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# Introduction

This is the document for the email discussion of the following items under the NR-U RRM performance agenda (email discussion with the flag [98-bis-e][202] NR\_unlic\_RRM\_2):

5.1.3 RRM perf. requirements (38.133)

5.1.3.1 General

5.1.3.2 Measurement accuracy requirements

5.1.3.3 Test cases

5.1.3.3.1 General

\* Include test case list, common test configuration, CCA models, requirements applicability

5.1.3.3.2 RRC IDLE cell re-selection

5.1.3.3.3 HO (I was thinkdelay and interruptions)

5.1.3.3.4 RRC Re-establishment

5.1.3.3.5 RRC Connection Release with Redirection

5.1.3.3.6 Random access

5.1.3.3.7 Timing (transmit timing and TA)

5.1.3.3.8 BWP switching delay and interruptions

5.1.3.3.9 PSCell addition/release (delay and interruption)

5.1.3.3.10 SCell activation/deactivation (delay and interruption)

5.1.3.3.11 Other interruptions

5.1.3.3.12 RLM

5.1.3.3.13 Beam management (BFD and link recovery)

5.1.3.3.14 SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR/L1-RSRP measurement procedure (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)

5.1.3.3.15 RSSI/CO measurement procedure (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)

5.1.3.3.16 SFTD measurement procedure

5.1.3.3.17 SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR/L1-RSRP measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)

5.1.3.3.18 RSSI/CO measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)

5.1.3.3.19 SFTD measurement accuracy

5.1.3.3.20 Other

The discussion on this thread is organized in the following topics:

* Topic #1: Workplan
* Topic #2: NR-U RRM test configuration
* Topic #3: Test case specific details
* Topic #4: Test case list and work split

Because of the massive number of contributions and proposals under the agenda items discussed in this document, the moderator proposes the following prioritization for the discussion:

**First round:** Concentrate on the discussion on technical issues. Comments on Draft CRs are welcome, but no decision on Draft CRs is expected in the first round.

**Second round:** Conclusion for finalizing the technical agreements, and revision of the Draft CRs.

This work is organized using the Big CR approach, and a Big Draft CR is to be endorsed in after the meeting as described in the chairman’s meeting’s arrangements document.

# Topic #1: Workplan

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |  |
| R4-20xxxxx | Company A | Proposal 1:  Observation 1: |  |
| [**R4-2107362**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107362.zip) | Qualcomm | With the target completion date of June 2021, we propose the following modified work plan:   * RAN4 #97e (Oct-Nov 2020)   + Way forward on general framework and test cases split * RAN4 #98e (Jan-Feb 2021)   + Discussion on CCA models, test configurations and test cases   + CR endorsement and agreement * RAN4 #98-bis-e (April 2021)   + Discussion on CCA models, test configurations and test cases   + CR endorsement and agreement * RAN4 #99e (May 2021)   + Discussion on CCA models, test configurations and test cases   + CR endorsement and agreement   + Performance part completion | Issue 1-1 |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 1-1 Workplan

*Sub-topic description:*

*After the extension of the RRM performance part of NR-U in the last plenary, it is necessary to update the work plan accordingly.*

**Issue 1-1: Updated workplan**

* Proposals
* With the target completion date of June 2021, we propose the following modified work plan:
  + RAN4 #97e (Oct-Nov 2020)
    - Way forward on general framework and test cases split
  + RAN4 #98e (Jan-Feb 2021)
    - Discussion on CCA models, test configurations and test cases
    - CR endorsement and agreement
  + RAN4 #98-bis-e (April 2021)
    - Discussion on CCA models, test configurations and test cases
    - CR endorsement and agreement
  + RAN4 #99e (May 2021)
    - Discussion on CCA models, test configurations and test cases
    - CR endorsement and agreement
    - Performance part completion
* Recommended WF
  + Can we agree on the proposed workplan?
  + If not please comment on how this should be updated.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | **Issue 1-1: Updated workplan** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Issue 1-1: Updated workplan**  We agree with the workplan. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 1-1: Updated workplan**  Support the workplan as the proponent company. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## 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:*   * + RAN4 #97e (Oct-Nov 2020)     - Way forward on general framework and test cases split   + RAN4 #98e (Jan-Feb 2021)     - Discussion on CCA models, test configurations and test cases     - CR endorsement and agreement   + RAN4 #98-bis-e (April 2021)     - Discussion on CCA models, test configurations and test cases     - CR endorsement and agreement   + RAN4 #99e (May 2021)     - Discussion on CCA models, test configurations and test cases     - CR endorsement and agreement     - Performance part completion   *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

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

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

No further discussion is needed for this topic.

# Topic #2: NR-U RRM test configuration

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |  |
| [**R4-2107360**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107360.zip) | Qualcomm | Observation 1: MIB is always transmitted with 80 ms periodicity on PDSCH with repetitions scheduled within 80ms according to SSB periodicity. This implies that SMTC periodicity cannot be more than 80ms.  Observation 2: In NR-U, SIB1 is always transmitted with 20 ms periodicity on PDSCH and SIB1 TTI is 160 ms implying that TSI,CCA doesn’t have to be a function of TDBT.  Observation 3: The performance tests related to RRC re-establishment and RRC release with re-direction requirements in NR assume 1280ms for SI reading.  Observation 4: Under no DL CCA failure in NR-U, the network needs 600ms in the worst-case scenario to transmit 6 samples each for MIB and SIB1.  Observation 5: Existing SI decoding time of 1280ms in NR allows the network with 680ms of additional time, which is more than sufficient to compensate for any missed transmission opportunities due to DL CCA failure. |  |
|  |  | Proposal 1: SI decoding time, TSI,CCA, is kept at 1280ms during RRC re-establishment and RRC release with re-direction in NR-U networks. | Issue 2-2-3 |
| [**R4-2107139**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107139.zip) | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Legacy test cases to verify legacy requirements in TS 38.133 that apply to NR-U capable UE are defined for NR-U with NR-U test configuration parameters. | Issue 2-1-3 |
|  |  | Proposal 2: The test cases in proposal 1 are applicable only for the following UE capabilities:   * EN-DC capable UE supporting EN-DC band combinations with only NR-U band(s) (i.e. NR band with shared spectrum access) * SA capable UE supporting ony NR-U band(s) (i.e. NR band with shared spectrum access) | Issue 2-1-3 |
|  |  | Proposal 3: The principles of testing based on proposals 1 and 2 are defined as applicability rule in annex A of TS 38.133. | Issue 2-1-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 4: Add a note in each NR-U test case for verifying the legacy requirements as follows:   * In EN-DC test:   + The UE supporting EN-DC with only NR band(s) with shared spectrum access is required to be test. * In SA test:   + The UE supporting SA operation with only NR band(s) with shared spectrum access is required to be tested. | Issue 2-1-4 |
| [**R4-2104431**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104431.zip) | ZTE | Observation 1: A UE passing tests for LBE mode does not necessarily pass the tests of FBE mode and vice versa.  Observation 2: Correct UE behavior is critical since it ensures the fair usage of spectral resources, benefiting not only the UE itself, but also other UEs operating under NR-U, and more devices operating under WiFi or other networks. |  |
|  |  | Proposal 1:  A UE that signals both FBE and LBE capability need to tested under both modes.  A UE that signals FBE only capability is subject to tests only with FBE configuration.  A UE that signals LBE only capability is subject to tests only with LBE configuration. | Issue 2-1-1 |
| [**R4-2****106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip) | MediaTek inc. | Proposal 1: if one requirement is not impacted by the LBT behavior, it is not necessary to verify the requirement again if the UE has been tested in the corresponding non-NR-U SA, ENDC tests. | Issue 2-1-5 |
|  |  | Proposal 2: Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD). | Issue 3-1-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 3: Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1). | Issue 3-1-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 4: Not to introduce TC for “NR-U-> NR-U, Inter-frequency, known” in R16. | Issue 3-2-5 |
|  |  | Proposal 5: Use the same test case to verify HO for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD). | Issue 3-2-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 6: Use the same test case to verify HO for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1).  Observation 1: Legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be introduced for the UE support NR-U SA but not NR SA or EN-DC. | Issue 3-2-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 7: For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped.  Observation 2: No TCs defined for active TCI in R15 in FR1. | Issue 3-7-5 |
|  |  | Proposal 8: Low priority for defining the TCs for active TCI state switching delay for NR-U. | Issue 3-10-2 |
|  |  | Proposal 9: For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the following TCs for interruption can be skipped:  Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)  During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)  Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements  Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release | Issue 3-11-1 |
|  |  | Proposal 10: For NR-U intra-frequency measurements accuracy (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, L1-RSRP, RSSI, CO),  Tests with “NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC” can be skipped, if the UE has been tested with “NR-U PCC”  Tests with “NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)” can be skipped, if the UE has been tested with “NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)” | Issue 3-12-1 |
|  |  | Proposal 11: For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, it can skip the following tests for inter frequency measurement accuracy:  NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC  NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) | Issue 3-12-2 |
| [**R4-2106574**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106574.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 1: If a UE supporting both dynamic and semi-static channel access (LBE and FBE) would be required to be tested with both CCA variants, this would double the number of test cases for such UE.  Observation 2: It may not be feasible to assume that a UE that can pass all RRM tests with dynamic channel access (LBE) can also pass the same tests with semi-static channel access (FBE).  Observation 3: It is not clear if UEs that only support semi-static channel access (FBE) will be actually available. |  |
|  |  | Proposal 1: For a UE that supports both LBE and FBE, all test cases are run with LBE, and additionally some specific test cases are also run with FBE.  Observation 4: UEs are not allowed to initiate COT when using FBE mode. | Issue 2-1-1 |
|  |  | Proposal 2: Assuming the above Proposal 1 is agreed, include at least the following test cases for FBE mode: “RRC\_Idle, cell-reselection intra-frequency, NR-U (LBE mode) -> NR-U (FBE mode)” and “Random Access to NR-U PCell in FBE mode”. | Issue 2-1-2 |
|  |  | Proposal 3: In the case the PRACH is transmitted within a gNB-initiated COT – which is always the case for FBE mode, a gap greater than 16 µs has to be configured between the DL-UL transmissions. | Issue 3-5-7 |
|  |  | Proposal 4: For CCA success probability for LBE CCA model our preferred option is Option 2, i.e. P1 = P2 = 0.75. On the other hand, we would have no objection against Option 1 (P1 = 0.75, P2 = 0.5) if this is the preferred option in RAN4. | Issue 2-3-2 |
|  |  | Proposal 5: For CCA success probability for FBE CCA model, agree on Option 2: P(FBE) = 0.9.  Observation 5: The principle of the non-DRX CCA model would not be changed when using the DRX CCA model. | Issue 2-3-3 |
|  |  | Proposal 6: RAN4 should deal first with the non-DRX CCA model and deal with the DRX CCA model afterwards. | Issue 2-3-5 |
|  |  | Proposal 7: For the basic principle of UL CCA model, agree on Option 1:  Option 1 Define baseline UL CCA model as:  i. Use DL FBE model to transmit a OCNG noise pattern with CCA BW in one or more of the scheduled/configured UL resource with probability P.  1. P is FFS  ii. The test equipment keeps a count of the number of UL CCA failures it may cause.  iii. When the OCNG signal is transmitted, the test equipment does not monitor the UL resource in which the OCNG is transmitted.  iv. When the OCNG signal is not transmitted, the test equipment monitors the UL resource for the desired UL signal.  v. Based on whether it receives the signal or not, the test equipment declares the test case pass/fail  vi. Consistent UL CCA failures are modelled by means of a low CCA success probability.  Observation 6: Consistent UL CCA failure depends on an optional UE feature ul-LBT-FailureDetectionRecovery-r16. | Issue 2-4-1 |
|  |  | Proposal 8: RAN4 to define consistent UL CCA failures only as part of the following RRM test cases:  -NR-U – NR-U PCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure  Observation 7: PRACH transmitted power does not increase after UL LBT failure.  Observation 8: Existing RACH RRM test cases in FR1 specify that the power of the first preamble shall be -30 dBm. | Issue 2-4-3  Issue 3-5-5 |
|  |  | Proposal 9: Specify RACH requirements that reuse NR FR1 configurations and expected PRACH transmitted power. | Issue 3-5-6 |
|  |  | Proposal 10: Specify that the power of the first preamble for NR-U random access test cases to be the same as in NR test cases.  Observation 9: If test runs where Lmax is exceeded are allowed but just not included in the statistics, testing time would be higher and some of the test runs would be useless. | Issue 3-5-6 |
|  |  | Proposal 11: Test environment should not have test runs that are rendered useless due to exceeded LBT failures | Issue 2-3-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 12: Test equipment should make sure that Lmax is not exceeded during a test by monitoring the number of CCA failures and preventing additional CCA failures from happening after Lmax is reached. | Issue 2-3-4 |
| [**R4-2106976**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106976.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Observation 1: DCI-based dynamic UL/DL means tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon will not be configured and UE determine whether to receive or transmit according to the detection of DCI. |  |
|  |  | Proposal 1: The default UL/DL pattern shall be the same as that in existing configurations, according to which TE shall schedule the UE in each slot. | Issue 2-2-1 |
|  |  | Observation 2: UE may not receive and transmit corresponding signals configured by higher layer by using DCI-based dynamic UL/DL pattern.  Observation 3: Discuss to have RMC burst transmission model for LBE and FBE respectively. |  |
|  |  | Proposal 2: Add a note in each test cases where no particular behaviour to be verified that a test where Lmax is exceeded shall not be considered in the statistics. | Issue 2-3-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 3: The UL CCA failure in PRACH transmission shall only be considered in RA test cases. | Issue 2-4-4 |
| [**R4-2107361**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107361.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | Observation 1. For DL LBE CCA model, P1=0.75, P2 = 0.5 would be good choice as it gives a good overall transmission probability, P = P1 + (1-P1)\*P2 = 0.875, without having a significant impact on test time. |  |
|  |  | Proposal 1. Suggest RAN4 to define P1 = 0.75, P2 = 0.5 for DL LBE CCA model | Issue 2-3-2 |
|  |  | Observation 2. FBE is used when the operator can guarantee a controlled environment (no WiFi neighbors), implying that the rate of LBT failure is extremely small in FBE mode. |  |
|  |  | Proposal 2. Suggest that RAN4 defines SSB transmission probability in FBE to be higher than SSB transmission probability in LBE   * P(FBE) > P(LBE) = P1 + (1-P1)\*P2 | Issue 2-3-1 |
|  |  | Proposal 3. Suggest RAN4 to define P(FBE) = 0.95 | Issue 2-3-3 |
|  |  | Proposal 4. Suggest RAN4 to adopt a baseline UL CCA model as below:   * + TCCA ms prior to each UL transmission burst in the test:     - The test equipment (TE) generates a uniform random variable p from the range [0, 1].     - If p<PCCA\_UL, the TE transmits a OCNG noise pattern with a high [TBD] energy within the UE BW scheduled/configured for the UL transmission for at-least TCCA ms.       * TCCA is the channel sensing period depending on LBT category being used by the UE       * PCCA\_UL is the probability of a successful UL CCA         + To be determined along with the test case specification         + To model consistent UL CCA failure, PCCA\_UL takes a low value, e.g. 0%         + To model no UL CCA failure, PCCA\_UL takes a high value, e.g. 100%         + A typical/default value is TBD for PCCA\_UL in other test cases, e.g. 75%   + The TE keeps a count of the number of UL CCA failures it causes.   + The TE monitors the UL resource for the desired UL signal.   + Based on when and/or whether the TE receives the desired UL signal, it deems the test case to pass/fail | Issue 2-4-1  Issue 2-4-2 |
|  |  | Observation 3. During random access, the uncertainty in the UE calculated UL transmission power may cause decoding failure at the test equipment leading to falsely assuming an UL LBT failure and failing the test case. |  |
|  |  | Proposal 5. Test equipment to configure *preambleReceivedTargetPower* for msg1 and *msgA-PreambleReceivedTargetPower* for msgA to the highest value for UL LBT test cases. | Issue 3-5-6 |
|  |  | Observation 4. It is a good idea to choose one typical test tase to test the same requirement, e.g., delay in acquiring PRACH resource across multiple RRM features.  Observation 5. List of features impacted with UL LBT failure   * Handover to target cell using CCA   + Delay in acquiring PRACH resource * RRC re-establishment using CCA   + Delay in acquiring PRACH resource * Random access   + Delay in acquiring PRACH resource * RRC connection release with re-direction   + Delay in acquiring PRACH resource * BWP switch delay on consistent UL LBT recovery   + Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource as in Handover * SCell activation   + Additional delay in transmission of CSI reporting due to CCA failure * Event triggered measurement reporting delay   + Additional delay due to UL LBT failure not defined   + FFS: Assume it similar to above-mentioned SCell activation case * MAC CE based TCI state switch delay   Delay in sending HARQ feedback transmissions |  |
|  |  | Proposal 6. RAN4 to define one typical test case to test – Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures for the following requirements:   * Handover to target cell using CCA * RRC re-establishment using CCA * Random access * RRC connection release with re-direction * BWP switch delay on consistent UL LBT recovery | Issue 2-4-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 7a. Suggest RAN4 to test – Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures in the following requirement:   * Random access to a target cell using CCA | Issue 2-4-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 7b. (Based on Proposal 7a) Suggest RAN4 to not test – Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures in the following requirements:   * Handover to target cell using CCA * RRC re-establishment using CCA * RRC connection release with re-direction * BWP switch delay on consistent UL LBT recovery | Issue 2-4-4 |
|  |  | Proposal 8. RAN4 to discuss whether to include UL LBT failures for the following cases:   * SCell activation   + Additional delay in transmission of CSI reporting due to CCA failure * Event triggered measurement reporting delay   + Additional delay due to UL LBT failure not defined   + FFS: Assume it similar to above-mentioned SCell activation case * MAC CE based TCI state switch delay   + Delay in sending HARQ feedback transmissions | Issue 2-4-5 |
| [**R4-2106849**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106849.zip) | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Two SSBs are modelled in all NR-U test cases, regardless of LBE or FBE, except cell detection where one SSB is stated in the requirements | Issue 2-2-2 |
|  |  | Proposal 2: At least at a low Es/Iot (e.g., Es/Iot<-6 dB), the probability of CCA success is higher for the semi-static channel occupancy compared to that for dynamic channel occupancy:  o PCCA,semi-static,i > PCCA,dynamic,I, when Es/Iot<X,  o PCCA,semi-static,i = PCCA,dynamic,I, when Es/Iot≥X,  where X=TBD (e.g., X=-6 dB). | Issue 2-3-1 |
|  |  | Proposal 3: Prior to each UL transmission burst within a time interval i of the test:  1. Generate a uniform random variable p from the range [0, 1].  2. If p<PCCA\_UL,i, then the energy generated by the test system in the corresponding portion of UL slot is equal to or below the energy detection threshold [TBD]; otherwise the energy generated by the test system in the portion of UL slot is above the energy detection threshold [TBD]. | Issue 2-4-1 |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules

*Sub-topic description*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-1-1: FBE and LBE applicability**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1 (R4-2104431):
    - A UE that signals both FBE and LBE capability need to be tested under both modes.
    - A UE that signals FBE only capability is subject to tests only with FBE configuration.
    - A UE that signals LBE only capability is subject to tests only with LBE configuration.
  + Option 2 (R4-2106574):
    - For a UE that supports both LBE and FBE, all test cases are run with LBE, and additionally some specific test cases are also run with FBE.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss options 1 and 2.

**Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases**

* Assuming Option 2 is agreed on Issue 1.2.1, which test cases should be tested for FBE and LBE:
  + Option 1 (R4-2106574): include at least the following test cases for FBE mode:
    - RRC\_Idle, cell-reselection intra-frequency, NR-U (LBE mode) -> NR-U (FBE mode)
    - Random Access to NR-U PCell in FBE mode
* Recommended WF
  + To be discussed depending upon the decision for issue 2-1-1.

**Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1 (R4-2107139):
    - Legacy test cases to verify legacy requirements in TS 38.133 that apply to NR-U capable UE are defined for NR-U with NR-U test configuration parameters
    - The test cases from the bullet above are applicable only for UE with the following capabilities:
      * EN-DC capable UE supporting EN-DC band combinations with only NR-U band(s) (i.e. NR band with shared spectrum access)
      * SA capable UE supporting only NR-U band(s) (i.e. NR band with shared spectrum access)
  + Option 2: Other options?
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss option 1.

**Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (R4-2107139): If we agree on Option 1 of the previous issue, consider the following proposals:
    - The principles of testing based on proposals 1 and 2 are defined as applicability rule in annex A of TS 38.133.
    - Add a note in each NR-U test case for verifying the legacy requirements as follows:
      * In EN-DC test:
        + The UE supporting EN-DC only on NR band(s) with shared spectrum access is required to be tested.
      * In SA test:
        + The UE supporting SA operation only on NR band(s) with shared spectrum access is required to be tested.
* Recommended WF
  + Postpone discussion or 2nd round if Option 1 is agreed in Issue 2-1-3.

**Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA**

Please consider the following proposal on requirements not impacted by CCA:

* Proposal 1 **(**[R4-2106357](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** If one requirement is not impacted by the LBT behavior, it is not necessary to verify the requirement again if the UE has been tested in the corresponding non-NR-U SA, ENDC tests.

Recommended WF

* Discuss Proposal 1, please include examples of test cases for which Proposal 1 would apply.

### Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests

**Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration**

Consider the following proposal

* Proposal 1 (R4-2106976): The default UL/DL pattern shall be the same as that in existing configurations, according to which TE shall schedule the UE in each slot.

Recommended WF

* It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1.

**Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases**

Consider the following proposal

* Option 1 (R4-2106849): Two SSBs are modelled in all NR-U test cases, regardless of LBE or FBE, except cell detection where one SSB is stated in the requirements.
* Option 2: The number of SSB indexes to be used in each test case is configured to be the same as in the existing NR test case.

Recommended WF

* Discuss options 1 and 2.

**Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time**

Please consider the following proposal:

* Proposal 1 (R4-2107360): SI decoding time, TSI,CCA, is kept at 1280ms during RRC re-establishment and RRC release with re-direction in NR-U networks.

Recommended WF

* Please discuss this issue considering Issue 2-1-1 from [201] NR-U RRM part 1.

### Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL

**Issue 2-3-1: FBE vs. LBE transmission probability**

How should the LBE model probabilities differ among LBE and FBE configurations?

* Option 1 (R4-2107361): define SSB transmission probability in FBE to be higher than SSB transmission probability in LBE P(FBE) > P(LBE) = P1 + (1-P1)\*P2
* Option 2 (R4-2106849): At least at a low Es/Iot (e.g., Es/Iot<-6 dB), the probability of CCA success is higher for the semi-static channel occupancy compared to that for dynamic channel occupancy:
  + PCCA,semi-static,i > PCCA,dynamic,I, when Es/Iot<X,
  + PCCA,semi-static,i = PCCA,dynamic,I, when Es/Iot≥X,
  + where X=TBD (e.g., X=-6 dB).
* Option 3: The LBT model probabilities should not be defined comparing the probabilities from FBE and LBE as a working assumption.

Recommended WF

* Indicate your preferred option.

**Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations**

Which value should be used as a baseline for the CCA success probability for dynamic channel access (LBE) configurations?

* Candidate options:
  + Option 1 (R4-2106574): P1=P2= 0.75
  + Option 2 (R4-2107361): P1 = 0.75, P2 = 0.5
* Recommended WF:
  + Please indicate your preferred option.

**Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations**

Which value should be used as a baseline for the CCA success probability for semi-static channel access (FBE) configurations?

* Candidate options:
  + Option 1 (R4-2106574): P(FBE)= 0.9
  + Option 2 (R4-2107361): P(FBE) = 0.95
* Recommended WF:
  + Please indicate your preference

**Issue 2-3-4: How to avoid exceeding Lmax in RRM tests**

On the last meeting it was agreed that in test cases where no particular behaviour is verified, exceeding Lmax shall be avoided. Regarding how this should be avoided, consider the following options:

* Candidate options:
  + Option 1 (R4-2106574):
    - Proposal 1a: Test environment should not have test runs that are rendered useless due to exceeded LBT failures
    - Proposal 1b: Test equipment should make sure that Lmax is not exceeded during a test by monitoring the number of CCA failures and preventing additional CCA failures from happening after Lmax is reached.
  + Option 2 (R4-2106976): Add a note in each test cases where no particular behaviour to be verified that a test where Lmax is exceeded shall not be considered in the statistics.
* Recommended WF
  + Indicate your preferred option.

**Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model**

Consider the following proposal:

* Proposal 1(R4-2106574): RAN4 should deal first with the non-DRX CCA model and deal with the DRX CCA model afterwards

Recommended WF:

* It is proposed to agree on proposal 1.

### Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL

**Issue 2-4-1: UL CCA model**

Consider the following proposals for the UL CCA model:

* Proposal 1 (R4-2106574) Define baseline UL CCA model as:
  + Use DL FBE model to transmit a OCNG noise pattern with CCA BW in one or more of the scheduled/configured UL resource with probability P.
    - P is FFS
  + The test equipment keeps a count of the number of UL CCA failures it may cause.
  + When the OCNG signal is transmitted, the test equipment does not monitor the UL resource in which the OCNG is transmitted.
  + When the OCNG signal is not transmitted, the test equipment monitors the UL resource for the desired UL signal.
  + Based on whether it receives the signal or not, the test equipment declares the test case pass/fail
  + Consistent UL CCA failures are modelled by means of a low CCA success probability.
* Proposal 2 (R4-2107361): to adopt a baseline UL CCA model as below:
* TCCA ms prior to each UL transmission burst in the test:
  + The test equipment (TE) generates a uniform random variable p from the range [0, 1].
  + If p<PCCA\_UL, the TE transmits a OCNG noise pattern with a high [TBD] energy within the UE BW scheduled/configured for the UL transmission for at-least TCCA ms.
    - TCCA is the channel sensing period depending on LBT category being used by the UE
    - PCCA\_UL is the probability of a successful UL CCA
* The TE keeps a count of the number of UL CCA failures it causes.
* The TE monitors the UL resource for the desired UL signal.
* Based on when and/or whether the TE receives the desired UL signal, it deems the test case to pass/fail
* Proposal 3 (R4-2106849): Prior to each UL transmission burst within a time interval i of the test:
  + Generate a uniform random variable p from the range [0, 1].
  + If p<PCCA\_UL,i, then the energy generated by the test system in the corresponding portion of UL slot is equal to or below the energy detection threshold [TBD]; otherwise the energy generated by the test system in the portion of UL slot is above the energy detection threshold [TBD].

