TSG-RAN Working Group 1(Radio) meeting #3
NYNÄSHAMN, Sweden 22-26, March 1999

TSGW1#3(99)3

Agenda Item:

Source: **Temporary Secretary**

Title: **Meeting minutes**

Document for:

Minutes for 3GPP RAN-TSG 3rd WG1 Meeting

Meeting start: March. 22nd,
Day 1, start 9.00

1. Opening of the meeting by vice chairman Takehiro Nakamura

2. Selected Adhoc group meetings (Day 1 9:30-12:30 & 13.30 –18.00 & 19:00-22:00+)
Morning: Adhoc 1, 5, 12
Afternoon: 4, 14
Evening: 3, 6, 11

Day 2. Start 9.15

3. Opening of the plenary meeting

Chairman Antti Toskala starts plenary meeting

4. Assignment of secretary

Andreas Wilde (Ericsson) temporary secretary for this meeting.

5. Approval of agenda. Approved.

6. Report from ad hoc groups

Ad Hoc 1: TDD
Adhoc report 228 presented by Siemens. Report approved.
(TDocs: 228, 229, 159, 161, 163, 167, 166, 169, 165)

General Clarification: Basic procedures ready until April 99, Advanced features ready until December 99.

TDD Text proposals:

SCH/CCCH: 161: T_offset (1/32 frame) and T_gap have to be defined soon. To be added to S1.23. Approved. 159: Informative annex for S1.21. Approved.

DTX: 229: (Panasonic) one scheme will be used only. Approved.

TPC scheme: 163: (Ericsson) add worst case 2 sync slots/frame. Approved.

HO preparation: 167: cross check according to FT ok. (Nortel) much descriptive text in this document. (Vodafone) how is the case of multiple GSM target cells handled? Text proposal will be updated by Siemens and approved together with S-doc.

DCA: 166: (Nokia) is FER better than BER measurement/estimation? (Nortel) Measurement reporting is a higher layer issue and thus more related to WG2. Add editors comments. Update this text proposal and include in S1.31. To be approved in S1.31.

RACH: 169: Added editors note regarding RACH capacity. Only intra-slot interleaving is used. No timing advance is used. Some overlapping to subsequent slot is possible, but effect is negligible (Siemens) cell size: 2km radius (small), 3.8 km (large). Approved.

Network Synchronization: 165: To be discussed later.

Ad Hoc 5: Channel Coding
Adhoc report 234 presented by HNS. All documents were presented with short Q/A periods. No new conclusions. Tdoc 201 was also presented in Adhoc 4. Adhoc 5 will continue Wednesday evening. Report approved.

Ad Hoc 7: Field Structure
Adhoc report 158 presented by NEC. Table 1 to be included in S1.11. Approved.

Ad Hoc 8: Handover:
Adhoc report 199 presented by FT. Physical meeting during WG1#3. (Nortel) align terminology with S1.31. Approved.

Ad Hoc 10: Spreading & Scrambling
Adhoc report 214 presented by Panasonic. (Mannesmann) question on code shortage by using different codes for sectors. No serious limitation on code planing. Long discussion on technical impact of using time offsets visa different scrambling codes for sectors. Timing offsets are recommended not to be used in the network. Approved.

Ad Hoc 3 : RACH
Adhoc report 241 presented by Ericsson. (Nokia) decoding of BCCH should be avoided (text will be added to the report). (Vodafone) what are emergency call requirements related to AICH? To be handled in next RAN meeting. Figure 1 to be included in S1.11 with editors note on timing values. Approved. Updated report: Tdoc 244.

Ad Hoc 4: Multiplexing and channel interleaving
Adhoc report 216 presented by Siemens. Drafting group meets Wednesday morning to specify simulation parameters for channel interleaver comparison. (Nortel) requests to remove statement in section 3 about better performance of MIL; text will be deleted. (Nokia) Table item 5: Blind rate detection should be FFS (FDD and TDD). (Nortel) requests more information from TSG-SA WG4 (codec group). Text proposals for S-documents will be prepared. Approved. Updated report: Tdoc 243.

Ad Hoc 6: Tx Diversity
Adhoc report 142 presented by Motorola. Text proposals to be included. Approved.

Ad Hoc 9: Power Control:
Adhoc report 181 presented by Nortel. No answers from WG4 yet. (Omnitel) asks for the rationale of having 0.5 dB as minimum PC step size optional; no conclusion. Maximum step size (multiple of minimum step size) FFS. Long discussion about Panasonic proposal on ASPC (151). SSDT discussion. Doc 219 (Fujitsu) will try to clarify SSDT. (Vodafone) question on min/max values for PC; (Nortel) there are min/max values. Liason to WG4 to be prepared during this meeting. Report approved.

Ad Hoc 11: Physical layer capabilities
Adhoc report 245 presented by CSELT. Discussion on Tx diversity and SSDT in this report. (Item on Tdoc 233). (Mitsubishi) comment on testability of mandatory UE capabilities on Tx Div. and SSDT when those capabilities are optional in the network. (Mitsubishi) question on impact of TSG-T liason. (Chairman) TSG-T is more interested in service dependent capabilities. Discussion on milestones especially towards test and verification (WG4). Liasons will be discussed separately later. Approved. Updated report: Tdoc 255.

Ad Hoc 12: Cell Search
Adhoc report 237 presented by DoCoMo. (TI) comment on parameters. (Shinsegi) clearification on simulation model. Approved. Updated report: Tdoc 257.

Ad Hoc 13: Specification Structure
Not discussed.

Ad Hoc 14: Packet mode operation
Adhoc report 240 presented by Motorola. (Ericsson) fast power control benefit for packets over several frames should be further specified to 5 or more frames. (Fujitsu) overhead of common visa dedicated channel to be included. Small changes to the text proposal. Approved. Updated report: Tdoc 258. Approved.

(Nortel) presents Tdoc 252 (LS to TSG SA WG4). Approved.

Day 3. Start 9.00

6. Input from other groups

CPCH: Liason document 172 from WG2 was presented by GBT. On CPCH concept. This should be discussed in Adhoc 14.

Hybrid ARQ: Liason document 269 from WG2 was presented by chairman. Random Access: Is identical FDD/TDD payload on RACH possible? Specify current payload for TDD and FDD and study further (Interdigital proposal for TDD). Impact of hybrid ARQ type II/III on L1? (Siemens) Tdocs 177 and 178 available. (Nortel) additional signaling necessary. (Chairman) Current L1 functionality does not support hybrid ARQ. (Panasonic) Tdocs from WG1#2 have not been presented yet. (Panasonic) will draft the liason statement.

Terminal Capabilities: Liason document 256 from TSG-T2 presented by Samsung. Principles for continued work with UE capabilities. Adhoc 11 to draft an answer. Mention joint TSG meeting for coordination. (DoCoMo) requested revising the Adhoc 11 results to take into account this liason; general opinion is that Adhoc 11 output is valid also taking the liason into account.

7. Report on the S1.xx documents produced by the editors, version approval.
   Changes during the presentation of the S-documents will result in a new version V1.0.x. Final approval of S-documents in this meeting will result in Vx.1.1.0 version. (Except S1.31 which is raised

from V0.0.2 to V0.1.0 because it was generated by merging S1.15 and S1.25 after TSG RAN).

7.1 S1.01 Physical layer – general description

V1.0.2 (157) presented by editor. Comments on naming of documents; agreed. Approved with change. New version V1.1.0.

7.2 S1.02 UE capabilities

V1.0.2 (265) was discussed in Adhoc 11 on Thursday and not approved. (See below)

7.3 S1.11 Transport channels and physical channels (FDD)

V1.0.3 (271) presented by editor. (Nortel) asked about the status of AICH timing; an editors note will be added stating that AICH timing is still under discussion. (Philips) commented that FAUSCH should be in square brackets also in the channel mapping figure (section 6). Approved with changes. New version V1.1.0. New name: "Physical Channels and mapping of Transport Channels onto Physical Channels".

