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# 1 Introduction

AT RAN#89, the following was agreed in [RP-202069](https://protect2.fireeye.com/v1/url?k=41a5db26-1f051960-41a59bbd-86fc6812c361-73f443258ff773bf&q=1&e=bc078f84-983d-45f3-ab31-19e60d911036&u=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.3gpp.org%2Fftp%2Ftsg_ran%2FTSG_RAN%2FTSGR_89e%2FDocs%2FRP-202069.zip) on providing evaluations for 5G-ACIA:

* Start an offline email-based activity to provide evaluation results for 5G-ACIA
* One company volunteers as moderator
  + Proposes a work plan to follow
  + Ericsson is willing do this
* Discussions are on the RAN1\_NR reflector
  + Email activity only during short periods (< week) distributed across the time allocated to the activity
  + No email activity in weeks before/during/after RAN1 meetings or RAN defined inactive periods
  + All companies should strive to limit email activity as much as possible
  + Outcome of the offline discussion will directly go to RAN without need for discussion in RAN1 nor need for LS from RAN1 to RAN
* Target completion by RAN#91
* At RAN#91, RAN will decide on a response LS to 5G-ACIA

The moderator made the following proposal on a timeline:

1. 12-16 October 2020
   * Discussion on which URLLC features to include in the evaluations and simulation assumptions
2. 14-18 December 2020
   * First round of simulation results
3. 22-26 February 2021
   * Second round of simulation results
4. 8-12 March 2021
   * Finalization of the report to RAN#91

This contribution is the summary of the inputs provided by companies with first proposals for agreements. The purpose is to establish a baseline of features and simulation assumptions that all companies will simulate. Companies are as always free to submit additional results that they find relevant to the evaluations.

The documents related to the evaluations can be found here:

[https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\_ran/TSG\_RAN/TSGR\_90e/Inbox/Drafts/5G-ACIA October/](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_90e/Inbox/Drafts/5G-ACIA%20October/)

The input contributions are also listed in the reference section.

