TSG-RAN Working Group 2 (Radio layer 2 and Radio layer 3)   R2-000583
Torino, IT, 28 Feb – 3 March, 2000

Title: **Concerning proposed changes to RAN2 CPCH model and use of CSICH**

Source: **TSG-RAN WG2**

To: **TSG-RAN WG1**

Cc: **TSG-RAN WG3**

Contact: Joe Kwak
Golden Bridge Technology
Joekwak@mcs.net
+1 630-739-4327

RAN2 has discussed R2-000552 from Nokia and would like to inform RAN1 of its decision concerning the request to modify the RAN2 CPCH model in TS25.303 contained in this contribution. For reference, find attached R2-000552.

In the attached contribution, Nokia proposes a solution to the "false mobile" problem which may occur in the Channel Assignment (CA) mode of CPCH operation when an incorrect CA message is received at the UE. The proposed solution consists of modifying the CSICH information to send the available PCPCH channel status instead of the maximum available data rate status. The information about the availability of each PCPCH channel is then used to confirm the validity of the CA message which is received as part of the CPCH access protocol. This confirmation may decrease the probability that this "false mobile" condition occurs. However, by removing the maximum available data rate status from the CSICH, the RAN2 model for CPCH is modified. RAN2 sees no need for such a modification of the CPCH model.

RAN2 would like to suggest that if RAN1 determines the need to include PCPCH availability information in the CSICH, that it does so by adding PCPCH availability information to the status information which is normally broadcast on the CSICH for CA mode of CPCH operation. This additional status information may then be optionally broadcast with little change to the existing CPCH model.

If this additional CSICH option can be supported by RAN1, RAN2 requests an immediate reply from RAN1 so that RAN2 may modify the Layer 2 and 3 specs to include such an option in Release 99.

In addition, RAN2 has some concerns regarding R2-000563:
1. Using the PCPCH availability status to confirm the validity of the CA message may imply some new timing requirements at the UE and new constraints on CSICH broadcast at the Node B. The current view is that the CPCH status information is changing constantly and information received in one access slot may not be correct in the next access slot.
2. If CPCH status information is used to confirm the validity of a CA message, the UE response to the condition when the status information conflicts with the CA message would need to be clearly specified, including any time constraints.

RAN2 thanks RAN1 in advance for a quick reply on this matter.