d2privat.de
Mr. Michael Roberts	Lucent Technologies N. S. UK	+44 1793 883 220	mr85@lucent.com
Mr. Göran Rune	ERICSSON L.M.	+46 13 284 200	goran.rune@era.ericsson.se
Mr. Yasutaka Sasaki	NEC Corporation	+81 45 939 2092	sasakiy@nwk2.msc.yh.nec.co.jp
Mr. Takaaki Satoh	NTT DoCoMo	+810468403220	tsatoh@mlab.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Mr. Enrico Scarrone	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.	+39 011 228 7084	enrico.scarrone@cselt.it
Mr. Michael Schopp	SIEMENS AG	+49 89 722 43039	michael.schopp@oen.siemens.de
Mr. Prasid Shah	NEC Technologies (UK) LTD	+44 175 360 69 23	shah@isd-nec.co.uk
Mr. Akinori Shimamura	Fujitsu Limited	+81 44 740 8152	shima@hcs.ts.fujjitsu.co.jp
Mr. Elliot Stewart	MOTOROLA A/S	+1 847 632 7590	stewrtem@cig.mot.com

Mr. Ravi Tammana	MOTOROLA Ltd	+1 847 632 4704	tammana1@email.mot.com
Mr. Kiran Thakare	Telecom Modus Ltd.	+44 1372 804 826	kiran.thakare@t-modus.co.uk
Frances Thomson	SYMBIONICS Ltd	+44 1506 595 196	frances@cadence.com
Mr. Richard Townend	BT	+44 1473 605 429	richard.townend@bt.com
Terhi Virtanen	NOKIA Corporation	+358 8 565 4354	terhi.virtanen@nokia.com
Mr. Pontus Wallentin	ERICSSON L.M.	+46 13 287 388	pontus.wallentin@ericsson.com
Mr. Per Willars	ERICSSON L.M.	+46 87573448	per.willars@era.ericsson.se
Mr. Mick Wilson	FUJITSU Europe Telecom R & D C	+44 181 606 4801	m.wilson@fujitsu.co.uk
Mr. Fumihiko Yokota	Fujitsu Limited	+81 44 754 6936	yokota@ss.ts.fujitsu.co.jp
Mr. Takayuki Yoshimura	Japan Telecom Co. Ltd	+81 3 3551 2807	yosi@japan-telecom.co.jp
Mrs. Karin Zickermann	GOLDEN BRIDGE TECHNOLOGY INC	+1 732 870 8088	kzickermann@gbtwireless.com

Annex D – Document Register

Number	Title	Source
R3-99806	25.401	Editor
R3-99807	25.410	Editor
R3-99808	25.420	Editor
R3-99809	25.430	Editor
R3-99810	25.442	Editor
R3-99811	25.413	Editor
R3-99812	25.423	Editor
R3-99813	25.433	Editor
R3-99814	25.415	Editor
R3-99815	25.425	Editor
R3-99816	25.435	Editor
R3-99817	25.427	Editor
R3-99818	25.931	Editor
R3-99819	25.832	Editor
R3-99820	30.531	Editor
R3-99821	25.831	Editor
R3-99822	I3.05	Editor
R3-99823	Draft Agenda #6	Chairman
R3-99824	Draft Minutes #5	Secretary
R3-99825	Draft Agenda, Sync Ad Hoc Meeting	WG3 chairman
R3-99826	LS from N3 on CS data	TSG N3
R3-99827	Answer to Liaison Statement from WG3 on Timing Advance for TDD	TSG RAN1
R3-99828	LS on Separate delivery of Transport Blocks within a Transport Block Set by MAC-d to L1	TSG RAN1
R3-99829	Liaison statement to WG2, WG3 and WG4 on power control issues	TSG RAN1
R3-99830	SSDT impacts on Iub and Iur	Telecom Modus
R3-99831	GSM/BSS -> UMTS Handover	Telecom Modus
R3-99832	: NBAP Message parameters for: System Information Update	Telecom Modus
R3-99833		Telecom Modus
R3-99834		Telecom Modus
R3-99835		Telecom Modus
R3-99836	Liaison Statement on the evolution of GTP for Release'99	TSG N 2
R3-99837	Liaison Statement on Response to GTP-U SAP and primitives	TSG N 2
R3-99838	Liaison statement to RAN WG3 on paging co-ordination over the Gs	TSG N 2
R3-99839	Liaison statement to RAN WG3 on CN Domain Identifiers used over the Iu & Iur interfaces	TSG N 2
R3-99840	Liaison statement to SA WG2 & RN WG3 on a new Subsystem Number (SSN) for RANAP	TSG N 2
R3-99841	Response LS to TSG CN WG1 on CM-SERVICE-REQUEST for multicall	TSG RAN2
R3-99842	Response to LS on UE requirement to report OFF	TSG RAN2
R3-99843	Answer to Liaison Statement on Separate delivery of Transport Blocks within a Transport Block Set by MAC-d to L1	TSG RAN2

