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Motivation for the ID

- To bridge the two communities
  - “Internet/TCP People”
  - “2.5/3G Radio Link People”
On the WG LAST CALL, several comments raised:

- Section 3.2 : Applications
- RLC description against 3GPP RRC
- BDP (Bandwidth Delay Product) for 2.5G/3G networks
- Split TCP
- Other comments
Section 3.2 : Applications

- **Comment:**
  - Inadequate description

- **Action Taken**
  - Removed entire Section 3.2.
  - Revised concise description is added to Section 1, “Introduction”, as an applicability statement.
Reorganize Section 2 “2.5G3G Link Characteristics”

- RLC description against 3GPP RRC
- BDP for 2.5G3G networks
RLC description against 3GPP RRC

- Comment: “Section 2 description of W-CDMA contradicts 3GPP RRC (3GPP 25.331)”

- 3GPP specification is broad and thus specific implementation is inevitable

- In the new revision, clear distinction between 3GPP and implementation will be emphasized
BDP (Bandwidth Delay Product) for 2.5G/3G networks

Comment:

- “link BDP tends to large” is vague.
- “I wonder if there is any information which covers the BDPs of a range of such (2.5G/3G) services”

Action taken:

- Experiment with FOMA
- Open for suggestion
Summary of Reorganizing Section 2

- Clear distinction between 3GPP spec and specific implementation

Outline

- Brief desc. of Link ARQ
- Brief desc. of 3GPP spec for W-CDMA
- Implementation example
  - (Typical) RTT
  - (Typical) BDP
Split TCP(1)

Comment:

“Does this ID really advocate ‘careful’ Split TCP as an IETF recommended approach?? “

Background:

Split TCP discussed in the context of “Lager Initial CWND”
Split TCP(2)

- Initial CWND > 2 is effective for long latency channels
  - This draft does not attempt to recommend Split TCP
    - “PEP” RFC discusses pros and cons of Split TCP
    - Initial CWND > 2 is discussed in RFC2414
      - But, experimental
  - Recommendation (statement in section 3.1.2):
    - RFC2581: initial cwnd=2 is recommended and STD
    - Deal with initial cwnd>2 (up to 4380Bytes) as experimental
      - Leverage PEP device feature, in accordance with “PEP” RFC.
      - Accelerate RFC2414 for STD track (as written “Open Issues”)
        - “Proposed STD” soon!
Various other comments

- Thank a lot for LOTS of Editorial comments! Very helpful!
  - We hope it is fixed now.
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