produced on: 05/04/2002 09:25:16

page 1 of 9

| Nr. of error report | Test step name            | Version | Problem   | Comment from MCC Task 160  | Done date  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---------|---|--|------------|
| 020008              |                           |         |   |  |            |
|                     | ts_RRC_SetUpRAB_UM_15_RLC | v1.1.0  | ts_SS_RB_TM_Cfg_RLC( p_CellId, 366, tsc_RB_UM_15_RLC) shall be ts_SS_RB_TM_Cfg_RLC( p_CellId, 1344, tsc_RB_UM_15_RLC).  | Accepted - v120 - Done - The simulated AM payload size is 1336 bits, and the UM header size is 8 bits. The configured TM payload size must be equal to the sum of these values = 1344 (and equal to the transport block size)  | 07/02/2002 |
| 020009              |                           |         |   |  |            |
|                     | ts_AT_OrgPS_Call          | v1.1.0  | The AT-command CGDCONT is wrong in the TTCN code. Quatation marks is missing around string parameters and "," signs are missing. It should be (tcv_AT_Cmd :=o_ConcatStrg( o_ConcatStrg( "AT+CGDCONT=1,""IP"",""", o_ConcatStrg (o_ConcatStrg ("ABCDEF",""","""), "200.1.1.80")), """,0,0 <cr>"))</cr> | Accepted - v120 - Done   | 22/01/2002 |
|                     | ts_AT_SetQoS              | v1.1.0  | Line1: There is one too many parameter in the list. According to the header description field there are three '64's before the omit on 'gaurented bit rate dl', but on line 1 there are four.   | Accepted - v120 - Done   | 07/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_InitVariables          | v1.1.0  | why is ts_InitVariables used twice? (Both in ts_RRC_InitVariablesCS and in ts_RRC_InitVariables)  | Accepted - v120 - ts_InitVariables should be deleted from ts_RRC_InitVariables as it is used in ts_RRC_InitVariablesCS and ts_RRC_InitVariablesPS. ts_InitVariables shall be kept in ts_RRC_InitVariablesCS and ts_RRC_InitVariablesPS, because these two steps could be called from a test case to force a CN domain. | 07/02/2002 |

produced on: 05/04/2002 09:25:16 page 2 of 9

| Nr. of error report | Test step name                 | Version | Problem  | Comment from MCC Task 160   | Done date  |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|---|------------|
|                     | ts_RRC_ConnEst_DCH_MT_TMSI     | v1.1.0  | Row 7: ts_SS_CPHY_SyncReceive is redundant - the default RRC_DefConnEst will take care of sync signalling. ts_SS_CPHY_SyncReceive is also setting verdicts on the sync signalling which I think is not correct because the CPHY stuff is internal signalling in the SS and should not fail or pass the UE. My suggestion is to remove the ts_SS_CPHY_SyncReceive from RLC suite and on row 7 put START t_T312 instead. Then in the default RRC_DefConnEst on row 8 put ?TIMEOUT t_T312 instead of the RETURN statement (no need to return to the test case if there is no sync) and maybe have a final verdict Inconclusive on this row and on row 7 as well to end the test case. | Accepted - v120 - The step ts_SS_CPHY_SyncReceive has been removed in all RRC connection established steps. The usage of the timer T312 is not necessary because we have a T_Guard timer started at the beginning of each test case. In addition, T312 checks the reception of the downlink transmission in UE. | 07/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_DCH_64k_CS | v1.1.0  | Table 6.10.2.4.1.13.1.1.1 in 34.108 says TFS 0x640 or 2x640. Shouldn't this be declared as numberOfTbSizeList { zero : NULL}, and a bit further down, numberOfTbSizeList { small : 2} which should represent 0 and 2 times 640?  | Object name: c_DCH_640_TFS - Accepted - v120 - Done   | 22/01/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_DCH_64k_CS | v1.1.0  | The rlc_Size is octetModeType1: sizeType2 {part1 11, part2 2} is not correct   | Object name: c_DCH_640_TFS - Accepted - v120 - Done   | 22/01/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_DCH_64k_CS | v1.1.0  | The second time numberOfTbSizeList appears it should have the value { small : 2} instead of { one : NULL}, all according to 34.108 table 6.10.2.4.1.13.1.1.1. The detailed comments should be changed accordingly  | Object name: c_DCH_640_TFS - Accepted - v120 - Done   | 06/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_DCH_Speech | v1.1.0  | Maybe do a check on the RRC transaction identifier   | Object name: cr_RB_RelCmpl - Accepted - v120 - Done - renamed to cr_108_RB_RelCmpl  | 06/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_DCH_Speech | v1.1.0  | transmissionRLC_Discard is set to timerBasedNoExplicit : dt100 while in "Contents of RADIO BEARER SETUP message: AM or UM" in 34.123-1 it says "Not Present"   | Object name: c_RLC_InfoTM_Def - Accepted - v120 - Done  | 06/02/2002 |

