TSG-RAN Working Group 1 meeting No. 8 *TSGR1-99h77*
Octber 12 - 15, New York, U.S.A.

Agenda Item: **-**

Source: **Secretary**

Title: **draft minutes**

Document for:

Draft Minutes for 3GPP RAN-TSG 8th WG1 Meeting

Meeting start: October 12th, 1999

Day 1, start 9.00

1. Opening of the meeting

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

2. Approval of agenda (R1-99e52)

Chairman presented the revision of the agenda on the screen.

(Chairman's comment regarding agenda item of "Approval of text proposals
The most important thing to be noted is that we get CRs produced by WG1 to be included in the specifications in the next RAN meeting in December. Even if we approve the text proposals, CRs must be produced in order for those modifications to be included in the specifications officially in the RAN meeting.

There were two comments.

1. (LGIC)
   Though the Ad Hoc 10 meeting was not scheduled, text proposal of " Time delay between physical channels of different scrambling codes " (Tdoc R1-99g31 and R1-99g32) should be discussed.
   → Chairman suggested that we would be able to discuss them in the plenary in agenda item 11.

2. (Samsung)
   In which agenda item, the issues of gated transmission which had been postponed in the 7bis would be discussed ?
   → Chairman suggested that we would be able to discuss them in the agenda item 17.

Agenda was approved without modifications.

3. Report from TSG RAN (Tdoc R1-99g64)

Chairman made brief presentation about the report of TSG RAN.

(1) All our specifications were raised to version 3.0.0 and this means they are now under change control. With other specifications, our specifications will be submitted to ITU meeting in the end of this month. Whatever we decide here will not be able to affect anymore the materials for ITU submissions

(2) Open Items reported to RAN from WG1

- 25.211 & 25.214: CPCH monitoring/channel assignment
  → This would be discussed in **Ad Hoc 14**.
- 25.214: DPCCH gating issues not included in 25.214
  (WG1 is still doing investigations and WG2 is also expected to study the issue.)
  → **Agenda item 17**
- 25.215 & 25.225: Work to be done on the parameter limitations and ranges for measurement values. New TGL duration is needed for TDD monitoring.
  → This would be discussed in **Ad Hoc 6 and Ad Hoc 16** (for both FDD/TDD).

- 25.221 Tx diversity for BCH
- 25.222 AMR support related issue
- 25.224 WG1 to discuss whether there needs to be cell synchronization issues specified in the physical layer
  → These 3 issues would be discussed in **Ad Hoc 1.**

(3) UE Radio Access Capabilities

- The guidance on UE capabilities was sought from RAN.
- New TR was agreed, UE radio access capabilities definition, WG2 is responsible to progressing and maintaining the report (TR 25.926) Ref: Tdoc RP-99577

(4) Measurement naming alignment

(5) TDD specific issue

- Narrow band TDD chip rate (value earlier FFS) was replaced with 1.28 Mcps chip into TS 25.223. Ref: RP-99549
- Included in the ITU submission

4. Introduction to Change Request procedure

Ms. Evelyne Le Strat explained the Change Request Procedure using the slides.
(The slides are attached to this minutes.)

(1) Since our specifications had version 3.0.0, from now on change requests have to be used to modify the approved specifications even if to change comma.

(2) Change requests are numbered on a per specification basis.
These numbers are to be asked from the secretary.

(3) Change request can be revised like 25.211-001 rev 1, 25.211 -001 rev 2
Change request are contained in Tdocs (temporary documents) therefore there will be no confusion.

(4) Change request should normally be agreed at the working group level before being presented to the TSG level for approval.
Though it is not preferred way, CRs can be brought directly to the plenary. But if technical analysis are required then they will most probably be sent back to the WGs

(5) Approval process and update of the specifications

- CRs are presented to the TSG plenary for approval.
- If approved they will be incorporated in the specification by 3GPP support team.
- After each TSG plenary the specifications are updated.
- There is no intermediate version of the specification in between 2 WG plenaries.
- CRs are to be prepared on the last official version.
- For some specifications it is allowed to work on intermediate version (e.g. 25.331). In this case the CR must indicate the reference version + CRs.

(6) Content of the change request

- Change request form
- Modified pages of the specifications

(7) All modified pages apart from sections numbering modification must be attached to the CRs
(8) One particular change must be propagated in the whole specification
(9) A CR must correspond to the exact text
(10) CR form explains how to make sure that the modified pages appear with correct numbering and section separation
(11) There is no one-to-on relationship between Tdoc and CRs.
One Tdoc number can contain several CRs.
(12) Treatment of a CR
- CR can be withdrawn.
- CR can be postponed, pending other decisions.
- CR can be rejected.
(13) One CR is for one type of modification

Q.1 Justification for Change request
Is it acceptable to have a justification reference in another Tdoc which may provide detailed justification (e.g. detailed simulation results) ?

A. We usually do not use reference Tdoc.
Change request is something just for people to understand whether it is correction or it is better scheme. Therefore usually references are not required.

Q.2 How we will agree change request.
Is it acceptable to get agreement by reflector or do we need physical meeting ?

A. In very exceptional case it can be approved by reflector, but normally it should be agreed in the physical meeting. Reflector can be used for discussion, but to approve it, we had better have physical meeting.

Q.3 What kind of document number is used for the number on the right top of the Change Request form ?

A The document number which CR contains for approval. (ex. Tdoc number of WG1)

Q.4 There might be several WG meetings between RAN meetings. In WG3, when they approve change requests in their meeting, they also incorporate these change requests into the specifications and use these specifications purely for their internal purposes in order for the people to know what the status of their work is. The official change request are based on the official RAN approved documents, to be sure. How this intermediate should be considered ?