# 2 Simulation assumptions

## 2.1 Company input

Companies’ input is summarized in the table below. Only proposals for parameter settings that differ from what is proposed in the 5G-ACIA LS are shown.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Parameters | 5G-ACIA LS | Ericsson | Huawei, HiSilicon | Intel | Nokia | Qualcomm | ZTE | vivo |
| Factory hall size | 120x50 m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Room height | 10 m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-BS/TRP distance | Depending on the number of TRPs, which are evenly deployed in the factory hall. Simulation company should provide the number of BSs/TRPs used in the simulation. | Reuse the factory automation use case layout from TR 38.824 |  | X = 20 m inter-TRP distance Y = 20 m inter-TRP distance (as in TS 38.824) | For the network layout, 12 BSs are assumed to be deployed in the 120x50x10 m3 area with the same 2D placement as in TR 38.901 and TR 38.824. |  | 12 m |  |
| BS/TRP antenna height | 1.5 m for InF-SL and InF-DL 8m for InF-SH and InF-DH | 8 m |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Layout – BS/TRP deployment | Depending on the number of TRPs | Reuse the factory automation use layout from TR 38.824 |  | 12 single-sector TRPs Reuse Rel.15-16 evaluation assumption. As for 18 TRPs considered in InF channel model study, it seems more suitable for 120x60 m scenario while may provide excessive # of access nodes in 120x50 m | For the network layout, 12 BSs are assumed to be deployed in the 120x50x10 m3 area with the same 2D placement as in TR 38.901 and TR 38.824. | 5G-ACIA with 12 service areas and one to two gNBs per service area to keep the simulation complexity low. | The layout used in Rel-16 URLLC SI. The BS/TRP is more uniformly located compared to the one suggested by 5G-ACIA. |  |
| Channel model | UC-2: InF-DH > InD-DL > InF-SH > InF-SL | InF-DH | UC #2: InF-DH > InD-DL > InF-SH > InF-SL | Pick InF-DH as the most challenging as per geometry SINR, and InF-SL as the opposite in terms of clutter density and BS elevation |  | Simulate InF-SH and InF-SL if the number of UEs is less than 25 per service area and simulate InF-DH and InF-DL if the number of UEs is more than 25 per service area | InF-DH | First priority: InF-DH, InF-DL  Second priority: InF-SH, InF-SL |
| Carrier frequency and simulation bandwidth | TDD 4 GHz: 100 MHz 30 GHz: 160 MHz | FR1: 2.6 GHz FDD with 50 MHz BW and 30 kHz SCS FR2: 30 GHz TDD with 160 MHz BW and 120 kHz SCS |  | TDD Mandatory: 4 GHz: 100 MHz Optional: 30 GHz: 160 MHz |  |  |  |  |
| TDD DL-UL configuration | Simulation company should report the used DL-UL configuration. |  | Simulation company should report the used DL-UL configuration. Due to symmetric DL/UL traffic, 1:1 DL-UL configuration is recommended. | ~1:1 UL-DL ratio 7 symbols for DL, 7 symbols for UL, necessary gap for switching |  |  | DDDSUDDSUU (S: 10D:2G:2U) for 4GHz and DDSU (S: 11D:3G:0U) for 30GHz | Option1: TDD, {S}, S={D6, G2, U6}  Option2: TDD, as per RAN4 agreements R4-1809555, {SU}, where S={D10, G2, U2} with SCS 30kHz is used for FR1; For FR2, {DSUU}, where S={D10,G2,U2} with SCS 120kHz is used  Option3: FDD |
| Number of UEs per service area | Up to 50 per service area, e.g., 10, 20, 40, and 50 | {10, 20, 40, 50} | Up to 50 per service area, e.g., 10, 20, 40 and 50. | 10, 20, 40, 50 Encourage companies to evaluate each density to show load dependency |  |  | Up to 50 per service area, e.g., 10, 20, 40, and 50 |  |
| UE distribution | All UEs randomly distributed within the respective service area. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Message size | 48 bytes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DL traffic model | DL traffic arrival with option-1, option-2, and option-3. | Either Option 1 (the best case for the system) or Option 2 (the worst case) from 5G-ACIA. | Option 3 from 5G-ACIA | TI, TS, E2E: {0.5, 0.5, 0.45} ms {1, 1, 0.9} ms {2, 2, 1.8} ms  Burst model: Mandatory: Option-1 Optional: Option-2, Option-3 | Option 1 (random distributed offset) is mandatory Option 2 (simultaneous traffic arrival for all UEs) is optional Option 3 (2 groups per service area and aligned traffic arrival per group) is optional with low priority | Option 2 | Option 1 | Option1 |
| UL traffic model | UL traffic is symmetric with DL, and DL-UL traffic arrival time relationship with option-1 and option-2 | Option 1 from 5G-ACIA. | Option1 from 5G-ACIA | Option1 from 5G-ACIA | Option 1 (random distributed offset) is mandatory Option 2 (simultaneous traffic arrival for all UEs) is optional Option 3 (2 groups per service area and aligned traffic arrival per group) is optional with low priority Burstiness: Option 1 DL and UL traffic arrival time instants are independent. | Option 2 with x equal 4 -5 symbols | Same as UL traffic model, while the is traffic arrival is independent with DL. | Option 1 |
| CSA requirements | UC-#2: 99.9999% | CSA = 99.9999% Or, equivalently: BLER <=1e-3 | CSA: 99.9999% (UC #2) | 99.9999% | Focus on UC#2 |  | 99.9999% packet reliability |  |
| Performance metrics | 1) CSA: single CDF of CSA distribution of all UEs in factory hall 2) Latency: single CDF of latency distribution of all UEs in factory hall 3) Percentage of UEs satisfying requirements  4) resource utilization | 1) CSA: single CDF of CSA distribution of all UEs in factory hall  2) Latency: single CDF of latency distribution of all UEs in factory hall |  | Metric 2 requires clarification how a given point in the CDF is obtained: - A point is for each packet in the system - A point is a function from all packets of a UE, e.g. average, maximum, etc. Metric 3) and 4) are low priority. |  |  | 1) CSA: single CDF of CSA distribution of all UEs in factory hall. Zero survival time could be the baseline.  2) Percentage of UEs satisfying requirements  3) Resource utilization | Further discuss the necessity of increasing reliability performance as an evaluation metric. |
| E2E latency & air interface latency | - E2E latency: 1 ms for UC#2  - Air interface latency: 1ms  5G-ACIA assumes that the CN induced latency is negligible |  | E2E latency: 1 ms for UC #2 Air interface latency: NA |  | For the selected use case #2 of motion control, the latency budget available to the air interface corresponds to the entire E2E latency budget of 1 ms. | 1 ms air interface latency | 1 ms user plan latency |  |
| UE speed | Linear movement |  | Linear movement: 75 km/h |  | Fast fading is modeled assuming a UE speed of 75 km/h. No explicit UE mobility (nor handovers) are modeled in the evaluations. | Simulate only rotational motion where the UE moving speed is to be agreed upon. | Linear movement | Only fast fading is modeled, no explicit mobility and handovers are modeled. |