Number	Title	Source
R3-99844	Liaison statement on choosen Logical and Transport Channel on the Radio Interface for Cell Broadcast Service in UMTS	TSG RAN2
R3-99845	LS to RAN WG3 on inclusion of TFI transmission without data	TSG RAN2
R3-99846	New proposal for the logical model of Node B regarding the DSCH in TS 25.430	Alcatel
R3-99847	Proposal for a new DCH downlink control frame for DSCH signalling	Alcatel
R3-99848	New proposal for the structure of checksum indicator in the DCH data frame (TS 25.427) and RACH frame (TS 25.435)	Alcatel
R3-99849	Proposal to remove the Silence Detection procedure in the DCH user plane FP (TS 25.427)	Alcatel
R3-99850	Addition of DSCH protocol stack model to TS 25.401	Alcatel
R3-99851	Flow control mechanisms between MAC-D and MAC-c/MAC-sh	Alcatel
R3-99852	Synchronisation of UTRAN nodes by AAL0/ATM cells	Alcatel
R3-99853	Use of SCCP for Iub interface	Alcatel
R3-99854	Synchronised RL Reconfiguration procedure for DSCH	Alcatel
R3-99855	I3.05 modifications according to X.731	Alcatel
R3-99856	RNSAP "Cell Overload Information" procedure and message contents	Alcatel
R3-99857	LS on MExE support of handover notifications	TSG-T2 SWG1 MExE
R3-99858	LS on MExE support of QoS negotiation	TSG-T2 SWG1 MExE
R3-99859	Node B Restarted / RNC Restarted message contents	Motorola Inc
R3-99860	Block Resource procedure to support O&M lock and shutdown functionality	Motorola Inc
R3-99861	Cell Reconfiguration	Motorola Inc
R3-99862	Cell Setup and Cell Delete message structures	Motorola Inc
R3-99863	Node B Configuration and Initial Cell Configuration Procedures	Motorola Inc
R3-99864	Call Trace	Motorola Inc
R3-99865	Capability Exchange Procedure - Message Content and Format	Motorola Inc
R3-99866	Block Resource, Resource Notification, Node B Failure - Message Content and Format	Motorola Inc
R3-99867	Common transport channel management	Motorola Inc
R3-99868	CR on 25.431	Motorola Inc
R3-99869	Iu Data Frames	Motorola Inc
R3-99870		Motorola Inc
R3-99871	Reply to Liaison Statement TSGR3#4(99)572 "Liaison on Cell Configuration and Management Philosophy	TSG-SA WG5
R3-99872	A potential merged sync solution including two approaches	Ericsson
R3-99873	Node offset measurements using Synchronisation Control frames	Ericsson
R3-99874	Relationship between Cell SFN and super-frame cycle	Ericsson
R3-99875	Definition of TOA, ToAWS and ToAWE in 25.401 (.427 & .435)	Ericsson
R3-99876	Initialization of CFN Including Frame Offset	Ericsson
R3-99877	Sync related counters - ranges, resolutions and acronyms	Ericsson
R3-99878	Comments on R3-99 914 "Length of SFN	Ericsson
R3-99879		Ericsson

Number	Title	Source
R3-99880	Model and parameters for UE-UTRAN frame synchronisation	Nokia
R3-99881	Measurement of UL/DL transmission delay and Achievement of Node synchronisation	Nokia
R3-99882	Not Used	
R3-99883	Not Used	
R3-99884	Not Used	
R3-99885	Not Used	
R3-99886	Not Used	
R3-99887	Not Used	
R3-99888	Not Used	
R3-99889	Not Used	
R3-99890	Not Used	
R3-99891	Not Used	
R3-99892	Not Used	
R3-99893	Not Used	
R3-99894	Not Used	
R3-99895	Not Used	
R3-99896	Not Used	
R3-99897	Not Used	
R3-99898	Not Used	
R3-99899	Not Used	
R3-99900	Not Used	
R3-99901	Not Used	
R3-99902	LS on I3.05 - Node B O&M Functional Description	TSG SA-WG5
R3-99903	Binding Id in Q.2630.1	Mitsubishi Electric
R3-99904	Intra Node B Hard Handover	InterDigital
R3-99905	Synchronization of TDD cells	InterDigital
R3-99906	Tight control of Dedicated Channel activation/deactivation	InterDigital
R3-99907	Outer Loop Power Control for TDD	InterDigital
R3-99908	Editor's proposal for TS 25.420 'UTRAN Iur Interface:General Aspects & Principles' (v0.1.6)	Editor
R3-99909	Crossing of the Reset Message	NEC
R3-99910	Contents in the Paging Message	NEC
R3-99911	The contents of the Location Reporting Control and Location Report Message	NEC
R3-99912	Contents in the Source RNC to Target RNC Transparent Field	NEC
R3-99913	Timer for RANAP	NEC
R3-99914	Liaison Statement on Length of SFN	TSG RAN WG1
R3-99915	LS answer to Overall Delay Budget within the Access Stratum Results and Requirements	TSG SA WG2
R3-99916	LS on Clarification of RAB Sub Flows concept and associated definitions	TSG SA WG2
R3-99917	Answer to the LS on the time constraints on the execution of cryptographic algorithms	TSG SA WG2
R3-99918	Answer to LS on Interactions between Mobility Management and Radio Mobility	TSG SA WG2
R3-99919	Answer to Liaison Statement concerning Paging Co-ordination	TSG SA WG2
R3-99920	LS on CN Domain Identifiers used over the Iu & Iur Interfaces	TSG SA WG2
R3-99921	Iub NBAP Signalling Bearer	Ericsson

Number	Title	Source
R3-99922	Uplink Quality Estimate in the DCH Frame Protocol	Ericsson
R3-99923	Coding and structure of DCH FP data frames	Ericsson
R3-99924	Power Control parameters on Iur and Iub	Ericsson
R3-99925	Replacement of NBAP Procedures for Radio Resource Management: Node B Restarted and RNC Restarted	Ericsson
R3-99926	Refined NBAP Procedure for Cell Configuration Management: Cell Setup	Ericsson
R3-99927	Proposed NBAP Procedure for Cell Configuration Management: Cell Reconfiguration	Ericsson
R3-99928	Refined NBAP Procedure for Cell Configuration Management: Cell Delete	Ericsson
R3-99929	Addressing Schemes for SCCP used for Iu and Iur	Ericsson
R3-99930	Description of Usage of SCCP as Signalling Bearer for RNSAP	Ericsson
R3-99931	Measurements to be provided in Node B	Ericsson
R3-99932	The need for a "C-RNTI Release" procedure	Ericsson
R3-99933	UE Identification over Iur (RNSAP)	Ericsson
R3-99934	FACH/PCH Frame Protocol data frame structure	Ericsson
R3-99935	Downlink Rate Control over Iu	Ericsson
R3-99936	Frame coding for PDU type 0 for Support Mode for predefined SDU size	Ericsson
R3-99937	RANAP information elements definition	Ericsson
R3-99938	Clarification on usage of Classical IP over ATM	Ericsson
R3-99939	Editor's proposal of TS 25.415: V0.2.2	Ericsson
R3-99940	Comments to RANAP V1.1.1	Ericsson
R3-99941	Iu Interface Characteristics	Ericsson
R3-99942	Principles and text proposal for RANAP RAB Assignment	Ericsson
R3-99943	Proposed Example Procedure of DL Physical Channel Reconfiguration	FUJITSU Limited
R3-99944	Proposed Example Procedure of Channel Type Switching from RACH/FACH to RACH/PCH	FUJITSU Limited
R3-99945	Proposed Example Procedure of Timer on RNSAP/NBAP	FUJITSU Limited
R3-99946	Proposed Example Parameters of Timer on RNSAP/NBAP	FUJITSU Limited
R3-99947	Proposed Parameters to SRNS RELOCATION COMMIT MESSAGE	FUJITSU Limited
R3-99948	Proposed Principle on the Support for RRC Connection	FUJITSU Limited
R3-99949	Priority handling at AAL2 and ATM layer on the Iub/Iur interfaces	Alcatel France
R3-99950	Proposal to add transmission power measurement reports per code in TS 25.433	Alcatel France
R3-99951	Proposal for modification of parameters in the Radio Link Setup	Alcatel France
R3-99952	Transparent field in Relocation Required and Relocation Request	Alcatel
R3-99953	TDD Parameters in RNSAP Messages	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99954	TDD Parameters in NBAP Messages	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99955	AAL2 Packetisation and De-packetisation Delay	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99956	Combined event-triggered and periodic reporting	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99957	Amendments to 25.420 in support of "Standalone" USCH/DSCH	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99958	Amendments to 25.430 in support of "Standalone" USCH/DSCH	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99959	TDD synchronisation	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99960	Timing Advance for TDD	Siemens, Italtel

