

Report on test step L2M problems - v105

produced on: 07/03/2002 15:17:11
page 1 of 6

Nr. of error report	Test step name	Version	Problem	Comment from MCC Task 160	Done date
010001					
	ts_ReconfigureRAB_To_SRB	v1.0.5	--> Line 7: c_TrLogMapping_PchFach1 : Channel ID confused	Accepted - v106 - TTCN and TS34.123-3 have been aligned	14/11/2001
010004					
	po_ConnectionAndSS_Release	v1.0.5	Row 11: to make a tcv_N308 based loop or let the default RRC_Default01 take care of it	Accepted - v110 - The default RRC_Def1 has been updated and two new defaults have been created : RRC_DefConnEst (to be used during an RRC connectio establishment) and RRC_DefConnRel (to be used during an RRC connection realease)	14/11/2001
	ts_AT_TriggerGMM_Detach	v1.0.5	The comment field states that the teststep does an ATTACH	Accepted - V110	14/11/2001
	ts_BCH_SCH_CPICH_Config	v1.0.5	Spelling error in the Objective and Comments header field Objective and Comments has same input	Accepted - v110 - The step has been renamed to ts_SS_BCH_SCH_CPICH_Cfg	14/11/2001
	ts_CellConfig	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Comments and Description field. Comments not mapped to line numbers or Test Step numbers and badly described. Detailed Comments Line 6: exists no CPHY_INIT primitive, but a local test step called It_CPHY_Init	Accepted - v110 - Done. This steps has been renamed to ts_SS_CellCfg	14/11/2001
	ts_CellConfig	v1.0.5	"Comments/Detailed Comments not mapped to line numbers or Test Step numbers and badly described including spelling and grammatical errors Detailed Comments Line 6: exists no CPHY_INIT primitive, but a local test step called It_CPHY_Init"	Accepted - v110	14/11/2001

Report on test step L2M problems - v105

produced on: 07/03/2002 15:17:11
page 2 of 6

Nr. of error report	Test step name	Version	Problem	Comment from MCC Task 160	Done date
	ts_CellDependentPara	v1.0.5	Is this test step necessary? These things are taken care of by a TSO's. If necessary, at least change the qualifiers from [p_CellID = 0] to [p_CellId = tsc_CellA] and so on	Accepted - v106 - Already done - This step is used to set cell information in the SYSINFO messages to be broadcasted.	14/11/2001
	ts_ChangeMIB_ValueTag	v1.0.5	It seems redundant to have two tcv's with exactly the same contents: tcv_MIB.mib_ValueTag := tcv_MIB_ValueTag	Accepted - v110 - tcv_MIB_ValueTag is deleted	14/11/2001
	ts_ChangeMIB_ValueTag	v1.0.5	row 2 : tcv_MIB_ValueTag := (1+ tcv_MIB.mib_ValueTag) MOD 8 + 1 i.e remove the '1+'. This line should increase the tcv_MIB_ValueTag by one but here it is by two. It should say: tcv_MIB_ValueTag := (tcv_MIB.mib_ValueTag) MOD 8 + 1 i.e remove the '1+'.	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_CPHY_ActivationTime	v1.0.5	Remark on row 3: tcv_TGCFN := (tcv_FrameNumber+(256-4)) MOD 256) is assuming a TTI of 40. It could be better to have an input parameter for the TTI. The formula is (Current CFN + (256 - TTI/10msec)) mod 256	Accepted - v110 - The tti value is passed as parameter	14/11/2001
	ts_CreateCell_DCH	v1.0.5	Only partially commented in Detailed Comments	Closed - Not in our current priority working list.	14/11/2001
	ts_CRLC_Release	v1.0.5	Error in Comments field in Test Body - should NOT read "release radio bearer 0" - change to "release radio bearer"?	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_InitVariables	v1.0.5	Comments to describe tcv assignments would be good to have. Some of the tcv's are not commented within them selves	Accepted - v110	14/11/2001
	ts_PCH_FACH_CCCH_Config	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Comments and Description fields	Closed - Not in our current priority working list	14/11/2001