## 2.2 Highlights of views

In the following, the parameters where the is a difference of opinion are highlighted.

**Layout – BS/TRP deployment**

4 out of 6 companies prefer to adopt the layout used in the Rel-16 study that can be found in TR 38.824.

**Carrier frequency and simulation bandwidth**

One company prefers to simulate FDD at 2.6 GHz instead of TDD at 4 GHz.

**DL traffic model**

4 companies stated option 1, one company either option 1 or 2, one company option 2 and one company option 3

**UL traffic model**

5 companies wanted option 1 and one company wanted option 2.

## 2.3 Proposal

Based on the company inputs, the proposals for each parameter is listed in the table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameters | 5G-ACIA LS | **Proposal for agreement** |
| Factory hall size | 120x50 m | As in 5G-ACIA LS |
| Room height | 10 m | As in 5G-ACIA LS |
| Inter-BS/TRP distance | Depending on the number of TRPs, which are evenly deployed in the factory hall. Simulation company should provide the number of BSs/TRPs used in the simulation. | According to proposed layout below |
| BS/TRP antenna height | 1.5 m for InF-SL and InF-DL 8m for InF-SH and InF-DH | As in 5G-ACIA LS |
| Layout – BS/TRP deployment | Depending on the number of TRPs | 12 TRPs within area with the same 2D placement as in TR 38.901 and TR 38.824. |
| Channel model | UC-2: InF-DH > InD-DL > InF-SH > InF-SL | Mandatory: InF-DH  Optional: InD-DL, InF-SH, InF-SL |
| Carrier frequency and simulation bandwidth | TDD 4 GHz: 100 MHz 30 GHz: 160 MHz | As in 5G-ACIA LS |
| TDD DL-UL configuration | Simulation company should report the used DL-UL configuration. | Companies should report the used DL-UL configuration. 1:1 DL-UL configuration is recommended. |
| Number of UEs per service area | Up to 50 per service area, e.g., 10, 20, 40, and 50 | As in 5G-ACIA LS |
| UE distribution | All UEs randomly distributed within the respective service area. | As in 5G-ACIA LS |
| Message size | 48 bytes | 48 bytes |
| DL traffic model | DL traffic arrival with option-1, option-2, and option-3. | 5G-ACIA Option 1 is mandatory |
| UL traffic model | UL traffic is symmetric with DL, and DL-UL traffic arrival time relationship with option-1 and option-2 | 5G-ACIA Option 1 is mandatory |
| CSA requirements | UC-#2: 99.9999% | UC-#2: 99.9999% |
| Performance metrics | 1) CSA: single CDF of CSA distribu-tion of all UEs in factory hall 2) Latency: single CDF of latency distribution of all UEs in factory hall 3) Percentage of UEs satisfying requirements  4) resource utilization | As in 5G-ACIA LS with 3) and 4) as low priority |
| E2E latency & air interface latency | E2E latency: 1 ms for UC#2  Air interface latency: 1ms | As in 5G-ACIA LS |
| UE speed | Linear movement | Linear movement: 75 km/h  No explicit UE mobility (nor handovers) are modeled in the evaluations. |

1. Agree on the proposals for simulation assumptions given in the table

Intel also raised additional simulation parameters that should be agreed on, like antenna configuration, noise figures, TX power etc. Those seem to be already captured in TR 38.824 and can then be reused.

