* Comments on ‘Draft LS on interference modelling for duplex evolution-v001’

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | As we mentioned in the GTM call, we are a bit uncomfortable to send the LS without the link level simulation aspect. Therefore, would it be possible to add the following sentence in the LS to RAN4 because we ran out of time to discuss further on the Link level simulation proposal.   “*RAN1 is still discussing link level simulations and the need for a net-effect model and will come back to RAN4 with further questions.*” |
| Samsung | To align the definition of interferences in RAN1 and RAN4, it would be better to add two proposals (3-1c and 3-2c) we made today GTW. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are generally fine with the LS. Regarding to what Ericsson pointed out, we have already sent many questions to RAN4, so we can send LS after one more round discussion in RAN1.  For easy communication with RAN4, it is better to compile all questions separately and numbering them . Q1-1, Q1-2, Q2-1 etc. |
| MediaTek | In our view, it is essential to trigger the LS based on the questions related to the SLS. However, we acknowledge the necessity of the information related to the LLS evaluations. Thus, we are fine with the Note from Ericsson. |
| Sony | Number the questions as suggested by Nokia is a good idea. It will also make it easier for us to refer to specific questions.  On putting note that RAN1 is working on LLS, it isn’t clear what RAN4’s actions are or supposed to do with it. RAN4 already has loads of questions from RAN1. |