Recommended WF:

* Please comment on which of the proposals can be agreed.

**Issue 2-4-2: UL CCA success probability**

* Proposal 1 (R4-2107361): PCCA\_UL is the probability of a successful UL CCA
  + To be determined along with the test case specification
  + To model consistent UL CCA failure, PCCA\_UL takes a low value, e.g. 0%
  + To model no UL CCA failure, PCCA\_UL takes a high value, e.g. 100%
  + A typical/default value is TBD for PCCA\_UL in other test cases, e.g. 75%

Recommended WF:

* Can we agree on Proposal 1?

**Issue 2-4-3: Configuration of UL CCA Failure Detection Recovery**

Consider the following option:

* Proposal 1 (R4-2106574) Configure UL CCA failure recovery only as part of the following RRM test case:
  + NR-U – NR-U PCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure

Recommended WF:

* It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 2-4-4: Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures**

Considering the additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures, please evaluate the following proposals:

* Proposal 1 (R4-2107361): RAN4 to define one typical test case to test – Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures for the following requirements:
  + Handover to target cell using CCA
  + RRC re-establishment using CCA
  + Random access
  + RRC connection release with re-direction
  + BWP switch delay on consistent UL LBT recovery
* Proposal 2 (R4-2107361): RAN4 to test – Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures in the following requirement:
  + Random access to a target cell using CCA
* Proposal 3 (R4-2107361): RAN4 to not test – Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures in the following requirements:
  + Handover to target cell using CCA
  + RRC re-establishment using CCA
  + RRC connection release with re-direction
  + BWP switch delay on consistent UL LBT recovery
* Proposal 4 (R4-2106976): The UL CCA failure in PRACH transmission shall only be considered in RA test cases.

Recommended WF

* Please indicate which proposals can be agreed.

**Issue 2-4-5 Test case list to include UL CCA failures**

Discuss whether to include UL LBT failures for the following cases (R4-2107361):

* Proposal 1: SCell activation
  + Additional delay in transmission of CSI reporting due to CCA failure
* Proposal 2: Event triggered measurement reporting delay
  + Additional delay due to UL LBT failure not defined
  + FFS: Assume it similar to above-mentioned SCell activation case
* Proposal 3: MAC CE based TCI state switch delay
  + Delay in sending HARQ feedback transmissions

Recommended WF:

* Discuss which of the above test cases should include UL CCA failures.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-1: FBE and LBE applicability  Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases  Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1  Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2  Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA  Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration  Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases  Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time  Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-1: FBE vrs LBE transmission probability  Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations  Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations  Issue 2-3-4: How to avoid exceeding Lmax in RRM tests  Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model  Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL  Issue 2-4-1: UL CCA model  Issue 2-4-2: UL CCA success probability  Issue 2-4-3: Configuration of UL CCA Failure Detection Recovery  Issue 2-4-4: Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures  Issue 2-4-5: Test case list to include UL CCA failures |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-1: FBE and LBE applicability We support Option 2, based upon the following assumptions (to be confirmed by UE vendors): - It is beneficial from a conformance tests workload perspective to limit test duplication between LBE and FBE mode. - No UE supporting FBE mode only may be actually available, so defining test case applicability for such UE is not needed.  Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases  We agree with Option 1.  Assuming issue 2-1-1/option 2 is agreed we propose at least these two tests to be included for FBE mode. The reason to have Random Access to NR-U PCell included is that for FBE mode PRACH can be transmitted only within gNB-initiated COT, which has an impact upon random access performances and makes it more sensitive to DL CCA failures.  Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1  We have some concern on whether this is the best approach for defining that applicability rule. We understand this is a RAN5 issue to be defined under Annex B of 38.533. It also needs to be clarified how the NR-U test configuration parameters would be defined. As we have observed based on our discussion paper for handover test cases in R4-2106575, it may not be straightforward to define a general NR-U cell configuration that could be used in all legacy test cases.  Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2  We have some concern on whether this is the best approach for defining that applicability rule. We understand this is a RAN5 issue to be defined under Annex B of 38.533.  Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA  If the UE supports both NR and NR-U, then the proposal seems to make sense. If the UE supports only NR-U and not NR, then the UE should be tested.  Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration  We don’t agree. We think different patterns should be used for FBE and LBE.  Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases  We prefer Option 2.  Unless there is a technical reason, we prefer to follow the configuration of the Rel 15 NR test cases as a baseline in order to define the configuration for the NR-U test cases.  Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-1: FBE vrs LBE transmission probability We prefer Option 3.  We would suggest to focus on the issues 2-3-2 and 2-3-3 first: depending of the outcomes of the discussion it might not be needed to eventually discuss 2-3-1.  Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations We support option 1 (consistency with LTE-LAA), but we may accept option 2 if this is the preferred option for the Group.  Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations We support option 1, which offers more opportunities to test the UE behaviour when DL CCA fails: in our view P(FBE) = 0.95 is too close to “1” from this perspective.  Issue 2-3-4: How to avoid exceeding Lmax in RRM tests We support option 1. Having in mind conformance tests efficiency, option 2 would mean to run more tests to achieve the expected result.  Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model We support option 1 (non-DRX CCA model prioritization).  Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL  Issue 2-4-1: UL CCA model  We are fine either with proposal 1 or proposal 2.  In Proposal 3 it has to clarify how the energy is generated, if it is OCNG noise pattern for example.  Issue 2-4-2: UL CCA success probability  We agree with Proposal 1.  Issue 2-4-3: Configuration of UL CCA Failure Detection Recovery  We agree with Proposal 1.  Issue 2-4-4: Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures  We don’t agree with Proposal 1, 2, 3, and 4.  In general we are ok with proposal 1, but the current Random access test cases do not test additional delay in acquiring PRACH and the core specs also do not have timing requirements for RACH.  For this reason we do not agree with Proposal 2 and 3, and should prefer that another test case is used for verifying that delay.  About Proposal 4, we believe UL LBT failures have to be modelled for RA test, but for the reasons above it cannot be the only test case that tests it.  We propose that if we use one test case to verify the additional delay in acquiring PRACH, we do it with the HO test cases.  Issue 2-4-5: Test case list to include UL CCA failures  We are fine with Proposals 1, 2, and 3 considering also the outcome of Issue 2-4-4. If we agree on having only one test case for testing the additional delay in acquiring PRACH then only 1 of these would be needed. It also has to be made sure that all NR-U scenarios include at least one test case where UL LBT is considered. For example, SCell activation test cases cannot be the only test case to include UL CCA failures.  We also think random access must include UL CCA failures. |
| Apple | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-1: FBE and LBE applicability  Fine with option 2.  Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases  Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1  Fine with option 1.  Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2  Fine with option 1.  Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA  Fine with option 1, e.g., UE timer accuracy, UE TA adjustment accuracy and etc.  Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration  Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases  Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time  Agree with proposal 1.  Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-1: FBE vrs LBE transmission probability  Support option 1.  Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations  Support option 1.  Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations  Support option 2.  Issue 2-3-4: How to avoid exceeding Lmax in RRM tests  Fine with either proposal 1b or proposal 2.  Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model  Agree with recommended WF. |
| ZTE | Issue 2-1-1: FBE and LBE applicability  We support Option 1 since it is critical to ensure the correct UE behavior, especially under NR-U. For NR-U UEs, if the correct behavior cannot be guaranteed, then the UE itself, other UEs also working in unlicensed bands and other devices using WiFi will all be affected.  Issue 2-3-1: FBE vrs LBE transmission probability Prefer Option 3.  Issue 2-3-4: How to avoid exceeding Lmax in RRM tests  Option 1b seems fine.  Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model  Support the recommended WF. |
| Qualcomm | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-1: FBE and LBE applicability  We support the following modified/combined proposal:  Option 3:   * For a UE that supports both LBE and FBE, all test cases are run with LBE, and additionally some specific test cases are also run with FBE. * A UE that signals FBE only capability is subject to tests only with FBE configuration. * A UE that signals LBE only capability is subject to tests only with LBE configuration.   Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases  Support the recommended WF.  Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1  Before specifying such applicability rules, it would be better to identify the relevant test-cases and the corresponding NR\_U specific test configurations.  Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2  Support the recommended WF.  Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA  We are fine with this general direction, but it would be better to identify the relevant test-cases. One approach to treat this issue(and Issue 2-1-3) can be to list all the NR test-cases and indicate whether the test applies to a particular NR-U scenario or not.  Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration  …  Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases  In our understanding, Option 1 and Option 2 are talking about two different things and should be treated separately.  If option 1 relates to candidate SSB position for a particular SSB index, we don’t think two candidate SSB positions need to be modelled for FBE.  Option 2 appears to be talking about the number of SSB indices to be used in the test cases. If that is the case, we are fine with Option 2  Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time  We support the proposal as the proponent,  Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-1: FBE vrs LBE transmission probability  We support Option 1.  Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations  We support Option 2.  Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations  We support Option 2.  Issue 2-3-4: How to avoid exceeding Lmax in RRM tests  We are fine with Option 1.  Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model  Agree with the recommended WF  Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL  Issue 2-4-1: UL CCA model  Support Proposal 2, which is a refined version of Proposal 1 and Proposal 3.  Issue 2-4-2: UL CCA success probability  Agree with proposal 1.  Issue 2-4-3: Configuration of UL CCA Failure Detection Recovery  Agree with proposal 1.  Issue 2-4-4: Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures  Support proposal 1.  Support proposal 2, but we are also fine with testing UL CCA failure with Handover related test-cases.  Agree with proposal 3 in general, but could be modified based on agreement from proposal 2.  Issue 2-4-5: Test case list to include UL CCA failures  We support specifying one test case with UL CCA failure for each of the following scenarios –   * Additional delay in transmission of CSI reporting due to CCA failure * Additional delay due to UL LBT failure not defined * Delay in sending HARQ feedback transmissions |
| Huawei | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA  Generally fine with proposal 1, but prefer to have a clear list of related cases.  Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration  Support option 1, otherwise configuration of SSB/CSI-RS/SRS may needed to be updated. We are also fine to further consider the issue for FBE.  Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-1: FBE vrs LBE transmission probability  Support option 3.  Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations  Support option 1.  Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model  DRX mode and non-DRX shall all be considered.  Issue 2-4-5: Test case list to include UL CCA failures  For option 3, it depends on whether to have TCI switching test cases. |
| MTK | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-3: Support Option 1. The test cases can still be introduced. And the intention is not to verify the same functionality many times.  Issue 2-1-4: Fine with Option 1.  Issue 2-1-5: The corresponding tests are listed below:   * *the* ***legacy*** *DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell* * *for interruption (Same requirement as legacy)*   + *Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)*   + *During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)*   + *Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements*   + *Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release* * *for inter frequency measurement accuracy:*   + ***NR (FR1) inter-frequency****, with NR-U PCC*   + ***NR (FR1) inter-frequency****, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)*   Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-2:  Option 1 & 2 are separate discussion.  Fine with Option 2.    Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-1: Fine with Option 1 and Option 3.  Option 2 would be not-necessarily complicated. For some tests with multiple SINR levels, e.g. RLM, it would be difficult to determing which formula shall apply.  Issue 2-3-2: Option 1 seems more reasonable. Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model  Issue 2-3-5: Agree with Option 1. Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL Issue 2-4-2: Fine with Option 1  Issue 2-4-3: Fine with Option 1  Issue 2-4-5: We are fine with Proposals 1 or 2. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-1-1: FBE and LBE applicability**  Regarding option 1, Not sure UE capable of both LBE and FBE needs to pass the tests targeting LBE and FBE. Since the LBE is more challenging for UE, probably it is enough to pass LBE tests only for UE capable of both LBE and FBE.  Regarding option 2, It depends on how to specify FBE and LBE tests. If the difference is only for the DL/UL CCA probability parameters, it is enough to pass LBE tests only for UE capable of both LBE and FBE. If there are tests which have difference more than CCA parameters, UE needs to pass both LBE and FBE tests.  **Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases**  Should be discussed after conclusion on issue 2-1-1 is reached.  **Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1**  Option 1 is agreeable.  **Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2**  Option 1 is agreeable.  **Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA**  We prefer to follow the existing test applicability rule assuming it is available.  **Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration**  Fine to configure 'default TDD pattern' as far as the actual DL/UL configuration is up to network. If we fix the DL/UL pattern, there is limitation of RMC burst scheduling, i.e., MRC burst can be scheduled only in DL slots.  **Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases**  We support option 1.  **Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time**  We refer to the ongoing discussion on this topic in NR-U Core thread #201. No need to discuss the same topic in two threads. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| **AI 5.1.3.1 General** | |
| R4-2106846  Ericsson | Draft Big CR: Introduction of Rel-16 NR-U RRM performance requirements |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| **5.1.3.2 Measurement accuracy requirements** | |
| [R4-2106847](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106847.zip)  Ericsson | NR-U accuracy requirements |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| [R4-2106879](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106879.zip)  Ericsson | DraftCR 36.133 Correction of accuracy requirements for NR-U bands |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| [R4-2106975](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106975.zip)  Huawei | Draft CR on inter-RAT NR measurement accuracy requirements |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| **5.1.3.3.1 General** | |
| R4-2106580  Nokia | Draft CR on DL CCA model for NR-U |
| Ericsson: This issue is still open and CR approval should wait until three are issues are resolved. |
| Company B… |
| R4-2106850  Ericsson | CCA model in NR-U test cases |
| Nokia:  1) DL CCA model  • Could you please clarify how FBE mode is handled?  • Could you please clarify how the case of DL CCA failures exceeding Lmax is handled?  2) UL CCA model: could you please explain how the "energy" is generated by the TE (e.g. OCNG noise pattern)? |
| Company B… |
| R4-2106873  Ericsson | Draft CR: Update of RMC for NR-U test cases |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| R4-2106977  Huawei | Draft CR of test case configurations for NR-U |
| Nokia: to be revised depending on the decision on Issue 2-2-1. |
| Ericsson: If TE use this fixed pattern, RMC burst transmission is limited in DL slots, is it the intention? |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.20 other** | |
| R4-2107140  Ericsson | Applicability rules for legacy NR tests for NR-U in 38.133 |
| Nokia:  We are not yet convinced of the need of this CR.  1 - This sounds like a RAN5 issue, not RAN4.  2 – In 38.133, the clause A.3 is meant for "RRM test configurations". Including principles of testing and applicability in this session seems misplaced.  In case still we agree with this Draft CR, we have some further comments:  Tables with test cases applicable to UE supporting only NR-U  We don’t understand why they are citing the NR-U test cases (A.10 and A.11) and not the NR ones, (i.e. A.4 and A.6). Our understanding from the proposal in Issue 2-1-3 and 2-1-4 is that the objective would be to choose which of the legacy NR tests should be performed, and not to limit the number of NR-U tests. |
| Company B… |

## 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#2-1** | *GTW agreements:*  **Issue 2-1-1: FBE and LBE applicability**   * Agreements:   + For a UE that supports both LBE and FBE, all test cases are run with LBE, and additionally some specific test cases are also run with FBE.     - The set of test cases is FFS   + A UE that signals FBE only capability is subject to tests only with FBE configuration.   + A UE that signals LBE only capability is subject to tests only with LBE configuration.   **Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases**  Considering the agreement in 2-1-1, and that there were only comments supporting the proposal in this issue, it is proposed to agree on the following:  *Tentative agreements:*   * For a UE that supports both LBE and FBE, the following test cases should be run for LBE and FBE:   + RRC\_Idle, cell-reselection intra-frequency, NR-U (LBE mode) -> NR-U (FBE mode)   + Random Access to NR-U PCell in FBE mode   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Agreement is agreeable. * Discuss if other FBE test cases should be included for a UE that supports both FBE and LBE.   **Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1**  Some companies agreed with the proposed option, however one company expressed concerns that this proposal might be a RAN5 issue. Therefore consider the following proposals.  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1: Legacy test cases to verify legacy requirements in TS 38.133 that apply to NR-U capable UE are defined for NR-U with NR-U test configuration parameters   + The test cases from the bullet above are applicable only for UE with the following capabilities:     - EN-DC capable UE supporting EN-DC band combinations with only NR-U band(s) (i.e. NR band with shared spectrum access)     - SA capable UE supporting only NR-U band(s) (i.e. NR band with shared spectrum access) * Option 2: Leave this applicability part to be decided in RAN5.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Continue the discussion on Options 1 and 2. For the proponents of Option 1, please clarify which are the test cases affected by that.   **Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2**  No agreement can be reached, keep on discussing with the same candidate options.  *Tentative agreements:*   * Keep on discussing with the same candidate options.   **Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA**  Some companies asked for clarification on the list of relevant test cases, therefore it is recommended to keep on discussing considering the enhanced proposal including the relevant test cases.  *Candidate options:*   * Proposal 1: If one requirement is not impacted by the LBT behavior, it is not necessary to verify the requirement again if the UE has been tested in the corresponding non-NR-U SA, ENDC tests.   + Option 1a: For all UEs supporting NR-U bands.   + Option 1b: For a UE that supports both NR-U and NR bands. * The proposal above, applies to the following proposed test cases:   + Proposal 2: UE timer accuracy, UE TA adjustment accuracy and etc   + Proposal 3: the legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell   + Proposal 4: Interruption     - Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)     - During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)     - Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements     - Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release   + Proposal 5: Inter frequency measurement accuracy:     - NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC     - NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)   + Proposal 6: Others   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Discuss proposal 1, with options 1a and 1b, as well as the list of test cases related to the proposal that are listed in Proposal 2 to 6. |
| **Sub-topic#2-2** | Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  **Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration**  There was no convergence on the comments, with one company stating that UL/DL patterns configuration should consider FBE and LBE independently.  *Candidate options:*   * Proposal 1: For LBE, the default UL/DL pattern shall be the same as that in existing configurations, according to which TE shall schedule the UE in each slot. * Proposal 2: For FBE, the default UL/DL pattern shall be the same as that in existing configurations, according to which TE shall schedule the UE in each slot.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Based on the opinions of the 1st round, discuss proposals 1 and 2.   **Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases**  There was no conclusion on the options. Clarification was requested for the proponent of Option1, therefore the revised candidate options are edited in order to avoid confusion between SSB candidate positions and SSB indexes.  *Candidate options:*   * Options regarding SSB candidate positions, please choose between Option 1 and 2:   + Option 1 – Two SSB candidate positions are modelled in all NR-U test cases, regardless of LBE or FBE, except cell detection where one SSB is stated in the requirements.   + Option 2 – One SSB candidate position is used for semi-static channel access configurations, and 2 SSB candidate positions are used for dynamic channel access configurations * Options regarding SSB indexes, please choose between Option 3 and 4:   + Option 3 - Two SSB indexes are modelled in all NR-U test cases, regardless of LBE or FBE, except cell detection where one SSB is stated in the requirements.   + Option 4 - The number of SSB indexes to be used in each test case is configured to be the same as in the existing NR test case.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Based on the majority view in the 1st round, there was strong support for agreeing in Option 2 and Option 4. Please discuss if Options 2 and 4 are agreeable.   **Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time**  This topic is also being covered by Issue 2-1-1 from [201] NR-U RRM part 1, so many companies did not provide comments on that topic. Therefore, it is proposed to maintain the proposals as they were and discuss further considering the parallel discussion in [201].  *Candidate options:*   * Proposal 1: SI decoding time, TSI,CCA, is kept at 1280ms during RRC re-establishment and RRC release with re-direction in NR-U networks   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Please discuss this proposal considering Issue 2-1-1 from [201] NR-U RRM part 1. |
| **Sub-topic#2-3** | Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  GTW agreements:  **Issue 2-3-4: How to avoid exceeding Lmax in RRM tests**   * + Agreements:     - Test environment should not have test runs that are rendered useless due to exceeded LBT failures     - Test equipment should make sure that Lmax is not exceeded during a test by monitoring the number of CCA failures and preventing additional CCA failures from happening after Lmax is reached.   **Issue 2-3-1: FBE vrs LBE transmission probability**  The companies views were diverging on that topic, but as there are tentative agreements on Issue 2-3-2 and 2-3-3 this discussion may not be relevant anymore. Therefore, the moderator proposes that this issue is close without agreement.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Close this issue considering that tentative agreements on Issues 2-3-2 and 2-3-3 are enough to progress the work.   **Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations**  There was no converging opinions on that issue, therefore it is suggested to continue with the previous options.  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1: P1=P2= 0.75 * Option 2: P1 = 0.75, P2 = 0.5   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * The majority of the companies expressed their option in favour of Option 1. Can Option 1 be agreed?   **Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations**  There was no converging opinions on that issue, therefore it is suggested to continue with the previous options.  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1: P(FBE)= 0.9 * Option 2: P(FBE) = 0.95   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * At least one company expressed concerns on Option 2, indicating that it is close to “1” to provide efficient testing. Can companies defending option 2 comment if Option 1 is agreeable?   **Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model**  Most of the companies agreed with Option 1, but one company argues that DRX and non-DRX model should be considered. Therefore it is proposed to further discuss in second round considering the following options.  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1: Current DL CCA model applies only for non-DRX   + Model that applies for DRX is FFS * Option 2: Current DL CCA model applies for both DRX and non-DRX   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Discuss the recommended options trying to highlight the specific modelling requirements for a DL CCA model that applied for DRX. Can Option 1 be agreed? |
| **Sub-topic#2-4** | Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL  GTW agreements:  **Issue 2-4-1: UL CCA model**   * Agreements:   + Adopt a baseline UL CCA model as below:     - TCCA ms prior to each UL transmission burst in the test:       * The test equipment (TE) generates a uniform random variable p from the range [0, 1].       * If p<PCCA\_UL, the TE transmits an [OCNG noise pattern] with an energy level X within the UE BW scheduled/configured for the UL transmission for at-least TCCA ms.         + TCCA is the channel sensing period depending on LBT category being used by the UE         + PCCA\_UL is the probability of a successful UL CCA         + Energy level X is FFS and is higher than the LBT detection threshold     - The TE keeps a count of the number of UL CCA failures it causes.     - The TE monitors the UL resource for the desired UL signal.     - Based on when and/or whether the TE receives the desired UL signal, it deems the test case to pass/fail     - Note 1: applicability of OCNG noise pattern is FFS   **Issue 2-4-4: Additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures**   * Agreements:   + RAN4 to test additional delay in acquiring PRACH resource due to UL LBT failures in the following requirement:     - Handover to a target cell using CCA   **Issue 2-4-2: UL CCA success probability**  All companies replying to that issue agreed with Proposal 1.  *Tentative agreements:*   * PCCA\_UL is the probability of a successful UL CCA   + To be determined along with the test case specification   + To model consistent UL CCA failure, PCCA\_UL takes a low value, e.g. 0%   + To model no UL CCA failure, PCCA\_UL takes a high value, e.g. 100%   + A typical/default value is TBD for PCCA\_UL in other test cases, e.g. 75%   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * The proposed agreement is agreeable   **Issue 2-4-3: Configuration of UL CCA Failure Detection Recovery**  All the companies replying to this issue agreed with proposal 1.  *Tentative agreements:*   * Configure UL CCA failure recovery only as part of the following RRM test case:   + NR-U – NR-U PCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * The proposed agreement is agreeable.   **Issue 2-4-5: Test case list to include UL CCA failures**  Considering the decision on Issue 2-4-4, and that no clear convergence of comments, the following option are still open  *Candidate options:*   * Proposal 1: Include UL CCA failure in Random Access test cases * Proposal 2: Include UL CCA failure in one of these options   + Option 2a: SCell activation     - Additional delay in transmission of CSI reporting due to CCA failure   + Option 2b: Event triggered measurement reporting delay     - Additional delay due to UL LBT failure not defined     - FFS: Assume it similar to above-mentioned SCell activation case   + Option 2c: MAC CE based TCI state switch delay     - Delay in sending HARQ feedback transmissions   + Option 2d: Specifying one test case with UL CCA failure for each of the options 2a, 2b and 2c above. * Note: Option 2c depends on the decision on whether to include tests for Active TCI state switching under Topic #4.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Discuss with Proposal 1 is agreeable. Comment if Proposal 2 is agreeable with one of its variants Option 2a, 2b, 2c, or 2d. |

### 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** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

### Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules

**Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases**

Considering the agreement on Issue 2-1-1, it is proposed to verify with all the companies which test cases should be tested for both FBE and LBE if a UE supports both modes.

* Recommended WF
  + Discuss if other FBE test cases should be included for a UE that supports both FBE and LBE.

**Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1**

Considering the discussion on the 1st round, please consider the following options regarding UEs supporting only NR-U bands:

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Legacy test cases to verify legacy requirements in TS 38.133 that apply to NR-U capable UE are defined for NR-U with NR-U test configuration parameters
    - The test cases from the bullet above are applicable only for UE with the following capabilities:
      * EN-DC capable UE supporting EN-DC band combinations with only NR-U band(s) (i.e. NR band with shared spectrum access)
      * SA capable UE supporting only NR-U band(s) (i.e. NR band with shared spectrum access)
  + Option 2: Leave this applicability part to be decided in RAN5.
* Recommended WF
  + Continue the discussion on Options 1 and 2. For the proponents of Option 1, please clarify which are the test cases affected by that.

**Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: If we agree on Option 1 of the previous issue, consider the following proposals:
    - The principles of testing based on proposals 1 and 2 are defined as applicability rule in annex A of TS 38.133.
    - Add a note in each NR-U test case for verifying the legacy requirements as follows:
      * In EN-DC test:
        + The UE supporting EN-DC only on NR band(s) with shared spectrum access is required to be tested.
      * In SA test:
        + The UE supporting SA operation only on NR band(s) with shared spectrum access is required to be tested.
* Recommended WF
  + Please comment on Option 1.

**Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA**

Please consider the following proposal on requirements not impacted by CCA:

* Proposal 1: If one requirement is not impacted by the LBT behavior, it is not necessary to verify the requirement again if the UE has been tested in the corresponding non-NR-U SA, ENDC tests.
  + Option 1a: For all UEs supporting NR-U bands.
  + Option 1b: For a UE that supports both NR-U and NR bands.
* The proposal above, applies to the following proposed test cases:
  + Proposal 2: UE timer accuracy, UE TA adjustment accuracy and etc
  + Proposal 3: the legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell
  + Proposal 4: Interruption
    - Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)
    - During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)
    - Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements
    - Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release
  + Proposal 5: Inter frequency measurement accuracy:
    - NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC
    - NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)
  + Proposal 6: Others

Recommended WF

* Discuss proposal 1, with options 1a and 1b, as well as the list of test cases related to the proposal that are listed in Proposal 2 to 6.

### Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests

**Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration**

Consider the following proposal

* Proposal 1: For LBE, the default UL/DL pattern shall be the same as that in existing configurations, according to which TE shall schedule the UE in each slot.
* Proposal 2: For FBE, the default UL/DL pattern shall be the same as that in existing configurations, according to which TE shall schedule the UE in each slot.

Recommended WF

* Based on the opinions of the 1st round, discuss proposals 1 and 2.

**Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases**

Clarification was requested in the first round for the options presented, therefore the revised candidate options are edited in order to avoid confusion between SSB candidate positions and SSB indexes.

Consider the following options

* Options regarding SSB candidate positions, please choose between Option 1 and 2:
  + Option 1 – Two SSB candidate positions are modelled in all NR-U test cases, regardless of LBE or FBE, except cell detection where one SSB is stated in the requirements.
  + Option 2 – One SSB candidate position is used for semi-static channel access configurations, and 2 SSB candidate positions are used for dynamic channel access configurations
* Options regarding SSB indexes, please choose between Option 3 and 4:
  + Option 3 - Two SSB indexes are modelled in all NR-U test cases, regardless of LBE or FBE, except cell detection where one SSB is stated in the requirements.
  + Option 4 - The number of SSB indexes to be used in each test case is configured to be the same as in the existing NR test case.

Recommended WF

* Based on the majority view in the 1st round, there was strong support for agreeing in Option 2 and Option 4. Please discuss if Options 2 and 4 are agreeable.

**Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time**

Please consider the following proposal:

* Proposal 1 (R4-2107360): SI decoding time, TSI,CCA, is kept at 1280ms during RRC re-establishment and RRC release with re-direction in NR-U networks.

Recommended WF

* Please discuss this issue considering Issue 2-1-1 from [201] NR-U RRM part 1.

### Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL

**Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations**

Which value should be used as a baseline for the CCA success probability for dynamic channel access (LBE) configurations?

Candidate options:

* Option 1: P1=P2= 0.75
* Option 2: P1 = 0.75, P2 = 0.5

Recommended WF:

* P The majority of the companies expressed their option in favour of Option 1. Can Option 1 be agreed?

**Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations**

Which value should be used as a baseline for the CCA success probability for semi-static channel access (FBE) configurations?

Candidate options:

* Option 1 (R4-2106574): P(FBE)= 0.9
* Option 2 (R4-2107361): P(FBE) = 0.95

Recommended WF:

* At least one company expressed concerns on Option 2, indicating that it is close to “1” to provide efficient testing. Can companies defending option 2 comment if Option 1 is agreeable?

**Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model**

Consider the following proposal:

* Option 1: Current DL CCA model applies only for non-DRX
  + Model that applies for DRX is FFS
* Option 2: Current DL CCA model applies for both DRX and non-DRX

Recommended WF:

* Discuss the recommended options trying to highlight the specific modelling requirements for a DL CCA model that applied for DRX. Can Option 1 be agreed?

### Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL

**Issue 2-4-5 Test case list to include UL CCA failures**

Considering the decision on Issue 2-4-4, and no clear convergence on the 1st round comments, please discuss the following options.

Candidate Options:

* Proposal 1: Include UL CCA failure in Random Access test cases
* Proposal 2: Include UL CCA failure in one of these options
  + Option 2a: SCell activation
    - Additional delay in transmission of CSI reporting due to CCA failure
  + Option 2b: Event triggered measurement reporting delay
    - Additional delay due to UL LBT failure not defined
    - FFS: Assume it similar to above-mentioned SCell activation case
  + Option 2c: MAC CE based TCI state switch delay
    - Delay in sending HARQ feedback transmissions
  + Option 2d: Specifying one test case with UL CCA failure for each of the options 2a, 2b and 2c above.
  + Note: Option 2c depends on the decision on whether to include tests for Active TCI state switching under Topic #4.

Recommended WF:

* Discuss with Proposal 1 is agreeable. Comment if Proposal 2 is agreeable with one of its variants Option 2a, 2b, 2c, or 2d.

## Companies views’ collection for 2nd round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases  Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1  Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2  Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA  Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration  Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases  Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time  Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations  Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations  Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model  Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL  Issue 2-4-5: Test case list to include UL CCA failures |
|  | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-3: Option 1 is already covered by the discussion in Issue 2-1-5 in our view. It seems no need discuss issue 2-1-3 further.  Issue 2-1-4: Fine with Option 1.  Issue 2-1-5:  Support option 1a.  Support proposal 2, proposal 3, and proposal 4.  Since some test are exuded in the 1st round, Proposal 4 can be updated as:  Iinterruption   * Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements * Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release   Proposal 5 is not needed because the test cases are excluded in the 1st round.  Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-2: Fine with Option 2 & option 4.  Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-2: Option 1 seems more reasonable.  Issue 2-3-5: Agree with Option 1. Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL Issue 2-4-5: Proposal 1 is agreeable to us. |
| Nokia | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases  We are fine if companies want to propose more test cases that apply for both LBE and FBE.  Issue 2-1-3: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 1  We agree with Option 1.  Issue 2-1-4: How to handle legacy tests for UEs supporting only NR bands with CCA part 2  We agree with Option 1.  Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA  We agree with Proposal 1 with Option 1b.  Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration  We can agree with proposal 1 and 2.  Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases  Agree with the WF, meaning Option 2 and Option 4.  Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time  Wait for decision in [201] email discussion.  Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations  We can agree with any of the options.  Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations  We still prefer Option 1.  We have concerns related to 0.95, where only 1 out of 20 SSBs would experience LBT failure. We think this might not be enough to verify the UE behaviour.  Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model  To us it seems that the model could apply for both DRX and non-DRX, but we would like to hear company opinions on whether there would be a need to distinguish between those in the model and how.  Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL  Issue 2-4-5: Test case list to include UL CCA failures  We agree on Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. We have no clear preference between Options 2a, 2b, 2c. |
| Qualcomm | Sub-topic 2-1 Applicability rules  Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases  Prefer to postpone the decision to next meeting to see if any other cases are needed  Issue 2-1-5: Applicability of NR-U test cases if the requirement is not impacted by CCA  We don’t understand the motivation behind Options 1a/1b. The proposal says, “if the UE has been tested in the corresponding non-NR-U SA, ENDC test”, that itself means that the UE supports both NR-U and NR/LTE bands. So, no such clarification is needed.  We support the proposal as is:  If one requirement is not impacted by the LBT behavior, it is not necessary to verify the requirement again if the UE has been tested in the corresponding non-NR-U SA, ENDC tests.    Sub-topic 2-2 General configuration of the RRM tests  Issue 2-2-2: SSB configuration for NR-U test cases  Support option 2 for SSB candidate positions  Support option 4 regarding SSB indexes  Issue 2-2-3: SI decoding time  Support proposal 1  Sub-topic 2-3 CCA models in DL  Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations  We can consider the probabilities for both dynamic and semi-static channel access together. At-least some of the companies agree that P(FBE)>P(LBE). If we analyse the proposed options:  For LBE,   * P1=P2= 0.75 🡪 P(LBE) = 0.9375 * P1 = 0.75, P2 = 0.5 🡪 P(LBE) = 0.875   So, as a compromise we propose the following two options  Option 1   * LBE: P1=P2=0.75, * FBE: P = 0.95   Option 2   * LBE: P1=0.75, P2=0.5, * FBE: P = 0.9   We are fine with either of these options  Issue 2-3-3: CCA DL success probability for semi-static channel access configurations  See comment on Issue 2-3-2 above  Issue 2-3-5 DRX CCA model  Prefer option 1 for now  Sub-topic 2-4 CCA models in UL  Issue 2-4-5: Test case list to include UL CCA failures  Agree with proposal 1.  Agree with Option 2d for proposal 2. |
| Huawei | Issue 2-1-2: FBE and LBE test cases  Suggest to have further check whether more test cases are needed.  Issue 2-2-1: UL/DL pattern configuration  We agree with proposal 1 and 2.  Issue 2-3-2: CCA DL success probability for dynamic channel access configurations  Prefer option 1 but fine with option 2.  Issue 2-4-5: Test case list to include UL CCA failures  Agree with proposal 1. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| **AI 5.1.3.1 General** | |
| R4-2106846  Ericsson | Draft Big CR: Introduction of Rel-16 NR-U RRM performance requirements |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| **5.1.3.2 Measurement accuracy requirements** | |
| [R4-2106847](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106847.zip)  Ericsson | NR-U accuracy requirements |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| [R4-2106879](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106879.zip)  Ericsson | DraftCR 36.133 Correction of accuracy requirements for NR-U bands |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| [R4-2106975](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106975.zip)  Huawei | Draft CR on inter-RAT NR measurement accuracy requirements |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| **5.1.3.3.1 General** | |
| R4-2106580  Nokia | Draft CR on DL CCA model for NR-U |
| Ericsson: This issue is still open and CR approval should wait until three are issues are resolved. |
| Company B… |
| R4-2106850  Ericsson | CCA model in NR-U test cases |
| Nokia:  1) DL CCA model  • Could you please clarify how FBE mode is handled?  • Could you please clarify how the case of DL CCA failures exceeding Lmax is handled?  2) UL CCA model: could you please explain how the "energy" is generated by the TE (e.g. OCNG noise pattern)? |
| Qualcomm : Agreements on UL CCA model are not captured.… |
| R4-2106873  Ericsson | Draft CR: Update of RMC for NR-U test cases |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |
| R4-2106977  Huawei | Draft CR of test case configurations for NR-U |
| Nokia: to be revised depending on the decision on Issue 2-2-1. |
| Ericsson: If TE use this fixed pattern, RMC burst transmission is limited in DL slots, is it the intention? |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.20 other** | |
| R4-2107140  Ericsson | Applicability rules for legacy NR tests for NR-U in 38.133 |
| Nokia:  We are not yet convinced of the need of this CR.  1 - This sounds like a RAN5 issue, not RAN4.  2 – In 38.133, the clause A.3 is meant for "RRM test configurations". Including principles of testing and applicability in this session seems misplaced.  In case still we agree with this Draft CR, we have some further comments:  Tables with test cases applicable to UE supporting only NR-U  We don’t understand why they are citing the NR-U test cases (A.10 and A.11) and not the NR ones, (i.e. A.4 and A.6). Our understanding from the proposal in Issue 2-1-3 and 2-1-4 is that the objective would be to choose which of the legacy NR tests should be performed, and not to limit the number of NR-U tests. |
| Company B… |

# Topic #3: Test case specific details

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip) | MediaTek Inc. | **Proposal 1:** if one requirement is not impacted by the LBT behavior, it is not necessary to verify the requirement again if the UE has been tested in the corresponding non-NR-U SA, ENDC tests.  **Proposal 2:** Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD).  **Proposal 3:** Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1).  **Proposal 4:** Not to introduce TC for “NR-U-> NR-U, Inter-frequency, known” in R16.  **Proposal 5:** Use the same test case to verify HO for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD).  **Proposal 6:** Use the same test case to verify HO for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1).  Observation 1: Legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be introduced for the UE support NR-U SA but not NR SA or EN-DC.  **Proposal 7:** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped.  Observation 2: No TCs defined for active TCI in R15 in FR1.  **Proposal 8:** Low priority for defining the TCs for active TCI state switching delay for NR-U.  **Proposal 9:** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the following TCs for interruption can be skipped:   * Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.) * During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.) * Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements * Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release   **Proposal 10:** For NR-U intra-frequency measurements accuracy (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, L1-RSRP, RSSI, CO),   * Tests with “NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC” can be skipped, if the UE has been tested with “NR-U PCC” * Tests with “NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)” can be skipped, if the UE has been tested with “NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)”   **Proposal 11:** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, it can skip the following tests for inter frequency measurement accuracy:   * NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC * NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.2 RRC IDLE cell re-selection** | | |
| [R4-2106853](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106853.zip) | Ericsson | Discussions on cell reselection test cases for NR-U   * Observation #1: Not possible to verify the requirement that UE shall trigger cell detection on all configured carriers after two unsuccessful measurement attempts. * Observation #2: Not possible to verify the requirement on minimum spacing between two measurements used in the filtering. * **Proposal #1:** Test configurations in Table 3 and Table 4 are proposed for cell reselections between NR-U and NR, and between NR-U and E-UTRAN.   Table 3 Test configurations for cell reselections between NR-U and NR   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA | | 1 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode | | 2 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | | 3 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |   Table 4 Test configurations for cell reselections between NR-U to E-UTRAN   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA | | 1 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | | 2 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode | | Note: The UE is only required to be tested in one of the supported test configurations. | | |  * **Proposal #2:** Cell specific test parameters should contain following new or modified parameters to account for the LBT impact:   + DL CCA model   + UL CCA model   + DBT Window Configuration   + DL CCA probability PCCA\_DL   + UL CCA probability PCCA\_UL   + New RMCs * **Proposal #3:** Reselection test shall verify that maximum allowed CCA failures for Md, Mm and Me. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.3 HO (delay and interruptions)** | | |
| [R4-2106575](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106575.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Discussion about HO test cases with shared core requirements  Observation 1: NR(FR1) -> NR-U handover: The core requirements are the same as for NR-U->NR-U handover. Only the cell configuration for Cell 1 (NR FR1 source cell) needs to be updated.  Observation 2: NR-U -> NR(FR1) handover: The core requirements are the same as for NR(FR1)->NR(FR1) handover in section 6.1.1.2. The existing NR test cases are in A.6.3.1.1 (Intra-frequency handover from FR1 to FR1; known target cell), A.6.3.1.2 (Intra-frequency handover from FR1 to FR1; unknown target cell) and A.6.3.1.3 (Inter-frequency handover from FR1 to FR1; unknown target cell). The only difference to the existing NR test cases would be the cell configuration for Cell 1 (NR-U source cell).  Observation 3: NR-U - > E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) handover: The existing NR test cases are in A.6.3.1.4 (SA NR - E-UTRAN handover) and A.6.3.1.5 (SA NR - E-UTRAN handover with unknown target cell), and the only difference to NR-U -> NR(FR1) handover test case would be the cell configuration for Cell 1 (NR-U source cell).  Observation 4: Some of the cell specific parameters for at least handover test cases depend on the time period in the test and making such parameters general may be difficult.   1. Introduce NR-U test cases that share core requirements with already existing NR or NR-U test cases as new test cases in their own sections with the required changes in the cell configuration. |
| [R4-2106855](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106855.zip) | Ericsson | Discussions on handover test cases for NR-U  **Proposal #1:** Following test configurations are proposed for handovers between NR-U and NR, and between NR-U and E-UTRAN:  Table 3 Test configurations for cell reselections between NR-U and NR   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA | | 1 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode | | 2 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | | 3 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |   Table 4 Test configurations for cell reselections between NR-U to E-UTRAN   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA | | 1 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | | 2 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode | | Note: The UE is only required to be tested in one of the supported test configurations. | | |  * **Proposal #2:** Cell specific test parameters should contain following new or modified parameters to account for the LBT impact:   + DL CCA model   + UL CCA model   + DBT Window Configuration   + DL CCA probability PCCA\_DL   + UL CCA probability PCCA\_UL   + New RMCs * **Proposal #3:** Handover delay verified in test requirements is expressed using a formula containing L1, L1’, L2 and L3 depending on the type of test case, and the total delay is limited by T304 timer. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.4 RRC Re-establishment** | | |
| [R4-2104432](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104432.zip) | ZTE Corporation | Test cases for RRC re-establishment in NR-U  Proposal 1: The value of PCCA\_DL can be independent from the channel access mode (FBE / LBE)  Proposal 2: Serving cell: PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1 in all test times. Target cell: PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL = 0.75 in all test times. |
| [R4-2107141](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107141.zip) | Ericsson | RRC re-establishment tests for NR-U   * **Proposal 1:** At least the following NR-U to NR-U RRC re-establishment tests to verify core requirements in clause 6.2.1A, TS 38.133, are defined:  1. TC1: Intra-frequency RRC Re-establishment in FR1 with serving cell is subject to CCA and known target cell subject to CCA 2. TC2: Inter-frequency RRC Re-establishment in FR1 with serving cell is subject to CCA and with unknown target cell subject to CCA 3. TC3: Intra-frequency RRC Re-establishment in FR1 with serving cell is subject to CCA, with unknown target cell subject to CCA and without serving cell timing.  * **Proposal 2:** NR-U to NR-U RRC re-establishment tests are defined for the following configuration related to SSB SCS and BW for both serving and target cells:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description | | 1 | With CCA: 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |  * **Proposal 3:** In the test under the following parameter settings (non-DRX, no gaps are used and SSB periodicity is 20 ms), the out of sync detection evaluation period = 480 ms when the serving cell is inactivated (RLM-RS SSB Es/Iot <-7 dB). * **Proposal 4:** NR-U to NR-U RRC re-establishment tests can be defined for the following LBT configuration/setting subject to agreements on the LBT. The initial draft contains these values are TBD due to lack of agreement on LBT model.   + **Serving cell:** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1 in all test times   + **Target cell:** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL< 1 (e.g. 0.5) in all test times |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.5 RRC Connection Release with Redirection** | | |
| [R4-2104433](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104433.zip) | ZTE Corporation | Test cases for RRC release with re-direction in NR-U   1. Serving cell: PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1 in all test times. Target cell: PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL = 0.75 in all test times. |
| [R4-2107143](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107143.zip) | Ericsson | RRC connetion release with re-direction from NR to NR-U test   * **Proposal 1:** The following NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection test to verify core requirements in clause 6.2.3.2.3, TS 38.133, is defined:  1. TC2: Redirection from NR FR1 carrier without CCA to NR FR1 carrier with CCA  * **Proposal 2:** NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection tests are defined for the following configuration related to SSB SCS and BW for both serving and target cells:  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | Source cell without CCA | Target cell with CCA | | 1 | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD | | 2 | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD | | 3 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD |  * **Proposal 3:** NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection test is defined for the following LBT configuration/setting. The initial draft contains these values are TBD due to lack of agreement on LBT model.   + **Target cell:** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL< 1 (e.g. 0.75) in all test times * **Proposal 4:** In NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection test ensure that number of DL LBT failures (L1) in target cell does not exceed L1,max ; L1,max is defined in Table 6.2.3.2.3-1, TS 38.133. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.6 Random access** | | |
| [R4-2106876](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip) | Ericsson | Test cases on random access for NR-U  **Proposal 1:** Define the random access procedure test cases for NR-U as follows.   |  | | --- | | A.10 EN-DC Tests with NR PSCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1  […]  A.10.1.1.1 Random Access  A.10.1.1.1.1 Contention-based random access for NR PSCell  A.10.1.1.1.1.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.10.1.1.1.1.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.10.1.1.1.2 Non-contention based random access for NR PSCell  A.10.1.1.1.2.1 4-step RA type non-contention based random access test  A.10.1.1.1.2.2 2-step RA type non-contention based random access test  A.11 NR Standalone Tests with NR PCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1  […]  A.11.2.2.2 Random Access  A.11.2.2.2.1 Contention-based random access for NR PCell  A.11.2.2.2.1.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.11.2.2.2.1.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.11.2.2.2.2 Non-contention based random access for NR PCell  A.11.2.2.2.2.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.11.2.2.2.2.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test |   **Proposal 2:** For the non-contention random access procedure in NR-U, define only the SSB-based random access procedure test cases.  **Proposal 3:** NR-U random access procedure tests do not need to configure DL LBT failure, i.e., set PCCA\_DL=1.0.  **Proposal 4:** NR-U random access procedure tests should configure UL LBT failure, i.e., set PCCA\_UL < 1.0.  **Proposal 5:** Configure lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig for the random access procedure test cases for NR-U. Set *FailureInstanceMaxCount* to 4 and *lbt-FailureDetectionTimer* to 320ms. |
| **5.1.3.3.7 Timing (transmit timing and TA)** | | |
| [R4-2104434](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104434.zip) | ZTE Corporation | Test cases for timing in NR-U  Proposal 1: UE timing advance adjustment accuracy tests are defined for the following LBT configuration/setting in SpCell: PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL =1 in all test times. |
| [R4-2106980](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106980.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Discussion on test cases for timing requirements for NR-U  Observation 1: The reference cell shall be considered as available only if all SSB are available during the last 160 ms.  Observation 2: Handling the DL CCA failure in transmit timing requirements:   * Option 1: PCCA\_DL <1, and add a note that the UL transmission is not taken in to statistics if there is at least on SSB not available during the last 160 ms * Option 2: PCCA\_DL = 1.   **Proposal 1:** Configure PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1 for transmit timing test cases. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.8 BWP switching delay and interruptions** | | |
| [R4-2104435](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104435.zip) | ZTE Corporation | Test cases for BWP switching in NR-U  Proposal 1: Periodic SRS shall be configured in the SpCell to enable the UE to detect consistent UL LBT failure in the SpCell.  Proposal 2: Endorse the configurations in the WF [1]:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Active BWP in SpCell | PCCA\_UL | PCCA\_DL | | UL active BWP before active BWP switching (UL BWP-1) | 0 | 1 | | UL active BWP after active BWP switching (UL BWP-2) | 1 | 1 | | DL active BWP before active BWP switching (DL BWP-1) | 1 | 1 | | DL active BWP after active BWP switching (DL BWP-2) | 1 | 1 | |
| [R4-2107145](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107145.zip) | Ericsson | Test cases on BWP switching for NR-U SA   * **Proposal 1:** The following BWP switching tests to verify core requirements in clauses 8.6.2 and 8.6.3, TS 38.133, are defined:  1. TC1: A.10.3.5.2.1 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC 2. TC2: A.10.3.5.2.2 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch with FR1 SCell in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC 3. TC3: A.10.3.5.3.1 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC 4. TC4: A.11.4.5.2.1 NR FR1- NR FR1 DL active BWP switch of PCell with non-DRX in SA 5. TC5: A.11.4.5.2.2 NR FR1 DL active BWP switch with non-DRX in SA 6. TC6: A.11.4.5.3.1 NR FR1 DL active BWP switch of Cell with non-DRX in SA  * **Proposal 2:** BWP switching tests are defined for the following configurations related to SSB SCS and BW for both serving and target cells:   + The EN-DC tests shall be done for the following two set of test configuration:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Config | Description | | 1 | LTE FDD,  With CCA: NR TDD, SSB SCS 30 kHz, data SCS 30 kHz, BW 40 MHz | | 2 | LTE TDD,  With CCA: NR TDD, SSB SCS 30 kHz, data SCS 30 kHz, BW 40 MHz |  * + The SA tests shall be done for the following test configuration:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Config | Description | | 1 | With CCA: NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |  * **Proposal 3:** No LBT failure is modelled in any of above the test cases i.e.   + **In all NR-U cells:** PCCA\_UL= PCCA\_DL =1 * **Proposal 4:** The above test cases are applicable as follows:   + EN-DC tests TC1-TC3 for UE capable of EN-DC with only NR-U bands   + SA tests TC4-TC6 for UE capable of SA with only NR-U bands |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.13 Beam management (BFD and link recovery)** | | |
| [R4-2106874](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106874.zip) | Ericsson | Test cases on link recovery and L1-RSRP reporting for NR-U  **Proposal 1:** Set the time durations and timer values of link recovery tests for NR-U as follows:   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | SSB-based LR with non-DRX  (both EN-DC and SA) | | SSB-based LR with DRX  (both EN-DC and SA) | | | BFD-RS SSB Es/Iot | Es/Iot ≥ -7 dB | Es/Iot < -7 dB | Es/Iot ≥ -7 dB | Es/Iot < -7 dB | | T310 | 1000ms | 1000ms | 1000ms | 1000ms | | N310 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | T1 | 0.2s | 0.2s | 1s | 1s | | T2 | 0.85s | 0.93s | 8.37s | 9.01s | | T3 | 0.44s | 0.52s | 4.52s | 5.16s | | T4 | 0s | 0s | 0s | 0s | | T5 | 0.45s | 0.45s | 3.89s | 3.89s | | D1 | 0.41s | 0.41s | 3.85s | 3.85s |   **Proposal 2:** Set the CCA parameters in the link recovery tests for NR-U as follows. For DL LBT parameters, RAN4 should wait for the conclusion of CCA models for NR-U RRM performance requirements.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | | PCCA,DL | semi-static channel access | 1.0 | FFS | FFS | FFS | FFS | | dynamic channel access | 1.0 | FFS | FFS | FFS | FFS | | PCCA,UL |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |   **Proposal 3:** Set PCCA\_DL=100% and PCCA\_UL=100% during T1 for L1-RSRP measurement reporting tests.  **Proposal 4:** Set PCCA\_DL=75% and PCCA\_UL=75% during T2 for L1-RSRP measurement reporting tests. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.18 RSSI/CO measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)** | | |
| [R4-2104829](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104829.zip) | Apple | On RSSI and CO testing in NR-U  **Proposal 1:** RAN4 set the RMTC parameters for NR-U RSSI/CO measurement TCs as below, including intra-frequency/inter-frequency and inter-RAT.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | measDurationSymbols-r16 | sym14or12 | | rmtc-Periodicity-r16 | ms40 | | rmtc-SubframeOffset-r16 | 20 | | ref-SCS-CP-r16 | kHz30 | | ReportInterval | ms120 |   **Proposal 2:** in the NR-U RSSI/CO measurement TCs the parameter configuration shall guarantee the Io difference between inside RMTC and outside RMTC within a range of [14dB, 15dB]. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.20 Other** | | |
| [R4-2106984](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106984.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Discussion on test cases for TCI switching for NR-U  Observation 1: Introduce the timing different between the RS in the two TCI states.  **Proposal 1:** Introduce the timing different between the RS in the two TCI states in the TCI state switching test cases, where the exact value needs further discussion. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selection

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-1-1: Test configurations for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106853**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106853.zip)**):** Test configurations in Table 3-1-1.1 and Table 3-1-1.2 are proposed for cell reselections between NR-U and NR, and between NR-U and E-UTRAN.