7.4 S1.12 Multiplexing and channel coding (FDD)

V1.0.2 (260) presented by editor. (Nokia) CRC initial value sentence was deleted by mistake; accepted. (Nokia) uplink puncturing should be allowed (P=0.2); accepted. (Nokia) limit for using turbo coding on DCH (including 32 kbps or not) needs to be clarified in Adhoc 5; accepted. (Lucent) editorial comment on turbo coding section (4.2.2.2); accepted. (Siemens) asked about text from Adhoc 14; this should be discussed in the next Adhoc 14 meeting (Thursday?). (Nokia) last bullet in section 4.2.9 is inadequate, (Ericsson) first bullet in section 4.2.9 is inadequate; Adhoc 4 should provide adequate text proposal, responsibility Ericsson. Otherwise approved, final approval after inclusion of comments and changes.

7.5 S1.13 Spreading and modulation (FDD)

V1.0.2 (261) presented by editor. (Ericsson) remove editors note for short scrambling code (section 6.3.2.3); accepted. (Panasonic) Remove SF=1,2 from Table 1 according to Adhoc 7 conclusions; accepted. (TTA) requests to include deleted text in first paragraph of section 6.3.2.2; remains deleted. Otherwise approved, final approval after inclusion of comments and changes.

7.6 S1.14 Physical layer procedures (FDD)

V1.0.2 (263) presented by editor. (Ericsson) section 10 (Access control ... for Packet Data Transmission) should not be in this document; (Matsushita) this can be moved to WG2; will be moved to the Annex and this should be handled by WG2. Approved with change. New version V1.1.0.

7.7 S1.21 Transport channels and physical channels (TDD)

V1.0.2 (267) presented by editor. Editorial comment; agreed. Approved with change. New version V1.1.0.

7.8 S1.22 Multiplexing and channel coding (TDD)

V1.0.1 (268) presented by editor. (CSELT) Is slotted mode applicable for TDD ; (Siemens) applicable for high data rates (otherwise free slots are available anyway). (Chairman) what is the status of 7/8 coding rate in Table 6.2.2-1; conclusion is to add RACH to square brackets ([2/3, 7/8 for RACH]). (Siemens) section 6.2.4 (rate matching): remove sentence starting with "In this scheme ..."; agreed. (Nortel) keep editors note in section 6.2.3 (1st interleaving); agreed. Otherwise approved, final approval after inclusion of comments and changes.

7.9 S1.23 Spreading and modulation (TDD)

V1.0.1 (231) presented by editor. Approved. New version V1.1.0.

7.10 S1.24 Physical layer procedures (TDD)

V1.0.1 (230) presented by editor. Approved. New version V1.1.0.

7.11 S1.31 Measurements

V0.0.1 (182) presented by editor. (NEC) Include Nortel paper on WG1/2 worksplit; agreed. Approved. New version V0.1.0.

Report from TSG RAN (Antti Toskala) (Tdoc 286 - slides):

RAN chairman election. Version handling(TSG RAN 71/99). Official report: TSG RAN 174/99.

Approval of WG1#2 minutes (Tdoc 227):

Chairman presents changes to minutes. Approved.

Liason from WG2 regarding FACH requirements (Tdoc 287) was presented and noted.

Day 4, Start 9.00

9. New contributions (not part of merging process)

9.1 Transport channels and physical channels (FDD)

Tdoc 161 presented by LGIC. (Pilot patterns for Frame Synchronization).
(Siemens, Ericsson) why is this kind of frame synchronisation necessary? (LGIC) check sync status on all channels described and support sync in UL. (Nortel) frame sync based on pilot pattern was agreed from ARIB spec. (Ericsson) check necessity of this in respect of increasing number of slot formats. (LGIC) will study different number of pilot bits in UL (5-8/slot).

