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# 1 Introduction

This is a summary document on collection of comments to TS 38.304 CR during below running CR discussion:

* [POST124][038][NES] 38.304 CR (Apple)

 Intended outcome: Agree to CR

 Deadline: 2 weeks

# 2 Collection of comments

Please provide your comments in below table, and Rapporteur will response. Please do not insert any comments in running CR directly, which is hard for Rapporteur to follow all comments.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Detailed comments** | **Rapporteur response** |
| vivo | Suggest to remove the last sentence: *cellBarred* (IE type: "barred" or "not barred") Indicated in *MIB* message. In case of multiple PLMNs or NPNs indicated in *SIB1*, this field is common for all PLMNs and NPNs. This field is ignored by UEs supporting NTN while *cellBarredNTN* is included in SIB1. This field is ignored by NES-capable UEs while *cellBarredNES* is included in SIB1.The reasons are the following:* 1)There is a NOTE in RRC Running CR, which means NES-capable UEs needs to read cellBarred in MIB and its value to determine whether the UE needs to acquire SIB1. Moreover, when cellBarredNES is included in SIB1, the UE does not need to check cellBarred in MIB again, because the value in cellBarred can only be “barred”. So, the UE actually does not ignore the bar in MIB.

NOTE 2: A UE capable of NES cell DTX/DRX should acquire SIB1 to determine the cell barring status when the *cellBarred* in MIB is set to *barred*.* 2) Having the below text is sufficient.

When *cellBarredNES* is absent and *cellBarred* is set to"barred",- The NES-capable UE shall treat this cell as if cell status is "barred". | The suggestion is technically reasonable (i.e. the NES capable UE needs to read cellBarred field first. So, the UE actually don’t “ignore”). Rapporteur will make the change in v2.However, one issue is that the last sentence is also captured in field description of *cellBarred* in running TS 38.331 CR. I will notify Rapporteur of 38.331 on the change. |
| Huawei | We prefer to change “NES-capable UE” to “UE capable of NES cell DTX/DRX” or “UE supporting NES cell DTX/DRX” and remove the NES-capable UE from the definitions section. The reasons are the following:The definitions are far from the relevant section and in my view adding a definition can lead to misunderstandings for someone that is only reading the cell barring section. Making a definition of NES capable UE is not optimal from the readability and spec clarity perspective as this term is used in various places in 38.331 and for a reader/implementer it would not be obvious to check the definitions section before analysing the NES cell barring. Therefore for 38.331 I have adopted the above wording and suggest the same for 38.304.  | I am fine with either way. Since Rapporteur of running TS 38.331 prefer this way, I am inclined to align with TS 38.331. However, in running 38.331 discussion, I saw some companies suggested opposite way. Thus, I will hear more companies’ view. |
| Nokia | We agree with both Vivo and Huawei. Both proposals make specification clearer. | OK |
| Qualcomm | Vivo’s comment makes sense. The field is technically not ignored as the SIB1 reading is only relevant of MIB is set to “barred”. WE can remove as vivo proposed or reword to When this field is set to “barred”, the UE may further check SIB1 for further NES specific barring information.  | OK. Let us just remove the last sentence as vivo proposed.  |
| OPPO | We also think vivo’s comment is reasonable. Also, as the Rapporteur indicated, the related field description in TS 38.331 may also need to be updated.  |  |
| Samsung | On CR cover sheet:* Please use CR form 12.2
* Title “Introduction of Network Energy Savings for NR”
* Source to TSG: RAN2
* Update “Date”
* Other specs affected may need to have at least the NES RRC CR.
* Rel-18 barring is not “legacy”.

~~Legacy~~ UE barring mechanism of Rel-18 Network Energy saving feature is not supported. |  |
| CATT | On vivo’s point, we have no strong view considering, as also commented in RRC CR offline, the specification should not impose a UE implementation and it is also a possible implementation to first check *cellBarredNES* before reading *cellBarred*. In any case, both 38.304 and 38.331 should be aligned on whether both implementation approaches are described or only one.  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

TBD