A (Chairman answered.)
We are now facing what the support team practically can do for the release 99. First of all, I think, editors should not think that their job was over because it is not realistic for the 3gpp support team to be able to incorporate in very short period all the CRs we are going to see in the RAN meeting in December. So I think the help of editors is needed to help the support team include the CRs for the specification documents. How is this help in practice done ? When we have agreed CRs then editors would make a version just for the editing purpose. This is what they are doing in WG3. When we have the CRs approved, the editors would implement them . Of course the approved version would be shown after the RAN meeting assuming all the CRs have been incorporated and also approved. And if something is not approved, in the RAN, then it has to be taken away before it can be presented at as approved version.

So we agree that editors would maintain this kind of editing documents and that specifications would not be anything official until those things would be approved in RAN. Anybody using that document for any purposes would do that at their own risk. After RAN meeting then we check that specifications contain CRs exactly as we approved. Probably this would be maybe the practical way to go with.

We had a meeting among the chairmen with 3gpp support team in Sophia. 3gpp support team had not yet have resources needed to update specifications with current time frame after RAN meeting. So we need to have this intermediate version. Help from editors is needed. We can not avoid that. But we must be very careful when editors do this so that by no means we present those anywhere as an official specifications. Of course, CRs must be based on only the version approved in the RAN. We would discuss this after next RAN meeting about what is the role of 3gpp support team. But they are not able to give commitment. They are not able to include all CRs.

Due to the CR procedure, there now is a certain restrictions when we can have our meetings. From now on, after this meeting, we can never ever have our meetings one week before or one week after RAN meeting. There will be always at least one week time before and after RAN meeting when they are no WG meetings. Because, first of all, in order for the 3gpp support team to make sure that all CRs approved appear to RAN with correct editing. There will be a lot of CRs and so even one week after the RAN would not be necessary enough to ensure all the changes to be included.

5. RAN WG1 meeting schedule for year 2000

Meeting	Month	Date	Location	Notes
RAN WG1 #9	November	30-Dec.3	Dresden, Germany	(1999)
RAN #6	December	13-17	Nice, France	(1999)
RAN WG1 #10	January	24-28		
RAN WG1 #11	February	28 - March 3		
RAN #7	March	13-15	Madrid, Spain	
RAN WG1 #12	April	10-14		(TTA)
RAN WG1 #13	May	22-26		
RAN #8	June	19-21	Dusseldorf, Germany	
RAN WG1 #14	July	3-7		
RAN WG1 #15	August	21-25		
RAN #9	September	25-27	Asia	
RAN WG1 #16	October	9-13		(TTA)
RAN WG1 #17	November	20-25		
RAN #10	December	11-13	USA	

7. Identification of the incoming liaison statements

	Title	Source	To/ Cc	Tdoc No.	Forwarded To	Notes
1	LS on Support of Speech Service in RAN	SA WG4	To	R1-99e51	Ad Hoc 4 Ad Hoc 5	
2	LS to RAN WG1 answering to T199105	T WG1	To	R1-99f18	Ad Hoc 6	No answer expected
3	LS on Physical Layer Measurement Requirements	RAN WG4	To	R1-99e63	Ad Hoc16	
4	LS on CBS Functionality and Responsibility	T WG2	To	R1-99f19	Plenary	Conclusion : "NOTED"
5	LS –Cover letter for TR21.904 Terminal Capabilities Report, interim version	T WG2 SWG6	To	R1-99f20	Agenda 8	
6	LS about outer loop performance criteria and testing	RAN WG4	Cc	R1-99e64	Ad Hoc 9	
7	LS on radio simulator capabilities	RAN WG4	Cc	R1-99e62	Plenary	Conclusion : "NOTED"
8	LS on measurement order parameters sent to the MS, for GSM to UMTS handovers	SMG2	Cc	R1-99f21	Ad Hoc16	
9	LS on CBS Functionality and Responsibility	N1	Cc	R1-99f22	Plenary	Conclusion : "NOTED"
10	Acceptable interference level from 3G systems into a UMTS MS receiver for the purpose of the cross border co-ordination of UMTS systems	ERC TG1	To	R1-99f23	Plenary	Would be discussed later
11	LS to RAN-WG1 regarding SSDT	RAN WG3	To	R1-99f24	Ad Hoc 9	
12	LS to RAN-WG1 regarding Physical Channel Structure selection	RAN WG3	To	R1-99f25	Ad Hoc 4	
13	LS to RAN-WG1 regarding Adjustment Loop for DL power drifting	RAN WG3	To	R1-99f26	Ad Hoc 9	
14	LS on selected location service methods for Release '99	RAN WG3	To	R1-99f61	Ad Hoc17	
15	Response to liaison on removal of superframe concept in layer 1	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f62	Plenary	
16	LS on compressed mode control	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f63	Ad Hoc 8	
17	Answer to LS on transport channel multiplexing	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f64	Ad Hoc 4	
18	Proposed LS on impact of gated DPCCH, at cell boundaries	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f65	Agenda17	
19	LS on Outer loop power control	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f66	Ad Hoc 9	
20	LS on Slow TPC	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f67	Ad Hoc 9	Already covered in WG1 #7bis
21	Response to LS on "Definitions for usage of Multi-mode/system terminals"	RAN WG2	Cc	R1-99f68	Plenary	Conclusion : "NOTED"
22	LS to WG1 Regarding the Use of PICH Reserved Bits	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f69	Ad Hoc 2	Refer Motorola Contribution
23	LS on RACH/FACH response time	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f70	Plenary	
24	LS to WG1 on measurement naming	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f71	Ad Hoc16	Already Covered in RAN
25	Answer to LS on Measurements	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f72	Ad Hoc16	
26	Response to the LS on SFN and BCH coding in FDD	RAN WG2	To	R1-99f73	Ad Hoc 4	
27	LS on the decoding of the TFCI in UL radio frames	RAN WG3	To	R1-99f75	Ad Hoc 4	
28	LS on power control limits	RAN WG3	To	R1-99f76	Ad Hoc 9	
29	Proposed Liaison : Reply to LS from WG1 on power control	RAN WG3	To	R1-99g60	Ad Hoc 9	
30	(TDD synchronization issue)			R1-99c64	Ad Hoc 1	

8. Review of RAN WG1 issues in TR 21.904 and identification for necessary actions to complete answer to T2 liaison.

This item was postponed to Day2 morning because there was new version provided but it was not distributed yet.

9. Ad Hoc sessions. (Afternoon)
Ad Hoc 4 & Ad Hoc 1

Day 2 Start 9.00

Postponed Agenda item 8 (T2 liaison)

R1-99f20 and R1-99g74

Conclusion : WG1 should provide the information which WG1 can provide especially on AMR to T2 as well as to WG2 as a starting point.
(It would be easier once WG2 has created their first version of the report, because then WG1 can see in which kind of form we should provide the information for the report. We will see this later based on Ad Hoc4 discussions plus some materials to complement it from TDD side on AMR.)

(Chairman's comment)

The main issue in RAN was that the WG2 would create this kind of technical report for the work on the protocol specifications and that report was to be maintained for the time being so that in case there physical layer capabilities were needed, they would be directly reflected on the values, say, allowed values or useful values, in those protocol specifications. Now the report in WG2 might become unnecessary for the some point of time, but whatever we sent, it is most useful to refer the report in WG2 because WG1 and WG2 are supposed to be aligned in the report maintained in WG2, for example, how many transport channels in which case, etc.

In my personal opinion, we should provide T2 what we can provide now noting that the WG2 technical report does not exist. I think we should provide same material that we can provide to T2 as well as to WG2. (maybe some additional notes about what we expect WG2, for example, Random Access Channel Bit Rate requirements which they will map on the physical layer by spreading factors or stuff like that.) It is impossible for WG1 to try to limit the highest bit rate that all terminals need to support in random access. This can be done by only WG2. I hope in our next meeting, we will get this technical report from WG2 for our review. Then we will see what is the inconsistency between those.

Now we should provide the information we have both to T2 and to WG2. We also should clearly identify in the liaison statement that there will be this kind of alignment within RAN which will be done in the WG2 report. Then T2 will aware that there is this kind of inconsistency we could mention in random access channel bit rate which is something cannot be handled within RAN WG1 only. These are only mapped between WG1 and WG2. I assume that once WG2 has some words in the report they will provide for T2, then T2 can note that these issues are available on that report.

10. Report from Ad Hocs from Day 1
Ad Hoc 1 (Tdoc R1-99g81)

Approved with following 2 comments

(1) R1-99g16 "Text proposal for cycling of cell parameters for TDD" would affect TS 25.221 – 224, instead of TS 25.221-223.

(2) In the section of "Tdoc R1-99g37, Bosch, contains the text proposal related to joint predistortion ",
"complexity" should be "base station complexity".

Ad Hoc 4 (Tdoc R1-99g94) (Presented on Day3 afternoon)

11. Contributions on Issues needed cleaning up in Ad Hocs (plenary session)

Ad Hoc 3 related issues

No	Tdoc No.	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
1	R1-99g26	Updates to description of Random Access procedure	Ericsson	Postponed	(*1)
2	R1-99f58	Proposal to have optional 20 ms RACH message length	Nokia	Postponed	(*2)
3	R1-99g47	Introduction of randomness in RACH preamble retransmission timing	Nortel Networks	Postponed	(*3)

(*1) In principle, the text proposal was agreed, but for final approval, we need CR.
(*2) 2 points remained and further discussions were needed.
- Whether are simulation conditions acceptable ? (This would be discussed by offline discussion)
- Should 20ms be useful also for other spreading factors besides highest one ? (Offline discussion)

(*3) We need to continue detailed discussion in the Ad Hoc 3 reflector so that people can investigate what RACH sub-channels configurations will suffer from this problem and point out whether this problem is generic or it is only for the special case questioned in this document.

Ad Hoc 5 related issues

No	Tdoc No.	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
1	R1-99f28	Text proposal for Turbo codes and rate matching in TS 25.212, TS 25.222	Samsung & LGIC	Postponed	no comments (*1)
2	R1-99f48	Simulation Results of Convolutions Code Puncturing with Initial Offset of '1'	LGIC	----	(just simulation results) no comments
3	R1-99g85	CR to 25.212 for initial offset value change for convolutional code rate matching	LGIC	Postponed	no comments (*2)

(*1) In principle, corrections were agreed but separate CRs needed to be produced per specification. This will be approved in the next meeting.
(*2) In principle, text proposal was approved. CR number is needed. This will be approved in the next meeting.

Ad Hoc10 related issues (Discussed on Day 3 afternoon)

No	Tdoc No.	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
1	R1-99f33	Text proposal for 3.2 and 3.3 of TS25.213v2.3.0	Nokia	Postponed	(*1)
2	R1-99f34	Text proposal for 4.3.2.1 of TS25.213v2.3.0	Nokia	Postponed	(*2)
3	R1-99f35	Text proposal for 4.3.2.2 of TS25.213v2.3.0	Nokia		

(*1) PAPR : Peak to Average Power Ration ← "Ratio" instead of "Ration"
Text proposal was accepted but CR needed to be produced.
(*2) Some comments were made to the equations.
(Chairman's conclusion)
We need to make CR and we would discuss this in the beginning of the next meeting so that people can have time to check the equations or if there are something to be clarified.
R1-99f33, f34, f35 are all concerning the same specification (TS 25.213), so these can be put into one CR.
* Decimation factor 2 would only be used in Release-99.