produced on: 05/04/2002 09:25:16 page 3 of 9

| Nr. of error report | Test step name              | Version | Problem  | Comment from MCC Task 160  | Done date  |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------|--|--|------------|
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_FACH_PS | v1.1.0  | rlc_SizeList is set to allSizes while in "Contents of RADIO BEARER SETUP message: AM or UM" in Annex A in 34.123-1 it says Explicit.   | Object name: c_RAB_InfoListFACH_PS - Accepted - v120 - Done  | 06/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_FACH_PS | v1.1.0  | logicalChannelIdentity is tsc_FACH2 which is 14. In<br>"Contents of RADIO BEARER SETUP message: AM or<br>UM" in Annex A in 34.123-1 it says 6  | Object name: c_RAB_InfoListFACH_PS - Closed - This field is set to 'Not present' in v410.  | 06/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_FACH_PS | v1.1.0  | there is a line looking like this:rb_Identity tsc_RB_BCCH_FACHand when analysing in Tau 4.3.3 it points out an error on this. tsc_RB_BCCH_FACH has the value -3 while the RB_Identity is of INTEGER (132).   | Object Name: c_RB_AffectedlistSRB_FACH - Accepted/Closed - This constraint has been removed, because the corresponding field in the default message contents is omitted in v410.   | 07/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_FACH_PS | v1.1.0  | mac_LogicalChannelPriority is set to 1 while in "Contents of RADIO BEARER SETUP message: AM or UM" in Annex A in 34.123-1 it says 6  | Object name: c_RAB_InfoListFACH_PS -<br>Accepted - v120 - Done   | 06/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SetUpRAB_UM_15_RLC   | v1.1.0  | Line 1 could be removed, ts_SetTmpCellInfo is inside ts_RRC_InitSecurityIE_RAB as well.  | Closed - In this example we can agree, the line 1 is a redundant test step. But at the moment we are not sure if in the future the step is called without security initialization. We think it is more secure to keep line 1. When a step is using tcv_TmpCellInfo, the step ts_SetTmpCellInfo shall be called beforehand. | 07/04/2002 |
|                     | ts_SendSIB1                 | v1.1.0  | There is an example of a SIB and what should be the result when this is PER encoded. The resulting bitstring lacks three bits in the beginning telling which of the three OPTIONALs in the SIB that are OMITted or used. The bitstring should start with '111' | Object name: o_SIB_PER_Encoding -<br>Accepted - v120- Done   | 07/02/2002 |