Number	Title	Source
R3-99961	Info Model and State Management Functions for NodeB logical O&M	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99962	NBAP Procedures for object oriented logical O&M	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99963	USCH/DSCH data frames on Iub	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99964	NBAP Messages for USCH/DSCH configuration	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99965	Study Item (ARC/3) "Overall Delay Budget within the Access Stratum	Siemens, Italtel
R3-99966	Proposal for addition of DSCH parameters in the Radio Link SetUp Request and Radio Link Reconfiguration messages	Alcatel France
R3-99967	NBAP procedures for Communication Control Port management, Common Transport Channel management	Nortel networks
R3-99968	NBAP procedures for Cell management	Nortel networks
R3-99969	Iub and Iur support of Asymmetric RL Reconfiguration	Nortel networks
R3-99970	Clarification on the "CN information broadcast" RANAP procedure	Nortel networks
R3-99971	NBAP procedures for NodeB Setup and Availability	Nortel networks
R3-99972	Liaison Statement concerning the Iu network layer services for the packet domain	TSG SA WG2
R3-99973	Iu Interface Definitions	BT
R3-99974	Iu Interface Objectives	BT
R3-99975	Iu Interface Architecture	BT
R3-99976	A new RNSAP and NBAP parameter	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99977	Proposed Introduction of DL Timing Adjustment command in Iur/Iub user plane protocols	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99978	Iu UP framing	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99979	Time alignment procedure without user data transmission	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99980	Correspondence of mode in Iu UP protocol layer to services	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99981	Separation of Header and Payload Checksum in Iub/Iur DCH Frame Protocol format and in Iub CTCH Frame Protocol Format	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99982	Evaluation procedure	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99983	Association between UE and events in UTRAN nodes	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99984	Proposed Introduction of Radio failure detection in Iur/Iub user plane protocols	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99985	Rationale for AAL0 on high priority VC for Node Offset Measurement (NOM)	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99986	Draft Report at SI-ARC/5: Synchronization	Ericsson
R3-99987	Parallel Procedures on RNSAP	Ericsson
R3-99988	Overload Control Procedure	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99989	Health check (Layer3)	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99990	Restriction for active calls	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99991	NBAP : Block Resource Request Message	Vodafone
R3-99992	NBAP : Block Resource Response	Vodafone
R3-99993	NBAP : Block Resource Failure	Vodafone
R3-99994	NBAP : Node B Failure Indication	Vodafone
R3-99995	NBAP : Node B Resource Notification	Vodafone
R3-99996	NBAP : Capability Exchange Study Item	Vodafone
R3-99997	NBAP : Proposed New Cause Values	Vodafone
R3-99998	I3.05: Editors Proposal v.0.2.2	Editor
R3-99999	Delay component TN1 (AAL delay)	Nokia
R3-99a00	Iu functions	Nokia