12. Second session of Ad Hocs (afternoon) 14:00
Ad Hoc 16 & Ad Hoc 9

Day 3.

13. Third session of Ad Hoc (morning)
Ad Hoc 8 & Ad Hoc 17

14. Reports from the Ad Hocs from Day 2 & 3.

Ad Hoc 4 report (R1-99g94)
(This was postponed from Day 1)

Approved with the following 5 comments.

(1) Discussion results concerning R1-99f73 (Response to the LS on SFN and BCH coding in FDD :WG2)
The description about SFN handling can be misunderstood. It should be modified.

(2) Discussion result concerning R1-99f56
Proposal should be "endorsed" by the plenary.

(3) Discussion result concerning R1-99f59
this proposal continues …."
should be removed.

(4) Discussion result concerning R1-99g46
The sentence in the last paragraph which begins with " Furthermore, it should be
is relevant not only to Nortel proposal but in general.

(5) Discussion results concerning R1-99f73
It seems that there are some issues that should be discussed regarding BCH decoding not only for SFN but in general.

Ad Hoc 16 report (R1-99h01)
Approved with no comments.
No CRs were made.

/ The following Ad Hoc reports were presented on Day 4 ***/***

Ad Hoc 10 report (R1-99h18)
Approved with no comments

Ad Hoc 17 report (R1-99g87)
Approved with following 2 comments

(1) Section 7 Discussion on R1-99g57 {Panasonic proposal using PE (Positioning elements)}
"Simulation results would be needed in order to evaluate this method" should be needed for conclusion.

(2) Section 7 Discussion on R1-99g15 { Motorola simulation results (TA-IPDL) }
"The UE position was assumed to be fixed during the overall measurement time of 1 sec." should be removed. Because the movement was included in the simulation.

Tdoc number for this revision is **R1-99h50**.
No text proposals were made.

Ad Hoc 9 report (R1-99h31)
Approved with some comments. But comments did not have direct relations to the report.

Ad Hoc 6 report (R1-99g35)
A question was made by Mr.Fredrik Ovesjo (Ericsson) regarding the conclusion of "R1-99g96", but the chairman suggested the offline discussion due to the lack of the time. This issue will be discussed in the next meeting. Other issues were approved with no remarks.

Ad Hoc 8 report (R1-99h45)
There was one comment concerning "R1-99g76". Small change was made to the simulation condition compared to other pattern analyzed. TI used short time for switching.

Ad Hoc 14 report (R1-99h57)

2 comments were made regarding

- channel monitoring discussion agreement
- channel assignment discussion

Ad Hoc 14 chairman agreed to the comments.

15. Text proposals from Ad Hocs for specifications

Ad Hoc 1 related issues

No	Tdoc No.	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
1	R1-99g92	CR concerning primary and secondary CCPCH for TDD	Siemens AG	Postponed	(*1)
2	R1-99g93	CR concerning removal of superframe in TDD	Siemens AG	Postponed	(*2)
3	R1-99g89	Removal of superframe notation	Ericsson	Postponed	(*3)

(*1) - Pages should not be cut and all pages which are to be affected must be included in CR. Revised version of CR must be produced.
- How the CR should be was discussed.
- There are "SACCH" and "SDCCH" in the Definitions and abbreviations section. But these 2 abbreviation are not used in the specification. These should be checked.
- Technical contents were approved.

(*2) Technical contents are approved with no comments. CR must be revised in terms of formalities.

(*3) - Regarding TDD issues, System Frame Number is defined by WG3 (or WG2) and so WG1 should not put the absolute number in our specification. Absolute SFN should be removed and instead we should put reference to the corresponding WG3(WG2) specification.
- Values in all figures should refer the relevant references instead of the absolute numbers.
- Should we add the references to the FDD issues as well ? Yes, we should add references.
- CR must be revised in terms of formalities.

16. Other corrections/clarifications to the specifications not covered in WG1#7bis

R1-99f 47 (Corrections to TS 25.212 : Nokia)

Approved with following comments.

(1) Table 1 should be modified so that the Transport Channel Type should not appear repeatedly.
(2) 4.2.8 Definition of *I* as the number of the Transport Channel should be placed in the beginning of document.
(3) 4.2.9.2 We should not start with Note. We should remove the title "Notes" (???)
(4) 4.2.15 might be removed if we agreed not to define SFN
(5) In the reference, there is TS 25.231. This should be split into TS 25.215 and TS 25.225

CR should be produced incorporating those comments by the next meeting.

R1-99g45 (Additional open issues to be discussed in R1 : Fujitsu, Hitachi, Japan Telecom, Mitsubishi Electric, NEC, NTT DoCoMo, Panasonic, Sharp, Texas Instruments, Toshiba)

NEC introduced this document very briefly.

This document was noted.

17. Contributions for additional items in specifications

17.1 Discussion was made about the PICH reserved bits with regard to the pending Motorola contributions and related liaison statement from WG2{*R1-99f69* (Liaison Statement to WG1 Regarding the Use of PICH Reserved Bits)}

Motorola contribution

R1-99d08 (Support of Configuration Change Indicators on the PICH: Motorola)

Main point of the liaison statement **R1-99f69**

(1) Can the currently reserved bits on the PICH be allocated for the use of the higher layers?
(2) What are the bit-error-rate characteristics of the PICH?
(3) What is the battery life improvement of decoding the reserved PICH bits rather than decoding a PCH frame?
- We currently have no contributions concerning this issue, so it is difficult answer.
- This also depends on the WG2 as well because WG2 sets the parameters for cell reselections these parameters have impact on how often the mobile performs this kind of cell reselections. It is difficult for WG1 to answer this.