1. Additional simulation parameters are taken from TR 38.824.

## 2.4 Companies comments to proposals

Companies can add comments on the proposals in the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| HW/HiSi | We have some questions for our understanding of the proposals. It would be great if that could be clarified before agreeing on the assumptions, so that we are all on the same page what we would be agreeing to:  **CSA requirements.**  We think the proposed CSA *= 99.9999%* requirement seems fine.  But we have questions to Ericsson on the “*equivalently: BLER <=1e-3”*   * One question is if you please could elaborate on the equivalent BLER requirement? Is the understanding correct that you obtained the value of 10^-3 by assuming uncorrelated errors? If errors would appear in bursts, then the BLER <= 10^-3 would not be valid, is this understanding correct? * Could you please clarify on the intention of using BLER = 10^-3? Is the purpose to shorten the simulation time so that substantially less packets are generated than what would be done when using CSA=99.9999%?   **Performance metric**  In our view metric#1 from 5G-ACIA is clear and should be agreed. We think on the other hand, that metric #4 is more important than metric#2. Or at least the importance of metric#2 depends on which strategy shall be adopted for the packet transmission. Intel provided two options that are copied below, If option 2 is adopted (which we think would be meaningful), then the latency is cut after the deadline, and it would not be useful to adopt metric 2) in this case.   |  | | --- | | From Intel’s input.   * + Option 1: a packet transmission can be performed after the latency deadline. The collected statistics can exceed the latency requirement.   + Option 2: a packet transmission cannot be performed after the latency deadline. The collected statistics cannot exceed the latency requirement. The packets exceeding the deadline are visible in the UE packet error statistics |   **On E2E latency and air-interface latency**  We are not sure if the LS can be interpreted as that the entire E2E latency should be given to the air interface. In our understanding, 5G-ACIA has not done such a breakdown. We would like to discuss it further and clarify.  5G-ACIA has written in their LS in Section 5.1.3: “*Typically, end-to-end latency in service application level is affected by both core network latency and RAN part latency. It is assumed that the CN included latency can be negligible in this WI. As a result, this WI focuses on the latency performance of the RAN. The RAN latency performance is affected by multiple RAN system parameters, e.g. system capacity, user load,….,the wireless communication system is controlled to achieve different desired performance trade-offs* ”  In our understanding, this paragraph is not about the latency requirement and how to divide the requirement between CN and RAN. Instead it is about the latency performance and describes which latency part shall be modeled in the simulations. The CN part will not change due to different resource allocation strategies. 5G-ACIA has not performed a split of the E2E delay budget into the CN part and the air-interface part. Still some portion should be reserved for the CN and some portion for the air-interface. When it is said that in this WI the CN latency is negligible, it means in our understanding that the latency performance evaluation shall focus on impact the air-interface part (since the CN latency will remain constant). In other words the CN latency shall not be studied or simulated, it is constant but not zero.  **UE speed**  Is it common understanding that in simulations the 75 km/h linear movement are only used for the fast fading modeling, the object positions are not changing?  **DL traffic model**  Our observation is that companies might have a different understanding about Option 1. We are not sure about this and would like to clarify. Possible understandings about Option 1:   * Understanding #1: The data to each UE has a random offset that has no relationship to other UE’s offset. That means that traffic to two UEs could happen at the same time if they happen to have the same offset, it could have a slightly different offset or large offset. Once the randomly chosen offset to one UE is set, it will be the same in each slot for this UE. * Understanding #2: In the feedback from Nokia it is written ”*option 1 uniformly ‘spreads’ the traffic across all available TTIs/mini-slots thus significantly better performance is expected*”. We read this that the traffic to the UEs is evenly distributed throughout the slot. For example, if the cycle time is 1ms and there are K UEs being served, then the packet arrival time of UE #n is (n-1)/K\*1ms. @Nokia: Have we understood your intention correctly?   In case that Option1 is described by Understanding #1, we would expect significant disadvantages coming with this model, e.g like shown below, and would not prefer it.   * The timing offsets between Ues is different and random. It will be hard to calibrate results across companies. We think it would be better to start with something more deterministic and fully random offsets cold be added optionally. * The simulation effort of such an approach is more intense * In realistic applications at least some devices are synchronized |