**Table 3-1-1.1: Test configurations for cell re-selections between NR-U and NR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA |
| 1 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode |
| 2 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |
| 3 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |

**Table 3-1-1.2: Test configurations for cell re-selections between NR-U and E-UTRAN**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA |
| 1 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |
| 2 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode |
| Note: The UE is only required to be tested in one of the supported test configurations. | | |

* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposal 1 be agreed?

**Issue 3-1-2: Cell specific test parameters for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106853**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106853.zip)**):** Cell specific test parameters should contain following new or modified parameters to account for the LBT impact:
  + DL CCA model
  + UL CCA model
  + DBT Window Configuration
  + DL CCA probability PCCA\_DL
  + UL CCA probability PCCA\_UL
  + New RMCs
* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposal 1 be agreed?

**Issue 3-1-3: Verifying maximum allowed CCA failures for Md Mm and Me in RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106853**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106853.zip)**):** Reselection test shall verify that maximum allowed CCA failures for Md, Mm and Me.
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**

Background:

The following test cases have been agreed for NR-U RRC IDLE cell re-selection:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group of requirements** | **Test cases** |  | **Requirements section** | **Agreed** |
| RRC\_IDLE, cell re-selection | NR-U -> NR-U | intra-frequency | 4.2A | Yes |
| inter-frequency | Yes |
| NR(FR1) -> NR-U |  | Yes |
| NR-U -> NR(FR1) |  | Yes |
| NR-U - > E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |
| E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) -> NR-U |  | TS 36.133 | Yes |

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD).
* **Proposal 2 (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1).
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss Proposals 1 and 2.

### Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-2-1: Test configurations for handover test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106855**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106855.zip)**):** Following test configurations are proposed for handovers between NR-U and NR, and between NR-U and E-UTRAN:

**Table 3-2-1.1 Test configurations for handover between NR-U and NR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA |
| 1 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode |
| 2 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |
| 3 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA |
| 1 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |
| 2 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode |
| Note: The UE is only required to be tested in one of the supported test configurations. | | |

**Table 3-2-1.2 Test configurations for handover between NR-U and E-UTRAN**

* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposal 1 be agreed?

**Issue 3-2-2: Cell specific test parameters for handover test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106855**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106855.zip)**):** Cell specific test parameters should contain following new or modified parameters to account for the LBT impact:
  + DL CCA model
  + UL CCA model
  + DBT Window Configuration
  + DL CCA probability PCCA\_DL
  + UL CCA probability PCCA\_UL
  + New RMCs
* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposal 1 be agreed?

**Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106855**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106855.zip)**):** Handover delay verified in test requirements is expressed using a formula containing L1, L1’, L2 and L3 depending on the type of test case, and the total delay is limited by T304 timer.
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-2-4: The way to introduce handover test cases**

Background:

The following test cases have been agreed for handover:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group of requirements | Test cases |  | Requirements section | Agreed |
| HO (delay and interruptions) | NR-U-> NR-U | intra-frequency, known | 6.1B | Yes |
| intra-frequency, unknown | Yes |
| inter-frequency, unkown | Yes |
| Inter-frequency, known | FFS |
| NR(FR1) -> NR-U | known | 6.1B | Yes |
| unkown | Yes |
| NR-U -> NR(FR1) | known |  | Yes |
| unknown | 6.1.1.2 | Yes |
| NR-U - > E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) |  | 6.1.2.1 | Yes |
| E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) -> NR-U |  | TS 36.133 | Yes |

* **Option 1 (**[**R4-2106575**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106575.zip)**):** Introduce NR-U test cases that share core requirements with already existing NR or NR-U test cases as new test cases in their own sections with the required changes in the cell configuration.
* **Option 2a (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify HO for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD).
* **Option 2b (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify HO for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1).
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss Options 1, 2a and 2b.

**Issue 3-2-5: Test case for NR-U to NR-U inter-frequency handover to known cell**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Not to introduce TC for “NR-U-> NR-U, Inter-frequency, known” in R16.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss Proposal 1. Please indicate your company view also under Topic 4.

### Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases**

* Proposal 1 ([R4-2104432](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104432.zip)): The value of PCCA\_DL can be independent from the channel access mode (FBE / LBE)
* Proposal 2 ([R4-2104432](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104432.zip), [R4-2107141](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107141.zip)):
  + In all test times:
    - **Serving cell:** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1
    - **Target cell:** 
      * PCCA\_UL=1
      * PCCA\_DL
        + **Option 1 (**[**R4-2107141**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107141.zip)**):** < 1 (e.g. 0.5)
        + **Option 2 (**[**R4-2104432**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104432.zip)**):** 0.75
* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposals 1 and 2 be agreed? Please indicate your company preference for PCCA\_DL, is 0.75 acceptable?

**Issue 3-3-2: Tests for RRC re-establishment**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2107141**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107141.zip)**):** At least the following NR-U to NR-U RRC re-establishment tests to verify core requirements in clause 6.2.1A, TS 38.133, are defined:

1. TC1: Intra-frequency RRC Re-establishment in FR1 with serving cell is subject to CCA and known target cell subject to CCA
2. TC2: Inter-frequency RRC Re-establishment in FR1 with serving cell is subject to CCA and with unknown target cell subject to CCA
3. TC3: Intra-frequency RRC Re-establishment in FR1 with serving cell is subject to CCA, with unknown target cell subject to CCA and without serving cell timing.

* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposal 1 be agreed?

**Issue 3-3-3: Test configuration for RRC re-establishment test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2107141**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107141.zip)**):** NR-U to NR-U RRC re-establishment tests are defined for the following configuration related to SSB SCS and BW for both serving and target cells:

**Table 3-3-3.1: Test configuration for RRC re-establishment tests**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Configuration | Description |
| 1 | With CCA: 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |

* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-3-4: CCA probabilities in RRC re-establishment test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2107141**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107141.zip)**):** In the test under the following parameter settings (non-DRX, no gaps are used and SSB periodicity is 20 ms), the out of sync detection evaluation period = 480 ms when the serving cell is inactivated (RLM-RS SSB Es/Iot <-7 dB).
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

### Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases**

* **Proposal 1:**
  + **Serving cell (**[**R4-2104433**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104433.zip)**):** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1 in all test times.
  + **Target cell (**[**R4-2104433**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104433.zip)**,** [**R4-2107143**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107143.zip)**):** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL = 0.75 in all test times.
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-4-2: Test for RRC connection release with redirection test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2107143**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107143.zip)**):** The following NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection test to verify core requirements in clause 6.2.3.2.3, TS 38.133, is defined:
  + TC2: Redirection from NR FR1 carrier without CCA to NR FR1 carrier with CCA
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-4-3: Test configurations for RRC connection release with redirection test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2107143**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107143.zip)**):** NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection tests are defined for the following configuration related to SSB SCS and BW for both serving and target cells:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Configuration** | **Source cell without CCA** | **Target cell with CCA** |
| 1 | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD |
| 2 | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD |
| 3 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD |

* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-4-4: Lmax in RRC connection release with redirection test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2107143**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107143.zip)**):** In NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection test ensure that number of DL LBT failures (L1) in target cell does not exceed L1,max ; L1,max is defined in Table 6.2.3.2.3-1, TS 38.133.
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

### Sub-topic 3-5: Random access

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106876**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip)**):** Define the random access procedure test cases for NR-U as follows.

A.10 EN-DC Tests with NR PSCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1

[…]

A.10.1.1.1 Random Access

A.10.1.1.1.1 Contention-based random access for NR PSCell

A.10.1.1.1.1.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.10.1.1.1.1.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.10.1.1.1.2 Non-contention based random access for NR PSCell

A.10.1.1.1.2.1 4-step RA type non-contention based random access test

A.10.1.1.1.2.2 2-step RA type non-contention based random access test

A.11 NR Standalone Tests with NR PCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1

[…]

A.11.2.2.2 Random Access

A.11.2.2.2.1 Contention-based random access for NR PCell

A.11.2.2.2.1.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.11.2.2.2.1.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.11.2.2.2.2 Non-contention based random access for NR PCell

A.11.2.2.2.2.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.11.2.2.2.2.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test

* Recommended WF

It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1.

**Issue 3-5-2: SSB and CSI-RS based random access in test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106876**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip)**):** For the non-contention random access procedure in NR-U, define only the SSB-based random access procedure test cases.
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-5-3: DL CCA failure probability in random access test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106876**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip)**):** NR-U random access procedure tests do not need to configure DL LBT failure, i.e., set PCCA\_DL=1.0.
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106876**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip)**):** NR-U random access procedure tests should configure UL LBT failure, i.e., set PCCA\_UL < 1.0.
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1. Please consider that PCCA\_UL is also discussed on Issue 2-4-2.

**Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases**

* **Option 1 (**[**R4-2106876**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip)**):** Configure lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig for the random access procedure test cases for NR-U. Set *FailureInstanceMaxCount* to 4 and *lbt-FailureDetectionTimer* to 320ms.
* **Option 2 (**[**R4-2106579**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106579.zip)**):** Not to configure lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig for the random access procedure test cases.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss options considering also the Issue 2-4-3.

**Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases**

* Option 1 ([**R4-2107361**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107361.zip)): Test equipment to configure *preambleReceivedTargetPower* for msg1 and *msgA-PreambleReceivedTargetPower* for msgA to the highest value for UL LBT test cases.
* Option 2 ([**R4-2106574**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106574.zip)):
  + Specify RACH requirements that reuse NR FR1 configurations and expected PRACH transmitted power.
  + Specify that the power of the first preamble for NR-U random access test cases to be the same as in NR test cases.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss your preferred options, 1 or 2

**Issue 3-5-7: PRACH configuration for UL CCA testing**

Considering UL CCA failure testing, consider the following proposal related to PRACH configuration:

* Proposal 1 ([**R4-2106574**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106574.zip)): In the case the PRACH is transmitted within a gNB-initiated COT – which is always the case for FBE mode, a gap greater than 16 µs has to be configured between the DL-UL transmissions.

Recommended WF:

* It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

### Sub-topic 3-6: Timing (transmit timing and TA)

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-6-1: CCA probabilities in timing test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2104434**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104434.zip)**,** [**R4-2106980**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106980.zip)**):** UE timing tests are defined for the following CCA probabilities: PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL =1 in all test times.
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

### Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-7-1: Periodic SRS in UL BWP switching test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2104435**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104435.zip)**):** Periodic SRS shall be configured in the SpCell to enable the UE to detect consistent UL LBT failure in the SpCell.
* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-7-2: CCA probabilities in UL BWP switching test cases**

* Proposal 1 ([R4-2104435](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104435.zip)): Endorse the configurations in the WF [1]:

**Table 3-7-2.1: BWP switching test configurations for EN-DC**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Active BWP in SpCell | PCCA\_UL | PCCA\_DL |  |
| UL active BWP before active BWP switching (UL BWP-1) | 0 | 1 |  |
| UL active BWP after active BWP switching (UL BWP-2) | 1 | 1 |  |
| DL active BWP before active BWP switching (DL BWP-1) | 1 | 1 |  |
| DL active BWP after active BWP switching (DL BWP-2) | 1 | 1 |  |

* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-7-3: New Tests for DL BWP switching**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2107145**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107145.zip)**):** The following BWP switching tests to verify core requirements in clauses 8.6.2 and 8.6.3, TS 38.133, are defined:
  1. TC1: A.10.3.5.2.1 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC
  2. TC2: A.10.3.5.2.2 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch with FR1 SCell in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC
  3. TC3: A.10.3.5.3.1 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC
  4. TC4: A.11.4.5.2.1 NR FR1- NR FR1 DL active BWP switch of PCell with non-DRX in SA
  5. TC5: A.11.4.5.2.2 NR FR1 DL active BWP switch with non-DRX in SA
  6. TC6: A.11.4.5.3.1 NR FR1 DL active BWP switch of Cell with non-DRX in SA
* **Proposal 2 (**[**R4-2107145**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107145.zip)**):** The above test cases are applicable as follows:
  + EN-DC tests TC1-TC3 for UE capable of EN-DC with only NR-U bands
  + SA tests TC4-TC6 for UE capable of SA with only NR-U bands
* **Proposal 3 (**[**R4-2107145**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107145.zip)**):** No LBT failure is modelled in any of above the test cases i.e.
  + In all NR-U cells:PCCA\_UL= PCCA\_DL =1

Recommended WF

* + Can Proposals 1, 2 and 3 be agreed?

**Issue** **3-7-4: Test configurations for DL BWP switching test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2107145**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107145.zip)**):** BWP switching tests are defined for the following configurations related to SSB SCS and BW for both serving and target cells:
  + The EN-DC tests shall be done for the following two set of test configuration:

**Table 3-7-4.1: BWP switching test configurations for EN-DC**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Config | Description |
| 1 | LTE FDD,  With CCA: NR TDD, SSB SCS 30 kHz, data SCS 30 kHz, BW 40 MHz |
| 2 | LTE TDD,  With CCA: NR TDD, SSB SCS 30 kHz, data SCS 30 kHz, BW 40 MHz |

* + The SA tests shall be done for the following test configuration:

**Table 3-7-4.2: BWP switching test configurations for SA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Config | Description |
| 1 | With CCA: NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |

* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-7-5: Applicability of BWP switching test cases**

Background:

The following test cases have been agreed for BWP switching:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group of requirements | Test cases | Requirements section | Agreed |
| BWP switching delay and interruptions |        E-UTRAN – NR-U PSCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure | 8.6 | Yes |
|        NR-U – NR-U PCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure | Yes |
| Legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching on NR-U SCell, with: |  |
|         NR PCC (PCC) | FFS |
|         NR-U PCC | FFS |
|         NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) | FFS |

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss Proposal 1.

### Sub-topic 3-8: Beam management (BFD and link recovery)

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-8-1: Time durations and timer values for link recovery test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106874**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106874.zip)**):** Set the time durations and timer values of link recovery tests for NR-U as follows:

**Table 3-8-1.1: Time durations and timer values for link recovery tests for NR-U**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SSB-based LR with non-DRX  (both EN-DC and SA) | | SSB-based LR with DRX  (both EN-DC and SA) | |
| BFD-RS SSB Es/Iot | Es/Iot ≥ -7 dB | Es/Iot < -7 dB | Es/Iot ≥ -7 dB | Es/Iot < -7 dB |
| T310 | 1000ms | 1000ms | 1000ms | 1000ms |
| N310 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| T1 | 0.2s | 0.2s | 1s | 1s |
| T2 | 0.85s | 0.93s | 8.37s | 9.01s |
| T3 | 0.44s | 0.52s | 4.52s | 5.16s |
| T4 | 0s | 0s | 0s | 0s |
| T5 | 0.45s | 0.45s | 3.89s | 3.89s |
| D1 | 0.41s | 0.41s | 3.85s | 3.85s |

* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposal 1 be agreed?

**Issue 3-8-2: CCA probabilities for link recovery test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106874**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106874.zip)**):** Set the CCA parameters in the link recovery tests for NR-U as follows. For DL LBT parameters, RAN4 should wait for the conclusion of CCA models for NR-U RRM performance requirements.

**Table 3-8-2.1: CCA parameters in link recovery tests for NR-U**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 |
| PCCA,DL | semi-static channel access | 1.0 | FFS | FFS | FFS | FFS |
| dynamic channel access | 1.0 | FFS | FFS | FFS | FFS |
| PCCA,UL |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

* **Proposal 2 (**[**R4-2106874**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106874.zip)**):** Set PCCA\_DL=100% and PCCA\_UL=100% during T1 for L1-RSRP measurement reporting tests.
* **Proposal 3 (**[**R4-2106874**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106874.zip)**):** Set PCCA\_DL=75% and PCCA\_UL=75% during T2 for L1-RSRP measurement reporting tests.
* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposals 1-3 be agreed?

### Sub-topic 3-9: RSSI/CO measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-9-1: RMTC parameters for RSSI/CO measurement test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2104829**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104829.zip)**):** RAN4 set the RMTC parameters for NR-U RSSI/CO measurement TCs as below, including intra-frequency/inter-frequency and inter-RAT.

**Table 3-9-1.1: RMTC parameters for NR-U RSSI/CO measurement test cases**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| measDurationSymbols-r16 | sym14or12 |
| rmtc-Periodicity-r16 | ms40 |
| rmtc-SubframeOffset-r16 | 20 |
| ref-SCS-CP-r16 | kHz30 |
| ReportInterval | ms120 |

* Recommended WF
  + It is proposed to agree on Proposal 1

**Issue 3-9-2: Io difference between inside and outside RMTC in RSSI/CO measurement test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2104829**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104829.zip)**):** In the NR-U RSSI/CO measurement TCs the parameter configuration shall guarantee the Io difference between inside RMTC and outside RMTC within a range of [14dB, 15dB].
* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposal 1 be agreed?

### Sub-topic 3-10: TCI state switching

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-10-1: Timing difference between RSs in two TCI states**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106984**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106984.zip)**):** Introduce the timing different between the RS in the two TCI states in the TCI state switching test cases, where the exact value needs further discussion.
* Recommended WF
  + Can Proposal 1 be agreed?

**Issue 3-10-2: Introducing TCI state switching test cases**

Background:

The status of the TCI state switching test cases is the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group of requirements** | **Test cases** | **Requirements section** | **Agreed** |
| Active TCI state switching delay | For known and unknown target TCI state in NR-U, on: | 8.10A |  |
|         NR-U PCC | FFS |
|         NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) | FFS |
|         NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) | FFS |

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Low priority for defining the TCs for active TCI state switching delay for NR-U.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss Proposal 1.

### Sub-topic 3-11: Interruptions

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-11-1: Introducing interruption test cases**

Background:

The status of interruption test cases after RAN4#98-e meeting is the following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Interruptions | Due to NR-U SCell addition/release, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  | Ericsson |
|         NR PCC (FR1) |  | FFS |
|         NR-U PCC |  | FFS |
|         NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | FFS |
| Due to NR-U SCell activation/deactivation, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  |
|         NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes |
|         NR-U PCC |  | Yes |
|         NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |
| During measurements no deactivated NR-U SCell, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  |
|         NR PCC (FR1) |  | FFS |
|         NR-U PCC |  | FFS |
|         NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | FFS |
| Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements between: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |
|         NR-U PCell and E-UTRAN PCell (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |
| Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release, with: |  | TS 36.133 | Yes |  |
|         E-UTRA PCell |  | Yes |

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the following TCs for interruption can be skipped:
  + Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)
  + During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)
  + Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements
  + Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss Proposal 1.

### Sub-topic 3-12: Measurement accuracy test cases

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-12-1: Applicability of intra-frequency measurement accuracy test cases**

Background:

The following configurations for intra-frequency measurement accuracy test cases have been agreed after RAN4#98-e:

|  |
| --- |
|         NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |
|         NR-U PCC |
|         NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |
|         NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |
|         NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** For NR-U intra-frequency measurements accuracy (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, L1-RSRP, RSSI, CO),
  + Tests with “NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC” can be skipped, if the UE has been tested with “NR-U PCC”
  + Tests with “NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)” can be skipped, if the UE has been tested with “NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)”
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss Proposal 1.

**Issue 3-12-2: Applicability of inter-frequency measurement accuracy test cases**

Background:

The following inter-frequency measurement accuracy test cases are marked FFS after RAN4#98-e meeting:

|  |
| --- |
|         NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |
|         NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, it can skip the following tests for inter frequency measurement accuracy:
  + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC
  + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss Proposal 1.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selectionSub topic 1-2:  Issue 3-1-1: Test configurations for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  ….  Issue 3-1-2: Cell specific test parameters for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  …  Issue 3-1-3: Verifying maximum allowed CCA failures for Md Mm and Me in RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  …  Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)  Issue 3-2-1: Test configurations for handover test cases  …  Issue 3-2-2: Cell specific test parameters for handover test cases  …  Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements  …  Issue 3-2-4: The way to introduce handover test cases  …  Issue 3-2-5: Test case for NR-U to NR-U inter-frequency handover to known cell  …  Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment  Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases  …  Issue 3-3-2: Tests for RRC re-establishment  …  Issue 3-3-3: Test configuration for RRC re-establishment test cases  …  Issue 3-3-4: CCA probabilities in RRC re-establishment test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection  Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases  …  Issue 3-4-2: Test for RRC connection release with redirection test cases  …  Issue 3-4-3: Test configurations for RRC connection release with redirection test cases  …  Issue 3-4-4: Lmax in RRC connection release with redirection test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-5: Random access  Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access  …  Issue 3-5-2: SSB and CSI-RS based random access in test cases  …  Issue 3-5-3: DL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  …  Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  …  Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases  …  Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases  …  Issue 3-5-7: PRACH configuration for UL CCA testing  …  Sub-topic 3-6: Timing (transmit timing and TA)  Issue 3-6-1: CCA probabilities in timing test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions  Issue 3-7-1: Periodic SRS in BWP switching test cases  …  Issue 3-7-2: CCA probabilities in BWP switching test cases  …  Issue 3-7-3: Tests for BWP switching  …  Issue 3-7-4: Test configurations for BWP switching test cases  …  Issue 3-7-5: Applicability of BWP switching test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-8: Beam management (BFD and link recovery)  Issue 3-8-1: Time durations and timer values for link recovery test cases  …  Issue 3-8-2: CCA probabilities for link recovery test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-9: RSSI/CO measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)  Issue 3-9-1: RMTC parameters for RSSI/CO measurement test cases  …  Issue 3-9-2: Io difference between inside and outside RMTC in RSSI/CO measurement test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-10: TCI state switching  Issue 3-10-1: Timing difference between RSs in two TCI states  …  Issue 3-10-2: Introducing TCI state switching test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-11: Interruptions  Issue 3-11-1: Introducing interruption test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-12: Measurement accuracy test cases  Issue 3-12-1: Applicability of intra-frequency measurement accuracy test cases  …  Issue 3-12-2: Applicability of inter-frequency measurement accuracy test cases  … |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selection  Issue 3-1-1: Test configurations for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  These configurations were already agreed in the last meeting, so Proposal 1 is fine.  Issue 3-1-2: Cell specific test parameters for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  These parameters were already agreed in many CRs during the last meeting, so also for these test cases Proposal 1 is ok.  Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  Could the motivation behind this proposal be clarified a bit? Does such approach save some testing time, or is this just to make the spec shorter? If this is just for specification drafting purposes, it would need to be made sure that the spec is still clear and simple to read and easy to update, if test cases are being combined.  Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)  Issue 3-2-1: Test configurations for handover test cases  These configurations were already agreed in the last meeting, so Proposal 1 is fine.  Issue 3-2-2: Cell specific test parameters for handover test cases  These parameters were already agreed in many CRs during the last meeting, so also for these test cases Proposal 1 is ok.  Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements  Proposal is ok as such, but L3 just depends on whether UL LBT failures are to be tested in this test case (L3=0 if not), so we think agreement should first be made under Topic 2 regarding the test cases that will be used to test UL LBT failures.  Issue 3-2-4: The way to introduce handover test cases  Similar comment as for Issue 3-1-4. Can some testing time be saved if Options 2a and 2b are agreed or is this just to make the spec shorter?  Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment  Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases  We think the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities should be agreed first before agreeing on the probabilities on test case level.  Issue 3-3-2: Tests for RRC re-establishment  Follows legacy principle, so proposal 1 is ok for us. We have introduced these tests in our CR for this topic.  Issue 3-3-3: Test configuration for RRC re-establishment test cases  Proposal 1 is ok, as already agreed in the last meeting in general level.  Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection  Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases  We think the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities should be agreed first before agreeing on the probabilities on test case level.  Issue 3-4-3: Test configurations for RRC connection release with redirection test cases  Proposal 1 is ok, as agreed in the last meeting.  Issue 3-4-4: Lmax in RRC connection release with redirection test cases  Proposal 1 is ok to us, and we would prefer to use this approach in any test case where Lmax parameter is involved and testing of exceeding Lmax is not desired. However, we think this discussion should be first taken on general level under Topic 2 before agreeing on test case specific level.  Sub-topic 3-5: Random access  Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access  We prefer to use the same clause structure as used in NR, so we propose (new) Option 2 based on our CR:  A.10 EN-DC Tests with NR PSCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1  […]  A.10.1.1.1 Random Access  A.10.1.1.1.1 4-step contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.10.1.1.1.2 4-step non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.10.1.1.1.3 2-step RA type contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.10.1.1.1.4 2-step RA type non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  […]  A.11 NR Standalone Tests with NR PCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1  […]  A.11.2.2.2 Random Access  A.11.2.2.2.1 4-step contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.11.2.2.2.2 4-step non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.11.2.2.2.3 2-step contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.11.2.2.2.4 2-step non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  Issue 3-5-2: SSB and CSI-RS based random access in test cases  We agree with Proposal 1.  There is no CSI-RS core requirements for now, so it is fine not to define test cases for that now.  Issue 3-5-3: DL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  We don’t agree with Proposal 1.  We would like to have DL LBT failures as well because of the different behavior of FBE and LBE.  For FBE the UE cannot initiate COT, while for LBE it is possible to configure a UE-initiated COT. And the random access test is one good test case to verify the differences of FBE and LBE.  Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  We prefer to discuss the probability of LBT failure as part of Issue 2-4-2.  Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases  We prefer Option 2. lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig is an optional UE feature, it we cannot assume that the UE will be able to configure it in order to perform the random access test.  If lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig is to be tested, it has to be in a separate test that doesn’t reduce test coverage for UEs that do not support that feature.  Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases  We prefer Option 2.  As we show in our discussion paper, there is no power ramping caused by LBT failures, so the power for the first transmitted PRACH preamble should not be affected by LBT.  Issue 3-5-7: PRACH configuration for UL CCA testing  We agree with Proposal 1.  By having the 16 us gap, we can ensure that LBT behaviour is verified.  Sub-topic 3-6: Timing (transmit timing and TA)  Issue 3-6-1: CCA probabilities in timing test cases  We think the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities should be agreed first before agreeing on the probabilities on test case level.  Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions  Issue 3-7-1: Periodic SRS in BWP switching test cases  OK to agree with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-7-2: CCA probabilities in BWP switching test cases  We think the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities should be agreed first before agreeing on the probabilities on test case level.  Issue 3-7-3: Tests for BWP switching  OK to agree with Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. Regarding Proposal 3, we think the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities should be agreed first before agreeing on the probabilities on test case level.  Issue 3-7-4: Test configurations for BWP switching test cases  OK to agree with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-7-5: Applicability of BWP switching test cases  We disagree with Proposal 1 as we think we should not skip test cases with a NR-U CC because LBT can affect BWP switch implicit ACK based on decoding the DCI at target BWP in any CC with NR-U.  Sub-topic 3-8: Beam management (BFD and link recovery)  Issue 3-8-2: CCA probabilities for link recovery test cases  We think the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities should be agreed first before agreeing on the probabilities on test case level. |
| Apple | Sub-topic 3-9: RSSI/CO measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)  Issue 3-9-1: RMTC parameters for RSSI/CO measurement test cases  Agree with recommended WF  Issue 3-9-2: Io difference between inside and outside RMTC in RSSI/CO measurement test cases  Support option 1. Reason: (1) to make sure there is sufficient power difference between inside RMTC window and outside RMTC window to verify UE measurement on RSSI/CO (2) to make sure the power difference is not too big so that the AGC estimated before RMTC window could still be workable for the measurement inside RMTC window. |
| Qualcomm | Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selection:  Issue 3-1-1: Test configurations for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-1-2: Cell specific test parameters for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-1-3: Verifying maximum allowed CCA failures for Md Mm and Me in RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  We are fine with this kind of approach. For clarification, will such a test involve two cell-reselection procedures, e.g. NR-> NR-U->NR? And as pointed out by Nokia, does it offer any benefit in terms of saving some test time?  Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)  Issue 3-2-1: Test configurations for handover test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-2-2: Cell specific test parameters for handover test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-2-4: The way to introduce handover test cases  We are fine with both the options  Issue 3-2-5: Test case for NR-U to NR-U inter-frequency handover to known cell  Agree with Proposal 1. No need to test the known cell case again.  Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment  Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases  Default PCCA DL values (TBD under other issues) should apply in this case. PCCA UL can be set to 1 if it’s decided that UL LBT failures won’t be tested for these test cases.  Issue 3-3-2: Tests for RRC re-establishment  We are fine with proposal 1.  Issue 3-3-3: Test configuration for RRC re-establishment test cases  Fine with proposal 1.  Issue 3-3-4: CCA probabilities in RRC re-establishment test cases  Fine with proposal 1.  Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection  Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases  PCCA DL should be the default probability being discussed under other issue.  Issue 3-4-2: Test for RRC connection release with redirection test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-4-3: Test configurations for RRC connection release with redirection test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-4-4: Lmax in RRC connection release with redirection test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Sub-topic 3-5: Random access  Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-5-2: SSB and CSI-RS based random access in test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-5-3: DL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1, the default PCCA UL should be used.  Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases  Support option 2.  Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases  Support option 1 for UL CCA failures. We think there’s some misunderstanding behind the motivation for this proposal. This proposal is not to test power-ramping procedure but to avoid any ambiguity at the TE regarding the UL CCA failures. In order to test UL CCA failures, the TE would monitor the UL resources following the UL CCA sensing period at the UE. If the UE transmits msg1/msgA with low power and the TE fails to decode the UL signal, it doesn’t know whether to treat it as an UL CCA failure or UL decoding failure on its end (which would be the case in NR). So the TE would not be able to correctly count the number of UL CCA failures in such a scenario. Setting a high target power would avoid such an ambiguity at the TE.  Issue 3-5-7: PRACH configuration for UL CCA testing  …  Sub-topic 3-6: Timing (transmit timing and TA)  Issue 3-6-1: CCA probabilities in timing test cases  Timing related test cases may be put on low priority.  Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions  Issue 3-7-1: Periodic SRS in BWP switching test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-7-2: CCA probabilities in BWP switching test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-7-3: Tests for BWP switching  Fine with Proposals 1,2,3.  Issue 3-7-4: Test configurations for BWP switching test cases  We are fine with Proposal 1. |
| Huawei | Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements  Fine with proposal 1.  Issue 3-6-1: CCA probabilities in timing test cases  Support proposal 1.  Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases  Not very clear about the motivation. Does it mean the initial transmit power of preamble calculated maybe lower than the threshold? Not sure whether it is possible.  Issue 3-10-1: Timing difference between RSs in two TCI states  Since we don't have FR1 TCI state switching test cases, proposal 1 seems to be the only feasible way. But it may related to the demod requirements when deciding the exact time difference.  Issue 3-10-2: Introducing TCI state switching test cases  Fine with proposal 1. |
| MTK | Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selection:  Issue 3-1-2: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-1-3: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-1-4: Proposal 1 and 2 will make the spec shorter. And perhaps save some time for test initialization.  Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)  Issue 3-2-2: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-2-3: OK with Proposal 1 except for L3.  Issue 3-2-4: Proposal 2 will make the spec shorter. And also perhaps save some time for test initialization.  Issue 3-2-5: Support Proposal 1.  Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment  Issue 3-3-2: We are fine with proposal 1.  Issue 3-3-3: Fine with proposal 1.  Issue 3-3-4: Fine with proposal 1.  Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection  Issue 3-4-2: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-4-3: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-4-4: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Sub-topic 3-5: Random access  Issue 3-5-1: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-5-2: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-5-3: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-5-5: Support option 2.  Sub-topic 3-6: Timing (transmit timing and TA)  Issue 3-6-1: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions  Issue 3-7-1: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-7-4: We are fine with Proposal 1.  Issue 3-7-5:  @ Nokia: Trying to understand the comment. Would you clarify a bit on how the LBT can affect the e.g. legacy timer-based BWP switch test. Sub-topic 3-10: TCI state switching Issue 3-10-2: proposal 1. |
| Ericsson | Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selectionSub topic 1-2:  **Issue 3-1-1: Test configurations for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Issue 3-1-2: Cell specific test parameters for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Issue 3-1-3: Verifying maximum allowed CCA failures for Md Mm and Me in RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**  Having separate test is clearer. These tests are also defined in different specifications. Thus we don’t suppose these proposals.  Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)  **Issue 3-2-1: Test configurations for handover test cases**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Issue 3-2-2: Cell specific test parameters for handover test cases**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Issue 3-2-4: The way to introduce handover test cases**  Option 1 is a clearer approach. We support option 1.  **Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment**  **Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases**  Recommended WF is acceptable to us.  **Issue 3-3-2: Tests for RRC re-establishment**  We support proposal 1.  **Issue 3-3-3: Test configuration for RRC re-establishment test cases**  We support proposal 1.  **Issue 3-3-4: CCA probabilities in RRC re-establishment test cases**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection**  **Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases**  LBT modelling for target cell is fine. There is no LBT modelling in the serving cell.  **Issue 3-4-2: Test for RRC connection release with redirection test cases**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Issue 3-4-3: Test configurations for RRC connection release with redirection test cases**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Issue 3-4-4: Lmax in RRC connection release with redirection test cases**  Recommended WF is fine.  **Sub-topic 3-5: Random access**  **Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access**  We support the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-5-2: SSB and CSI-RS based random access in test cases**  We support the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-5-3: DL CCA failure probability in random access test cases**  We support the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases**  We support the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases**  We understand this is the optional feature, so we apply the applicability rule if necessary. But we propose to configure the parameters as follows: *FailureInstanceMaxCount* to 4 and *lbt-FailureDetectionTimer* to 320ms.  **Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases**  We prefer option 2. If we use option 1, the maximum preamble received target power can by configured to -60dBm for both Msg1 and MsgA, according to TS 38.331. On the other hand, the existing NR PRACH configuration sets -120dBm. We are wondering if we need to set power level 60dB higher than NR test cases.  **Issue 3-5-7: PRACH configuration for UL CCA testing**  We want to understand how this configuration is captured in the test case parameters.  **Sub-topic 3-6: Timing (transmit timing and TA)**  **Issue 3-6-1: CCA probabilities in timing test cases**  Proposal 1 is not agreeable to us. We are fine to set PCCA\_UL=1, but for the LBT modelling in the downlink is necessary for this test case.  **Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions**  **Issue 3-7-3: Tests for BWP switching**  Proposals are agreeable.  **Issue 3-7-4: Test configurations for BWP switching test cases**  Proposals are agreeable.  **Issue 3-7-5: Applicability of BWP switching test cases**  We need to separate between NR SA and EN-DC as shown below:   * For the UE supporting NR SA, the SA DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped. * For the UE supporting EN-DC, the EN-DC DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped.   **Sub-topic 3-8: Beam management (BFD and link recovery)**  **Issue 3-8-1: Time durations and timer values for link recovery test cases**  Proposal is agreeable.  **Issue 3-8-2: CCA probabilities for link recovery test cases**  Proposals are agreeable.  **Issue 3-10-2: Introducing TCI state switching test cases**  We agree with the observation by MTK on that TCI state switching test cases have not yet been introduced for operation on licensed carrier in FR1, and therefore, corresponding test cases for operations on unlicensed carrier in FR1 can be down-prioritized.  **Sub-topic 3-11: Interruptions**  **Issue 3-11-1: Introducing interruption test cases**  Applicability should be similar to issue 3-7-5.  We need to separate between NR SA and EN-DC as shown below:   * For the UE supporting NR SA, the following TCs for interruption tests on NR-U cell can be skipped:   + Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)   + During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)   + Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements   + Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release * For the UE supporting EN-DC, the following EN-DC interruption tests on NR-U cell can be skipped:   + Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)   + During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)   + Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements   + Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release   **Sub-topic 3-12: Measurement accuracy test cases**  **Issue 3-12-2: Applicability of inter-frequency measurement accuracy test cases**  We need to separate between NR SA and EN-DC as shown below:   * For the UE supporting NR SA, the following TC for inter-frequency measurement accuracy test on NR-U cell can be skipped:   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC * For the UE supporting EN-DC, the following TC for inter-frequency measurement accuracy test on NR-U cell can be skipped:   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |

### 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** |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.2 RRC IDLE cell re-selection** | |
| [R4-2106854](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106854.zip)  Ericsson | Introduction of NR-U cell reselection tests |
| Nokia: NR-U specific test parameters are still mostly marked as TBD, although they would already be available in the big CR. We think these could be updated during this meeting. It would also be good to leave time to update the CCA model details if agreements are achieved during the meeting. |
| Company B… |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.3 HO (delay and interruptions)** | |
| [R4-2106576](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106576.zip)  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Draft TC NR-U handover test cases |
| Nokia: proposed adjustments to the CR after further checking:   * Rename A.12.2.1.2 NR with CCA – NR handover with unknown target cell to A.11.2.1.4 Inter-frequency NR with CCA – NR handover with unknown cell and update references accordingly * Rename A.12.2.1.3 NR with CCA – NR handover with unknown target cell to A.11.2.1.5 Inter-frequency NR with CCA – NR handover with unknown cell and update references accordingly * Rename A.X.1 NR– NR with CCA handover with unknown target cell to A.11.2.1.6 Inter-frequency NR– NR with CCA handover with unknown cell and update references accordingly * Rename A.X.2 NR– NR with CCA handover with unknown target cell to A.11.2.1.7 Inter-frequency NR– NR with CCA handover with unknown cell and update references accordingly * Fixt text to indicate multiple test configurations instead of a single one for the cases NR with CCA – NR (unknown cell), NR with CCA – NR (known cell) and NR – NR -with CCA (known cell) * Add caption for Table A.12.2.1.3.2-3 (A.11.2.1.5-3) * Remove T3 columns from Table A.12.2.1.3.2-3 (A.9.5.1.2-3) and Table A.X.2.2-3 (A.11.2.1.7) * Align general and cell-specific parameters for NR with CCA – NR (unknown cell) and NR – NR with CCA (unknown cell) test cases with values specified in R4-2106856 * Update the total time for the A.12.2.1.3 (A.11.2.1.5) test case to 132ms and adjust other values accordingly |
| Ericsson: There are test cases for both known and unknown test cases for inter-frequency case, it is being discussed whether that is needed. Test parameters specific to CCA needs to be aligned with other test cases. |
| [**R4-2106856**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106856.zip)  Ericsson | Introduction of NR-U handover tests |
| Nokia: NR-U specific test parameters are still mostly marked as TBD, although they would already be available in the big CR. We think these could be updated during this meeting, considering alignment with values specified e.g. in R4-2106576, in special for the cases colliding (NR with CCA – NR unknown cell and NR – NR with CCA unknown cell). It would also be good to leave time to update the CCA model details if agreements are achieved during the meeting. |
|  |
| [R4-2106978](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106978.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon | Draft CR of test cases for HO delay and interruption for NR-U |
| Nokia: We would prefer to agree the CCA probabilities after high level agreements on the default probability and other probabilities is agreed under Topic 2. |
| Ericsson: Why UE behaviour comment upon expiry of T310 timer is removed? The statement that the test will not be considered in the statistics when timer expires due to LBT failures, I guess it applies to all test cases where LBT failures could occur. Then perhaps it is better to have a common approach on how/where to capture it. The LBT values for UL/DL failures need to be kept as TBDs as there is no agreement yet and they should it be aligned with other test cases. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.4 RRC Re-establishment** | |
| [R4-2106577](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106577.zip)  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Draft TC RRC re-establishment with CCA |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2107142](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107142.zip)  Ericsson | RRC re-establishment tests for NR-U in 38.133 |
| Nokia: It seems that many test configurations are NR-specific, although NR-U specific test configurations were agreed for NR-U in the last meeting (e.g. SSB and CORESET configurations). These would need to be updated. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.5 RRC Connection Release with Redirection** | |
| [R4-2106979](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106979.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon | Draft CR on test cases for RRC release with redirection for NR-U |
| Nokia: We would prefer to agree the CCA probabilities after high level agreements on the default probability and other probabilities is agreed under Topic 2. |
| Ericsson: This tests uses specific values for Pdl and Pul which are being discussed in this meeting, so at least they should be kept as TBD until there is an agreement. Also T\_SI delay should be set to 1280ms. |
| [R4-2107144](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107144.zip)  Ericsson | RRC connetion release with re-direction from NR to NR-U test in 38.133 |
|  |
| Nokia: It seems that some test configurations are NR-specific, although NR-U specific test configurations were agreed for NR-U in the last meeting (e.g. CORESET configurations). These would need to be updated. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.6 Random access** | |
| [R4-2106579](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106579.zip)  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Draft CR NR-U RRM random access performance requirements |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2106877](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106877.zip)  Ericsson | Draft CR: Random access procedure test cases for NR-U |
| Nokia: - It is not clear whether this CR is applicable to LBE mode, FBE mode or both.  - Although both DL and UL CCA models are referred to within the "general test parameters" tables the tests description do not address any "DL/UL CCA failure" case, i.e. it seems assumed by default that DL/UL CCA is always successful.  - As lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig is an optional feature (i.e. not supported by all UEs) it does not seem relevant to have it configured for the test cases.  Depending on the conclusion of Issue 2-1-2 and 2-1-2, we suggest also to use the table on R4-2106578 as a reference on how to include the semi-static and dynamic channel access configurations. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.8 BWP switching delay and interruptions** | |
| [R4-2107146](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107146.zip)  Ericsson | Test cases on BWP switching for NR-U SA in TS 38.133 |
| Nokia:  It is unclear how LBT is considered in the test cases.  Draft CR should also include the NR-U specific test configurations, for example for TDD and SSB.  Depending on the conclusion of Issue 2-1-2 and 2-1-2, we suggest also to use the table on R4-2106578 as a reference on how to include the semi-static and dynamic channel access configurations. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.9 PSCell addition/release (delay and interruption)** | |
| [R4-2106981](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106981.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon | Draft CR of test cases for PSCell addition and release for NR-U |
| Nokia: We would prefer to agree the CCA probabilities after high level agreements on the default probability and other probabilities is agreed under Topic 2. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.13 Beam management (BFD and link recovery)** | |
| [R4-2106875](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106875.zip)  Ericsson | Draft CR: Update of beam management test cases for NR-U |
| Nokia: We would prefer to agree the CCA probabilities after high level agreements on the default probability and other probabilities is agreed under Topic 2. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.14 SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR/L1-RSRP measurement procedure (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)** | |
| [R4-2106578](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106578.zip)  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Draft TC NR-U inter-frequency measurements |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2106982](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106982.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon | Draft CR on test cases for inter-RAT measurement for NR-U |
| Nokia: Please provide further comments on how the b2-Threshold values were obtained.  Please consider adding dynamic channel access configuration, depending on the outcome of Issue 2-1-1.  Please update PCCA\_DL after we reach agreement on Issues 2-3-2 and 2-3-3.  The test case A.12.4.2.4 is missing the SSB configuration, TDD configuration,  Depending on the conclusion of Issue 2-1-2 and 2-1-2, we suggest also to use the table on R4-2106578 as a reference on how to include the semi-static and dynamic channel access configurations. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.17 SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR/L1-RSRP measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)** | |
| [R4-2106359](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106359.zip)  MediaTek inc. | Introduction of test cases for L1-RSRP measurement accuracy with CCA serving cell |
| Nokia: Please consider adding dynamic channel access for the SSB configuration depending on the outcome of issue 2-1-1.  Please review the definition of the parameters defined in Table A.9.4.4.1.2-1: FR1 SSB based L1-RSRP test parameters. Some of the parameters are only defined for test configuration 1.  We suggest adding the definition of the “Test 1” and “Test 2” in each test case for completeness |
| Ericsson: Wrong version in the coversheet. |
| MTK: we would like to request a revision number to provide revisions based on the comment above. |
| [R4-2106983](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106983.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon | Draft CR on test cases for intra-frequency measurement accuracy for NR-U |
| Nokia: Please update PCCA\_DL after we reach agreement on Issues 2-3-2 and 2-3-3.  In addition to semi-static channel access for the SSB configuration, please consider adding dynamic channel access, depending on the outcome of Issue 2-1-1.  Please review the proposed value for the DBT window configuration in Table A.11.6.1.1.2-2: SS-RSRP Intra frequency test parameters  We suggest adding the definition of the “Test 1”, “Test 2” and “Test 3” in each test case for completeness |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.18 RSSI/CO measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)** | |
| [R4-2104830](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104830.zip)  Apple | Test cases for RSSI and CO measurement accuracy in NR-U R16 |
| Nokia: Would be good to align the CCA model parameters to be added in a similar manner with other CRs (probabilities and model separately). We would also prefer to wait for high level agreements on CCA probabilities before agreeing on them for each test case. |
| Ericsson: This CR contains too many TBDs values, it is better to wait until there are more agreements so that those values can be replaced. |