Number	Title	Source
R3-99a01	RANAP functions	Nokia
R3-99a02	Transmission of DSCH TFI in a DCH FP connection	Nokia
R3-99a03	Clarification on the quality indicator parameter in DCH FP	Nokia
R3-99a04	Handling of TB with air interface CRC failures	Nokia
R3-99a05	Use of the Propagation Delay for the Uplink synchronisation	Nokia
R3-99a06	Clarification on RNSAP Load Information Request and Load Information procedures	Nokia
R3-99a07	DCH priorities	Nokia
R3-99a08	RRM parameters in RNSAP RL Setup/RL Addition/RL Reconfiguration procedures	Nokia
R3-99a09	KA1 "Radio Access Bearer Assignment Procedure	Nokia
R3-99a10	Coordination of Relocation in multiple Iu signalling connections	Nokia
R3-99a11	Interaction of Relocation Related and Other RANAP Procedures	Nokia
R3-99a12	Measurement Termination Response	T-Mobile
R3-99a13	Measurement Initiatian Request	T-Mobile
R3-99a14	Measurement Termination Request	T-Mobile
R3-99a15	Measurement Report	T-Mobile
R3-99a16	E-mail discussion report for Study Item[Tdocs 750,751,763,764]	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99a17	Silence Detection Study Item Report	Nokia
R3-99a18	UMTS Delay Budget	Vodafone Ltd
R3-99a19	Node Offset Measurement Procedure	NTT DoCoMo
R3-99a20		NTT DoCoMo
R3-99a21	Proposed LS from WG3 to WG1 on Synchronisation Issues	Alcatel
R3-99a22	Iu interface characteristics, Use of SCCP	Alcatel
R3-99a23	Ciphering in case of multiple RABs	TSG SA WG3
R3-99a24	Definition of Frame Sync Model & Parameters	Nokia
R3-99a25	Draft LS to SA2 on Sub-Flows	Ericsson
R3-99a26	Draft LS to N2 on GTP-U SAP	Ericsson
R3-99a27	Draft LS to N2 on CN Domain Ids	Ericsson
R3-99a28	Draft LS to N2 on RNSAP SSN.	Ericsson
R3-99a29	Clean up of Message Names in RNSAP	Editor
R3-99a30	Dedicated NBAP Measurement & Reporting	Nokia
R3-99a31	Modifications of Message Names for Dedicated Measurements in RNSAP and NBAP	Editors (NBAP & RNSAP)
R3-99a32	Draft CR to 25.414	Mitsubishi Electric
R3-99a33	Draft CR to 25.424	Mitsubishi Electric
R3-99a34	Draft CR to 25.434	Mitsubishi Electric
R3-99a35	Draft CR to 25.426	Mitsubishi Electric
R3-99a36	Draft LS to R1, R2 & R4 on synchronisation issues	Ericsson
R3-99a37	LS from R2 on timing advance for TDD.	RAN2
R3-99a38	Proposed LS to R1on TFCI transmission.	Alcatel
R3-99a39	LS to R1, R2, R4 on UL quality estimate	Ericsson
R3-99a40	Summary Iur/Iub SWG	Iur/Iub SWG chairman
R3-99a41	25.433 v1.1.2, NBAP specification	Editor
R3-99a42	Proposed LS to R1 on SFN	
R3-99a43	Proposed LS on feasibililty of tdd synch to R1+R4	
R3-99a44	Definition of the synchronisation parameters	
R3-99a45	Inclusion of Node synchronisation control frames	

Number	Title	Source
R3-99a46	TDD parameters in RNSAP and NBAP RL ADDITION messages	
R3-99a47	Proposed LS on MeXE support for handover and QoS negotiation	Ericsson
R3-99a48	Proposed LS on L1 timing issues	
R3-99a49	Proposed LS on different RL DL_TX_power levels in case of soft handover	
R3-99a50	NOT USED	
R3-99a51	NOT USED	
R3-99a52	NOT USED	
R3-99a53	NOT USED	
R3-99a54	NOT USED	
R3-99a55	NOT USED	
R3-99a56	NOT USED	
R3-99a57	NOT USED	
R3-99a58	SCCP Modifications	Editor (Iu GA&P)
R3-99a59	Comments to A00	Ericsson
R3-99a60	UTRAN Definitions	Nokia
R3-99a61	Draft LS regarding Relocation and GSM-U MTS Handover	Nokia
R3-99a62	Draft LS Response to N2 on GTP evolution	Ericsson
R3-99a63	Summary of Iu SWG Editors' Meeting	Iu SWG Chairman
R3-99a64	Summary of Iu SWG	Iu SWG Chairman
R3-99a65	Proposed LS to SA2 on Clarifications of RAB sub-flows concept & associated definitions	Ericsson
R3-99a66	LS on length of SFN	R2
R3-99a67	reply to LS on power control issues	R2
R3-99a68	ls on delay budget	R2
R3-99a69	response to LS on ciphering in case of multiple RABs	R2
R3-99a70	Liaison Statement to clarify transmission of variable-rate codec mode commands on the Iu -interface	R2
R3-99a71	ls to R3 on SMS-CB	R2
R3-99a72	ls to R3 on LCS status	R2
R3-99a73	ls on Timing advance for TDD	R2
R3-99a74	modified principles & text proposal for RAB Assignment	ericsson
R3-99a75	LS to R2 about support of assymetric channel reconfiguration in R99	Nokia
R3-99a76	draft LS to s2, s4, N3 on the Iu UP specification status in RAN3	Ericsson