produced on: 05/04/2002 09:25:16 page 4 of 9

| Nr. of error report | Test step name   | Version | Problem  | Comment from MCC Task 160  | Done date  |
|---------------------|--|---------|--|--|------------|
|                     | New name in v110:  ts_SS_PCH_FACH_CCCH_Cfg / Old name in v106:  ts_SS_PCH_FACH_CCCH_Cnfg | v1.1.0  | There seem to be 2 contradicting constraints included for the CMAC_Config_Req (contraint ca_CMAC_CfgInfo): - c_TrChInfoPCH_FACH has 3 elements including one for mapping the Common Transport Channel TFS (constraint c_FACH_TFS) to the transport channel with trChId = tsc_FACH1 c_TrLogMappingPCH_FACH2 includes 2 logical channel mappings with only 1 element including the mapping for RBs tsc_RB_BCCH_FACH and tsc_RB0 to only 1 transport channel with trChId = tsc_FACH2. | Accepted - v120 - The constraint c_TrLogMappingPCH_FACH2 was wrong. We should have a mapping for tsc_FACH1 and not tsc_FACH2. In tsc_FACH1 only CCCH is mapped. To make it clearer the constraint has been renamed to c_TrLogMappingPCH_FACH_CellDCH.  | 04/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_GMM_ServiceRequest  | v1.1.0  | In the constraint ciphKeySeqNo must be ? Instead of * (M not O)  | Object Name: cr_ServiceRequest - Accepted - v120 - Done  | 05/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_ConnEst   | v1.1.0  | integrity result ? Instead of * (M not O)  | Object name: car_Rrc_ConnSetupCmpl -<br>Accepted - v120 - Done   | 05/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_DCH_Speech   | v1.1.0  | in this constraint the IE nonCriticalExtensions is set to ? instead of *. *.   | Object name: cr_RRC_RB_SetupCmpl -<br>Accepted - v120 - Done - renamed to<br>cbr_108_RB_SetUpCmpl  | 12/12/2001 |
|                     | ts_SendDefSysInfo  | v1.1.0  | aich_PowerOffset = pCellInfo.powerAICH - pCellInfo.powerpCPICH AICH_PowerOffset range is - 225; powerpCPICH is of type DL_Tx_Power_PCIPCH, range -6030, default -60; powerPICH is of type DL_Tx_Power, range -3515; With the powerpCPICH default the pich_PowerOffset can take a value in the range from 25 to 75. This range is out of the valid range for aich_PowerOffset.  | Object name: cb_SIB5_Def - cb_SIB6_Def - Accepted - v120 - The calculation comes from 25.331 clause 10.3.6.3 for AICH power offset and clause 10.3.6.50 for PICH power offset. But, the default values provided in the ATS are wrong. The default value of pixit px_PowerAICH has been updated and a new pixit has been created px_PowerPICH with default value -65. The comments in the constraints have been reviewed as well. | 05/02/2002 |

produced on: 05/04/2002 09:25:16 page 5 of 9

| Nr. of error report | Test step name   | Version | Problem  | Comment from MCC Task 160  | Done date  |
|---------------------|--|---------|--|--|------------|
|                     | ts_SendDefSysInfo  | v1.1.0  | pich_PowerOffset = pCellInfo.powerPICH - pCellInfo.powerpCPICH PICH_PowerOffset range is - 105; powerpCPICH is of type DL_Tx_Power_PCIPCH, range -6030, default -60; powerPICH is of type DL_Tx_Power, range -3515. With the powerpCPICH default the pich_PowerOffset can take a value in the range from 25 to 75.This range is out of the valid range for pich_PowerOffset. | Object name: cb_SIB5_Def - cb_SIB6_Def - Accepted - v120 - The calculation comes from 25.331 clause 10.3.6.3 for AICH power offset and clause 10.3.6.50 for PICH power offset. But, the default values provided in the ATS are wrong. The default value of pixit px_PowerAICH has been updated and a new pixit has been created px_PowerPICH with default value -65. The comments in the constraints have been reviewed as well. | 05/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_SS_CreateCellDCH  | v1.1.0  | The presence or absence of the powerOffset in TFCS is not consistent in all TFCS constraints   | Object name: Constraints of type TFCS - Accepted - v120 - The value of the powerOffset is now passed as parameter, then the following rule has been followed:In messages sent to UE: UL powerOffset contains a value, DL powerOffset is omitted In ASPs sent to SS: UL powerOffset is omitted, DL powerOffset contains a value.  | 04/02/2002 |
| 020011              |  |         |  |  |            |
|                     | New name in v110: ts_GMM_ldleUpdated / Old name in v106: ts_PS_ldleUpdated | v1.1.0  | IE 'Equivalent PLMNs' is not coded in ATTACHACCEPT, and ROUTINGAREAUPDATEACCEPT PDUs   | Object name: ATTACHACCEPT and ROUTINGAREAUPDATEACCEPT - Accepted - v120 - Done   | 10/01/2002 |
|                     | ts_GMM_ServiceRequest  | v1.1.0  | IE 'PDP context status' is not coded in ROUTINGAREAUPDATEREQUEST and SERVICEREQUEST  | Object name: ROUTINGAREAUPDATEREQUEST and SERVICEREQUEST - Accepted - v120 - Done  | 16/01/2002 |
|                     | ts_MM_Authentication   | v1.1.0  | As per sub-clause 10.5.3.2.2. of TS24.008, the size of 'Authentication Failure Parameter' is 16 octets. But, in 'RRCv110.mp' file it has been coded as 18 octets. This IE is used in PDU 'Authentication Failure'.   | Object name: AuthFailParam - Accepted - v120   | 10/01/2002 |

produced on: 05/04/2002 09:25:16 page 6 of 9

| Nr. of error report | Test step name                 | Version | Problem   | Comment from MCC Task 160   | Done date  |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|---|------------|
|                     | ts_RRC_ConnEst                 | v1.1.0  | In constraint 'cbs_108_RRC_ConnSetup' in IE 'RBmappingInfo', IE 'rlc_SizeList' is coded as 'allSizes', according to 34.108 it should be 'configured'. | Object name: cbs_108_RRC_ConnSetup -<br>Accepted - v120 - Done  | 06/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_ConnEst                 | v1.1.0  | The ASP type definition in TTCN V 1.1.0 is different from the 34.123c110 document approved at the Cancun meeting                                      | Object name: RLC_UM_DATA_REQ> uM_message - Accepted - v120 - Done - there were some garbage in the 4 ASP definitions mentioned in TTCN V110. However, there is no further consequence in TTCN V110. | 14/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_ConnRel                 | v1.1.0  | In the test step ts_RRC_ConnRel The RRC connection release message is to be recieved tcv_N308+1 times. But it is being recieved only 1 time           | Rejected - v120 - The receipt of the RRC connection release message is checked once in the step, then the repetition is handle in the default step: RRC_DefConnRel                                  | 07/01/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_SendRB_SetUp_DCH_Speech | v1.1.0  | The ASP type definition in TTCN V 1.1.0 is different from the 34.123c110 document approved at the Cancun meeting                                      | Object name: RLC_AM_DATA_REQ> aM_message - Accepted - v120 - Done - there were some garbage in the 4 ASP definitions mentioned in TTCN V110. However, there is no further consequence in TTCN V110. | 14/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_SendSIB1                    | v1.1.0  | The ASP type definition in TTCN V 1.1.0 is different from the 34.123c110 document approved at the Cancun meeting                                      | Object name: RLC_TR_DATA_REQ> tM_message - Accepted - v120 - Done - there were some garbage in the 4 ASP definitions mentioned in TTCN V110. However, there is no further consequence in TTCN V110. | 14/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_SS_CreateCellDCH            | v1.1.0  | RLC size for DCCH's mapped on DCH (trch id 5) is given as 148, in place of 144  | Object name: c_DCH_148_TFS - Accepted - v120 - Done   | 06/02/2002 |