## 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#3-1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  **Issue 3-1-1: Test configurations for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*   * Test configurations in Table 3-1-1.1 and Table 3-1-1.2 are proposed for cell reselections between NR-U and NR, and between NR-U and E-UTRAN.   **Table 3-1-1.1: Test configurations for cell re-selections between NR-U and NR**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA | | 1 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode | | 2 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | | 3 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |   **Table 3-1-1.2: Test configurations for cell re-selections between NR-U and E-UTRAN**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA | | 1 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | | 2 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode | | Note: The UE is only required to be tested in one of the supported test configurations. | | |   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-1-2: Cell specific test parameters for RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*   * Cell specific test parameters for RRC IDLE cell re-selection should contain following new or modified parameters to account for the LBT impact:   + DL CCA model   + UL CCA model   + DBT Window Configuration   + DL CCA probability PCCA\_DL   + UL CCA probability PCCA\_UL   + New RMCs   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-1-3: Verifying maximum allowed CCA failures for Md Mm and Me in RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*  Reselection test shall verify that maximum allowed CCA failures for Md, Mm and Me.Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**  Two companies asked whether the approach of having two test cases in one would save any testing time. Proponent company answered that it may perhaps save some testing time, but mostly make the spec shorter. One company commented that they think having separate test cases is clearer.  *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1a (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD). * **Option 1b (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1). * **Option 2 (new, based on 1st round comments):** Define separate tests for the test cases mentioned in Options 1a and 1b.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue discussion based on the listed options taking into account proponent company’s clarification on the motivation of Options 1a and 1b. |
| **Sub-topic#3-2** | **Issue 3-2-1: Test configurations for handover test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*   * Following test configurations are used for handovers between NR-U and NR, and between NR-U and E-UTRAN:   **Table 3-2-1.1 Test configurations for handover between NR-U and NR**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA | | 1 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode | | 2 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | | 3 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description of a cell with CCA | Description of a cell without CCA | | 1 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | | 2 | NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode | LTE 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD duplex mode | | Note: The UE is only required to be tested in one of the supported test configurations. | | |   **Table 3-2-1.2 Test configurations for handover between NR-U and E-UTRAN**  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-2-2: Cell specific test parameters for handover test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*   * Cell specific test parameters for handover test cases contain following new or modified parameters to account for the LBT impact:   + DL CCA model   + UL CCA model   + DBT Window Configuration   + DL CCA probability PCCA\_DL   + UL CCA probability PCCA\_UL   + New RMCs   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements**  Three companies are ok with the proposal, while two companies comment that L3 is not ok at least before agreements the test cases to test UL LBT failures.  *Tentative agreements:*  Handover delay verified in test requirements is expressed using a formula containing L1, L1’ and L2 depending on the type of test case, and the total delay is limited by T304 timer.   * FFS: Parameter L3.   *Candidate options:*  **Option 1:** Include parameter L3 in the formula of handover delay in the test requirements, and thus update the tentative agreement from 1st round in the following way:  *Handover delay verified in test requirements is expressed using a formula containing L1, L1’****, ~~and~~*** *L2* ***and L3*** *depending on the type of test case, and the total delay is limited by T304 timer.*   * ***~~FFS: Parameter L~~~~3~~~~.~~***   **Option 2:** Do not include parameter L3 in the formula of handover delay test requirements i.e. do not test UL CCA failures in handover test cases.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Aim to agree on the tentative agreement, where parameter L3 is marked as FFS. Continue discussion on parameter L3 based on the listed options and Issue 2-4-5.  **Issue 3-2-4: The way to introduce handover test cases**  Both options received support from companies. Proponent company commented that Options 2a and 2b make the spec shorter and may save some testing time.  *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1 (**[**R4-2106575**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106575.zip)**):** Introduce NR-U test cases that share core requirements with already existing NR or NR-U test cases as new test cases in their own sections with the required changes in the cell configuration. * **Option 2a (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify HO for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD). * **Option 2b (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify HO for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1).   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue discussion based on the original options taking into account proponent company’s reasoning on the 1st round.  **Issue 3-2-5: Test case for NR-U to NR-U inter-frequency handover to known cell**  *Tentative agreements:*  Not to introduce TC for “NR-U-> NR-U, Inter-frequency, known” in R16.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue. |
| **Sub-topic#3-3** | **Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases**  Two companies commented that the proposals should be discussed based on the agreements for default configurations under Topic 2. One company supported the proposals.  *Candidate options:*   * Proposal 1 ([R4-2104432](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104432.zip)): The value of PCCA\_DL can be independent from the channel access mode (FBE / LBE) * Proposal 2 ([R4-2104432](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104432.zip), [R4-2107141](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107141.zip)):   + In all test times:     - **Serving cell:** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1     - **Target cell:**        * **Option 1:**   PCCA\_UL=1  PCCA\_DL< 1 (e.g. 0.5)   * + - * **Option 2:**   PCCA\_UL=1  PCCA\_DL= 0.75   * + - * **Option 3 (new based on 1st round comments):**   Adopt the default values as agreed for Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion based on the listed options and taking into account the discussion under Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.  **Issue 3-3-2: Tests for RRC re-establishment**  *Tentative agreements:*  At least the following NR-U to NR-U RRC re-establishment tests to verify core requirements in clause 6.2.1A, TS 38.133, are defined:   1. TC1: Intra-frequency RRC Re-establishment in FR1 with serving cell is subject to CCA and known target cell subject to CCA 2. TC2: Inter-frequency RRC Re-establishment in FR1 with serving cell is subject to CCA and with unknown target cell subject to CCA 3. TC3: Intra-frequency RRC Re-establishment in FR1 with serving cell is subject to CCA, with unknown target cell subject to CCA and without serving cell timing.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-3-3: Test configuration for RRC re-establishment test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*  NR-U to NR-U RRC re-establishment tests are defined for the following configuration related to SSB SCS and BW for both serving and target cells:  **Table 3-3-3.1: Test configuration for RRC re-establishment tests**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configuration | Description | | 1 | With CCA: 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-3-4: CCA probabilities in RRC re-establishment test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*   * In the test under the following parameter settings (non-DRX, no gaps are used and SSB periodicity is 20 ms), the out of sync detection evaluation period = 480 ms when the serving cell is inactivated (RLM-RS SSB Es/Iot <-7 dB).   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue. |
| **Sub-topic#3-4** | **Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases**  One company commented that LBT modelling for target cell is fine, but there is no LBT modelling in the serving cell. One wants to use the default values and one wants to wait for the conclusion on them.  *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1 (original):**   + **Serving cell (**[**R4-2104433**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104433.zip)**):** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1 in all test times.   + **Target cell (**[**R4-2104433**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104433.zip)**,** [**R4-2107143**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107143.zip)**):** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL = 0.75 in all test times. * **Option 2 (new based on comments on the 1st round):**   + Use the default values for PCCA\_DL.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion based on the listed options and Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.  **Issue 3-4-2: Test for RRC connection release with redirection test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*  The following NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection test to verify core requirements in clause 6.2.3.2.3, TS 38.133, is defined:   * + TC2: Redirection from NR FR1 carrier without CCA to NR FR1 carrier with CCA   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-4-3: Test configurations for RRC connection release with redirection test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*  NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection tests are defined for the following configuration related to SSB SCS and BW for both serving and target cells:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Configuration** | **Source cell without CCA** | **Target cell with CCA** | | 1 | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, FDD | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD | | 2 | 15 kHz SSB SCS, 10 MHz bandwidth, TDD | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD | | 3 | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD | 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD |   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-4-4: Lmax in RRC connection release with redirection test cases**  All commenting companies are ready to agree on the proposal, but one company commented that this discussion should first be taken on general level.  *Tentative agreements:*   * In NR to NR-U RRC connection release with redirection test ensure that number of DL LBT failures (L1) in target cell does not exceed L1,max ; L1,max is defined in Table 6.2.3.2.3-1, TS 38.133.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree on the tentative agreement as a reflection of the agreement on the first round:   * + - Test environment should not have test runs that are rendered useless due to exceeded LBT failures     - Test equipment should make sure that Lmax is not exceeded during a test by monitoring the number of CCA failures and preventing additional CCA failures from happening after Lmax is reached. |
| **Sub-topic#3-5** | **Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access**  Most companies are ok with the original proposal, one company would like to use legacy RA section structure instead.  *Candidate options:*  Define the random access procedure test cases for NR-U as follows.   * **Option 1 (original):**   A.10 EN-DC Tests with NR PSCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1  […]  A.10.1.1.1 Random Access  A.10.1.1.1.1 Contention-based random access for NR PSCell  A.10.1.1.1.1.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.10.1.1.1.1.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.10.1.1.1.2 Non-contention based random access for NR PSCell  A.10.1.1.1.2.1 4-step RA type non-contention based random access test  A.10.1.1.1.2.2 2-step RA type non-contention based random access test  A.11 NR Standalone Tests with NR PCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1  […]  A.11.2.2.2 Random Access  A.11.2.2.2.1 Contention-based random access for NR PCell  A.11.2.2.2.1.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.11.2.2.2.1.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.11.2.2.2.2 Non-contention based random access for NR PCell  A.11.2.2.2.2.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test  A.11.2.2.2.2.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test   * **Option 2 (new, based on 1st round comments, based on legacy spec structure):**   A.10 EN-DC Tests with NR PSCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1  […]  A.10.1.1.1 Random Access  A.10.1.1.1.1 4-step contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.10.1.1.1.2 4-step non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.10.1.1.1.3 2-step RA type contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.10.1.1.1.4 2-step RA type non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  […]  A.11 NR Standalone Tests with NR PCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1  […]  A.11.2.2.2 Random Access  A.11.2.2.2.1 4-step contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.11.2.2.2.2 4-step non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.11.2.2.2.3 2-step contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  A.11.2.2.2.4 2-step non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Companies to indicate their preferred option.  **Issue 3-5-2: SSB and CSI-RS based random access in test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*   * For the non-contention random access procedure in NR-U, define only the SSB-based random access procedure test cases.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-5-3: DL CCA failure probability in random access test cases**  Most companies agree with the original proposal, one company disagrees.  *Candidate options:*   * **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106876**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip)**):** NR-U random access procedure tests do not need to configure DL LBT failure, i.e., set PCCA\_DL=1.0.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion taking into account the comments from the first round.  **Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases**  One company is ok with the proposal, one wants to use the default value, and one wants to wait for agreements on general level.  *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1 (original):** NR-U random access procedure tests should configure UL LBT failure, i.e., set PCCA\_UL < 1.0. * **Option 2 (new, based on comments on 1st round):** Use the default values as agreed under issue 2-4-2.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion based on the listed options and Issue 2-4-2.  **Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases**  Three companies support option 2, while one company supports option 1.  *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1 (**[**R4-2106876**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip)**):** Configure lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig for the random access procedure test cases for NR-U. Set *FailureInstanceMaxCount* to 4 and *lbt-FailureDetectionTimer* to 320ms. * **Option 2 (**[**R4-2106579**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106579.zip)**):** Not to configure lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig for the random access procedure test cases.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion based on the original options. Would it be possible to compromise on Option 2?  **Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases**  Two companies support Option 2 and one company supports Option 1. One company is asking to clarify the motivation.  *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1** ([**R4-2107361**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107361.zip)): Test equipment to configure *preambleReceivedTargetPower* for msg1 and *msgA-PreambleReceivedTargetPower* for msgA to the highest value for UL LBT test cases. * **Option 2** ([**R4-2106574**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106574.zip)):   + Specify RACH requirements that reuse NR FR1 configurations and expected PRACH transmitted power.   + Specify that the power of the first preamble for NR-U random access test cases to be the same as in NR test cases.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion based on the original options. Please also take into account comments and questions from the 1st round.  **Issue 3-5-7: PRACH configuration for UL CCA testing**  One company supports the proposal, one company wants to understand how this configuration is captured in the test case parameters.  *Candidate options:*  Considering UL CCA failure testing, consider the following proposal related to PRACH configuration:   * Proposal 1 ([**R4-2106574**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106574.zip)): In the case the PRACH is transmitted within a gNB-initiated COT – which is always the case for FBE mode, a gap greater than 16 µs has to be configured between the DL-UL transmissions.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion based on the original option taking into account the question from the 1st round. |
| **Sub-topic#3-6** | **Issue 3-6-1: CCA probabilities in timing test cases**  Two companies are ok with the proposal. One company commented that timing test cases may be put on low priority. One company is ok with P\_CCA\_UL but says DL CCA modelling is not needed. One company wants to wait for general level decisions.  *Candidate options:*   * **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2104434**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104434.zip)**,** [**R4-2106980**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106980.zip)**):** UE timing tests are defined for the following CCA probabilities: PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL =1 in all test times.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Considering a wide split in the opinions on the 1st round, continue the discussion on the second round taking also into account discussion under Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2. |
| **Sub-topic#3-7** | **Issue 3-7-1: Periodic SRS in UL BWP switching test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*   * Periodic SRS shall be configured in the SpCell to enable the UE to detect consistent UL LBT failure in the SpCell.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Agree and close the issue.   **Issue 3-7-2: CCA probabilities in UL BWP switching test cases**  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1 (original): Endorse the configurations in the WF [1]:   **Table 3-7-2.1: BWP switching test configurations for EN-DC**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Active BWP in SpCell | PCCA\_UL | PCCA\_DL |  | | UL active BWP before active BWP switching (UL BWP-1) | 0 | 1 |  | | UL active BWP after active BWP switching (UL BWP-2) | 1 | 1 |  | | DL active BWP before active BWP switching (DL BWP-1) | 1 | 1 |  | | DL active BWP after active BWP switching (DL BWP-2) | 1 | 1 |  |  * **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round)** Discuss and agree first with the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities before agreeing on the probabilities on test case level.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Continue the discussion based on the listed options, taking into account Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.   **Issue 3-7-3: New Tests for DL BWP switching**  *Tentative agreements:*   * The following BWP switching tests to verify core requirements in clauses 8.6.2 and 8.6.3, TS 38.133, are defined:   + TC1: A.10.3.5.2.1 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC   + TC2: A.10.3.5.2.2 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch with FR1 SCell in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC   + TC3: A.10.3.5.3.1 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC   + TC4: A.11.4.5.2.1 NR FR1- NR FR1 DL active BWP switch of PCell with non-DRX in SA   + TC5: A.11.4.5.2.2 NR FR1 DL active BWP switch with non-DRX in SA   + TC6: A.11.4.5.3.1 NR FR1 DL active BWP switch of Cell with non-DRX in SA * The above test cases are applicable as follows:   + EN-DC tests TC1-TC3 for UE capable of EN-DC with only NR-U bands   + SA tests TC4-TC6 for UE capable of SA with only NR-U bands   *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1 (original):** No LBT failure is modelled in any of above the test cases i.e.   + In all NR-U cells:PCCA\_UL= PCCA\_DL =1 * **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round)** discuss and agree with the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities before agreeing, considering also Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Continue the discussion based on the listed options, taking into account Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.   **Issue 3-7-4: Test configurations for DL BWP switching test cases**  *Tentative agreements:*   * BWP switching tests are defined for the following configurations related to SSB SCS and BW for both serving and target cells:   + The EN-DC tests shall be done for the following two set of test configuration:   **Table 3-7-4.1: BWP switching test configurations for EN-DC**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Config | Description | | 1 | LTE FDD,  With CCA: NR TDD, SSB SCS 30 kHz, data SCS 30 kHz, BW 40 MHz | | 2 | LTE TDD,  With CCA: NR TDD, SSB SCS 30 kHz, data SCS 30 kHz, BW 40 MHz |  * + The SA tests shall be done for the following test configuration:   **Table 3-7-4.2: BWP switching test configurations for SA**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Config | Description | | 1 | With CCA: NR 30 kHz SSB SCS, 40 MHz bandwidth, TDD duplex mode |   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Agree and close the issue.   **Issue 3-7-5: Applicability of BWP switching test cases**  The following test cases have been agreed for BWP switching:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Group of requirements | Test cases | Requirements section | Agreed | | BWP switching delay and interruptions |        E-UTRAN – NR-U PSCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure | 8.6 | Yes | |        NR-U – NR-U PCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure | Yes | | Legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching on NR-U SCell, with: |  | |         NR PCC (PCC) | FFS | |         NR-U PCC | FFS | |         NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) | FFS |   *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1 (original):** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped. * **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round):**We need to separate between NR SA and EN-DC as shown below:   + For the UE supporting NR SA, the SA DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped.   + For the UE supporting EN-DC, the EN-DC DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Continue the discussions also considering the new Option 2 on the 2nd round. |
| **Sub-topic#3-8** | **Issue 3-8-1: Time durations and timer values for link recovery test cases**  A single company commented on this issue during the first round.  *Candidate options:*   * Set the time durations and timer values of link recovery tests for NR-U as follows:   **Table 3-8-1.1: Time durations and timer values for link recovery tests for NR-U**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | SSB-based LR with non-DRX  (both EN-DC and SA) | | SSB-based LR with DRX  (both EN-DC and SA) | | | BFD-RS SSB Es/Iot | Es/Iot ≥ -7 dB | Es/Iot < -7 dB | Es/Iot ≥ -7 dB | Es/Iot < -7 dB | | T310 | 1000ms | 1000ms | 1000ms | 1000ms | | N310 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | T1 | 0.2s | 0.2s | 1s | 1s | | T2 | 0.85s | 0.93s | 8.37s | 9.01s | | T3 | 0.44s | 0.52s | 4.52s | 5.16s | | T4 | 0s | 0s | 0s | 0s | | T5 | 0.45s | 0.45s | 3.89s | 3.89s | | D1 | 0.41s | 0.41s | 3.85s | 3.85s |   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Agree and close this issue.   **Issue 3-8-2: CCA probabilities for link recovery test cases**  *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1:** Set the CCA parameters in the link recovery tests for NR-U as follows. For DL LBT parameters, RAN4 should wait for the conclusion of CCA models for NR-U RRM performance requirements.   **Table 3-8-2.1: CCA parameters in link recovery tests for NR-U**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | | PCCA,DL | semi-static channel access | 1.0 | FFS | FFS | FFS | FFS | | dynamic channel access | 1.0 | FFS | FFS | FFS | FFS | | PCCA,UL |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  * **Option 2:** Set PCCA\_DL=100% and PCCA\_UL=100% during T1 for L1-RSRP measurement reporting tests. * **Option 3:** Set PCCA\_DL=75% and PCCA\_UL=75% during T2 for L1-RSRP measurement reporting tests. * **Option 4 (new, based on comments on the 1st round):** Discuss and agree with the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities before agreeing on test specific CCA probabilities.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Continue the discussion based on the listed options and taking into account the discussion under Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2. |
| **<Sub-topic#3-9** | **Issue 3-9-1: RMTC parameters for RSSI/CO measurement test cases**  A single company commented on this issue during the first round.  *Tentative agreements:*   * RAN4 set the RMTC parameters for NR-U RSSI/CO measurement TCs as below, including intra-frequency/inter-frequency and inter-RAT.   **Table 3-9-1.1: RMTC parameters for NR-U RSSI/CO measurement test cases**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | measDurationSymbols-r16 | sym14or12 | | rmtc-Periodicity-r16 | ms40 | | rmtc-SubframeOffset-r16 | 20 | | ref-SCS-CP-r16 | kHz30 | | ReportInterval | ms120 |   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Agree and close this issue.   **Issue 3-9-2: Io difference between inside and outside RMTC in RSSI/CO measurement test cases**  A single company commented on this issue during the first round.  *Tentative agreements:*   * In the NR-U RSSI/CO measurement TCs the parameter configuration shall guarantee the Io difference between inside RMTC and outside RMTC within a range of [14dB, 15dB].   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Agree and close this issue. |
| **Sub-topic#3-10** | **Issue 3-10-1: Timing difference between RSs in two TCI states**  A single company commented on this issue during the first round. It seemed that this company is ok to agree on the issue, but it is not completely clear, so we ask to confirm on the second round if the proposal is agreeable.  *Candidate options:*   * Proposal 1: Introduce the timing different between the RS in the two TCI states in the TCI state switching test cases, where the exact value needs further discussion.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Could Huawei please confirm if the Proposal is agreeable based on the first round comment.   **Issue 3-10-2: Introducing TCI state switching test cases**  Companies share the view of down-prioritizing this issue.  Background:  The status of the TCI state switching test cases is the following:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Group of requirements** | **Test cases** | **Requirements section** | **Agreed** | | Active TCI state switching delay | For known and unknown target TCI state in NR-U, on: | 8.10A |  | |         NR-U PCC | FFS | |         NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) | FFS | |         NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) | FFS |   *Tentative agreements:*   * Low priority for defining the TCs for active TCI state switching delay for NR-U.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Agree and down-prioritize this issue |
| **Sub-topic#3-11** | **Issue 3-11-1: Introducing interruption test cases**  Background:  The status of interruption test cases after RAN4#98-e meeting is the following:   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Interruptions | Due to NR-U SCell addition/release, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  | Ericsson | |         NR PCC (FR1) |  | FFS | |         NR-U PCC |  | FFS | |         NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | FFS | | Due to NR-U SCell activation/deactivation, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  | |         NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | |         NR-U PCC |  | Yes | |         NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | | During measurements no deactivated NR-U SCell, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  | |         NR PCC (FR1) |  | FFS | |         NR-U PCC |  | FFS | |         NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | FFS | | Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements between: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  | |         NR-U PCell and E-UTRAN PCell (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | | Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release, with: |  | TS 36.133 | Yes |  | |         E-UTRA PCell |  | Yes |   *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1 (original):** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the following TCs for interruption can be skipped:   + Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)   + During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)   + Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements   + Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release * **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round):** We need to separate between NR SA and EN-DC as shown below: * For the UE supporting NR SA, the following TCs for interruption tests on NR-U cell can be skipped:   + Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)   + During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)   + Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements   + Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release * For the UE supporting EN-DC, the following EN-DC interruption tests on NR-U cell can be skipped:   + Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)   + During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)   + Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements   + Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussions also considering the new Option 2 on the 2nd round. |
| **Sub-topic#3-12** | **Issue 3-12-1: Applicability of intra-frequency measurement accuracy test cases**  No comments on the first round i.e. no objection.  *Tentative agreements:*   * For NR-U intra-frequency measurements accuracy (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, L1-RSRP, RSSI, CO),   + Tests with “NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC” can be skipped, if the UE has been tested with “NR-U PCC”   + Tests with “NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)” can be skipped, if the UE has been tested with “NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)”   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree and close the issue.  **Issue 3-12-2: Applicability of inter-frequency measurement accuracy test cases**  One company wanted to modify the original proposal.  *Candidate options:*   * **Option 1 (original):** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, it can skip the following tests for inter frequency measurement accuracy:   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) * **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round):**    + For the UE supporting NR SA, the following TC for inter-frequency measurement accuracy test on NR-U cell can be skipped:     - NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC   + For the UE supporting EN-DC, the following TC for inter-frequency measurement accuracy test on NR-U cell can be skipped:     - NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Companies to comment if the updated Option 2 is ok, or is original Option 1 the preferred option. |

### 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** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

### Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selection

**Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases**

* **Option 1a (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD).
* **Option 1b (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify cell reselection for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1).
* **Option 2 (new, based on 1st round comments):** Define separate tests for the test cases mentioned in Options 1a and 1b.

Recommended WF:

* Continue discussion based on the listed options taking into account proponent company’s clarification on the motivation of Options 1a and 1b on the 1st round.

### Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)

**Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements**

Agreeable based on the first round discussion:

Handover delay verified in test requirements is expressed using a formula containing L1, L1’ and L2 depending on the type of test case, and the total delay is limited by T304 timer.

* FFS: Parameter L3.

Options to be discussed:

**Option 1:** Include parameter L3 in the formula of handover delay in the test requirements, and thus update the tentative agreement from 1st round in the following way:

*Handover delay verified in test requirements is expressed using a formula containing L1, L1’****, ~~and~~*** *L2* ***and L3*** *depending on the type of test case, and the total delay is limited by T304 timer.*

* ***~~FFS: Parameter L~~~~3~~~~.~~***

**Option 2:** Do not include parameter L3 in the formula of handover delay test requirements i.e. do not test UL CCA failures in handover test cases.

Recommended WF:

* Continue discussion on parameter L3 based on the listed options and Issue 2-4-5.

**Issue 3-2-4: The way to introduce handover test cases**

* **Option 1 (**[**R4-2106575**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106575.zip)**):** Introduce NR-U test cases that share core requirements with already existing NR or NR-U test cases as new test cases in their own sections with the required changes in the cell configuration.
* **Option 2a (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify HO for E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD)->NR-U and NR-U -> E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD).
* **Option 2b (**[**R4-2106357**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106357.zip)**):** Use the same test case to verify HO for NR(FR1) -> NR-U and NR-U -> NR(FR1).

Recommended WF:

* Continue discussion based on the original options taking into account proponent company’s reasoning on the 1st round.

### Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment

**Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases**

* Proposal 1 ([R4-2104432](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104432.zip)): The value of PCCA\_DL can be independent from the channel access mode (FBE / LBE)
* Proposal 2 ([R4-2104432](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104432.zip), [R4-2107141](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107141.zip)):
  + In all test times:
    - **Serving cell:** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1
    - **Target cell:** 
      * **Option 1:**

PCCA\_UL=1

PCCA\_DL< 1 (e.g. 0.5)

* + - * **Option 2:**

PCCA\_UL=1

PCCA\_DL= 0.75

* + - * **Option 3 (new based on 1st round comments):**

Adopt the default values as agreed for Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion based on the listed options and taking into account the discussion under Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.

### Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection

**Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases**

* **Option 1 (original):**
  + **Serving cell (**[**R4-2104433**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104433.zip)**):** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL=1 in all test times.
  + **Target cell (**[**R4-2104433**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104433.zip)**,** [**R4-2107143**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107143.zip)**):** PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL = 0.75 in all test times.
* **Option 2 (new based on comments on the 1st round):**
  + Use the default values for PCCA\_DL.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion based on the listed options and Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.

### Sub-topic 3-5: Random access

**Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access**

Define the random access procedure test cases for NR-U as follows.

* **Option 1 (original):**

A.10 EN-DC Tests with NR PSCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1

[…]

A.10.1.1.1 Random Access

A.10.1.1.1.1 Contention-based random access for NR PSCell

A.10.1.1.1.1.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.10.1.1.1.1.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.10.1.1.1.2 Non-contention based random access for NR PSCell

A.10.1.1.1.2.1 4-step RA type non-contention based random access test

A.10.1.1.1.2.2 2-step RA type non-contention based random access test

A.11 NR Standalone Tests with NR PCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1

[…]

A.11.2.2.2 Random Access

A.11.2.2.2.1 Contention-based random access for NR PCell

A.11.2.2.2.1.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.11.2.2.2.1.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.11.2.2.2.2 Non-contention based random access for NR PCell

A.11.2.2.2.2.1 4-step RA type contention-based random access test

A.11.2.2.2.2.2 2-step RA type contention-based random access test

* **Option 2 (new, based on 1st round comments, based on legacy spec structure):**

A.10 EN-DC Tests with NR PSCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1

[…]

A.10.1.1.1 Random Access

A.10.1.1.1.1 4-step contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA

A.10.1.1.1.2 4-step non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA

A.10.1.1.1.3 2-step RA type contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA

A.10.1.1.1.4 2-step RA type non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA

[…]

A.11 NR Standalone Tests with NR PCell under CCA and Other NR Cells in FR1

[…]

A.11.2.2.2 Random Access

A.11.2.2.2.1 4-step contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA

A.11.2.2.2.2 4-step non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA

A.11.2.2.2.3 2-step contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA

A.11.2.2.2.4 2-step non-contention-based random access for NR PSCell with CCA

Recommended WF:

* Companies to indicate their preferred option.

**Issue 3-5-3: DL CCA failure probability in random access test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2106876**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip)**):** NR-U random access procedure tests do not need to configure DL LBT failure, i.e., set PCCA\_DL=1.0.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion taking into account the comments from the first round.

**Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases**

* **Option 1 (original):** NR-U random access procedure tests should configure UL LBT failure, i.e., set PCCA\_UL < 1.0.
* **Option 2 (new, based on comments on 1st round):** Use the default values as agreed under issue 2-4-2.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion based on the listed options and Issue 2-4-2.

**Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases**

* **Option 1 (**[**R4-2106876**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106876.zip)**):** Configure lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig for the random access procedure test cases for NR-U. Set *FailureInstanceMaxCount* to 4 and *lbt-FailureDetectionTimer* to 320ms.
* **Option 2 (**[**R4-2106579**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106579.zip)**):** Not to configure lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig for the random access procedure test cases.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion based on the original options and taking into account comments from the first round. Would it be possible to compromise on Option 2?

**Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases**

* **Option 1** ([**R4-2107361**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107361.zip)): Test equipment to configure *preambleReceivedTargetPower* for msg1 and *msgA-PreambleReceivedTargetPower* for msgA to the highest value for UL LBT test cases.
* **Option 2** ([**R4-2106574**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106574.zip)):
  + Specify RACH requirements that reuse NR FR1 configurations and expected PRACH transmitted power.
  + Specify that the power of the first preamble for NR-U random access test cases to be the same as in NR test cases.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion based on the original options. Please also take into account comments and questions from the 1st round.

**Issue 3-5-7: PRACH configuration for UL CCA testing**

Considering UL CCA failure testing, consider the following proposal related to PRACH configuration:

* Proposal 1 ([**R4-2106574**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106574.zip)): In the case the PRACH is transmitted within a gNB-initiated COT – which is always the case for FBE mode, a gap greater than 16 µs has to be configured between the DL-UL transmissions.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion based on the original option taking into account the question from the 1st round regarding how to capture the configuration in test case parameters.

### Sub-topic 3-6: Timing (transmit timing and TA)

**Issue 3-6-1: CCA probabilities in timing test cases**

* **Proposal 1 (**[**R4-2104434**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104434.zip)**,** [**R4-2106980**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106980.zip)**):** UE timing tests are defined for the following CCA probabilities: PCCA\_UL=1 and PCCA\_DL =1 in all test times.

Recommended WF:

* Considering a wide split in the opinions on the 1st round, continue the discussion on the second round taking also into account discussion under Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.

### Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions

**Issue 3-7-2: CCA probabilities in UL BWP switching test cases**

* Option 1 (original): Endorse the configurations in the WF [1]:

**Table 3-7-2.1: BWP switching test configurations for EN-DC**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Active BWP in SpCell | PCCA\_UL | PCCA\_DL |  |
| UL active BWP before active BWP switching (UL BWP-1) | 0 | 1 |  |
| UL active BWP after active BWP switching (UL BWP-2) | 1 | 1 |  |
| DL active BWP before active BWP switching (DL BWP-1) | 1 | 1 |  |
| DL active BWP after active BWP switching (DL BWP-2) | 1 | 1 |  |

* **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round)** Discuss and agree first with the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities before agreeing on the probabilities on test case level.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion based on the listed options, taking into account Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.

