Source: **Secretary UMTS-L23 Expert Group (NEC Technologies UK)**

Draft minutes of the UMTS-L23 meeting #9
18 – 19 January 1999, Helsinki, Finland

The SMG2 UMTS-L23 Expert Group (EG) Chairman, Denis Fauconnier (Nortel) opened the meeting and introduced the agenda (tdoc 001/98). The agenda was approved.

The L23 EG Secretary, Georgi Petkov (NEC Technologies UK) presented the draft minutes (td 002) from the previous meeting #8 (9 - 11 December 1998). The minutes were approved with the comments provided on the L23 reflector and additional changes and clarifications proposed by Ericsson and Nokia.

1.   Review of permanent documents (Agenda Item 3.2)

Td 003 (Chairman): Deliverables and Work plan (YY.00)
The L23 work plan has been completed to a large extend and there was no new version of this document. The work of the group will continue under 3GPP and a new work plan will be required after this meeting.

Td 004 (Ericsson): UMTS YY.01 v. 1.0.2; MS-UTRAN Radio Interface Protocol Architecture; Stage 2
The Editor (Wolfgang Granzow, Ericsson) introduced the changes to v. 1.0.0 of YY.01. The document was approved.

Td 005 (Chairman): UMTS YY.02 v. 1.1.0: Layer 1; General requirements
The Editor (Denis Fauconnier, Nortel) presented the changes to version 1.0.0. The changes were not visible on the distributed hard copy, which also contained editorial modifications introduced in addition to those by the Editor. The document was approved.

Td 006 (Nokia): UMTS YY.03 v. 0.2.1: UE States and Procedures in Connected Mode
The Editor (Mikko Rinne, Nokia) introduced the changes to version 0.2.1 of the document.

Comments:
The document was approved with the above addition.
Philips: p.18 7.3.2 2nd paragraph, The UE can also uese … in the whole URA or parts of it
Ericsson: Allocate => request
Motorola: Regarding Figure 4 some text is needed to indicate that DSCH always comes on a signalling channel.

Td 007 (Nokia): UMTS YY.04 v. 0.2.1: Description of Idle Mode Procedures
The Editor (Tommi Leivonen, Nokia) presented the document. There were no changes to version 0.1.2. The document was approved.

Td 008 (Siemens): UMTS YY.21 v. 0.0.6: Description of the MAC protocol proposed v 0.0.3
The Editor (Armin Sitte, Siemens) introduced the changes to version 0.0.5 of the document.

Comments:
~~Ericsson~~Telia: It should be indicated on which side of the line indicating the Iur interface the control SAP-s should appear.
Chairman: One possibility is to split <u>the MAC control SAP in two</u>~~the MAC-c box~~. Proposals on this issue were invited.

<u>The editor had been inserted in the document a figure sent by Telia on the reflector before the meeting, reflecting to the above comments.</u>

The document was approved.

Td 009 (CSELT): UMTS YY.22 v0.0.4: Description of the RLC protocol
The Editor (Flavio Piolini) has moved to another company. Ricardo Santaneli (CSELT), presented the document and introduced the changes to v 0.0.2,.

Figure 1 had been proposed at the previous meeting only for illustration and had not been agreed for inclusion in the document. It will be removed.

In section 7 only the first bullet was left in the document.

The document was approved with the above comments.

Td 010 (Motorola): UMTS YY.31 v. 0.1.1: RRC protocol
The Editor (Stephen Barrett, Motorola) introduced the latest additions. The document was approved.

Td 011 (Philips): UMTS YY.40 v000: Description of principles for error handling and message description
The document has not been changed since the previous meeting. The new modified version was presented as td 39 (below).

Td 012 (Editor): UMTS 25.xx v 0.1.2: Vocabulary for the UTRAN
This document was not treated.

2. Proposals from e-mail discussions

2.1 Proposed changes to YY.04 (AI 3.1)

Td 39 (Nokia): CR to YY.04: Description of Idle Mode Procedures
The Editor presented the summary of changes proposed in contributions to the previous meeting and off-line comments.

Comments:
Chairman: The relationship between the Radio access mode Selection and Cell Selection Reselection was not clear.
Ericsson: It should be possible for the user to determine whether to select UMTS or GSM if e.g. provided by the same PLMN.

Chairman: There should be some indication from the NAS what modes are available for selection and possibly remove the "Radio access selection …" box

Ericsson: Prefer to keep the "Radio access selection …" box.

The "Radio access selection …" box will remain in the figure but the user intervention will be replaced by NAS selection and NAS indication and the automatic/Manual selection will be removed.

Vodafone agreed to draft a LS to SMG12 to clarify the definition of service selection, i.e. whether it is based on the user subscription or on criteria related to the radio access.

The proposed changes in the document were approved with the above modifications and will be incorporated in version 0.2.2 of YY.04.

2.2   Proposed changes to YY.31 (AI 4.2)

Td 014 (Motorola):   Editor's proposal for changes to YY.31 (Description of RRC protocol)
This document contained proposed modifications to YY.31 including changes reflecting relevant parts of the agreed versions of YY.03.

Comments:
Chairman: Remove section 8.3.5.3 as it should be reflected in the inter-frequency HO section. The inter-operator section (8.3.5.4) should also be removed as it also falls in the inter-frequency handover section.

Ericsson: Supported the above and "Inter-frequency" will be removed from the title of section8.3.5.2.

The document was approved.

2.3   Proposed changes to YY.22 (AI 4.3)

Td 021 (Ericsson, LGIC):   The Architecture Model of RLC sub-layer
Ericsson presented the document, which proposed a model of the RLC layer, which reflects previous contributions to the L23 EG on the subject.

Comments:
Ericson: Dashed lines in Figures 2 and 3 reflect possibility to have higher layer information piggy-backed on control PDU. This should be FFS.

Chairman: First bullet in Section two – segmentation/re-assembly could not be possible without adding any protocol information.

Ericsson: Could be done if the segmentation is predetermined and should be possible without overhead.

NTT DoCoMo: Figure 2 and 3 the Transparent SAP connection should be CCCH instead of DCCH. There should be only one SAP for DCCH coming out from the MUX. The DTCH SAP-s should be separate.

Chairman: Supported the NTT DoCoMo comment and proposed to split Figure 2 in two reflecting separately transparent and acknowledged/unacknowledged modes.

Nokia: Change the respective box in Figure 2 to the following "Set RLC header (e.g. poll bit)"

It was clarified that multiple logical channels are possible, hence multiple DCCH or DTCH SAP-s provide an adequate description. The understanding is that there is only one DCCH per UE. The MUX part should also include logical channel selection with indication FFS. The modifications apply to Figure 3 accordingly.

There will be some explanatory text that the protocol machines are independent for the different modes.

The issues raised by the Chairman's comments on the first bullet of Section 2, will have to be clarified further for incorporation in the permanent documents, including the relevant parts of YY.01.

Tables 1 and 2 will be modified to improve clarity with respect to the meaning of the –/+ entries.

3.   Reports and Liaisons from other groups (AI 5)

Td 49 (Philips): Editor's Proposals for changes to YY.40 after ETSI SMG2 Specification Methods Ad Hoc

Comments and Clarifications:
Section 5.1 will include definition of the use of "shall" (meaning mandatory). The use of verbs in this document needs very good clarification due to its sensitive nature.

Nokia: Regarding section 3, in the paragraph starting with SDL behaviour should be defined at the radio interfaces and not at the SAP-s.
Chairman: The scope should remain only as the first paragraph of Section 3. The 3rd paragraph should go to Section 8.
Motorola: use of shall and should to refer to agreed ETSI definitions. Sections 6.4.4 and 9.6 require clarification.

Td 13 (L1 EG): Liaison statement to Layer 2/3

Comments and Clarifications:
The reply on RACH included a query if L23 could use fewer than 20 octets, which is preferred by the L1 EG. With R=1/3 coding the maximum would be 13 octets which is viewed as insufficient for the L23 EG. The preference of the L23 is to consider using 20 octets for the time being and if necessary revise the requirements later.

Nokia: Fewer octects for the RACH frame would be possible if we choose e.g. the random number alternative for initial UE identification (as described in Ericsson Td 541/98) instead of the current L23 working assumption of a globally unique CN UE identity(also described in Td 541/98). ~~Using fewer octets could be possible by using some random number mechanism.~~
Siemens: The TDD could utilise a smaller number of octets with the respective UE ID scheme.
Chairman: The reply is for FDD but the possibility to use fewer octets could be beneficial to the harmonisation of FDD and TDD.

The reply on out-of-synch detection required clarification.

Regarding the questions on DSCH some of the answers were not applicable as option 3 had been dropped out by the L23 EG already. The comments on the other 2 options will be discussed in the DSCH agenda item. It was pointed out that the L1 EG suggested the DSCH should be optimised for high bit rates.

The L23 EG had decided not to select one of the two remaining options but to consider both of them.

4.   Clarifications/completion on permanent documents

4.1   Protocol architecture : YY.01 (AI 6.1)

Td 26 (Siemens):   Information Transfer Capacity on the RACH
Proposed an addition to YY.01 and respective updating of YY.21 including the use of short MAC-UE identifiers in order to reduce signalling overhead. The proposals were thought to be applicable to FDD, too.

Comments and Clarifications:
Vodafone: What is static trade-off?
Siemens: Possibility to reserve RACH capacity.
Motorola: Is the proposal regarding the initial access only?
Siemens: No, it is possible to use short identifier in other states of the connection (e.g. user registration). In case of ambiguity a random value scheme could be considered.
Vodafone: What is the envisaged number of available short ID-s.
Siemens: The number of ID-s considered necessary is envisaged to be around 5.
Ericsson: The Editor of YY.01 (Ericsson) pointed out that the proposed addition did not seem appropriate as the respective part of YY.01 is on a more general level. It would not be possible to include the proposed change, as it is not sufficiently clear what exactly is the short ID. It could be very similar to RNTI.
Chairman: The proposed to include the proposed text in section 8. It is necessary to decide what would be the best solution to provide for both FDD and TDD. Currently the FDD solution is not applicable to TDD.

Conclusion:
Keep FFS in Section 8 of YY.01 as is and include the proposal as an editorial note. Contributions were invited on the possibilities to utilise the 42 bits solution or alternatively the need for 20 octets. The possibility will be included in the LS to the L1 EG (td 56).

Td 33 (Ericsson):   Padding function

Chairman: The MAC is allowed to multiplex different lengths of PDU, which leads to the need to indicate all combinations with the TFCI. This appears to be unnecessary complication. In principle padding in multiple instances is less efficient than padding in one instance which can be achieved in the MAC.

Discussion: There was a discussion between Ericsson, the Chairman and NTT DoCoMo if the length indication and padding on RLC level provides any benefit and efficiency compared to MAC level length indication and padding.

Motorola: Supported the arguments presented by the Chairman.

Nokia: Having variable size RLC and an upper limit of the PDU still requires padding and Nokia supported the proposal in td 33.

Ericsson: Clarified that one MAC PDU for each RLC PDU had been considered in their proposal.

Conclusion was not reached at this stage. The discussion continues, with a related presentation by Nokia, under agenda item 7.

Td 042 (Nokia):   Comparison of alternative DSCH structures

Case A and B appear to have similar problems.

Clarifications and comments:

Chairman: There are issues discussed in the document, which have not been captured in the conclusions. The document provided a good analysis but the outcome was not reflected in the proposed changes to YY.01.

Nokia: The document provides a discussion of the issues.

Motorola: What are the assumptions regarding the framing alignment between the DSCH and DCH.

Chairman: There is no frame alignment.

Motorola: In the case of SRNC not the same as the CRNC there is difference between signalling on the common and the dedicated channel. There is advantage in using the common channel.

Philips: What is the limit on the number of UE-s supported.

Nokia: Depends on the code efficiency of the different solutions and no exact number was available at that stage.

Summary:

The changes to YY.01 were approved with the following additions:

- The first proposed paragraph for YY.01 is extended with "… that would be mapped on the TFCI of the associated DL DCH.
- Second paragraph, first line ends in "… TFCI on the DL DPCCH)"

Td 46 (Motorola):   Benefits of the ACCH for signalling fast assignments

The proposal for ACCH has already been reflected in YY.01 and YY.02 as DSCH control channel. The document was noted.

4.2   Services of the layer 1 : YY.02 (AI 6.2)

Td 19 (Sony): Some editorial corrections for YY.02

(This document was distributed incorrectly also as td 005.)

The changes were agreed.

4.3   Procedures in Connected Mode : YY.03 (AI 6.3)

<u>Td 22 (Philips):</u>   Performance of the RACH when used for reservation of DCHs for packet transmission
For information

<u>Td 36 (Ericsson):</u>   Cell and URA update – inter-layer interactions
Examples of inter-layer interaction for Cell and URA update procedures.

Clarifications and comments:
Chairman: the Cell Update example is based on CCCH, which applies if there is change of URA. There is need to clarify the model.
Nokia: Regarding section 2.2 if the identity is included in the RRC it will be ciphered and it will not be possible to route the message by the controlling RNC. Addressing on MAC level should not be excluded. It is possible to change the text to say that RNTI is included in the RACH without specifying the layer.

Decision:
The modification proposed by Nokia was accepted. The document was approved with indication that Section 2.1 applies only to Cell Update and changing the URA. Also the two sections will include text "the message includes the current RNTI" according to the Nokia comments.

<u>Td 37 (Ericsson):</u>   YY.03 update proposal

Clarifications and comments:
Nokia: Preferred to keep the names in the RRC Connection Establishment figures for the time being.
Chairman: Since this is a Stage 2 document the naming is of the usage of messages and not the messages themselves so the change should not be so critical.

Decision:
- The proposed changes on p. 2 were approved. (The first sentence of the second deleted paragraph will be kept.)
- The changes in the remaining of the document were mostly editorial and were accepted.

<u>Td 41 (Nokia):</u>   Interlayer Examples of Radio Access Bearer Procedures
Updated from a previously submitted contribution.

The changes were approved (conditional on possible comments by Ericsson).

4.4   Procedures in Idle Mode : YY.04 (AI 6.4)

4.5   Protocol description (YY.21, YY.22, YY.31) (AI 6.5)

4.5.1   Documents related to the RRC sub-layer.

<u>Td 20 (LGIC, ETRI):</u> The Architecture Model of RRC sub-layer

Clarifiations and comments:
Nokia: Why broadcast entity should use unacknowledged mode.

Nortel: Why functions have been grouped into BCE and PNCE.

Td 58 (Nokia):   RRC sub-layer architecture

Clarifications and comments:
Ericsson: What is the purpose of the proposed RRC architecture.
Nokia: There is no an immediate need and this is only one possibility. It was seen as useful to show that there are several functional entities provided by the RRC layer.
Chairman: It is useful to show the routing functions within the RRC (the triangular boxes) in the Fig. 1 and 2 diagrams.
Ericsson: Have the proposed functional entities been mapped on the state model.
Nokia: No, the state model does not reflect all possible states in its present form.
NTT DoCoMo: DCCH and CCCH can utilise unacknowledged mode and the proposal has not considered this possibility.
Ericsson: The interaction between the FE-s is incomplete.
Telia: Pointed out that the UTRAN side RRC sub-layer architecture figures, where in contradiction with the UTRAN architecture and protocol termination points. An editors note, to this effect, was included in the figure text of the UTRAN side RRC sub-layer architecture figure, which was included in YY.31.

The following was decided following the comparison between td 20 and td 58:
- multiple SAP-s with the NAS and the RFE, as proposed in td 58 were adopted, which corresponded to the current understanding in SMG12.
- The SAP-s with the RLC layer were left as in td 20, i.e. three separate SAP-s with appropriate connections between the functional entities and the SAP-s.
- Separate architectures will be shown for the UE and the UTRAN sides.
- The TME function from td 20 will be used with appropriate connections from the FE-s to the RLC SAP-s
- Connection between FE-s will not be shown.

Td 34 (Ericsson):   UE measurements – RRC elementary procedures

Clarifications and comments:
LGIC: What filter was proposed to use in measurement type and quantity.
Ericsson: This level of detail had not been discussed yet.
Vodafone: Would the type of services affect the measurement reports?
Ericsson: The type of reporting depends on the different requirements (e.g. is periodic reporting needed or not).
Chairman: In UMTS the measurements should be defined in more general way as the operators will be able to decide how frequent and what measurements will be done and the network should provide measurement opportunities to the UE. The proposal could be viewed as a starting point.
                 Which mode was proposed to be used?
Ericsson: The acknowledged mode was proposed but there is no restriction to use unacknowledged mode.
                 It is possible to have multiple measurements taking place simultaneously each having different identity number.
Chairman: How would the network know the UE capabilities?
Ericsson: UE-capabilities procedure could be used but there was no decision on this issue yet.

Siemens: Preferred not to restrict the type of possible measurements.
Chairman: Including further proposals is not precluded.

The proposal was approved.

Td 35 (Ericsson):   Cell and URA update – RRC elementary procedures

The proposal was in line with a previous proposal already agreed (td 36) and the document was approved.

Td 57 (Nokia):   Change and completion proposal to YY.31

Clarifications and comments:
Chairman: In which cases the UE capability enquiry would be used.
Nokia: In case of UE class mark change there could be UE capability change.
Chairman: Normally (in GSM) the UE class/capabilities information is sent once and it is known so there would not be need to measure.
Motorola: The procedure is available but not used in GSM.
Ericsson: Is the system information sent on the BCCH.
Nokia: System information could be sent separately on BCCH or DCCH.
Chairman: There are two cases for section 3. One is system information for a UE on a DCCH, which can be UE specific. The second case is system information sent on the BCCH to all listening UE-s.
Nokia: Direct transfer is shown only for uplink as an example but the proposal is for bi-directional.
Chairman: Regarding section 5 - Currently the understanding is that radio access bearer is mapped on radio bearers, which is mapped on physical channel.
Nokia: The RRC SAP provides the radio bearer. The RAB is provided by the NAS and the AS is responsible for radio bearers.

Decision:
Section 2 was withdrawn from the proposal.
Section 3 will be split in two cases: system information on (a) DCCH and (b) BCCH.
Section 4 was approved with minor rewording.
Section 5 to be renamed into "radio access bearer and signalling link reconfiguration".

Td 38 (Ericsson):   Parameters for Radio Access Bearer procedures

Clarifications and comments:
Chairman: Action Time is a global parameter (compared to RNTI, which is a UE parameter). This should be indicated.
Lucent: The UL Scrambling code could also be used for RAB set-up.
Chairman: The start of Section 2 should be modified to indicate that the proposed parameters are for RRC elementary procedures in general. ("… for Radio Access Bearer Control." – delete)

Td 53 (NTT DoCoMo):   Classification of RRC Parameters

Clarifications and comments:

Ericsson:　　How is the cell identity used. Is it necessary to have the cell ID in the RRC message.

NTT DoCoMo:　　Radio Link ID is temporary. Agreed that with a DL scrambling code cell ID might is not necessary. The length of the cell ID has not been decided.

Alcatel:　　There might be necessary to change the UL scrambling code in RRC connected mode.

Discussion of td 38 and td 53:

"RAB parameters" becomes RAB and signalling link parameters. Section 3.1.5 will be modified to Logical Channel ID: This parameter is used to distinguish logical channels, which are multiplexed in MAC.

Nokia:　　The RLC PDU size may not be needed as it could be derived (using the MAC header). A note will be added to the parameter definition.

Lucent:　　TFC set covers TF set.

Chairman:　　One is a superset of the other but they are different.

Philips:　　UL FAUSCH signalling code and UL FAUSCH time offset should be included.

Ericsson:　　TCH ID and Physical Channel ID is enough to determine the UE state.

Decision:

RAB parameters:　　Include the bullets from td 38 plus 3.1.2 and modified 3.1.5 from td 53. In RAB ID "(or logical channel)" to be deleted. TCH ID (3.2.8 in td 53) to be added.

TCH parameters:　　include TF Set, TFC Set, TFC Subset and TCH Identifier (combined from both documents).

Frequency param.:　　include 3.3.1.1

UL radio resources: from td 53 take 3.3.2.1, 3.3.3.4 and the proposal by Philips regarding FAUSCH (above).

DL radio resources: from td 53 take 3.3.3.6 and 3.3.3.7, add 'time slot' parameter.

UE parameters:　　from td 53 take 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and add 'Activation time' (suggested by Nokia)

Td 68 (Philips):　　CR to YY.21 and YY 31 to include FAUSCH specific details

Clarifications and comments:

Chairman:　　it should be indicated that the proposed changes apply only when FAUSCH is used.

The document was approved.

4.5.2　Documents related to the RLC sub-layer.

Td 15 (Fujitsu):　　Proposed Primitives between RLC and higher layers

Clarifications and comments:

MU is the same as SDU

Philips:　　IU contains configuration parameters and as it is included in the RLC-establish primitives does it mean that RLC configures and establishes the link? Does it also suggest that there are no separate RLC-configure and RLC-establish primitives?

Fujitsu: Yes.

Chairman: There is no need for RLC-Establish as after RRC is established then RLC configured by RRC

NTT DoCoMo: It is considered necessary as the procedure could be need before the RRC connection is established.

Ericsson: How to report on RLC - AM DATA

Fujitsu: It is assumed that confirmation is not necessary.

Chairman: Use confirmation of the primitives instead of the 'response' column in Table 8.1-1.

Decision:

The last three primitives from Table 8.1-1 were accepted with the corresponding text with 'confirmation' noted FFS.

Td 31 (Ericsson): RLC protocol states

Clarifications and comments:

Chairman: It was already agreed that there is no need for RLC-Establish/Configure. This will also eliminate some states in the RLC protocol state diagram. In YY.01 the RRC Establish also configures the Layer 2 signalling.

Ericsson: There was no strong opinion on whether to keep those primitives. The YY.01 does not preclude the RLC Establish procedures. The proposed mechanism is to have the RRC configuring wihle the RLC BGN and BGAK provides a kind of hand-shake procedure.

Nokia: The discussion should allow the parameters to be agreed with FFS notes and then consider what information need to be exchanged and then decide which parameters are necessary.

NTT DoCoMo: The reason for having establishment primitives could be the need for exchange control information at RLC level [?]

Nortel: Why there is no exit from transparant state?

Ericsson: It is assumed that there is exit from every state to the Null state, which was not shown.

Chairman: There should be separate protocol machines for each of transparent, ACK and NACK modes.

NTT DoCoMo: The state machines for ACK and NACK modes should be integrated.

Chairman: The state machines for the two modes are independent, hence should be separate.

Decision:

The document was noted and further contributions will be considered before including in the RLC Specification.

Td 30 (Ericsson): The ARQ function of the RLC

Clarifications and comments:

NTT DoCoMo: Why only single STAT messages for 2 different purposes.

Ericsson: The contents of the PDU-s are the same.

NTT DoCoMo: The two types of the STAT messages have different information content. The requested STAT only detects the missing message while the other type of STAT identifies all missing messages.

Motorola:	Why has the proposed ARQ scheme been selected? Is the use of other schemes precluded? Some schemes could perform better in different channel conditions.
Ericsson:	Ericsson studies have shown Selective Repeat is better than Go-Back N. There seems to be no advantage in using Go Back N if the protocol machine already uses Selective Repeat.
Motorola:	Disagreed to limit the type of ARQ to Select Repeat only.

Decision:

Accept the proposal to allow the standard to have a polling mechanism and unsolicited feedback.

Use of other types of ARQ will not be precluded.

The presentation of documents on RLC was stopped for lack of time. It was agreed to continue the presentation of RLC contributions during the TSG-RAN WG2 meeting (20 – 22 Jan. 99).

4.5.3 Documents related to the MAC sub-layer.

Td 28 (Ericsson):   MAC PDU Formats

Clarifications and comments:
Multiple PCCH channels were proposed for multi-cast services.

Td 70 (Nokia):   MAC PDU Formats
The following differences in comparison with td 28 were pointed out:
- The C/T and the T fields form td 28 are combined into one T field with a variable length.
- The UE-id is different depending on the C/D filed.
- The UE-id is included in the CCCH header.

Clarifications and comments:
Chairman:	The long and short RNTI in the UE-id field have not been discussed.
Nokia:	It is proposed to decide in the present discussion or refer to the UE-id in a more abstract way without specifying the type of RNTI.
Siemens:	Supported the T field flexibility provided by the Nokia proposal.

Decision on td 28 and td 70:
- The common parts of the two contributions were approved.
- The combined C/T and T fields into one field proposal in td 70 was approved as a C/T field without specifying a semi-static length.
- The use of UE-id was agreed with a note that RNTI is one type of UE-id and others are possible.
- The UE-id on the CCCH was left FFS.

Td 23 (Siemens):   Contribution to the UTRA UE MAC state machine

Clarifications and comments:
Ericsson:	What is meant by SCH, BCH finished in Figure 1?
Siemens:	Decoding of SCH and BCH is sufficient to go to MAC IDLE state.
Alcatel:	It is not clear why SCH would be different for FDD and TDD and is it needed at all above L1.

Ericsson:	The current understanding in the L1 EG is that the SCH for FDD and TDD has been harmonised, hence there is no longer difference which requires the existence of a SCH control channel at L2 and L3.
Chairman:	is it necessary to read the BCH to go to MAC IDLE or synchronisation on the cell is sufficient.
Ericsson:	It was not clear why there should be separate IDLE and ACTIVE state.
Chairman:	There are disagreements with the proposed model. The MAC could be presented as a very simple machine (e.g. ON/OFF states). It could be described as routing for the receiver and scheduling for the transmitter.

Decision:
The document was noted and the discussion will be continued, when further contributions are submitted.

Td 40 (Nokia):   MAC-Model Change Proposal
Proposed to add a TB size selection block in the MAC-d part of the MAC model to resolve a problem with the current model.

Clarifications and comments:
Motorola: How will the scheduling in MAC-sh affect the variable size selection.
Chairman: The selection of the RLC PDU determines the TB size, so it will be left only to select the TB set size.

Decison:
Add a note on the MAC model highlighting the issues and continue the discussion at a later stage.

5.   Proposed additions of new features on permanent documents (AI 7)

Td 72 (Ericsson):   Motivation for the padding and concatenation in RLC
The document was presented in connection with td 33.

Clarifications and comments:
Chairman: The document contains some principles, which should be reflected in the L23 EG permanent documents.

The conclusion in the document for updating YY.01 and YY.02 accordingly was approved.

6.   Liaison and output to other groups (AI 10)

Td 56 (Alcatel):   LS to SMG2 UMTS-L1 EG [proposed]
Alcatel presented the LS.

Clarifications and comments:
Editor YY.01   the text for Case A should be updated according to YY.01. The meaning of "L23 has interest in both cases" needs additional clarification.
Chairman: Possible clarification: There may be a number of UE-s using the same DSCH but having either case A or case B signalling mode.
Nokia: the L23 question (end of RACH section) needs to be more explicit

The LS was approved with modifications as document td 73

<u>Td 54 (Vodafone):</u>   Proposed LS to SMG12 [SMG1]

Clarifications and comments:
Ericsson: Refer Idle mode and Connected mode more explicitly. "Service selection" is not clear.
Chairman: The meaning of "network performance" is not clear.
Vodafone: Network performance refers to parameters, which are controlled by the operator for particular set of services

Proposed modifications:
- Change Service selection to cell selection
- Radio access mode selection based on both subscription and UTRAN criteria or radio criteria only.

The LS was approved with modifications as document td 74.

The approved permanent documents will be submitted to SMG2 plenary meeting #29 (25 – 29 January 99) and to the 3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 meeting (20 – 22 January 99).

YY.01 v103 (td 59):   approved
YY.02 v120 (td 60):   the latest modifications (in td 19) have been accepted already. It was agreed that if at the next meeting (TSG-RAN WG2) there is no information showing why the SCCH is needed as a TCH at L2 and L3 it will be removed.
YY.03 v040 (td 61):   approved with small corrections
YY.04 v030 (td 62):   approved
YY.21 v007 (td 63):   approved
YY.22 v060 (td 64):   approved
YY.31 v020 (td 65):   approved
YY.40 v010 (td 66):   approved
UMTS 25.XX v013 (td 67):   approved

Documents YY.21 YY.22 and YY.31 will be updated with any additional off-line changes according to the discussions at the meeting before their submission to the first TSG-RAN WG2 meeting (by 20 Jan. 99). agreements on padding earlier in this meeting to be included in YY.21 and YY.22.

The approved L23 EG permanent documents will be presented without change marks to SMG2.

7.   Any other business

Td 71 will be resubmitted by the L23 EG Secretary to TSG-RAN WG2 meeting (by 20 Jan. 99)

The Chairman announced the closing of the L23 EG activities and thanked the members for their work and contributions.

The Chairman also thanked the host Nokia and the sponsors Finnet Group, Sonera and the Telecommunications Administration Centre of Finland of the meeting for the excellent support and working conditions.

The meeting was closed.