Conclusion : Those reserved bits are not available within single frame as for the paging indicator so we need multiple frames. Regarding the BER characteristics, we have rough estimate but detailed simulation has not been done. As for the battery life improvement, we have no detailed evaluation in WG1.
We have little time to finalize this on our schedule for release 99. There would be no backward compatibility if this scheme were to be introduced in release 2000.

Motorola was asked to produce the answer liaison statement to WG2.

17.2 Paging occasions

R1-99c45 (LS on paging occasions to RAN WG2)
R1-99d15 (Paging channel configuration for improving the UE standby time in FDD :Ericsson)
R1-99d16 (Draft answer on LS on paging occasions : Ericsson, Siemens)

After plenary discussion, chairman suggested to continue offline discussion.
If the consensus was reached, then the liaison statement should be produced and sent to WG2.
(New Tdoc number for this liaison statement was R1-99h27)

17.3 DPCCH Gating

No	Tdoc No.	Title	Source	Conclusion	Notes
1	R1-99f77	A clarification on DPCCH gated transmission	Samsung	Not Approved	(*1)
2	R1-99g53	Further EMC Test in Gated Transmission of DPCCH (Rev. of f78)	Samsung	Noted	(*2)
3	R1-99g54	Revised Random Pattern for DPCCH Gated Transmission (Rev. of f80)	Samsung	Postponed	(*3)

(*1) It was pointed out some problem on the cell edge behavior. The chairman suggested offline discussion about what answer we should make to WG2. This would be discussed on Day 4 again assuming some proper proposal would be made.
(*2) Where does the assumption of 30cm (minimum distance) come from ?
→ based on the normal usage. (assuming the handheld devices)
(*3) *k* in the equation is not defined in anywhere.
Chairman concluded that WG1 agreed the Random patterns are preferred than the regular ones but we did not agree on the exact method proposed here regarding how to randomise. We need to discuss this further.

Mr. Nakamura (NTT DoCoMo) recommended to Samsung to accept the removal of the issue of (gating rate =0) to release 2000 taking into account of the fact that we do not have much time.

17.4

R1-99g62 (Common pilot pattern : Samsung)

Discussion was made regarding the AFC methods, that are FFT and CP-FDD, because the preferable common pilot pattern would change according to the AFC method.

Conclusion : Further offline discussion is maybe needed to reach consensus. Postponed.

17.5

R1-99e56 (Text Proposal of Pre-Wake up Power Control (PWPC) for Compressed Mode : Panasonic) (Presented on Day 4 A.M.)

Further discussion should be made on the Ad Hoc9 reflector on how is it simulated and modeled. Postponed.

18. Ad Hoc sessions, Ad Hoc 6 and Ad Hoc 14 (evening).

19. Liaison statements approval for the responses (or new liaisons) generated during the meeting

No	Discussed Tdoc	Source	To	Title	Approved Tdoc	Notes
1	R1-99g95	AH 1	RAN WG3	(Draft) answer to the LS about TDD synchronisation methods	R1-99h48	(*1)
2	R1-99h21	AH 4	RAN WG2	RAN WG1 view on SMG2 LS on measurement order parameters sent to the MS, for GSM to UMTS handovers	R1-99h49	(*2)
3	R1-99h11	AH 17	RAN WG2	(Draft) Liaison on LCS to WG2	R1-99h51	(*3)
4	R1-99h12	AH 17	RAN WG3	(Draft) Liaison on LCS to WG3	R1-99h52	no comments
5	R1-99h28	AH 9	RAN WG3	(Draft) Liaison statement on power control	R1-99h53	no comments
6	R1-99h29	AH 9	RAN WG3	(Draft) Liaison statement on RL DL_ TX_ power levels for Soft Handover	R1-99h54	(*4)
7	R1-99h30	AH 9	RAN 2,3,4	(Draft) Liaison statement on Downlink power control adjustment loop	R1-99h55	no comments
8	R1-99g96	AH 9	RAN WG3	(Draft:)Reply to WG3 regarding the operation of SSDT	R1-99h56	(*5)
10	R1-99h09	AH 9	RAN WG2	(Draft) LS on signalling of power offset between AICH/PICH and Primary CPICH	R1-99h58	no comments
11	R1-99h10	AH 9	RAN WG2	(Draft) LS on open loop power control	R1-99h59	(*6)
12	R1-99g97	AH 4	SA WG4	(Draft) Liaison statement on updating the number of AMR speech bits	R1-99h60	no comments
13	R1-99h07	AH 4	RAN WG2	Proposal for LS on SFN as a Physical Layer Parameter	R1-99h61	(*7)
14	R1-99g98	AH 4	RAN WG3	(Draft) answer on LS on the decoding of the TFCI in UL radio frames	R1-99h62	(*8)
15	R1-99g99	AH 4	RAN WG2	(Draft) Liaison on Physical Layer Service Implementation Capabilities	R1-99h63	(*9)
16	R1-99h00	AH 4	R2 SA4	(Draft) Liaison Statement on transmitting AMR Mode Command bits	R1-99h66	(*10)
17	R1-99h32	AH 4	SA4	Liaison statement on requirements for fast switching between AMR modes	R1-99h67	(*11)
18	R1-99h33	AH 6	R4 T1	Draft liaison to TSG-R WG4 and TSG-T WG1 informing about the changes made to FDD/TDD Tx diversity solutions in TSG-R WG1 #8	R1-99h68	no comments
19	R1-99h34	AH 6	RAN WG2	Draft liaison to TSG-R WG2 informing about the changes made to FDD/TDD Tx diversity solutions in TSG-R WG1 #8	R1-99h69	no comments
20	R1-99h46	AH 8	RAN 2	Liaison statement on compressed mode control	R1-99h70	(*12)
21	R1-99h25	AH16	RAN 2,4	Clarification of UE measurement abilities		(*13)
22	R1-99h24	AH16	RAN WG2	Additional GSM measurement abilities for the UE	R1-99h71	no comments
23	R1-99h40	Motorola	RAN WG2	Proposed liaison statement: Response to liaison regarding RACH/FACH response time	R1-99h72	no comments
24	R1-99h19	AH10	RAN WG2	Liaison statement on the mixture of primary and secondary scrambling codes	R1-99h72	no comments
25	R1-99h39	Motorola	RAN WG2	Response to liaison regarding the use of PICH reserved bits	R1-99h73	(*14)
26	R1-99h37	Nokia	RAN WG2	Liaison statement on RACH message length	R1-99h74	(*15)
27	R1-99h27	Ericsson	RAN WG2	Answer on LS on paging occasions	R1-99h27	no comments