| vivo | Generally, we are fine with most of above proposed simulation assumptions. But we have some concerns on TDD DL-UL configuration and performance metrics. It would be great if we can clarify them.  **On TDD DL-UL configuration**  The following TDD DL-UL configurations options can be considered in simulation,   * Option1: TDD, {S}, S = {D6, G2, U6} * Option2: TDD, As per RAN4 agreements R4-1809555, {SU}, S={D10, G2, U2} with SCS 30kHz is used for FR1; For FR2, {DSUU}, S={D10,G2,U2} with SCS 120kHz is used * Option3: FDD   In our understanding, the assumption on TDD DL-UL configuration will significantly affect URLLC transmission schemes that can be adopted to achieve the performance targets, i.e. by HARQ-based retransmission or repetition-based transmission or one-shot transmission. Take FR1 30KHz SCS as an example, HARQ-based retransmission cannot be completed within 1ms due to TDD DL-UL configuration, PDCCH/PDSCH alignment delay, PDCCH/PDSCH preparation time and etc. Therefore, only repetition or one-shot transmission can be considered. While there is no such issue for FR2 120KHz.  If companies agree to adopt 1:1 DL-UL configuration, we suggest to take Option 1 as baseline, then repetition or one-shot transmission can be performed for FR1 and one-shot retransmission can be performed for FR2.  **On performance metrics**  The CSA performance requirement can eliminate two or more consecutive message/TB reception errors, but not the isolated message/TB reception errors. In some extreme case, for some UE, if 50% message/TB are not correctly received with the isolated mode, the CSA metric is 100% but the message/TB reliability is only 50%, the motion control service for this UE maybe poor or invalid.  Based on above consideration, we proposed to discuss whether to increase the reliability as an additional performance metric or to further clarify the reliability requirement for the motion control use case. |
| Ericsson | * For CSA= 99.9999% and “equivalently BLER<1e-3”:   Yes, we assumed independent errors. Examining the CSA equation provided by 5G-ACIA LS, I believe independent errors were assumed. Also, see TS 22.104 Table 5.1-1 copied below. While companies will report CSA as performance metric, we showed BLER because it is the commonly used target for one transmission over the air interface.  TS 22.104, Table 5.1-1: Example of relationship between reliability (as defined in TS 22.261) and communication service availability when the survival time is equal to the transfer interval.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Communication service availability | Reliability ( as defined in TS 22.261)  1 - p | | 99.999 9 % | 99.9 % | | 99.999 999 % | 99.99 % | | 99.999 999 99 % | 99.999 % | | 99.999 999 999 9 % | 99.999 9 % | | 99.999 999 999 999 % | 99.999 99 % |  * Regarding TDD or FDD for FR1:   We urge companies to reconsider. In our view, it is better to simulate {FDD, 15 kHz SCS} instead of {TDD, 30 kHz SCS}. FDD is much better than TDD for short latency of 1ms.  In Rel-16 URLLC study item phase, E/// was the only company that simulated TDD for factory automation, see table 5.2.4-1 in TR 38.824. E/// R1-1903447 checked TDD + 4GHz (FR1). (R1-1903448 was also E///, for TDD + 30 GHz (FR2)). **All other companies’ results were for FDD + 4GHz (FR1).** Our experience was, it was very difficult to achieve 1ms latency with TDD in FR1, with 30kHz SCS, when the UE density is more than 10 UE per cell.   * We have a question about BS antenna mount.   There are 3 options of BS antenna mount, see 38.802 section A.2.1. In 38.824, it was not clearly described which option to assume. While it is reasonable to assume Option 1 (1 sector per BS, which was described as ‘baseline at least for calibration’ in 38.802), Option 2 (3 section per BS) allows the same BS antenna configuration (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np). Thus, we’d like to have this aspect (Option 1 or Option 2?) agreed among companies, and explicitly described in simulation assumption. |
| Intel | We highlight the parts which we want more discussion/clarification before agreement:   * UL traffic model. We think “Option 1” requires clarification:   + there are two “Option 1”, where one is for burst model and has same meaning as DL traffic, and another one is the connection to DL traffic (Option 1 – independent, Option 2 - dependent). It is better to state both aspects, like “Option 1 for burst model, Option 1 for dependency with DL traffic” * For DL and UL traffic, RAN1 needs to agree on values of E2E latency, air interface part of the E2E latency, Survival Time (TS), and Transmission Interval (TI). Table 1 in the LS hints values for TI and TS and those could be directly agreed. For E2E and the air interface latency, more discussion is required. We propose to consider E2E as 0.9 \* TI, and air interface latency as 0.5~0.9 \* E2E. We are open to other considerations. * UE speed distribution needs more details. 5G-ACIA LS mentions <=75 km/h, while RAN1 usually evaluates a distribution of speeds. We propose a uniform distribution between three possible values: 3, 30, and 75 km/h. * Performance metrics. Fine with the direction, but Metric 2) still requires clarification regarding how the latency deadline is treated by the scheduler (as cited by HW/HiSi above), and how a point in the CDF is calculated from packets of users. Putting each packet into the CDF mixes link performance and system performance, that is not representative anyway. Taking some function of every packet of the UE also biases the representation.   Additional assumptions.   * Since mobility is not explicitly modelled, we propose to model a handover margin of 1 dB |
| Nokia, NSB | In general we are fine with the moderator’s proposal, but we would like to comment on some specific points raised by companies above:   * E2E latency: In 5G-ACIA LS it is clearly stated *It is assumed that the CN included latency can be negligible*. Hence we do not see the value of discussing on any specific “negligible” value to be used in the evaluations. Moreover, based on the CDF of latency it is possible to infer the reliability of the system of other latency targets as well. * Question on Nokia’s assumption on Option 1 traffic model: answer is ‘no’, that is not our assumption. The spreading we refer to would happen on average only, not deterministically. Hence, we share understanding #1 from Huawei above. * TDD configurations: While we understand the concerns from vivo, and those are valid points, we would rather leave such details for each company to detail the configurations they choose to simulate. * FDD @2.6GHz: We are fine to include this as an optional case, given the challenges to fulfil the latency requirements with TDD and 30kHz SCS. * BS antenna mount: we are fine with option 1 (1 sector per BS) * UE speed: we think a single UE speed of 75km/h would be sufficient to characterize the intended scenario without the extra complexity of using a mixture of UE speeds in the same simulation. It is also more straightforward to characterize the exact impact of different UE speeds (if companies simulates different UE speeds) instead of just the average impact. |