produced on: 05/04/2002 09:25:16 page 7 of 9

| Nr. of error report | Test step name       | Version | Problem   | Comment from MCC Task 160   | Done date  |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------|---|---|------------|
|                     | ts_SS_CreateCellDCH  | v1.1.0  | Multiple RLC sizes are not allowed for Transport channels which carry Logical Channels with RLC mode being AM. If done so, the INVALID_CONFIGURATION set to TRUE and ultimatelyresults in failure of test case. Reference section 8.6.5.1 of 25.331. In TTCN for DCH with Transport Channel id 5, the RLC sizes 0 X 144 and 1 X 144 (presently in TTCN 148 as reported in Bug 6) is being coded as two entries with size 144 and number of PDUs 0, and 1 respectively. It needs to be combined in one entry in the set. | Object name: Constraints of type DedicatedTransChTFS - Accepted - v120 - Done   | 06/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_SS_CreateCellDCH  | v1.1.0  | The ASP type definition in TTCN V 1.1.0 is different from the 34.123c110 document approved at the Cancun meeting  | Object name: CMAC_Config_REQ>CmacConfigReq> trCHInfo> dlconnectedTrCHList>transportChannelInfo -Closed - v120 - it was taken as a TTCN work assumption. Another similar proposal was approved during the Cancun meeting. This proposal was implement in V120. | 14/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_SS_CreateCellDCH  | v1.1.0  | The ASP type definition in TTCN V 1.1.0 is different from the 34.123c110 document approved at the Cancun meeting  | Object name: CPHY_TrCH_Config_REQ> CphyTrchConfigReq>dlconnectedTrCHList>transportChannelInfo - Closed - v120 - it was taken as a TTCN work assumption. Another similar proposal was approved during the Cancun meeting. This proposal was implement in V120. | 14/02/2002 |
|                     | ts_SS_RB1_To_RB4_Cfg | v1.1.0  | The ASP type definition in TTCN V 1.1.0 is different from the 34.123c110 document approved at the Cancun meeting  | Object name: CRLC_Config_REQ> CrlcConfigReq - Accepted - v120 - Done - there were some garbage in the 4 ASP definitions mentioned in TTCN V110. However, there is no further consequence in TTCN V110.  | 14/02/2002 |

produced on: 05/04/2002 09:25:16 page 8 of 9

| Nr. of error report | Test step name  | Version | Problem   | Comment from MCC Task 160   | Done date  |
|---------------------|-----------------|---------|---|---|------------|
|                     | ts_CheckUE_Idle | v1.1.0  | This test step pages a UE and expects the UE to react. However, the parameter tcv_InitialUE_Identity is initialized to px_IMSI_Diff, and therefore the UE paged is different from the expected one. The parameter has to be adjusted.   | Accepted - v121 - Done - A new constraint c_UE_IdDefIMSI has been created to be used as default for tcv_InitialUE_id  | 25/03/2002 |
| 020017              |                 |         |   |   |            |
|                     | ts_IdleUpdated  | v1.1.0  | If NAS messages are sent by a test case and these messages are followed by an RRC Connection Release it is necessary to delay the sending of the RRC Connection Release because this message would arrive earlier than the NAS messages resp. the NAS message would not be forwarded by lower layers. To be kept in mind that the NAS test steps emulate RRC behaviour, therefore the ATS has to account for the described problem. Example: ts_MM_IdleUpdatedSpecial with IMSI. As in this example the ATC does not expect a NAS message back from the UE, the Location Updating Accept does not arrive at the UE side, because the RRC Connection Release takes precedence. This is a general problem for all releases following NAS sending activities !!! | Accepted - v121 - A delay of 1 second is implemented in the step ts_RRC_ConnRel before sending the RRC CONNECTION RELEASE msg.  | 25/03/2002 |
|                     | ts_RRC_ConnRel  | v1.1.0  | UEs are expected to send a number of RRC Release Complete messages upon one RRC Release received. The test cases expect only the first RRC Release Complete, and continue. As a consequence the repeated RRC Release Complete messages are received in circumstances where they have to be ignored properly. This is currently not achieved by the existing default test steps. All RRC default test steps, the UT default test step and others have to be updated to handle the "superfluous" RRC Release Complete messages.   | Accepted - v121 - All RRC CONNECTION RELEASE COMPLETE messages shall be received in the RRC step behaviour (ts_RRC_ConnRel and po_ConnectionAndSS_Rel ) or in the test case behaviour. The default RRC_DefConnRel shall not be used any more. | 25/03/2002 |

produced on: 05/04/2002 09:25:17 page 9 of 9

| Nr. of       |                |         |         |                           |           |
|--------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------------------------|-----------|
| error report | Test step name | Version | Problem | Comment from MCC Task 160 | Done date |

This report contains:

Number of problems: 39 Completed problems: 39