**Issue 3-7-3: New Tests for DL BWP switching**

Agreeable based on the first round:

* The following BWP switching tests to verify core requirements in clauses 8.6.2 and 8.6.3, TS 38.133, are defined:
  + TC1: A.10.3.5.2.1 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC
  + TC2: A.10.3.5.2.2 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch with FR1 SCell in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC
  + TC3: A.10.3.5.3.1 E-UTRAN – NR PSCell FR1 DL active BWP switch in non-DRX in synchronous EN-DC
  + TC4: A.11.4.5.2.1 NR FR1- NR FR1 DL active BWP switch of PCell with non-DRX in SA
  + TC5: A.11.4.5.2.2 NR FR1 DL active BWP switch with non-DRX in SA
  + TC6: A.11.4.5.3.1 NR FR1 DL active BWP switch of Cell with non-DRX in SA
* The above test cases are applicable as follows:
  + EN-DC tests TC1-TC3 for UE capable of EN-DC with only NR-U bands
  + SA tests TC4-TC6 for UE capable of SA with only NR-U bands

Open options:

* **Option 1 (original):** No LBT failure is modelled in any of above the test cases i.e.
  + In all NR-U cells:PCCA\_UL= PCCA\_DL =1
* **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round)** discuss and agree with the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities before agreeing, considering also Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion based on the listed options, taking into account Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.

**Issue 3-7-5: Applicability of BWP switching test cases**

* **Option 1 (original):** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped.
* **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round):** We need to separate between NR SA and EN-DC as shown below:
  + For the UE supporting NR SA, the SA DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped.
  + For the UE supporting EN-DC, the EN-DC DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching tests on NR-U cell can be skipped.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussions also considering the new Option 2 on the 2nd round.

### Sub-topic 3-8: Beam management (BFD and link recovery)

**Issue 3-8-1: Time durations and timer values for link recovery test cases**

Background: The issue seemed agreeable already based on the first round, but in the summary the proposal was accidentally not listed as a tentative agreement. Thus, the issue is still included.

* **Proposal 1:** Set the time durations and timer values of link recovery tests for NR-U as follows:

**Table 3-8-1.1: Time durations and timer values for link recovery tests for NR-U**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SSB-based LR with non-DRX  (both EN-DC and SA) | | SSB-based LR with DRX  (both EN-DC and SA) | |
| BFD-RS SSB Es/Iot | Es/Iot ≥ -7 dB | Es/Iot < -7 dB | Es/Iot ≥ -7 dB | Es/Iot < -7 dB |
| T310 | 1000ms | 1000ms | 1000ms | 1000ms |
| N310 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| T1 | 0.2s | 0.2s | 1s | 1s |
| T2 | 0.85s | 0.93s | 8.37s | 9.01s |
| T3 | 0.44s | 0.52s | 4.52s | 5.16s |
| T4 | 0s | 0s | 0s | 0s |
| T5 | 0.45s | 0.45s | 3.89s | 3.89s |
| D1 | 0.41s | 0.41s | 3.85s | 3.85s |

Recommended WF:

* Companies are asked to confirm if the proposal is not agreeable, otherwise agree on the proposal after the 2nd round.

**Issue 3-8-2: CCA probabilities for link recovery test cases**

* **Option 1:** Set the CCA parameters in the link recovery tests for NR-U as follows. For DL LBT parameters, RAN4 should wait for the conclusion of CCA models for NR-U RRM performance requirements.

**Table 3-8-2.1: CCA parameters in link recovery tests for NR-U**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 |
| PCCA,DL | semi-static channel access | 1.0 | FFS | FFS | FFS | FFS |
| dynamic channel access | 1.0 | FFS | FFS | FFS | FFS |
| PCCA,UL |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

* **Option 2:** Set PCCA\_DL=100% and PCCA\_UL=100% during T1 for L1-RSRP measurement reporting tests.
* **Option 3:** Set PCCA\_DL=75% and PCCA\_UL=75% during T2 for L1-RSRP measurement reporting tests.
* **Option 4 (new, based on comments on the 1st round):** Discuss and agree with the general principles of CCA modelling and the default probabilities before agreeing on test specific CCA probabilities.

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussion based on the listed options and taking into account the discussion under Issues 2-3-2, 2-3-3 and 2-4-2.

### Sub-topic 3-9: RSSI/CO measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)

All issues agreed on the first round.

### Sub-topic 3-10: TCI state switching

**Issue 3-10-1: Timing difference between RSs in two TCI states**

A single company commented on this issue during the first round. It seemed that this company is ok to agree on the issue, but it is not completely clear, so we ask to confirm on the second round if the proposal is agreeable.

* **Proposal 1:** Introduce the timing different between the RS in the two TCI states in the TCI state switching test cases, where the exact value needs further discussion.

Recommended WF:

* Could Huawei please confirm if the Proposal is agreeable based on the first round comment. Other comments are also still welcome.

### Sub-topic 3-11: Interruptions

**Issue 3-11-1: Introducing interruption test cases**

* **Option 1 (original):** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, the following TCs for interruption can be skipped:
  + Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)
  + During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)
  + Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements
  + Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release
* **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round):** We need to separate between NR SA and EN-DC as shown below:
* For the UE supporting NR SA, the following TCs for interruption tests on NR-U cell can be skipped:
  + Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)
  + During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)
  + Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements
  + Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release
* For the UE supporting EN-DC, the following EN-DC interruption tests on NR-U cell can be skipped:
  + Due to NR-U SCell addition/release. (if the TC are defined.)
  + During measurements on deactivated NR-U SCell. (if the TCs are defined.)
  + Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements
  + Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release

Recommended WF:

* Continue the discussions also considering the new Option 2 on the 2nd round.

### Sub-topic 3-12: Measurement accuracy test cases

**Issue 3-12-2: Applicability of inter-frequency measurement accuracy test cases**

* **Option 1 (original):** For the UE supporting NR SA or EN-DC, it can skip the following tests for inter frequency measurement accuracy:
  + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC
  + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)
* **Option 2 (new, based on comments on the 1st round):** 
  + For the UE supporting NR SA, the following TC for inter-frequency measurement accuracy test on NR-U cell can be skipped:
    - NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC
  + For the UE supporting EN-DC, the following TC for inter-frequency measurement accuracy test on NR-U cell can be skipped:
    - NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)

Recommended WF:

* Companies to comment if the updated Option 2 is ok or is original Option 1 the preferred option.

## Companies views’ collection for 2nd round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selection  Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)  Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements  …  Issue 3-2-4: The way to introduce handover test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment  Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection  Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-5: Random access  Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access  …  Issue 3-5-3: DL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  …  Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  …  Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases  …  Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases  …  Issue 3-5-7: PRACH configuration for UL CCA testing  …  Sub-topic 3-6: Timing (transmit timing and TA)  Issue 3-6-1: CCA probabilities in timing test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions  Issue 3-7-2: CCA probabilities in BWP switching test cases  …  Issue 3-7-3: Tests for BWP switching  …  Issue 3-7-5: Applicability of BWP switching test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-8: Beam management (BFD and link recovery)  Issue 3-8-1: Time durations and timer values for link recovery test cases  …  Issue 3-8-2: CCA probabilities for link recovery test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-9: RSSI/CO measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)  Issue 3-9-1: RMTC parameters for RSSI/CO measurement test cases  …  Issue 3-9-2: Io difference between inside and outside RMTC in RSSI/CO measurement test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-10: TCI state switching  Issue 3-10-1: Timing difference between RSs in two TCI states  …  Sub-topic 3-11: Interruptions  Issue 3-11-1: Introducing interruption test cases  …  Sub-topic 3-12: Measurement accuracy test cases  Issue 3-12-2: Applicability of inter-frequency measurement accuracy test cases  … |
| MTK | Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selection:  Issue 3-1-4: Option 1a and 1b simplifies the spec and save some time for test initialization.  Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)  Issue 3-2-4: Option 2 will simplifies the spec and save some time for test initialization.  Sub-topic 3-5: Random access  Issue 3-5-1: prefer to Option 2.  Issue 3-5-5: Support option 2.  Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions  Issue 3-7-5: Prefer to Option 2, which is clearer in our view. |
| Nokia | Sub-topic 3-1: RRC IDLE cell re-selection  Issue 3-1-4: The way to introduce RRC IDLE cell re-selection test cases  Both options (1a + 1b versus 2) are ok for us, but we have a slight preference for Option 2. Considering that it was not certain whether Option 1a and 1b save any testing time, the only clear benefit seems to be that the spec is shorter. This is of course a benefit, however, it might be simpler and clearer to just add test cases separately. Considering the length of the spec the relative number of pages that would be saved is quite small.  Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)  Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements  No agreement to include UL CCA failures in HO test cases yet, so the agreement from first round should apply. We think the outcome of this decision can be directly reflected to this issue.  Issue 3-2-4: The way to introduce handover test cases  Both options (1 versus 2a and 2b) are ok for us, but we have a slight preference for Option 2. Considering that it was not certain whether Option 1a and 1b save any testing time, the only clear benefit seems to be that the spec is shorter. This is of course a benefit, however, it might be simpler and clearer to just add test cases separately. Considering the length of the spec the relative number of pages that would be saved is quite small.  Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment  Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases  Proposal 2, Option 3 is ok for us.  Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection  Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases  Option 2 is ok for us.  Sub-topic 3-5: Random access  Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access  We prefer Option 2, which is in line with existing NR specification.  Issue 3-5-3: DL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  We don’t agree with Proposal 1.  We think that DL LBT failures can be useful for distinguished verification on LBE and FBE tests.  After a DL CCA failure the UE may or may not acquire the COT if it is LBE or FBE.  Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  We agree with Option 2.  Use the PCCA\_UL value from issue 2-4-2.  Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases  We prefer Option 2.  The lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig should not be configured for random access because it is an optional feature.  Even if we apply the applicability rule that would not help, because UEs not supporting that feature could skip the random access test.  We prefer to configure preambleTransMax and limit the number of LBT failures using a similar approach as in the Lmax issue to avoid randm access being not successfully completed on the test run due to LBT failures.  Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases  We still prefer Option 2.  We don’t understand why there would be ambiguity on the calculated power by the UE due to LBT failures.  I understand that the TE probably cannot know if the UE didn’t transmit on a RACH occasion due to LBT failure or not. However, LBT failures don’t impact the power ramping.  So, the TE can simple determine the calculated power each time that it detects a PRACH transmission. Since RRM tests are conducted in FR1, we think it is unlikely that the TE cannot detect mgs1/mgsA even when it is transmitting with low power.  Issue 3-5-7: PRACH configuration for UL CCA testing  We agree with proposal 1.  Answering to Ericsson’s comment on the first round. For example, we can try to find out a proper combination of TDD configuration and PRACH configuration index that ensures this minimum gap.  Sub-topic 3-7: BWP switching delay and interruptions  Issue 3-7-2: CCA probabilities in BWP switching test cases  Option 2 is agreeable to us.  Issue 3-7-3: Tests for BWP switching  Option 2 is agreeable to us.  Issue 3-7-5: Applicability of BWP switching test cases  No strong view, but slight preference for Option 2. Despite our comment on the first round, after further checking it is ok to take this approach.  Sub-topic 3-8: Beam management (BFD and link recovery)  Issue 3-8-2: CCA probabilities for link recovery test cases  Option 4 is agreeable to us. |
| Qualcomm | Sub-topic 3-2: HO (delay and interruptions)  Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements  Since it is already agreed to test UL CCA failures in handover cases, we can support Option 1  Sub-topic 3-3: RRC Re-establishment  Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases  Support Option 3 in Proposal 2  Sub-topic 3-4: RRC Connection Release with Redirection  Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases  Support option 2.  Issue 3-5-1: Tests for random access  Fine with option 2.  Issue 3-5-4: UL CCA failure probability in random access test cases  Support Option 2.  Issue 3-5-5: lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig in random access test cases  We prefer Option 2.  Issue 3-5-6: preambleReceivedTargetPower in random access test cases  Support option 1 for UL CCA failures. As clarified in our comment in the first round, the proposal is not to test power-ramping procedure but to avoid any ambiguity at the TE regarding the UL CCA failures.  In order to correctly test UL CCA failures, the TE should be able to tell whether or not an UL CCA failure happened at the UE. During PRACH transmission, the UE may not be able to transmit with enough UL power (and that is the reason to have power ramp-up procedure) which will cause a decoding failure at the TE. In this case, the TE may incorrectly treat it as UL CCA failure resulting in an inaccurate test result. Setting a high value for the RRC parameter *preambleReceivedTargetPower* would make UE to transmit at a higher power to avoid decoding failure at the TE and hence resolve any possible ambiguity. |
| Huawei | Issue 3-2-3: Handover delay in test requirements  Option 1.  Issue 3-3-1: PCCA\_DL and PCCA\_DL in RRC re-establishment test cases  Support Option 2 and 3  Issue 3-4-1: CCA probabilities in RRC connection release with redirection test cases.  Either option 1 and 2 are fine. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

The work on the following CRs will continue on the 2nd round. CRs that were merged to other CRs are not included on the list.

For convenience, the comments from the first round are included below. On the second round companies are encouraged to comment the revisions directly, but comments are also still welcome in the table below, if needed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.2 RRC IDLE cell re-selection** | |
| [R4-2106854](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106854.zip)  Ericsson  **Revised to xxx** | Introduction of NR-U cell reselection tests |
| Nokia: NR-U specific test parameters are still mostly marked as TBD, although they would already be available in the big CR. We think these could be updated during this meeting. It would also be good to leave time to update the CCA model details if agreements are achieved during the meeting. |
| Company B… |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.3 HO (delay and interruptions)** | |
| [R4-2106576](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106576.zip)  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  **Revised to xxx** | Draft TC NR-U handover test cases |
| Nokia: proposed adjustments to the CR after further checking:   * Rename A.12.2.1.2 NR with CCA – NR handover with unknown target cell to A.11.2.1.4 Inter-frequency NR with CCA – NR handover with unknown cell and update references accordingly * Rename A.12.2.1.3 NR with CCA – NR handover with unknown target cell to A.11.2.1.5 Inter-frequency NR with CCA – NR handover with unknown cell and update references accordingly * Rename A.X.1 NR– NR with CCA handover with unknown target cell to A.11.2.1.6 Inter-frequency NR– NR with CCA handover with unknown cell and update references accordingly * Rename A.X.2 NR– NR with CCA handover with unknown target cell to A.11.2.1.7 Inter-frequency NR– NR with CCA handover with unknown cell and update references accordingly * Fixt text to indicate multiple test configurations instead of a single one for the cases NR with CCA – NR (unknown cell), NR with CCA – NR (known cell) and NR – NR -with CCA (known cell) * Add caption for Table A.12.2.1.3.2-3 (A.11.2.1.5-3) * Remove T3 columns from Table A.12.2.1.3.2-3 (A.9.5.1.2-3) and Table A.X.2.2-3 (A.11.2.1.7) * Align general and cell-specific parameters for NR with CCA – NR (unknown cell) and NR – NR with CCA (unknown cell) test cases with values specified in R4-2106856 * Update the total time for the A.12.2.1.3 (A.11.2.1.5) test case to 132ms and adjust other values accordingly |
| Ericsson: There are test cases for both known and unknown test cases for inter-frequency case, it is being discussed whether that is needed. Test parameters specific to CCA needs to be aligned with other test cases. |
| [**R4-2106856**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106856.zip)  Ericsson  **Revised to xxx** | Introduction of NR-U handover tests |
| Nokia: NR-U specific test parameters are still mostly marked as TBD, although they would already be available in the big CR. We think these could be updated during this meeting, considering alignment with values specified e.g. in R4-2106576, in special for the cases colliding (NR with CCA – NR unknown cell and NR – NR with CCA unknown cell). It would also be good to leave time to update the CCA model details if agreements are achieved during the meeting. |
|  |
| [R4-2106978](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106978.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon  **Revised to xxx** | Draft CR of test cases for HO delay and interruption for NR-U |
| Nokia: We would prefer to agree the CCA probabilities after high level agreements on the default probability and other probabilities is agreed under Topic 2. |
| Ericsson: Why UE behaviour comment upon expiry of T310 timer is removed? The statement that the test will not be considered in the statistics when timer expires due to LBT failures, I guess it applies to all test cases where LBT failures could occur. Then perhaps it is better to have a common approach on how/where to capture it. The LBT values for UL/DL failures need to be kept as TBDs as there is no agreement yet and they should it be aligned with other test cases. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.4 RRC Re-establishment** | |
| [R4-2106577](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106577.zip)  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Draft TC RRC re-establishment with CCA |
|  |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.5 RRC Connection Release with Redirection** | |
| [R4-2106979](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106979.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon  **Revised to xxx** | Draft CR on test cases for RRC release with redirection for NR-U |
| Nokia: We would prefer to agree the CCA probabilities after high level agreements on the default probability and other probabilities is agreed under Topic 2. |
| Ericsson: This tests uses specific values for Pdl and Pul which are being discussed in this meeting, so at least they should be kept as TBD until there is an agreement. Also T\_SI delay should be set to 1280ms. |
| [R4-2107144](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107144.zip)  Ericsson  **Revised to xxx** | RRC connetion release with re-direction from NR to NR-U test in 38.133 |
|  |
| Nokia: It seems that some test configurations are NR-specific, although NR-U specific test configurations were agreed for NR-U in the last meeting (e.g. CORESET configurations). These would need to be updated. |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.6 Random access** | |
| [R4-2106877](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106877.zip)  Ericsson  **Revised to xxx** | Draft CR: Random access procedure test cases for NR-U |
| Nokia: - It is not clear whether this CR is applicable to LBE mode, FBE mode or both.  - Although both DL and UL CCA models are referred to within the "general test parameters" tables the tests description do not address any "DL/UL CCA failure" case, i.e. it seems assumed by default that DL/UL CCA is always successful.  - As lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig is an optional feature (i.e. not supported by all UEs) it does not seem relevant to have it configured for the test cases.  Depending on the conclusion of Issue 2-1-2 and 2-1-2, we suggest also to use the table on R4-2106578 as a reference on how to include the semi-static and dynamic channel access configurations. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.8 BWP switching delay and interruptions** | |
| [R4-2107146](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107146.zip)  Ericsson  **Revised to xxx** | Test cases on BWP switching for NR-U SA in TS 38.133 |
| Nokia:  It is unclear how LBT is considered in the test cases.  Draft CR should also include the NR-U specific test configurations, for example for TDD and SSB.  Depending on the conclusion of Issue 2-1-2 and 2-1-2, we suggest also to use the table on R4-2106578 as a reference on how to include the semi-static and dynamic channel access configurations. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.9 PSCell addition/release (delay and interruption)** | |
| [R4-2106981](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106981.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon  **Revised to xxx** | Draft CR of test cases for PSCell addition and release for NR-U |
| Nokia: We would prefer to agree the CCA probabilities after high level agreements on the default probability and other probabilities is agreed under Topic 2. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.13 Beam management (BFD and link recovery)** | |
| [R4-2106875](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106875.zip)  Ericsson  **Revised to xxx** | Draft CR: Update of beam management test cases for NR-U |
| Nokia: We would prefer to agree the CCA probabilities after high level agreements on the default probability and other probabilities is agreed under Topic 2. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.14 SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR/L1-RSRP measurement procedure (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)** | |
| [R4-2106578](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106578.zip)  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Draft TC NR-U inter-frequency measurements |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2106982](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106982.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon  **Revised to xxx** | Draft CR on test cases for inter-RAT measurement for NR-U |
| Nokia: Please provide further comments on how the b2-Threshold values were obtained.  Please consider adding dynamic channel access configuration, depending on the outcome of Issue 2-1-1.  Please update PCCA\_DL after we reach agreement on Issues 2-3-2 and 2-3-3.  The test case A.12.4.2.4 is missing the SSB configuration, TDD configuration,  Depending on the conclusion of Issue 2-1-2 and 2-1-2, we suggest also to use the table on R4-2106578 as a reference on how to include the semi-static and dynamic channel access configurations. |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.17 SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR/L1-RSRP measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)** | |
| [R4-2106359](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106359.zip)  MediaTek inc.  **Revised to xxx** | Introduction of test cases for L1-RSRP measurement accuracy with CCA serving cell |
| Nokia: Please consider adding dynamic channel access for the SSB configuration depending on the outcome of issue 2-1-1.  Please review the definition of the parameters defined in Table A.9.4.4.1.2-1: FR1 SSB based L1-RSRP test parameters. Some of the parameters are only defined for test configuration 1.  We suggest adding the definition of the “Test 1” and “Test 2” in each test case for completeness |
| Ericsson: Wrong version in the coversheet. |
| MTK: we would like to request a revision number to provide revisions based on the comment above. |
| [R4-2106983](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106983.zip)  Huawei, HiSilicon  **Revised to xxx** | Draft CR on test cases for intra-frequency measurement accuracy for NR-U |
| Nokia: Please update PCCA\_DL after we reach agreement on Issues 2-3-2 and 2-3-3.  In addition to semi-static channel access for the SSB configuration, please consider adding dynamic channel access, depending on the outcome of Issue 2-1-1.  Please review the proposed value for the DBT window configuration in Table A.11.6.1.1.2-2: SS-RSRP Intra frequency test parameters  We suggest adding the definition of the “Test 1”, “Test 2” and “Test 3” in each test case for completeness |
|  |
| **AI 5.1.3.3.18 RSSI/CO measurement accuracy (intra-frequency, inter-frequency, inter-RAT)** | |
| [R4-2104830](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104830.zip)  Apple  **Revised to xxx** | Test cases for RSSI and CO measurement accuracy in NR-U R16 |
| Nokia: Would be good to align the CCA model parameters to be added in a similar manner with other CRs (probabilities and model separately). We would also prefer to wait for high level agreements on CCA probabilities before agreeing on them for each test case. |
| Ericsson: This CR contains too many TBDs values, it is better to wait until there are more agreements so that those values can be replaced. |

# Topic #4: Test case list and work split

### Sub-topic 4-2: Test case list

**Issue 4-1-1: Test case list**

* Companies are asked to provide feedback in the way explained in Table 4-4-4.1 to the test case list in Table 4-1-1.2.