# 3 Features to include in simulations

## 3.1 Company input

Companies’ input is summarized in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | Rel-15 is baseline. Rel-16 enhancements can be considered.  The following to be simulated for FR1:   * UL CG with one configuration is assumed to achieve 1 ms latency in UL. * DL SPS with one configuration is assumed to achieve 1 ms latency in DL. * UE Capability: Capability #2 * (Optional) PDCCH performance of monitoring span (7,3) for FDD.   + If TDD has to be used for FR1, PDCCH performance of monitoring span (2,2)   The following to be simulated for FR2:   * UL CG with one configuration is assumed to achieve 1 ms latency in UL. * DL SPS with one configuration is assumed to achieve 1 ms latency in DL. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The following Rel-16 URLLC enhancements are included in the evaluations.   * DCI enhancements, * UCI enhancements, sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook, * DL SPS with one slot periodicity. |
| Intel | * A set of URLLC features for evaluation include any feature specified in NR Release 15 and 16.   + Being studied and/or specified Release 17 features are not considered for this activity |
| Nokia | For the performance evaluation of the motion control use case, the following NR features are considered:   * With high priority:   + UL and DL mini-slots of 2, 4 or 7 OFDM symbols   + Configured UL grants   + UE Processing capability 2 * With medium priority:   + URLLC MCS table and CQI reports with 1E-5 BLER target   + DL Semi-persistent scheduling * With low priority:   + PDCP duplication / joint multi-TRP DL transmissions   Other features can be ‘implicitly’ modeled as follows:   * Short DCI format x\_2 resulting in reduced PDCCH overhead as compared to legacy x\_0 and x\_1 DCI formats. * Sub-slot HARQ-ACK for potentially faster HARQ-ACK retransmission delay |
| Qualcomm | We would like to highlight the last two features as they have high potential to enhance performance of Factory automation:   * Setting 1ms periodicity for configured scheduling (CS) of DL IIoT traffic is an effective method to reduce control overhead given that most of IIoT data traffic is deterministic and periodic. * Using Multi-TRP as an optional feature to be considered, which has been shown useful if blocking is modeled |
| ZTE | Our views on possible Rel-16 URLLC features to be included in the evaluations are:   * PDCCH enhancement * Multiple HARQ-ACK transmission in one slot * PUSCH repetition type B * Multiple SPS configurations/Shorter SPS periodicities * Multiple CG configurations |

## 3.2 Discussion and proposals

Most companies only address which Rel-16 enhancement to include in the evaluations while there is less discussion on the Rel-15 URLLC features. However, it is assumed that all companies assume Rel-15 as the baseline.

