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# Introduction

This email thread discusses the SRVCC core part and performance part in agenda 6.10.1 and 6.10.2.

List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round:

* 1st round: Invite companies to review CRs, and provide comments. If no comment is received for a CR, it will be recommended to be agreed in the summary for the 1st round.
* 2nd round: TBA

# Topic #1: SRVCC test case

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2006986](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_95_e/Docs/R4-2006986.zip) | Ericsson | Endorsed CR R4-2005333 without further changes |
| [R4-2006987](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_95_e/Docs/R4-2006987.zip) | Ericsson | Endorsed CR R4-2003097 without further changes |
| [R4-2007755](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_95_e/Docs/R4-2007755.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Endorsed CR R4-2005334 without further changes |

## Open issues summary

Please directly provide comments for each CR in section 1.3.2.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2006986 | Huawei: ok to agree the endorsed CR |
| Nokia: Although the CR is technically ok, we have some general comments:  We think the term “inter-RAT UTRAN FDD” should be used rather than “inter-RAT UTRAN” in the title of subclause 6.6.5.1, in the test purpose and in the headers of all tables.  Title: “SA NR - UTRAN FDD event-triggered reporting in non-DRX in FR1”  Test purpose (first paragraph):  “inter-RAT UTRAN FDD measurements”  “inter-RAT UTRAN FDD neighbour cell”  Table headers: “…SA inter-RAT UTRAN FDD event triggered reporting”  Then, a clarification should be done related to T2 in subclause A.6.6.5.1.2. In fact, the start of time period T2 is not explained in the description, only implicitly given in the table. We propose to add the following marked text in the description of subclause A.6.6.5.1.2:  “The UE shall send one Event B1 triggered measurement report for Cell 2 to the PCell, with a measurement reporting delay less than 2.4s from the start of period T2, i.e. when Cell 2 becomes detectable. The measurement reporting delay…” |
|  |
| R4-2006987 | Huawei: ok to agree the endorsed CR |
| Nokia: Ok to agree the CR |
|  |
| R4-2007755 | Ericsson : OK to agree endorsed CR |
| Nokia: Although the CR is technically ok, we have some general comments:  The title of section A 6.3.1.6 is wrong. It should be “SA NR – UTRAN FDD handover”.  As for R4-2006986, we think the term “inter-RAT UTRAN FDD” should be used rather than “inter-RAT UTRAN”, in the test purpose and in the headers of all tables.  Test purpose (first paragraph):  “The purpose of this set of tests is to verify that the UE can make correct inter-RAT UTRAN FDD handover when operating in standalone (SA) operation with PCell in FR1. This test shall verify the NR to UTRAN FDD handover requirements as specified in clause 6.1.2.2.1.”  We observe that different terms are used in the table headers: “UTRAN handover”, “UTRA handover”. In our view all four table headers should carry the term “…for SA inter-RAT UTRAN FDD handover”.  Then, formatting of the NOTE in subclause A.6.3.1.6.2 needs to be corrected (line spacing). The last sentence of the section (“This gives a total of 190 ms.”) is part of the (informative) note and not of the normative text. |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2006986 | Although there are no technical issues, one company provided some further comments for clarification. The CR is suggested to be revised. |
| R4-2006987 | agreeable |
| R4-2007755 | Although there are no technical issues, one company provided some further comments for clarification. The CR is suggested to be revised. |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

Please directly provide comments for each CR in section 1.5.1.

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close-to-finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2008616  (revised from R4-2006986) | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| R4-208617  (revised from R4-2007755) | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |