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**Title: TR V1 comments collection for Post-110-R18-NW\_ES1**

**Document for: Discussion and Decision**

This triggers the email discussion of the following:

|  |
| --- |
| [Post-110-R18-NW\_ES1] Finalization of TR for submission to RAN by September 1 – Yi (Huawei) |

Two documents are uploaded in folder < [Post-110-R18-NW\_ES1](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110/Inbox/drafts/9.7(FS_Netw_Energy_NR)/9.7.1/Post-110-R18-NW_ES1)>.

Note, the draft TR is due to be sent to RAN#97e for information, therefore it will be for finalization of Version 0.1.0. Agreements made for EVM parts for the two meetings have been mostly captured, pending possible new agreements per the email discussion for *Post-110-R18-NW\_ES2* (if time allowed). Also, RAN3 approved TR skeleton is also incorporated.

Comments are to be collected using the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | We are OK with the format of the TR. However, some agreements were not captured, e.g., Table 5.1-3. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1. For table 5.1-1, the unit of “Total DL power level” for FR2 is missed. 2. In subclause 5.2, “ % ” should be added in the table for the load definition. |
| LG Electronics | I have a comment on the load definition table even though it was agreed as is. For light load, isn’t it correct that the load should be 15 < L≤30?   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Load scenario | Characteristics | | Idle/empty load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * L = 0 | | low load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 0 < L≤15 | | Light load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 0 < L≤30 | | Medium load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 30< L≤50 | | For CA, the companies report whether the load is defined per CC or across all CCs. | | |
| Qualcomm | We propose to remove “(e.g. Adapting transmission/reception of common channels/signals)” in 6.1.1, and to remove 6.1.1.z.  Furthermore, Table 5.1-3 is missing some agreements.  BTW, this text “Agreements made for EVM parts for the two meetings” in the above discussion is not correct. |