

SOURCE: Japan
TITLE : Consideration on error correction functionality in
H.222.1/AAL
PURPOSE: Discussion

1. Introduction

Necessity of error correction functionality in H.222.1/AAL is not clear yet. At Paris meeting, it was agreed that this necessity should be discussed based on network QOS scenarios. This document clarifies what range of error correction functionality is necessary for each scenario.

2. Network QOS scenarios

Cell loss ratio (CLR) and bit error ratio (BER) for each network scenario are shown in Table 1 [1].

Table 1 Performance Parameters Assumption

	Worst case	Average case	Best case
CLR;Cell loss ratio	10**-6	10**-9	10**-11
BER;Bit Error Ratio	10**-5	10**-7	10**-9

3. Mean Error Free Time (MEFT)

MEFT is the key parameter to decide the necessity of error correction. METF is derived from the following equations.

MEFT from cell loss ; $MEFT (sec) = P / (R * CLR)$

MEFT from bit error ; $MEFT (sec) = 1 / (R * BER)$

where R ; user information bitrate (bits/sec)

P ; 376 (bits/cell) that is user information length of one cell. AAL type 1 is assumed.

METF is calculated for the value of R being 6 Mbits/sec. The results are shown in Table 2. Based on table 2, it becomes clear that bit error correction is mandatory even if network QOS is of the best case. On the other hand, cell loss correction is not necessary except for the worst case.

Table 2 Mean Error Free Time

	Worst case	Average case	Best case
from cell loss	64 sec	64000sec=17hours	6400000sec=1700hours
from bit error	1/60 sec	1.5 sec	2.5 min.

note; If cell losses and bit errors occur consecutively, MEFT becomes longer.

4. Alternatives for error correction method

- Case 1 ; AAL type 1 short interleaver [I.363.x]
 This case can cope with the cell loss.
- Case 2 ; 4 bytes Reed Solomon (RS) for 255 bytes frame
 (RS is not aligned to either of both TS packet or cell boundary)
 case 2-1 ; RS frame with synch. byte
 case 2-2 ; Structured data transfer (SDT) is used for indication of RS frame boundary.
- Case 3 ; 4 bytes Reed Solomon (RS) for 188 TS packet
 case 3-1 ; Sync. byte in TS packet is used for indication of the RS frame.
 case 3-2 ; RS frame and cell are aligned. One bit user information in ATM header is used for indication of the RS frame.
- Case 4 ; RS and CRC for 47 Transport packets [2].

Table 3 Several alternatives for error correction method

	AAL	H.222.1 specific for error correction*1	CBR/VBR layering *3
case 1	Type 1 short interleaver	none	OK/?*2 good
case 2-1	Type 1	RS frame with sync. byte	OK/?*2 good
case 2-2	Type 1 SDT	RS frame without sync. byte	OK/?*2 bad
case 3-1	Type 1 / Type 2?	RS	OK/?*2 ?*4
case 3-2	Type 2? including RS	none	OK/OK good
case 4	Type 1 interleaver RS/CRC	none	OK/?*2 good

*1 ; Other functionalities such as jitter removal are out of consideration.

*2 ; VBR operation may be supported under minimum bitrate constrained.

However, it should not be called as AAL type 1.

*3 ; Layering "good" means that upper layer can work without lower layer functionality, such as synchronization.

*4 ; RS and sync. byte is not AAL. Therefore, layering between AAL and H.222 is good. However, layering between H.222.0 (sync. byte) and H.222.1 specific (RS) is not good.

Case 1;

```

+-----+
| PS/TS bitstream |      H.222.0 PS/TS
+-----+
===== AAL-SAP (Service Access Point)
          -SDU = Byte/bit stream

```

AAL Type 1 short interleaver generic AAL

Case 2-1;

```

+-----+
| PS/TS bitstream |      H.222.0 PS/TS
+-----+
===== H.222.1 specific-SAP
          -SDU = Byte/bit stream

      255 byte
<----->
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
|sync.|PS/TS |RS|sync.|PS/TS |RS|  H.222.1 specific (sync.+RS)
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
===== AAL-SAP
          -SDU = Byte/bit stream

```

AAL Type 1 generic AAL

Case 2-2;

```

+-----+
| PS/TS bitstream |      H.222.0 PS/TS
+-----+
===== H.222.1 specific-SAP
          -SDU = Byte/bit stream

      255 byte
<----->
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| PS/TS   |RS| PS/TS   |RS|  H.222.1 specific (sync.+RS)
+-----+-----+-----+-----+
=====|=====| AAL-SAP
          *               *   -SDU = Byte/bit stream with
                               structure

```

AAL Type 1 structure data transfer generic AAL

Case 3-1;

```

+-----+
|sync.| TS packet |      H.222.0 TS
+-----+
===== H.222.1 specific-SAP
          -SDU = TS packet

      188 byte
<----->
+-----+-----+-----+
|sync. TS packet |RS|  H.222.1 specific (RS)
                      RS sync. rely on TS sync..
+-----+-----+-----+
===== AAL-SAP
          -SDU = Byte/bit stream

```

Type 1 / Type 2? generic AAL

Case 3-2;

```

+-----+-----+
|sync.| TS packet |
+-----+-----+
=====|=====
*                               *
188 byte                        AAL-SAP
                                -SDU = 188byte (TS packet)

<----->
+-----+-----+-----+
|sync.  TS packet |RS|
+-----+-----+-----+

+-----+ +-----+ +-----+ +-----+ 1bit user-user information in
|cell.| |cell | |cell | |cell | ATM header is used to indicate
+-----+ +-----+ +-----+ +-----+ the position of RS.

Type 2?                          Specific AAL

```

Case 4;

```

-----+-----+-----+-----
|sync.| TS packet |
-----+-----+-----+-----
=====|=====
*                               *
47 TS                             -SDU = 47 TS packets

47 TS packets are mapped on
the interleave matrix.

Type 1 interleaver RS/CRC        Specific AAL

```

5. Consideration on AAL type 5

AAL type 5 is one of the alternatives for audiovisual communication. However, if error correction functionality is necessary, it may not be good solution to use AAL type 5. The reason is that the error correction (H.222.1) after the error detection (AAL type 5) at the receiving side is ridiculous.

AAL type 5;

```

+-----+-----+
|    PS/TS    |
+-----+-----+
=====|=====
*                               *
+-----+-----+-----+
|    PS/TS    |RS |
+-----+-----+-----+
H.222.1
Bit error correction

=====|=====
*                               *
+-----+-----+-----+
|    PS/TS    |RS | |CRC|
+-----+-----+-----+
generic AAL type 5
Error detection

=====|=====
*                               *
AAL type 5 -SAP
-SDU = RS frame?

```

6. Conclusion

The necessity of error correction functionality is discussed. Based on the network QOS scenarios assumed at the Paris meeting, it becomes clear that bit error correction is mandatory even if network QOS is of the best case. On the other hand, cell loss correction is not necessary except for the worst scenario. Several alternatives for error correction are shown.

References

- [1] AVC-635 ; ATM performance assumptions (Experts Group), Paris, 1994.3
- [2] AVC-658 Annex ; A study of the interaction with the AAL for the ATM transmission of TS packets (Japan), Grimstad, 1994.7