Report on test step L2M problems - v105

produced on: 07/03/2002 15:17:11
page 3 of 6

Nr. of error report	Test step name	Version	Problem	Comment from MCC Task 160	Done date
	ts_RACH_CCCH_Config	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Comments and Description fields	Closed - Not in our current priority working list	14/11/2001
	ts_RACH_CCCH_Config	v1.0.5	c_Rach_TFS states "turbo"-coding in Test body, but should read convolutional as stated in detailed Comments and ref. [4] clause 6.10.2.4.4.1.1.1	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_RB_BCCH_BCH_Config	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Comments and Description fields	Closed - Not in our current priority list	14/11/2001
	ts_RB_PCCH_Config	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Comments and Description fields	Closed - Not in our current priority list	14/11/2001
	ts_RB0_Config	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Objective and Description fields	Accepted - v110	14/11/2001
	ts_RB1_To_RB4_Config	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Objective and Description fields	Accepted - v110	14/11/2001
	ts_RelSRB_SecurityOffSS	v1.0.5	Spelling error in Objective header field. Change of Comments in Test Body (?)	Accepted - v110	14/11/2001
	ts_RRC_ConnRel	v1.0.5	Wildcard used in receive statement for structured type in cbr_RRC_RrcConnRelCmpl on line 24 in cabr_RrcConnRelCmpl_Um	Rejected - It is allowed to use wildcard in received ASN.1 constraints	14/11/2001
	ts_RRC_Security	v1.0.5	Wildcard used in receive statement for structured type in cbr_RRC_RrcSecModeFail on line 25.	Rejected - It is allowed to use wildcard in received ASN.1 constraints	14/11/2001
	ts_RRC_Security	v1.0.5	Wildcard used in receive statement for structured type in cbr_RRC_RrcSecModeCmpl on line 21	Rejected - It is allowed to use wildcard in received ASN.1 constraints	14/11/2001
	ts_SaveCellInfo	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Comments and Description fields	Closed - Not in our current priority working list	14/11/2001

Report on test step L2M problems - v105

produced on: 07/03/2002 15:17:11
page 4 of 6

Nr. of error report	Test step name	Version	Problem	Comment from MCC Task 160	Done date
	ts_SendDefSysInfo	v1.0.5	Line1 and 3 has the same behaviour - ts_SetTmpCellInfo (p_CellId) - One of them should be remove	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB1	v1.0.5	row 13: Should have a verdict 'I'.	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB1	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: "3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB1	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: "2. ..shall be one or two.." should be changed to "2. ..shall be one.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB11	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: "3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB12	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: "3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB16	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: "3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB18	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: "3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB2	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: "3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001

Report on test step L2M problems - v105

produced on: 07/03/2002 15:17:11
page 5 of 6

Nr. of error report	Test step name	Version	Problem	Comment from MCC Task 160	Done date
	ts_SendSIB3	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: 3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB4	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: 3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB5	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: 3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB6	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: 3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SendSIB7	v1.0.5	Detailed comments field: 3. ..info for first segment.." should be changed to "3. ..info for the segment.." 4. ..and sentto.. into "4. ..and sent it to.."	Accepted - v106	14/11/2001
	ts_SetCellConfig	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Comments and Description fields	Closed - Not in our current priority working list	14/11/2001
	ts_SetTmpCellInfo	v1.0.5	Spelling error (acscs) in the header Comments field. NOTE : Programmer could very well be female (he). No input in Comments fields in Test Body	Accepted - v110	14/11/2001
	ts_SetTmpCellInfo	v1.0.5	Test Step header input is missing in the Default and Description field.	Accepted - v110 - The same default as SS shall be used	14/11/2001
	ts_SS_ResetRLC_SRB	v1.0.5	No Comments, Description or Objective in TS header	Accepted - v110	14/11/2001

020014

Report on test step L2M problems - v105

produced on: 07/03/2002 15:17:12
page 6 of 6

Nr. of error report	Test step name	Version	Problem	Comment from MCC Task 160	Done date
	ts_RRC_PagType2	v1.0.5	In ts_RRC_PagType2 in I2mv023 ,the PagingType2 is sent on TM PCO,instead of AM.	Accepted	16/11/2001
	ts_SendRB_SetUp_FACH_PS	v1.0.5	In test step ts_SendRB_SetUp_FACH_PS RB setup message is sent with IE 'RRC state indicator' is set to CELL_DCH	Accepted - v106	16/11/2001
	ts_SendRB_SetUp_FACH_PS	v1.0.5	In test step ts_SendRB_SetUp_FACH_PS mapping UL_DTCH on RACH in SS is missing	Accepted - Now the complete configuration of SS is done in ts_CreateCell_FACH	16/11/2001
	ts_SendRB_SetUp_FACH_PS	v1.0.5	ts_RAB_set_up_CELL_FACH_PS :-> cb_RAB_infolist_FACH_PS RLC mode is UM. According to Annex 34.123-340 it should be AM for A6 condition.	Accepted - v106	16/11/2001

This report contains:

Number of problems: 47

Completed problems: 47