* 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. |
|  |  |

* Comments on ‘Draft LS on interference modelling for duplex evolution-v002’

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Moderator | Based on companies’ comments, I updated the LS:* Added two agreements regarding the interference types
* Added question numbering (Question 1-1/1-2/1-3/1-4/1-5/2-1/2-2/2-3/3-1/3-2/3-3) for facilitating the communication with RAN4

Regarding Ericsson’s comments, I’m wondering whether the first FFS (copied below) in the agreement for self-interference modelling can already deliver the similar message that Ericsson suggests to add. *“FFS: Model for link level simulations and relevant questions to ask RAN4”* |
| Spreadtrum | In **Agreement-1, “**a set of contiguous RBs” is used but in **Agreement-2,** “a set of RBs” is used. Although we all know they have the same meaning, but it may be confused to RAN4. We suggest to add a note to talk about it. |
| QC | * We acknowledge questions numbering as it makes easier for RAN4 LS reply.
* The FFS on the last agreement is related to RAN1 work on using the self-interference model. Not sure if it will be useful for RAN4.
* Regarding the note suggested by Ericsson, we don’t see the need to ask RAN4 about models for LLS at this stage. First, there are already models used in earlier RAN1 study. In addition, there is no agreement yet to have link-level analysis.
 |