1. Rel-15 URLLC features are assumed as baseline for the simulations

Regarding what Rel-16 features to include in the simulations, the views seems rather scattered, though there seems to be rather good support for the following:

1. Include the following Rel-16 features in simulations:

* UL configured grant
* DL SPS
* Multiple HARQ-ACK transmission in one slot

Further discussion on refinement of these can be done during the week. Again, companies are as always free to submit additional results that they find relevant to the evaluations.

## 3.3 Companies comments to proposals

Companies can add comments on the proposals in the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| HW/HiSi | Regarding the first bullet of Proposal 4, is it meant “multiple CG configurations”? In that case we are wondering if the benefit of having multiple configurations could be clarified when only one service is assumed to be supported in the UE? |
| vivo | We understand proposal 3 and 4 are just high-level proposals, details can be further decided by the email discussions. We have following comments for proposal 3 and proposal 4.  For proposal 3, it would be good to list the detailed Rel-15 URLLC features. From our understanding, the proposal 3 includes UE capability #2, URLLC MCS table and CQI reports with 1E-5 BLER target, single CG on one CC and PUSCH repetition type A with intra-slot or inter-slot FH.  For proposal 4, detailed sub-features for the same feature supported in both Rel-15 and Rel-16 needs to be clarified to understand the difference. In addition, it is also necessary to underrated the purpose of the proposed feature, for example, our understanding for the support of “Multiple HARQ-ACK transmission in one slot” is to enable the fast re-transmissions. While whether the re-transmission can be performed within 1ms depends on the assumed TDD DL-UL configuration, PDCCH/PDSCH alignment delay, PDCCH/PDSCH preparation time and etc. According to the conclusions in 38.824, only a single-shot transmission can meet 1ms latency requirement for SCS = 30 KHz considering Rel-15 timing capability. Re-transmission cannot be completed within 1ms. In summary our comments are below for each feature in proposal 4   * UL configured grant   + Multiple configurations if jitter and/or periodicity misalignment is assumed   + PUSCH repetition Type B with inter-repetition or intra-slot FH * DL SPS   + Multiple configurations if jitter and/or periodicity misalignment is assumed   + Shorter Periodicity down to one slot * Multiple HARQ-ACK transmission in one slot for fast retransmission |
| Ericsson | Agree with HW/HiSi that only one UL CG configuration is needed for the traffic. Hence Rel-15 UL CG is sufficient, no need of Rel-16 enhancement of UL CG (e.g., multiple configuration).  Regarding “multiple HARQ-ACK transmission in one slot”: we do not see why sub-slot HARQ-ACK is needed. In the scenario, when using DL-SPS of 1 ms periodicity, the periodicity corresponds to one PDSCH every n slots (n>=1 depending on SCS).  Thus, we propose update Proposal 4 to:  “**Include Rel-16 feature in simulation: DL SPS with reduced periodicity.**” |
| Intel | As we argued in the initial input, we don’t see much motivation to down-select some of the features. However, it seems current proposal still covers most of the URLLC-related enhanced procedures and thus we are fine with it, assuming the following clarifications:   * “UL configured grant” should be “multiple UL configured grant configurations” * “DL SPS” should “multiple DL SPS configurations and periodicities down to 1 slot”   We are further in favor of excluding multi-TRP considerations, or at least down-prioritizing them. |
| Nokia | We share similar views with vivo that proposals 3 and 4 are only high-level proposals, but they are not detailed enough for common understanding among companies. Regarding Intel’s comment above, it is not only about down-selecting features, but in Rel-15 there is no clear ear-marking of features as “URLLC”. Hence, the reason why we see it important to clarify the assumptions from different companies. Our views is that the features we listed above should be considered at least, not repeating them here unnecessarily. |

# 4 Conclusions

This document provided a summary of the input on 5G-ACIA simulation assumptions and features. The following proposals are made:

Proposal 1 Agree on the proposals for simulation assumptions given in the table

Proposal 2 Additional simulation parameters are taken from TR 38.824.

Proposal 3 Rel-15 URLLC features are assumed as baseline for the simulations

Proposal 4 Include the following Rel-16 features in simulations:

 UL configured grant

 DL SPS

 Multiple HARQ-ACK transmission in one slot
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