## TSG-RAN Working Group 1 New York, U.S.A., 12 – 15 October 1999

TSGR1#8(99)f71

TSG-RAN Working Group 2 (Radio layer 2 and Radio layer 3) Malmö, Sweden, September  $20^{\rm th}$  to  $24^{\rm th}$  1999

TSGR2#7(99)D32

Agenda Item: 20

Source: RAN2

Title: liaison statement to WG1 on measurement naming

**Document for:** Decision

## 1 Introduction

Since, measurements are specified in several working groups,

- WG1 specifying measurement definitions
- WG2 and WG3 specifying measurement signalling and control
- WG4 specifying measurement precision requirements

It is essential that naming and understanding of all measurements are aligned between the groups. It is important that there is a one-to-one mapping of a measurement in one group to the same measurement in the other groups.

Current assumption in our WG2 specifications is that the measurement as such also defines what should be measured, e.g. CPICH  $E_{\text{c}}/I_{\text{0}}$  or DPCH SIR. This is also the case in the WG4 specifications. However, that is not the current situation in the WG1 specifications and that could lead to some confusion since measurements are defined in WG1.

## 2 Proposal

In order to get better alignment of measurements between WG1 and WG2, it is proposed that the attached liaison statement is sent to TSG-RAN WG1.

## TSGR2#7(99)XXX

TSG-RAN Working Group 2 (Radio layer 2 and Radio layer 3) Malmö, Sweden, September 20<sup>th</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> 1999

**Source:** TSG-RAN WG2

To: TSG-RAN WG1

Title: Proposed liaison statement on measurements

WG2 has identified that there is a difference in the principle of naming the measurements between the WG1 and the WG2 specifications. Since, measurements are handled in several working groups it is beneficial if naming and meaning of measurements are aligned between the groups. This would facilitate the continuing work and discussions on measurements.

WG2 therefore asks WG1 if it is possible for WG1 to reconsider the naming of the measurements. It would be good if measurements are named and structured in such a way that there is a direct mapping between the naming of the measurement and the physical channel where the measurement shall be performed. In that way it will not be necessary to send a parameter in the measurement control message to state on which physical channel the measurement shall be made. This would then be inline with the current assumption within WG2.