No	Discussed Tdoc	Source	To	Title	Approved Tdoc	Notes
27	R1-99h44	Ericsson	RAN WG2	(Draft) Liaison Gated DPCCH transmission	R1-99h75	(*16)
28	R1-99h65		ERC TG1	TSG RAN WG1 reply to liaison: Acceptable interference level from third generation systems into a UMTS MS receiver for the purpose of the cross border co-ordination of UMTS systems.	R1-99h65	no comments
29	R1-99g84	Ericsson	RAN WG2	LS on transport channel multiplexing	R1-99g84	(*17)

(*1) WG3 might be informed as well that we have not been able to check whether the proposed method in WG1 can meet the requirements set by WG4 on the TDD synchronization. For example, we can do Node B synchronization over the air however we have been not able to evaluate whether WG4 requirements can be met with a proposed method.

(*2) (including timing information with respect to GSM timing). should be addressed in the first paragraph.

(*3) Reference [1] should be removed. (Ad Hoc 17 chairman's comment)

This information is sufficient for WG3 purposes. They need to know in their specifications there different power levels can be between different base stations and because this depends on the operator and type of network deployed. We should not try to give guidance especially to WG3 on this because they are not looking this kind of guidance.

(*5) - The last sentence in the first paragraph which begin with "WG1 requests WG3 to continue - - - " should be removed because it is not relevant for us to say that.
- The last paragraph should be removed.
- The sentence "**with some degree of performance loss.** " should be added to new last paragraph.

(*6) We should say "CR will be prepared."

(*7) " TSGR2#7(99)d10 " is from TSG RAN WG2 instead of TSG T WG2.

(*8) "Thus, in the general case there is no method for distinguishing that a TFCI word detection error has occurred." should be modified as
"Thus, in the WG1 specifications there is no method currently defined for distinguishing that a TFCI word detection error has occurred. If there is a need, WG1 can study the issue further."

(*9) For FDD part, no comments raised.
For TDD part, modification was made to the fast mode control.
" Cc: S4 " should be added

(*10) Possibility 4) should be removed.
Possibility 1) should be modified.
The sentence in the last paragraph,
"Would it be desirable e.g. to move the functionality of 1st multiplexing above Layer1, i.e. in MAC layer, since comments were given within WG1 that the multiplexing definition in Layer 1 is already very complex."
should be replaced by
"Could similar functionality to the former 1st multiplexing be handled at higher layers? Concerns have been raised in WG1 on the layer 1 multiplexing complexity."

(*11) In the second paragraph
"bit rate" should be replaced by "number of bits"

(*12) LS itself was approved with no comments, but it was pointed out that this LS has overlapping part with "R1-99h25". These should be merged.

(*13) Three questions of R1-99h46 were merged into R1-99h25 in the end of R1-99h25 with the introduction comment "For example the following questions were raised in WG1: "

(*14) - It was pointed out that it should be clarified that this proposal was for the FDD.
- The sentence
"WG1 is currently lacking a detailed proposal of how to make these bits available to the higher layers"
should be added in the item 1.

(*15) - This LS should be sent also to WG3 as Cc.
- RACH message should be replaced by "UTRA FDD RACH message"

(*16) The sentence "if it would be included in the WG1 specification." should be added to the last sentence.

(*17) It should be mentioned that this is only for FDD.
There is something which should be discussed on TDD but this should not be discussed now. The comments mentioned would be reflected in the R1-99g84 since g84 has not been distributed yet.

R1-99h38 was postponed

20. Other Isssues & next meeting

R1-99h36 (TR R1.03 v0.1.2)

2 modifications made to previous version were introduced.

Approved with no comments.

(Chairman's comment)

If there are no issues raised in the next meeting regarding this report then this version will be sent to RAN for information.

21. Closing

WG1 #8 meeting was closed at 15:15 October 15th.

Annex. Participants List

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Toskala	Antti	Antti.toskala@nokia.com
Steudle	Ville	Ville.steudle@nokia.com
Willenegger	Serge	C_sergew@qualcomm.com
Burbidge	Richard	Richard.Burbidge@motorola.com
Henriksson	Anders	Anders.p.henriksson@telia.sc
Truelove	Stephen	Stephen.truelove@t-modus.nec.co.uk
Lee	Kyung Ha	Ykh@khgw.info.samsung.co.kr
Hochn	Volker	Volker.hochn@d2ptival.de
Kraus	Joern	Joern.kraus@icn.siemens.de
Sommer	Volker	Volker.sommer@icn.siemens.de
Ulrich	Thomas	Thomas.ulrich@icn.siemens.de
Purat	Marcus	Marcus.purat@icn.siemens.de
Klein	Anja	Anja.klein@icn.siemens.de
Meyer	Klaus	Klaus.meyer@amd.com
Mohebbi	Rehzad	b.mohebbi@fujitsu.co.uk
Seidel	Eiko	
Kanterakis	Emmanual	e.kanterakis@gbtwireless.com
Zickermann	Karin	Kzickermann@gbtwireless.com
Parsa	Kourosh	Kparsa@gbtwireless.com
Kwak	Joe	
Harrold	Colin	Colin.harrold@bt.com
Fisher	Reed	Rfisher@okiteli.com
Kwon	Sung Lark	Slkwon@lgic.co.kr
Lyu	Dugin	Lyu@lgic.co.kr
Lee	Young	Leego@lgic.co.kr
Choi	Jin Sung	Jinsungc@lgic.co.kr
Ukonmaanaho	Mauri	Mauri.ukonmaananaho@nokia.com
Laukkanen	Mika	Mika.laukkanen@nokia.com
Ito	Kenja	Kenji.ito@skk.siemens.co.jp
Ziera	Ariela	Ariela.ziera@interdigital.com
Mochizuki	Takashi	Mochizuki@peerd.fe.nec.co.jp
Song	Young Joon	Youngjsong@lgic.co.kr
Liu	Tie	Liutie@otcs.okigrp.comsg
Yun	Youngwoo	Youngwooy@lgic.co.kr
Ikeda	Shinobu	Shinobu.ikeda@etsi.fr
Corden	Ian	Icorden@lucent.com
Virtanen	Anu	Anu.na.virtanen@nokia.com
Okuyama	Nobutaka	Nico@lsil.com
Pehkonen	Kari	Kari.pejlpmem@nokia.com
Kahtava	Jussi	Jussi.kahtava@nokia.com
Dick	Steve	Steve.dick@interdigital.com
Ovesjo	Frederick	Frederik.ovesjo@era.ericsson.se
Baker	Mathew	Bakermp2@prl.research.philips.com
Kim	Min-Goo	Mgkim@metro.telecom.samsung.co.kr
Park	Changso	Chang@metro.telecom.samsung.co.kr
Jang	Jaesung	
Sambhwani	Sharad	Ssambhwani@nj.algorex.com
Toussi	Karim	Ktoussi@nj.algorex.com
Hunt	Bernard	Bernard.hunt@philips.com
Lee	Hyunwoo	
Hwang	Sungoh	Sungoh@metro.telecom.samsung.co.kr
Clop	Oscar	Slop@crm.mot.com
Boixadera	Francesc	Boixadera@crm.mot.com
Kim	Jae-Heung	Kimjh@etri.re.kr

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Kim	JungIm	Jungim@etri.re.kr
Asanuma	Yutaka	Asanuma@yrp.toshiba.co.jp
Mangold	Peter	Peter.mangold@fr.bosch.de
Oestreich	Stefan	Stefan.oestreich@icn.siemens.de
Kasapidis	Makis	Makis.kasapidis@mci.co.uk
Kohlmann	Michael	Michael.kohlmann@philips.com
Barandalla	Ignacio	Iebt@tia.es
Kowalewski	Frank	Frank.kowalewski@fr.bosch.de
Okumura	Yukihiko	Okumura@mlab.yrp.nttdocomo.co.ip
Batz	Gerhard	Gerhard.batz@motorola.com
Bolgiano	Ridge	Rbolgiano@interdigital.com
Higashi	Akihiro	Higasi@mlab.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Aksentijevic	Mirko	Mirko.aksentijevic@nokia.com
Dick	Steve	Steve.dick@interdigital.com
Jechoux	Bruno	Jechoux@tcl.ite.mee.com
Rudolf	Marian	Rudolf@tcl.ite.mee.com
Narvinger	Per	Per.narvinger@era.ericsson.se
Kiernan	Brian	Brian.kiernan@interdigital.com
Bernocco	Carlo	Carlo.brenocco@italtel.it
Lunardon	Massimo	Lunardon.massimo@telital.it
Lee	Hyeonwoo	Woojaa@samsung.co.kr
LeDantec	Claude	Ledantec@crf.canon.fr
Yamamoto	Kazushi	Kazushi@isl.melco.co.jp
Perrin	Jean Hughes	Jean-hughes.perrin@alcatel.fr
Da Rocha	Alexandre	Alexandre.darocha@art.alcatel.fr
Romano	Giovanni	Giovanni.romano@cselt.it
Nakamura	Takehiro	Takehiro@wsp.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Wilde	Andreas	Andreas.wilde@nrj.ericson.se
Cosimini	Peter	Peter.cosimini@vf.vodafone.co.uk
Uno	Masahiro	Uno@wtlab.sony.co.jp
Tanaka	Yoshinori	Yoshi@flab.fujitsu.co.jp
Itoh	Katsutoshi	Kitoh@wtlab.sony.co.jp
Kim	Jaeyoel	Kimjy@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Choi	Hokyu	Choihk@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Kim	Younglok	Younglok.kim@interdigital.com
Shin	Sung-Hyuk	Sshin@interdigital.com
Ovesjo	Fredrik	Fredrik.ovesjo@era.ericsson.se
Bishop	Craig	Ckbishop@aol.com
Moon	Hichan	Hcmoon@telecom.samsung.co.kr
Cardiff	Barry	Barry.Cardiff@nokia.com
Kinjo	Shigenori	Kinjo@ti.com
Berens	Friedbert	Friedbert.berens@st.com
Futakata	Toshi-Yuki	Futakata@wsp.yrp.nttdocomo.co.jp
Wiedmann	Ralf	Ralf.wiedmann@mch.siemens.de
Raa	Bernhard	Bernhard.raaf@mch.siemens.de
Cho	Sung-Ho	Jaroclay@hei.co.kr
Robertson	Brett	Brett.robertson@motorola.com
Chambers	Peter	Peter.chambers@roke.co.uk
Cedervall	Mats	Mats.cedervall@era.ericson.se
Tomatis	Fabritio	Fabritio.tomatis@VLSi.com
Spaling	Gerke	Gerke.spaling@emn.ericsson.se
Barroso	Chris	Cbarroso@lucent.com
Baer	Siegfried	Siegfried.baer@de.bosch.com
Harada	Koichi	Harada@docomo.fr
Agin	Pascal	Pascal.agin@alcatel.fr
Meyer	Jan	Jetmeyer@lucent.com

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Palenius	Torgny	Torgny.palenius@ecs.ericsson.se
Blanz	Josef	Jblanz@qualcomm.com
Richton	Robert	Richton@lucent.com
Tsunerhara	Katsuhuko	Tsune@crl-hitachi.co.jp
Zack	Rafael	Rafi.zack@dspis.co.il
Schneider	Michael	Michael.schneider.mch@infineon.com
Suzuki	Hidetoshi	Hidetoshi.suzuki@yrp.mci.mei.co.jp
Hammons	Roger	Rhammons@hns.com
Adachi	Kazuhiro	Adachi.kazuhiro@exec.epson.co.jp
Iiada	Izumi	Iida.izumi@exc.epson.co.jp
Zangani	Marco	Marco.zangani@otinitel.it
Ikeda	Masayuki	Ikeda.asayuki@exc.epson.co.jp
Boccuzzi	Joseph	Joeb@candence.com
Iochi	Hitoshi	Hitoshi.iochi@yrp.mci.mei.co.jp
Tyra	Fred	Fred.tyra@interdigital.com
Dahlman	Erik	
Grieco	Don	Don.grieco@interdigital.com
Hiromatsu	Katsuhiko	
Sezgin	Nadir	Nadir.sezgin@interdigital.com
Ozluturk	Fatih	Fatih.ozluturk@interdigital.com
Kim	Seyoung	
Lopes	Luis	
Olesen	Robert	Robert.olesen@interdigital.com
Mardani	Reza	
Masoomzadeh-Fard	Ali	
Leretaille	Catherine	
Lehtinen	Otto	
Tatesh	Said	
Jalloul	Lorray	

How to use the change request

- **When to use the change request**
  - Change requests have to be used to modify the approved specifications (specifications version 3.x.y)
- **Change request renumbering**
  - Change requests are numbered on a per specification basis
    - *So we will CR 001, CR002 for 25.211 noted 25.211-001, 25.211-002*
  - Change request numbers are to be asked from the secretary of the working group
  - Change request can be revised so 25.211-001 rev 1, 25.211 -001 rev 2
- **Who can bring CR to the TSG plenary ?**
  - Change request should normally by agreed at the working group level before being presented to the TSG level for approval.
  - CR chan be brought directly to the plenary but if require technical analysis then they will most probably be sent back to the WGs

NORTEL NETWORKS

How to use the change request

- **Approval process and update of the specifications**
  - CRs are presented to the TSG plenary for approval
  - If approved they will be incorporated in the specification by 3GPP support team
  - After each TSG plenary the specifications are updated
  - There is no intermediate version of the specification in between 2 WG plenaries
  - CRs are to be prepared on the last official version
  - For some specifications it is allowed to work on intermediate version (e.g. 25.331). In this case the CR must indicate the reference version + CRs
- **Content of the change request**
  - Change request form
  - Modified pages of the specifications

NORTEL NETWORKS

How to fill in the CR form

3GPP TSG-? meeting #?
City, Country, DD-DD MMM YYYY

Document *?????????*

3G CHANGE REQUEST

Please see embedded help file at the bottom of this page for instructions on how to fill in this form correctly.

CR

Current Version:

3G specification number ↑ *↑ CR number as allocated by 3G support team*

For submision to TSG *list TSG meeting no. here ↑* **for approval** **for information** *(only one box should be marked with an X)*

Form: 3G CR cover sheet, version 1.0 *The latest version of this form is available from: ftp://ftp.3gpp.org/Information/3GCRF-xx.rtf*

Proposed change affects: *(at least one should be marked with an X)* **USIM** **ME** **UTRAN** **Core Network**

Source: Date:

Subject:

3G Work item:

Category: *(only one category shall be marked with an X)*

- **F** Correction
- **A** Corresponds to a correction in a 2G specification
- **B** Addition of feature
- **C** Functional modification of feature
- **D** Editorial modification

Reason for change:

Clauses affected:

Other specs affected:

- Other 3G core specifications → List of CRs:
- Other 2G core specifications → List of CRs:
- MS test specifications → List of CRs:
- BSS test specifications → List of CRs:
- O&M specifications → List of CRs:

Other comments:

Specification number

Change request number

Version of the specification on which the CR is prepared

Equipment affected
Only some of the equipments are impacted :
USIM, UE, UTRAN or CN

Source
The company name of the author of the CR. If the CR has already been agreed at a Working groups or sub working group, meeting, the subgroup name (and Tdoc number) should be used instead.

Category
Only one box should be ticked

Reason for change
This should be 1 to 10 lines of text that describes in further detail the reasons why the change is necessary and how the change is done.

NORTEL NETWORKS

Modified pages attached to the CR form

- **All modified pages apart from sections numbering modification must be attached to the CRs**
- **One particular change must be propagated in the whole specification**
  - > No modification one one page and then the secretary has to do the whole work.
- **A CR must correspond to the Exact text**
  - > Not possible to agree on a modified text of a CR.
  - > A New CR has to be prepared.
  - > That new CR may not be reviewed by the group of only editorial but must be available
- **CR form explains how to make sure that the modified pages appear with correct numbering and section separation**

NORTEL NETWORKS

Change requests

- **Change request and Tdoc numbers**
  - One document can contain some background information and presentation of a document + 1 or several CRs
  - So there is no one-to-one relationship between Tdoc and CRs
- **Treatment of a change request**
  - Change request can be withdrawn
  - Change request can be postponed, pending other decisions
  - Change request can be rejected
- **One change request is for one type of modification**

NORTEL NETWORKS