**Table 4-1-1.1: Instructions on how to fill Table 4-1-1.2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Column | Required feedback (please use company name) |
| Volunteer | Please indicate if your company is willing to volunteer for any of the blue marked test cases |
| Volunteer | Please provide a CR based on the existing volunteering for the next RAN4 meeting, or remove your company name in the light blue marked test cases if volunteering no longer applies. |
| Test case should be included | Please indicate in this column your company support for including some of the FFS test cases marked orange. |
| Test case should NOT be included | Please indicate in this column your company objection for introducing some of the FFS test cases marked orange OR objection for any of the already agreed test cases. |

**Table 4-1-1.2: Test case list for volunteering and indicating company support/objection for FFS test cases**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group of requirements** | **Test cases** | **Clarification** | **Requirements section** | **Agreed** | **Volunteer** | **Endorsed sections** | **RAN4#98-bis-e Draft CR** | **Test case should be included** | **Test case should NOT be included** |
| RRC\_IDLE, cell re-selection | NR-U -> NR-U | intra-frequency | 4.2A | Yes | Ericsson | A.11.1.1.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| inter-frequency | Yes | A.11.1.1.1.2 | R4-2106854 |  |  |
| NR(FR1) -> NR-U |  | Yes |  | R4-2106854 |  |  |
| NR-U -> NR(FR1) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106854 |  |  |
| NR-U - > E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106854 |  |  |
| E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) -> NR-U |  | TS 36.133 | Yes | Ericsson | A.12.1.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| HO (delay and interruptions) | NR-U-> NR-U | intra-frequency, known | 6.1B | Yes | Huawei | A.11.2.1.1 | R4-2106978 |  |  |
| intra-frequency, unknown | Yes | A.11.2.1.2 | R4-2106978 |  |  |
| inter-frequency, unkown | Yes | A.11.2.1.3 | R4-2106978 |  |  |
| Inter-frequency, known | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| NR(FR1) -> NR-U | known | 6.1B | Yes | [Nokia/Ericsson] |  | R4-2106576, R4-2106856 |  |  |
| unkown | Yes |  | R4-2106576, R4-2106856 |  |  |
| NR-U -> NR(FR1) | known |  | Yes | [Nokia] |  | R4-2106576 |  |  |
| unknown | 6.1.1.2 | Yes |  | R4-2106576 |  |  |
| NR-U - > E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) |  | 6.1.2.1 | Yes | [Ericsson?] |  | R4-2106856 (known + unknown) |  |  |
| E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) -> NR-U |  | TS 36.133 | Yes | Nokia |  | R4-2106576 |  |  |
| RRC Re-establishment | NR-U-> NR-U |  | 6.2.1A | Yes | Nokia |  | R4-2106577, R4-2107142 |  |  |
| NR(FR1) -> NR-U |  | FFS |  |  |  | Ericsson |  |
| Random access | Contention-based and non-contention based RA for both 2-step and 4-step RA types: |  | 6.2.2A [1] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        to NR-U PCell |  | Yes | [Ericsson/Nokia] |  | R4-2106579, R4-2106877 |  |  |
| ·        to NR-U PSCell |  | Yes | [Ericsson/Nokia] |  | R4-2106579, R4-2106877 |  |  |
| RRC Connection Release with Redirection | ·        NR-U-> NR-U |  | 6.2.3.2.3 | Yes | Huawei | A.11.2.2.3.1 | R4-2106979 |  |  |
| ·        NR(FR1) -> NR-U |  | FFS | [Ericsson] |  | R4-2107144 | Ericsson |  |
| Timing (transmit timing) | ·        NR-U PCell |  | 7.1, 7.3 | Yes | MTK/ | A.11.3.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCell |  | Yes | [Ericsson] | A.10.2.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| Timing (timing advance) | ·        NR-U PCell |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.11.3.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCell |  | Yes | A.10.2.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| BWP switching delay and interruptions | ·       E-UTRAN – NR-U PSCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure |  | 8.6 | Yes | Ericsson | A.10.3.5.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·       NR-U – NR-U PCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure |  | Yes | A.11.4.5.1 | No updates |  |  |
| Legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching on NR-U SCell, with: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR PCC (PCC) |  | FFS |  |  | R4-2107146 | Ericsson |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | FFS | Ericsson |  | R4-2107146 | Ericsson |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) |  | FFS |  |  | R4-2107146 | Ericsson |  |
| RLM (in-syn and out-of-sync) | ·        On NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) | OOS, non-DRX | 8.1A | Yes | Ericsson | A.10.3.1.2 | No updates |  |  |
| IS, non-DRX | Yes | A.10.3.1.3 | No updates |  |  |
| OOS, DRX | Yes | A.10.3.1.4 | No updates |  |  |
| IS, DRX | Yes | A.10.3.1.5 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U PCC | OOS, non-DRX | Yes | A.11.4.1.2 | No updates |  |  |
| IS, non-DRX | Yes | A.11.4.1.3 | No updates |  |  |
| OOS, DRX | Yes | A.11.4.1.4 | No updates |  |  |
| IS, DRX | Yes | A.11.4.1.5 | No updates |  |  |
| BM (beam failure detection and link recovery) | ·        On NR-U PCC | nonDRX | 8.5A | Yes | Ericsson | A.11.4.4.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.11.4.4.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) | nonDRX | Yes | A.10.3.4.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.10.3.4.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| SCell activation/deactivation delay | ·        NR PCC (FR1) | known | 8.3A | Yes | [Ericsson] | A.9.2.2.1/2 | No updates |  |  |
| unknown | Yes | A.9.2.2.3 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC | known | Yes | A.11.4.3.1/2 | No updates |  |  |
| unknown | Yes | A.11.4.3.3 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) | known | Yes | A.10.3.3.1/2 | No updates |  |  |
| unknown | Yes | A.10.3.3.3 | No updates |  |  |
| PSCell addition/release delay | NR-U PSCell with E-UTRA PCC | konwn | TS 36.133 | Yes | Huawei |  | R4-2106981 |  |  |
| Active TCI state switching delay | For known and unknown target TCI state in NR-U, on: |  | 8.10A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | FFS |  |  |  | Ericsson | MTK |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | FFS |  |  |  | Ericsson | MTK |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) |  | FFS |  |  |  | Ericsson | MTK |
| Interruptions | Due to NR-U SCell addition/release, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR PCC (FR1) |  | FFS | Ericsson |  |  |  | Ericsson, MTK |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | FFS |  |  |  | Ericsson, MTK |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | FFS |  |  |  | Ericsson, MTK |
| Due to NR-U SCell activation/deactivation/addition/release, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | [Ericsson] | A.9.2.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.4.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.3.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| During measurements no deactivated NR-U SCell, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR PCC (FR1) |  | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements between: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCell and E-UTRAN PCell (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release, with: |  | TS 36.133 | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        E-UTRA PCell |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| Intra-frequency measurement procedure (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, L1-RSRP, RSSI, CO) | Intra-frequency SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR, measurements on: |  | 9.2A.5, 9.2A.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.1.1/2/3/4 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.1/2/3/4 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.5/6/7/8 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.1/2/3/4 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC measurements, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.5/6/7/8 | No updates |  |  |
| L1-RSRP measurements on: |  | 9.5.4A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) | Non-DXR | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.3.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.9.3.3.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC | Non-DXR | Yes | A.11.5.4.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.11.5.4.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC | Non-DXR | Yes | A.11.5.4.3 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.11.5.4.4 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) | Non-DXR | Yes | A.10.4.3.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.10.4.3.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC measurements, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) and NR-U PSCC | Non-DXR | Yes | A.10.4.3.3 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.10.4.3.4 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| Intra-frequency RSSI measurements on: |  | 9.2A.7.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.1.5 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.9 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.11 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.9 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC measurements, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.11 | No updates |  |  |
| Intra-frequency CO measurements on: |  | 9.2A.7.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.1.6 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.10 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.12 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.10 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC measurements, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.12 | No updates |  |  |
| Inter-frequency measurement procedure (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, SFTD, RSSI, CO) | Inter-frequency SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR measurements on: |  | 9.3A.4, 9.3A.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Nokia |  | R4-2106578 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2106578 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106578 |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| Inter-frequency RSSI measurements on: |  | 9.3A.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
|  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| Inter-frequency CO measurements on: |  | 9.3A.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.2.2 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.2.2 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.2.2 | No updates |  |  |
|  | Inter-RAT SFTD between: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | ·        E-UTRAN PCell (FDD,TDD) and NR-U neighbor |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.12.4.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
|  | NOTE: under the condition of stationary paths |  |  |
|  | NR-U-E-UTRA RSRP/RSRQ (needed for HO): |  | 9.4.2, 9.4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ·        On E-UTRA (FDD,TDD), with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
|  | ·        On E-UTRA (FDD,TDD), with NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
|  | E-UTRA-NR-U SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ·        On NR-U non-serving neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC | With/without index detection with/without DRX | Yes | Huawei | A.12.4.2.1/2/3/4 | R4-2106982 |  |  |
|  | ·        On NR-U non-serving neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
|  | E-UTRA-NR-U RSSI/CO: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-RAT measurement procedure (SFTD, E-UTRA-NR-U SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR and RSSI/CO, NR-U-E-UTRA RSRP/RSRQ) | ·        On NR-U non-serving~~neighbor~~, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.12.4.2.5/6 | No updates |  |  |
|  | ·        On NR-U non-serving frequency~~neighbor~~, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| Accuracy for NR-U intra-frequency measurements (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, L1-RSRP, RSSI, CO) | Intra-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-RSRP on: |  | [10.1.27] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Huawei | A.9.4.1.1 | R4-2106983 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.6.1.1 | R4-2106983 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.6.1.2 | R4-2106983 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| Intra-frequency absolute accuracies for SS-RSRQ on: |  | [10.1.29] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| Intra-frequency absolute accuracies for SS-SINR on: |  | [10.1.31] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| Absolute and relative accuracies for L1-RSRP on: |  | [10.1.33] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | MTK |  | R4-2106359 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2106359 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106359 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| Intra-frequency RSSI on: |  | [10.1.34.1] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Apple |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| Intra-frequency CO on: |  | [10.1.35.1] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Apple |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| Accuracy for NR-U inter-frequency measurements (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, SFTD, RSSI, CO) | Inter-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-RSRP on: |  | [10.1.28] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | MTK |  | R4-2106358 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2106358 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106358 |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| Inter-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-RSRQ on: |  | [10.1.30] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| Inter-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-SINR on: |  | [10.1.32] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | FFS |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| Inter-frequency RSSI on: |  | [10.1.34.2] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Apple |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| Inter-frequency CO on: |  | [10.1.35.2] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Apple |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| Accuracy for inter-RAT measurements (SFTD, E-UTRA-NR-U SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR and RSSI/CO, NR-U-E-UTRA RSRP/RSRQ) | Inter-RAT SFTD between: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        E-UTRAN PCell (FDD,TDD) and NR-U neighbor |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.12.5.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| NOTE: under the condition of stationary paths |  |  |
| NR-U-E-UTRA RSRP with: |  | 10.2.2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| NR-U-E-UTRA RSRQ with: |  | 10.2.2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  |  | FFS |  |  | No CR | Ericsson |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC |  |  | FFS |  |  | No CR | Ericsson |  |
| E-UTRA-NR-U SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| E-UTRA-NR-U RSSI/CO: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | No CR |  |  |

* Recommended WF:
  + Update the test case list provided in [R4-2106848](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106848.zip) based on the input in Table 4-1-1.2.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub-topic 4-2: Test case list:  Please fill your input directly to Table 10. |

### 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** |
| **AI 5.1.3.1 General** | |
| [**R4-2106848**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106848.zip)  Ericsson | Updated test case list for NR-U |
| Company A… |
| Company B… |

## 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 #4-2** | *Tentative agreements:*  Based on the first-round discussion, the following test cases received feedback indicating that they should be included/excluded:  RAN4 agrees to include RRM tests for:   * RRC Re-establishment   + NR(FR1) -> NR-U * RRC Connection Release with Redirection,   + NR(FR1) -> NR-U * BWP switching delay and interruptions, Legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching on NR-U SCell, with   + NR PCC (PCC)   + NR-U PCC   + NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) * Accuracy for inter-RAT measurements (SFTD, E-UTRA-NR-U SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR and RSSI/CO, NR-U-E-UTRA RSRP/RSRQ), NR-U-E-UTRA RSRQ with:   + NR-U PCC   + NR-U PSCC   RAN4 agrees NOT to include RRM tests for:   * HO (delay and interruptions), NR-U-> NR-U   + Inter-frequency, known target cell * Interruptions due to NR-U SCell addition/release, with:   + NR PCC (FR1)   + NR-U PCC   + NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) * Interruptions, during measurements no deactivated NR-U SCell, with:   + NR PCC (FR1)   + NR-U PCC   + NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) * Inter-frequency measurement procedure (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, SFTD, RSSI, CO), Inter-frequency SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR measurements on   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) * Accuracy for NR-U inter-frequency measurements (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, SFTD, RSSI, CO), Inter-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-RSRP on:   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) * Accuracy for NR-U inter-frequency measurements (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, SFTD, RSSI, CO), Inter-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-RSRQ on:   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) * Accuracy for NR-U inter-frequency measurements (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, SFTD, RSSI, CO), Inter-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-SINR on:   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC   + NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD)   *Candidate options:*  Based on the first-round discussion, the following test cases received conflicting feedback and should be further discussed in the 2nd round:   * Active TCI state switching delay, For known and unknown target TCI state in NR-U, on:   + NR-U PCC   + NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1)   + NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD)   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Further discuss the open test cases.  Please consider also to volunteer for CR drafting responsibilities. |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

Please continue discussion in open issues summary, after the 2nd week/round delimiter.  
Please also continue the TP/CR discussions above.

### Sub-topic 4-2: Test case list

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Column | Required feedback (please use company name) |
| Volunteer | Please indicate if your company is willing to volunteer for any of the blue marked test cases |
| Volunteer | Please provide a CR based on the existing volunteering for the next RAN4 meeting, or remove your company name in the light blue marked test cases if volunteering no longer applies. |
| Test case should be included | Please indicate in this column your company support for including some of the FFS test cases marked orange. |
| Test case should NOT be included | Please indicate in this column your company objection for introducing some of the FFS test cases marked orange OR objection for any of the already agreed test cases. |
| Test case included in the 1st round discussion |  |
| Test case excluded in the 1st round discussion |  |

**Table 4-1-1.2: Test case list for volunteering and indicating company support/objection for FFS test cases**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group of requirements** | **Test cases** | **Clarification** | **Requirements section** | **Agreed** | **Volunteer** | **Endorsed sections** | **RAN4#98-bis-e Draft CR** | **Test case should be included** | **Test case should NOT be included** |
| RRC\_IDLE, cell re-selection | NR-U -> NR-U | intra-frequency | 4.2A | Yes | Ericsson | A.11.1.1.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| inter-frequency | Yes | A.11.1.1.1.2 | R4-2106854 |  |  |
| NR(FR1) -> NR-U |  | Yes |  | R4-2106854 |  |  |
| NR-U -> NR(FR1) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106854 |  |  |
| NR-U - > E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106854 |  |  |
| E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) -> NR-U |  | TS 36.133 | Yes | Ericsson | A.12.1.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| HO (delay and interruptions) | NR-U-> NR-U | intra-frequency, known | 6.1B | Yes | Huawei | A.11.2.1.1 | R4-2106978 |  |  |
| intra-frequency, unknown | Yes | A.11.2.1.2 | R4-2106978 |  |  |
| inter-frequency, unkown | Yes | A.11.2.1.3 | R4-2106978 |  |  |
| Inter-frequency, known | No |  |  |  |  | MTK |
| NR(FR1) -> NR-U | known | 6.1B | Yes | [Nokia/Ericsson] |  | R4-2106576, R4-2106856 |  |  |
| unkown | Yes |  | R4-2106576, R4-2106856 |  |  |
| NR-U -> NR(FR1) | known |  | Yes | [Nokia] |  | R4-2106576 |  |  |
| unknown | 6.1.1.2 | Yes |  | R4-2106576 |  |  |
| NR-U - > E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) |  | 6.1.2.1 | Yes | [Ericsson?] |  | R4-2106856 (known + unknown) |  |  |
| E-UTRAN (FDD,TDD) -> NR-U |  | TS 36.133 | Yes | Nokia |  | R4-2106576 |  |  |
| RRC Re-establishment | NR-U-> NR-U |  | 6.2.1A | Yes | Nokia |  | R4-2106577, R4-2107142 |  |  |
| NR(FR1) -> NR-U |  | Yes | [Huawei] |  |  |  |  |
| Random access | Contention-based and non-contention based RA for both 2-step and 4-step RA types: |  | 6.2.2A [1] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        to NR-U PCell |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | R4-2106579, R4-2106877 |  |  |
| ·        to NR-U PSCell |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | R4-2106579, R4-2106877 |  |  |
| RRC Connection Release with Redirection | ·        NR-U-> NR-U |  | 6.2.3.2.3 | Yes | Huawei | A.11.2.2.3.1 | R4-2106979 |  |  |
| ·        NR(FR1) -> NR-U |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | R4-2107144 |  |  |
| Timing (transmit timing) | ·        NR-U PCell |  | 7.1, 7.3 | Yes | MTK/ | A.11.3.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCell |  | Yes | [Ericsson] | A.10.2.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| Timing (timing advance) | ·        NR-U PCell |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.11.3.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCell |  | Yes | A.10.2.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| BWP switching delay and interruptions | ·       E-UTRAN – NR-U PSCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure |  | 8.6 | Yes | Ericsson | A.10.3.5.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·       NR-U – NR-U PCell UL active BWP switch based on persistent UL LBT failure |  | Yes | A.11.4.5.1 | No updates |  |  |
| Legacy DCI/timer/RRC-based BWP switching on NR-U SCell, with: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR PCC (PCC) |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | R4-2107146 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | R4-2107146 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | R4-2107146 |  |  |
| RLM (in-syn and out-of-sync) | ·        On NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) | OOS, non-DRX | 8.1A | Yes | Ericsson | A.10.3.1.2 | No updates |  |  |
| IS, non-DRX | Yes | A.10.3.1.3 | No updates |  |  |
| OOS, DRX | Yes | A.10.3.1.4 | No updates |  |  |
| IS, DRX | Yes | A.10.3.1.5 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U PCC | OOS, non-DRX | Yes | A.11.4.1.2 | No updates |  |  |
| IS, non-DRX | Yes | A.11.4.1.3 | No updates |  |  |
| OOS, DRX | Yes | A.11.4.1.4 | No updates |  |  |
| IS, DRX | Yes | A.11.4.1.5 | No updates |  |  |
| BM (beam failure detection and link recovery) | ·        On NR-U PCC | nonDRX | 8.5A | Yes | Ericsson | A.11.4.4.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.11.4.4.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) | nonDRX | Yes | A.10.3.4.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.10.3.4.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| SCell activation/deactivation delay | ·        NR PCC (FR1) | known | 8.3A | Yes | [Ericsson] | A.9.2.2.1/2 | No updates |  |  |
| unknown | Yes | A.9.2.2.3 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC | known | Yes | A.11.4.3.1/2 | No updates |  |  |
| unknown | Yes | A.11.4.3.3 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) | known | Yes | A.10.3.3.1/2 | No updates |  |  |
| unknown | Yes | A.10.3.3.3 | No updates |  |  |
| PSCell addition/release delay | NR-U PSCell with E-UTRA PCC | konwn | TS 36.133 | Yes | Huawei |  | R4-2106981 |  |  |
| Active TCI state switching delay | For known and unknown target TCI state in NR-U, on: |  | 8.10A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | FFS |  |  |  | Ericsson | MTK |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | FFS |  |  |  | Ericsson | MTK |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD, TDD) |  | FFS |  |  |  | Ericsson | MTK |
| Interruptions | Due to NR-U SCell addition/release, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR PCC (FR1) |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | No |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | No |  |  |  |  |
| Due to NR-U SCell activation/deactivation/addition/release, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.2.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.4.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.3.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| During measurements no deactivated NR-U SCell, with: |  | 8.2.1, 8.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR PCC (FR1) |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Due to inter-RAT SFTD measurements between: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCell and E-UTRAN PCell (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| Due to NR-U PSCell addition/release, with: |  | TS 36.133 | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        E-UTRA PCell |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| Intra-frequency measurement procedure (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, L1-RSRP, RSSI, CO) | Intra-frequency SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR, measurements on: |  | 9.2A.5, 9.2A.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.1.1/2/3/4 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.1/2/3/4 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.5/6/7/8 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.1/2/3/4 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC measurements, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.5/6/7/8 | No updates |  |  |
| L1-RSRP measurements on: |  | 9.5.4A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) | Non-DXR | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.3.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.9.3.3.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC | Non-DXR | Yes | A.11.5.4.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.11.5.4.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC | Non-DXR | Yes | A.11.5.4.3 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.11.5.4.4 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) | Non-DXR | Yes | A.10.4.3.1 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.10.4.3.2 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC measurements, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) and NR-U PSCC | Non-DXR | Yes | A.10.4.3.3 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| DRX | A.10.4.3.4 | R4-2106875 |  |  |
| Intra-frequency RSSI measurements on: |  | 9.2A.7.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.1.5 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.9 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.11 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.9 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC measurements, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.11 | No updates |  |  |
| Intra-frequency CO measurements on: |  | 9.2A.7.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.1.6 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.10 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.1.12 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.10 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC measurements, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes | A.10.4.1.12 | No updates |  |  |
| Inter-frequency measurement procedure (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, SFTD, RSSI, CO) | Inter-frequency SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR measurements on: |  | 9.3A.4, 9.3A.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Nokia |  | R4-2106578 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2106578 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106578 |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-frequency RSSI measurements on: |  | 9.3A.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
|  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.2.1 | No updates |  |  |
| Inter-frequency CO measurements on: |  | 9.3A.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.9.3.2.2 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.5.2.2 | No updates |  |  |
| ·        NR-U inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes | A.10.4.2.2 | No updates |  |  |
|  | Inter-RAT SFTD between: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | ·        E-UTRAN PCell (FDD,TDD) and NR-U neighbor |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.12.4.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
|  | NOTE: under the condition of stationary paths |  |  |
|  | NR-U-E-UTRA RSRP/RSRQ (needed for HO): |  | 9.4.2, 9.4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ·        On E-UTRA (FDD,TDD), with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
|  | ·        On E-UTRA (FDD,TDD), with NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
|  | E-UTRA-NR-U SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ·        On NR-U non-serving neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC | With/without index detection with/without DRX | Yes | Huawei | A.12.4.2.1/2/3/4 | R4-2106982 |  |  |
|  | ·        On NR-U non-serving neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
|  | E-UTRA-NR-U RSSI/CO: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-RAT measurement procedure (SFTD, E-UTRA-NR-U SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR and RSSI/CO, NR-U-E-UTRA RSRP/RSRQ) | ·        On NR-U non-serving~~neighbor~~, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.12.4.2.5/6 | No updates |  |  |
|  | ·        On NR-U non-serving frequency~~neighbor~~, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| Accuracy for NR-U intra-frequency measurements (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, L1-RSRP, RSSI, CO) | Intra-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-RSRP on: |  | [10.1.27] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Huawei | A.9.4.1.1 | R4-2106983 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.6.1.1 | R4-2106983 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes | A.11.6.1.2 | R4-2106983 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| Intra-frequency absolute accuracies for SS-RSRQ on: |  | [10.1.29] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| Intra-frequency absolute accuracies for SS-SINR on: |  | [10.1.31] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| Absolute and relative accuracies for L1-RSRP on: |  | [10.1.33] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | MTK |  | R4-2106359 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2106359 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106359 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | No CR |  |  |
| Intra-frequency RSSI on: |  | [10.1.34.1] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Apple |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| Intra-frequency CO on: |  | [10.1.35.1] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Apple |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U SCC, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| Accuracy for NR-U inter-frequency measurements (SS-RSRP, SS-RSRQ, SS-SINR, SFTD, RSSI, CO) | Inter-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-RSRP on: |  | [10.1.28] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | MTK |  | R4-2106358 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2106358 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2106358 |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Requirements missing | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Requirements missing | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-RSRQ on: |  | [10.1.30] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Requirements missing | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Requirements missing | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-frequency absolute and relative accuracies for SS-SINR on: |  | [10.1.32] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PCC |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR (FR1) inter-frequency, with NR-U PSCC and E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Requirements missing ~~FFS~~ | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-frequency RSSI on: |  | [10.1.34.2] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Apple |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| Inter-frequency CO on: |  | [10.1.35.2] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR PCC (FR1) |  | Yes | Apple |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| ·        NR-U neighbor, with NR-U PSCC, with E-UTRAN PCC (FDD,TDD) |  | Yes |  | R4-2104830 |  |  |
| Accuracy for inter-RAT measurements (SFTD, E-UTRA-NR-U SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR and RSSI/CO, NR-U-E-UTRA RSRP/RSRQ) | Inter-RAT SFTD between: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        E-UTRAN PCell (FDD,TDD) and NR-U neighbor |  | Yes | Ericsson | A.12.5.1.1 | No updates |  |  |
| NOTE: under the condition of stationary paths |  |  |
| NR-U-E-UTRA RSRP with: |  | 10.2.2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| NR-U-E-UTRA RSRQ with: |  | 10.2.2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PCC |  |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        NR-U PSCC |  |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| E-UTRA-NR-U SS-RSRP/SS-RSRQ/SS-SINR: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes |  |  | No CR |  |  |
| E-UTRA-NR-U RSSI/CO: |  | TS 36.133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | No CR |  |  |
| ·        On NR-U neighbor, with E-UTRA (FDD,TDD) PCC and NR-U PSCC |  | Yes | Ericsson |  | No CR |  |  |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on general test configurations for NR-U RRM performance requirements | Nokia | Sub topic 2-1, 2-2 ant Topic #3 |
| WF on LBT models for NR-U RRM performance requirements | Qualcomm | Sub topic 2-3 and 2-4 |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-2107362 | Updated NR-U RRM Performance Work Plan | Qualcomm Incorporated | Agreeable |  |
| R4-2106848 | Updated test case list for NR-U | Ericsson | revised |  |
| R4-2106846 | Draft Big CR: Introduction of Rel-16 NR-U RRM performance requirements | Ericsson | Revised | No comments in the 1st round |
| [R4-2106847](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106847.zip) | NR-U accuracy requirements | Ericsson | Return to (possibly agreeable) | No comments in the 1st round |
| [R4-2106879](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106879.zip) | DraftCR 36.133 Correction of accuracy requirements for NR-U bands | Ericsson | Return to (possibly agreeable) | No comments in the 1st round |
| [R4-2106975](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106975.zip) | Draft CR on inter-RAT NR measurement accuracy requirements | Huawei | Return to (possibly agreeable) | No comments in the 1st round |
| R4-2106580 | Draft CR on DL CCA model for NR-U | Nokia | Revised | No comments in the 1st round |
| R4-2106850 | CCA model in NR-U test cases | Ericsson | Merged with R4-2106580 |  |
| [R4-2106873](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106873.zip) | Draft CR: Update of RMC for NR-U test cases | Ericsson | Return to (possibly agreeable) | No comments in the 1st round |
| [R4-2106977](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106977.zip) | Draft CR of test case configurations for NR-U | Huawei, HiSilicon | Return to (possibly agreeable) | No comments in the 1st round |
| R4-2107140 | Applicability rules for legacy NR tests for NR-U in 38.133 | Ericsson | Revised |  |
| R4-2106854 | Introduction of NR-U cell reselection tests | Ericsson | Revised |  |
| R4-2106576 | Draft TC NR-U handover test cases | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Revised |  |
| R4-2106856 | Introduction of NR-U handover tests | Ericsson | Revised |  |
| R4-2106978 | Draft CR of test cases for HO delay and interruption for NR-U | Huawei, HiSilicon | Revised |  |
| R4-2106577 | Draft TC RRC re-establishment with CCA | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Return to (possibly agreeable) | No comments in the 1st round |
| R4-2107142 | RRC re-establishment tests for NR-U in 38.133 | Ericsson | Not pursued |  |
| R4-2106979 | Draft CR on test cases for RRC release with redirection for NR-U | Huawei, HiSilicon | Revised |  |
| R4-2107144 | RRC connetion release with re-direction from NR to NR-U test in 38.133 | Ericsson | Revised |  |
| R4-2106579 | Draft CR NR-U RRM random access performance requirements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Merged with R4-2106579 | No comments in the 1st round |
| R4-2106877 | Draft CR: Random access procedure test cases for NR-U | Ericsson | Revised |  |
| R4-2107146 | Test cases on BWP switching for NR-U SA in TS 38.133 | Ericsson | Revised |  |
| R4-2106981 | Draft CR of test cases for PSCell addition and release for NR-U | Huawei, HiSilicon | Revised |  |
| R4-2106875 | Draft CR: Update of beam management test cases for NR-U | Ericsson | Revised |  |
| R4-2106578 | Draft TC NR-U inter-frequency measurements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Return to (possibly agreeable) | No comments in the 1st round |
| R4-2106982 | Draft CR on test cases for inter-RAT measurement for NR-U | Huawei, HiSilicon | Revised |  |
| R4-2106359 | Introduction of test cases for L1-RSRP measurement accuracy with CCA serving cell | MediaTek inc. | Revised |  |
| R4-2106983 | Draft CR on test cases for intra-frequency measurement accuracy for NR-U | Huawei, HiSilicon | Revised |  |
| R4-2104830 | Test cases for RSSI and CO measurement accuracy in NR-U R16 | Apple | Revised |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-210xxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents