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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:

* [POST125][36][NES] CR to 38.304 (Apple)

Intended outcome: Agreed to CR

Deadline: Short

# 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** |
| OPPO | Would it be clearer to add a reference to TS 38.306 after“UEs indicating any of the values in nes-CellDTX-DRX” to define it?  For example:  - *cellBarredNES* (IE type: "not barred") Indicated in *SIB1* message. In case of multiple PLMNs or NPNs indicated in *SIB1*, this field is common for all PLMNs and NPNs. This field is only applicable to UEs indicating any of the values in *nes-CellDTX-DRX* as specified in TS 38.306 [24].  If accepted, we can further make similar modifications to the following.  When *cellBarredNES* is absent and *cellBarred* is set to"barred",  - The UE indicating any of the values in *nes-CellDTX-DRX* shall treat this cell as if cell status is "barred". |  |
| Nokia | CR looks fine. It seems in this specification we don’t refer much to 38.306 – So probably ok not to have reference to 38.306. But you could check with rapporteur (Ozcan) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

TBD