Tdoc 200 presented by LGIC. (Point-to-Multipoint DL Shared Common CH).
(Chairman) WG2 expects TFCI on Secondary CCPCH. (Ericsson) no necessity to define new physical channel. (Alcatel) are only mobiles with a call connection reached? (LGIC) currently yes. Will be further discussed in Adhoc 7.

Tdoc 210 presented by Nokia. (SF 512 in DL).
(Siemens) would UL shared channel be used in soft handover? (Nokia) rather not, but this has to be discussed further (Adhoc 14). SF 512 to be further discussed in Adhoc 7.

9.2 Multiplexing and channel coding (FDD)

Tdoc 61 presented by Panasonic. (Hybrid ARQ).
Tdoc 178 presented by Siemens. (ARQ techniques).
Tdoc 177 presented by Siemens. (Hybrid ARQ).
(Chairman) do the simulation results take into account limitations of the physical layer, i.e. limited buffer sizes? (Siemens) No.
Tdoc 296 presented by Siemens. (Hybrid ARQ).
(Nortel) Integrate ARQ coding box into existing coding boxes, do not use additional Transport Channels for ARQ.
Conclusion on Hybrid ARQ: Hybrid ARQ is currently not supported in L1. This is for further study (in Adhoc 4).

Tdoc 294 presented by Lucent. (Error floor turbo codes).
(Motorola) Does Circuit Switched Service require BER below 10E-6? Not clear. The requirement table should be checked by all.

9.3 Spreading and modulation (FDD)

Tdoc 205 presented by Ericsson. (New RACH preambles).
(Nortel) Effect on crosscorrelation? (Ericsson) crosscorrelation not so important, but will be studied.

(Interdigital) crosscorrelation is important, but the new codes probably have sufficient crosscorrelation properties. (Alcatel) Complexity? (Ericsson) store sequence in memory. Will be discussed in Adhoc 3. A text proposal should be provided until next meeting.

Tdoc 209 presented by Nokia.(New set of long codes for UL).
(Ericsson) Does the two dimensional selection of codes (m,n) mean that 10ms segments are used as different codes; (Nokia) yes. (Ericsson) is it guaranteed that different users do not use the same code for I and Q? (Nokia) yes. (Ericsson) IPR only on shift register generation? (Nokia) yes. Nokia will provide a text proposal until next meeting.

Tdoc 298 presented by Siemens. (Text proposal for S1.13 by editor). Accepted.

9.4 Physical layer procedures (FDD)

Tdoc 151 presented by Panasonic. (Adaptive Step Size Power Control).
Multilevel PC should be studied in Adhoc 9. Decision should be taken latest when the PC Milestone is due. Include information on this in liason on FACH to WG2.

Tdoc 152 presented by Panasonic. (Time Switched Transmit Diversity).
(Panasonic) will further study this and input results to Adhoc 6.

Tdoc 187 presented by Motorola. (Improvements to SSDT). (Nokia) Check low speed in respect of TPC errors. Discussion on general status of SSDT.

Tdoc 219 presented by Fujitsu. (Answer to 187). (Motorola) Average C/I measurement; (Fujitsu) not applicable. (Nortel) No agreement on interference broadcast. Further discussion in Adhoc 9.

Tdoc 191 presented by NTT DoCoMo. (Transmission stop and resumption control).
(Nortel) DCH is blocked from higher layer, thus shared channel seems to be better. (Nortel) impact on higher layer timers. (DoCoMo) Scheme will reduce the switching between dedicated to common or shared channels. (Nortel) difference to DTX? (DoCoMo) the difference is stopping also DPCCH. (Ericsson) this is not only Layer 1. (Siemens) Impact on Power Control? (DoCoMo) Some PC coordination is needed. (Siemens) are simulation results available to specify the time to stop/start transmission. (DCM) Several seconds non traffic possible, no data available on stop/start process time requirement. This should be further discussed in Adhoc 14. The status for S1.14 should be clarified until the next meeting.

Tdoc 242 presented by Alcatel. (Fast arbitration of radio resources for UL DCH).
To be discussed in Adhoc 14.

Liason to WG2:
Tdoc 303 presented by chairman. (Liason to WG2: Physical channel for FACH and issues related to multilevel power control). Accepted

9.5 Transport channels and physical channels (TDD): no input.
9.6 Multiplexing and channel coding (TDD): no input.
9.7 Spreading and modulation (TDD): no input.

Tdoc 156 presented by Bosch. (Joint Predistortion).
(Ericsson) how does this work with adaptive antennas? (Bosch) it works. (Ericsson) what do operators think about this? No comments from operators. Bosch will send more material on the reflector.

9.8 Physical layer procedures (TDD)

Tdoc 155 presented by Interdigital. (Combined Closed/Open-Loop PC).
(Siemens) what happens if one PC (open or closed loop) fails? (Interdigital) to be studied. (Siemens)

Cycle time? (Interdigital) 100 cycles/sec (worst case example). (Siemens) effect of joint detection? (Interdigital) simulation with optimal channel estimation. (Panasonic) switching open/closed loop is more appropriate than using both concurrently. To be further studied in Adhoc 1.

Tdoc 165 presented by Siemens. (TDD synchronization).
(Nortel) Current synchronization visa proposed scheme? (Siemens) different purpose; proposed scheme should reach neighbouring Node Bs. (Nokia) requirements (power of sync burst)? (Siemens) long correlation. (Nokia) requirement on phase stability. (Panasonic) only air interface sync? (Siemens) alternative or combined. (Panasonic) impact on standardisation? (Siemens) everything which is sent over the air interface should be standardised. (Nokia) could be included as informative. (Nortel) sync burst must be standardised if this should be used in the system. Further discussion in Adhoc 1.

Tdoc 186 presented by Motorola. (Tx Diversity for TDD).
(Nokia) user specific midamble? (Motorola) yes. (CSELT) WG4 matter. (Panasonic) standardization impact, mandatory in BS; UE does not depend on this functionality. (Nortel) how is user dependant selection done? (Motorola) no problem. (CSELT) higher delay possible? (Motorola) yes. (Ericsson) assignment of antennas? (Motorola) user can freely choose. (Nokia) channel estimation impact? (Motorola) results will be distributed. (Siemens) complexity in UE? (Panasonic) short/long preamble. (Motorola) can be used with short preamble. To be discussed further in Adhoc 1.

10. Output to other groups
Tdoc 306 presented by Interdigital. (Response to WG2 liason on RACH payload). Accepted.

9.8 Physical layer procedures (TDD)

Tdoc 148 is an update for Tdoc 192 and was not presented. (Interdigital: New burst structure for TDD RACH).

Tdoc 289 presented by Vodafone. (ODMA Routing).
Tdoc 292 presented by Vodafone. (Routing Control Information in ODMA Relay Node).
(Panasonic) requested information on sleep patterns for UE. Noted.

9.9 Measurements: no input.

Day 5, Start 8.15

10. Output to other groups

Tdoc 313 presented by Panasonic. (Liason statement to WG2 on Hybrid ARQ). Approved.

Tdoc 309 presented by Motorola. (Draft LS to WG2 on USCH). Approved (Tdoc 315).

Tdoc 270 presented by Nokia. (LS to WG2 on TX Diversity). (CSELT) BCCH broadcast capacity? (Nortel) Do not ask WG2 if there is enough room on BCCH. Approved.

Tdoc 311 presented by Nortel. (Draft LS to WG4 on clarification of CLPC assumptions).
(Panasonic) comment on variable step size text.

11. Other business

Discussion about meeting LAN and availability of documents. (Siemens) strong critics on working procedure about document availability. (DoCoMo) strong critics on meeting facilities. Goal for the next meeting is to make documents available 2 hours before discussion starts.

6. Report from ad hoc groups (cont'd)

Adhoc 8 report (Tdoc 307) presented by France Telecom. Approved.

Tdoc 254 presented by Nokia. (Providing relative timing information between UTRA cells).
Text proposal approved.

Tdoc 293 presented by Nokia. (2nd Revised text proposal from “Handover from UTRA to GSM” –paper).
Agreed by Nokia and Mitsubishi. (FT) UL slotted mode not mandatory to be reflected in S1.12; accepted text proposal changed (Section 2.3 p.4: "When slotted mode is used for both UL and DL the same slots are idle also the uplink slots are delayed compared to the downlink."). (Nortel) For dual receiver only UL slotted mode is used; agreed. (FT) t_margin value should be in square brackets "[200us]"; accepted. New text proposal will be provided by Nokia.

Adhoc 11 report (Tdoc 317) presented by CSELT. Small editorial change included in new Tdoc 324. New Tdoc approved. S1.02 will be changed to R1.xx.

Tdoc 316 presented by CSELT.(Draft LS on UE Physical Layer Capabilities).
(DoCoMo) how to deal with fundamental physical layer features (2nd paragraph); need guidance from TSG-T2. (Vodafone) WG1 has to define those features. (Mannesmann) the liason text reflects yhe Adhoc discussion. (Telia) LS is ok. (DoCoMo) ask TSG-T2 for solutions; not agreed. (Interdigital) split the LS into two parts and change mandatory to essential. (Vodafone) do not agree to essential. A short offline discussion follows. One sentence is added to the 2nd paragraph. New LS document is Tdoc 323 and is approved.

Tdoc 322 updated to Tdoc 325. (Corrected reference only).

Adhoc 5 report (Tdoc 319) presented by HNS.
(Lucent) Conclusion from Tdoc 189 is not reflected in the report, several comments to report; the text announced by Lucent is included in Annex 1 of this meeting minutes. (Nortel) Puncturing conclusion ... (Panasonic) Adhoc 4 guidance requested on puncturing patterns also for ARQ schemes. (Nortel) Adhoc 5 discussion currently limited to rates 1/3 and 1/2; explicit list needed. Workplan on interleaver for BER 10E-3 to 10E-6. (Lucent) BER below 10E-6 should be studied. Adhoc 5 will meet on Sunday (April 18th) in Japan. (Nokia) text proposals for interleavers for next meeting; yes. (CSELT) milestone for coding and interleaving. (Vodafone) if no conclusion on next meeting this should be raised to RAN. Revised report will be distributed on the reflector.

Adhoc 14 report (Tdoc 321) presented by Motorola.
(Alcatel) Title of Tdoc 242 is not correct in the report; further discussion on WG2 reflector; accepted.
Approved.

Tdoc 320 presented by GBT. (Response to the liason letter from WG2 on the CPCH concept).
(Ericsson) change "WG1 will continue on the refinement of..." to "WG1 will continue on the studies of ...". New Tdoc 326 with change is approved.

Tdoc 314 presented by Nortel. (Liason answer from TSG SA WG4 on speech services).
Noted. To be taken into consideration. Possibly have a joint meeting in the future.

Remaining S-Documents:

S1.12 V1.0.3 (275) presented by Fujitsu. Approved and raised to V1.1.0 (Tdoc 276).

S1.13 V1.0.3 (277) presented by Siemens. Approved and raised to V1.1.0 (Tdoc 278).

S1.22 V1.0.3 (281) presented by Nokia. Approved and raised to V1.1.0 (Tdoc 282).

7.12 Report from Nortel on study items document R1.01 V0.0.1 (Tdoc 312).
(Siemens) New TFCI scheme missing. Noted.

Adhoc 13: (Panasonic) what happens in this Adhoc? (Ericsson) FFS; should be a forum to discuss document structure on the reflector.

8. Work plan
Meeting schedule and mapping of the milestones.
Procedure for next meeting:
Physical Adhoc meeting planed for the next meeting on Sunday April 18th so far: 1, 5, 14.
Text proposals will be discussed and approved on Day 1 (Monday). In the evening of Day 1 the S1-documents will be edited to include the text proposals and then distributed. The S1-documents will be approved on Day 2 (Tuesday).
Deadline for input papers to the next meeting: Wednesday April 14th 16:00 CET.

Next meetings:

WG1#4 April 18-20 (Adhocs 18.4.), Host: Panasonic, Japan
WG1#5 June 1-4 (Adhocs 1.6.), Host: TTA (to be confirmed)
WG1#6 July 12-16, Host: TBD
WG1#7 August 31 - September 3, Host: TBD
WG1#8 October 12-15, Host: TBD
WG1#9 November 30 - December 3, Host: TBD

Closing (Day 5, closing 14.40)

==========

Annex 1: Lucent's comments on Adhoc 5 report at plenary section on Friday, March 26, 1999, Sweden

Puncturing

Regarding Lucent's results, with the proposed rate matching algorithm before this meeting, shows different behaviour of what in this report is presented. We don't see in Adhoc 5 report the Lucent's observations presented in Monday (see Tdoc. TSGR1#3(99)189).

The sentences "No consensus was reached on this point," is misleading. We beleive a proper description should be we continue to work with the established algorithm(s) for puncturing.

The HNS here is reporting: "… god performance without an evident error asymptote." In the range of in which the simulation results are performed there is not the position of the error floor and therefore this sentences is incorrect. In addition, the algorithm for rate matching should be established first for crosschecking the performance.

Lower data rates/High quality of services

The first sentence in this section is questionable, since the QoS are not specified enough well, and the number of iterations used by HNS is low. Many times we already presented that for small interleaver block sizes 100 iterations can be performed with the present technology. We also show that, by increasing the number of iterations the gain of SCCC is higher then PCCC.

To speed up the evaluation process for low quality services we made a proposal in Tdoc. TSGR1#3(99)295 which was presented at Adhoc 5. This issue is also not mentioned in the Adhoc 5 report. Therefore, this issue will be rise immediately on reflector for discussion.

We are not agree with the report, since the sentence "There was no agreement regarding this proposal" (i.e., Lucent presented a proposal to use SCCC for all data rates, block sizes and QoS), since it was not discussed under a clear strategy, since the QoS are misunderstand or misinterpreted.

More again: There is reported "Lucent presented simulation data for the independent Rayleigh channel and proposed that SCCC be accepted as the working assumption for data services requiring highest QoS (BER<10^{-6}). This proposal was also not agreed." We are concerning about such observation from the Chair, since our document TSGR1#3(99)294 presented in Wednesday at midnight was not discussed at all. It was reason for presenting this document yesterday on the plenary session.

We are concerning too why the simulation results from Lucent performed on independent Rayleigh fading channel and presented in TSGR1#3(99)294 are not reported in the report.

It seems we continue to push forward a working assumption for QoS between 10^{-3} – 10^{-6}. We would like to remember that in ETSI proposal for ITU four different classes are specified, namely, Class A, B, C and D. There you will find the established services and rates which required BER<10^{-3} and BER<10^{-6} for A, B and C, and BER<10^{-8} for D. Similar numbers you will find also for CDMA2000.

Regarding all this observations and comments and disagreement with the Adhoc 5 report we would like to express our concern that Adhoc 5 group is driven so much from interleaver point of view and not the code itself. We are worrying too about the established performance measure for evaluating the interleavers, since only the range 10^{-3} – 10^{-6} will be considered. We showed in the evening Adhoc 5 session and yesterday at the plenary session that the error floor of PCCC is just below BER<10^{-6}, and degradation between BER<10^{-6} – 10^{8} are significant for PCCC comparing with SCCC, since PCCC has the error floor and SCCC not.

If we keep this evaluation process for the interleaver, i.e., the code selection, based on observation BER<10^{-3} – 10^{6} we are going to disregard services for which a BER<10^{-6} is required.