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<Start of Change 1>

## 6a.4 Co-existence simulation results for 17/27GHz

### 6a.4.1 Scenario 1a: 27GHz NTN UL interfering TN UL

The co-existence results from all concerned options in this scenario were evaluated, and it has been agreed to select the 5% throughput loss of NR-NTN GEO UL and NR-NTN LEO1200 UL interfering the NR UL equipped with AAS antenna 25 degree elevation angle that deployed in urban environment as the most stringent case.

Table 6a.4.1-1 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 1a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACIR(dB) | 0.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 20.0 |
| Ericsson | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |
| ZTE | 6.7 | 5.3 | 4.1 |  | 3.3 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 0.9 |  | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Samsung | 2.3 | 1.8 | 1.3 |  | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 10.8 | 8.4 | 6.4 |  | 4.8 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 1.3 |  | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Qualcomm | 7.60 |  |  | 4.6 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 1.3 |  |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.1-1 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 1a - NTN GEO

Table 6a.4.1-2 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 1a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN GEO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 0.00 |
| ZTE | 2.50 |
| Samsung | 0.00 |
| Huawei | 0.00 |
| CATT | 5.80 |
| Qualcomm | 5.00 |
| NOTE: According to the principles, these values are not treated for later process. | |

Table 6a.4.1-3 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 1a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACIR(dB) | 0.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 20.0 |
| Ericsson | 11.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.7 |
| ZTE | 17.1 | 12.3 | 8.6 |  | 5.4 | 3.8 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 1.2 |  | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Samsung | 4.3 | 3.2 | 2.4 |  | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 |  | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 35.5 | 26.8 | 19.8 |  | 13.1 | 8.5 | 5.8 | 4.4 | 2.9 |  | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 |
| Qualcomm | 41.8 |  |  | 24.7 |  |  | 13.9 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.1-2 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 1a - NTN GEO

Table 6a.4.1-4 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 1a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN GEO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 9.50 |
| ZTE | 6.50 |
| Samsung | 0.00 |
| Huawei | 0.00 |
| CATT | 11.10 |
| Qualcomm | 15.00 |

Table 6a.4.1-5 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 1a - NTN GEO

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 10.5 |

Table 6a.4.1-6 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 1a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Ericsson | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.7 |
| ZTE | 3.60 | 2.77 | 2.14 |  | 1.59 | 1.13 | 0.77 | 0.53 | 0.38 |  | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.11 |
| Samsung | 2.30 | 1.77 | 1.35 |  | 1.02 | 0.77 | 0.57 | 0.42 | 0.31 |  | 0.23 | 0.17 | 0.12 |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 9.8 | 7.7 | 5.9 |  | 4.4 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 1.2 |  | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Qualcomm | 7.10 |  |  | 4.20 |  |  | 2.30 |  |  | 1.20 |  |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.1-3 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 1a - NTN LEO1200

Table 6a.4.1-7 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 1a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 4.10 |
| ZTE | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 |
| Huawei | 0.00 |
| CATT | 5.20 |
| Qualcomm | 5.00 |
| NOTE: According to the principles, these values are not treated for later process. | |

Table 6a.4.1-7 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 1a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACIR[dB] | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Ericsson | 35.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 13.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 |
| ZTE | 7.75 | 5.97 | 4.10 |  | 3.24 | 2.47 | 0.79 | 0.20 | 0.03 |  | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Samsung | 4.56 | 3.30 | 2.63 |  | 1.80 | 1.32 | 0.89 | 0.60 | 0.46 |  | 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.13 |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 35.04 | 25.78 | 18.92 |  | 13.58 | 8.57 | 5.96 | 4.43 | 2.70 |  | 1.27 | 0.63 | 0.51 |
| Qualcomm | 39.60 |  |  | 23.50 |  |  | 12.90 |  |  | 5.30 |  |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.1-4 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 1a - NTN LEO1200

Table 6a.4.1-8 Interoplated ACIR values for Scenario 1a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 20.00 |
| ZTE | 3.10 |
| Samsung | 0.00 |
| Huawei | 0.00 |
| CATT | 11.30 |
| Qualcomm | 15.00 |
| NOTE: According to the principles, some of the values are not treated for later process. | |

Table 6a.4.1-9 Averaged requried ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 1a - NTN LEO1200

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 13.15 |

### 6a.4.2 Scenario 2a: 27GHz TN UL interfering NTN UL

The co-existence results from all concerned options in this scenario were evaluated, and it has been agreed to select the 5% throughput loss NR UL interfering the NR-NTN GEO UL and NR-NTN LEO1200 UL that 25 degrees elevation angl and deployed in urban environment as the most stringent case.

Table 6a.4.2-1 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 2a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACIR dB | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Ericsson | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |
| ZTE | 1.79 | 1.14 | 0.73 |  | 0.46 | 0.29 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.07 |  | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| Samsung | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 |  | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 46.3 | 37.5 | 29.3 |  | 22.1 | 16.1 | 11.4 | 7.8 | 5.2 |  | 3.4 | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| Qualcomm | 18.30 |  |  | 7.70 |  |  | 2.70 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.2-1 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 2a - NTN GEO

Table 6a.4.2-2 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 2a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACIR dB | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Ericsson | NA |  |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  | NA |
| ZTE | 1.93 | 1.24 | 0.79 |  | 0.50 | 0.32 | 0.20 | 0.13 | 0.08 |  | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| Samsung | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 58.87 | 49.68 | 40.51 |  | 31.8 | 24.08 | 17.54 | 12.34 | 8.42 |  | 5.62 | 3.68 | 2.38 |
| Qualcomm | NaN |  |  | NaN |  |  | NaN |  |  | NaN |  |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.2-2 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 2a - NTN GEO

Table 6a.4.2-3 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 2a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN GEO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 0.00 |
| ZTE | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 |
| Huawei | 0.00 |
| CATT | 37.50 |
| Qualcomm | 7.7 |

Table 6a.4.2-4 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 2a - NTN GEO

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 1.54 |

Table 6a.4.2-5 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 2a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACIR dB | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 |
| Ericsson | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE | 3.98 | 2.58 | 1.66 |  | 1.06 | 0.67 | 0.43 | 0.27 | 0.17 |  | 0.11 | 0.07 |
| Samsung | 0.38 | 0.24 | 0.15 |  | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 |  | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 29.5 | 22.3 | 16.3 |  | 11.5 | 7.9 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 2.3 |  | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| Qualcomm | 10.30 |  |  | 3.90 |  |  | 1.30 |  |  | 0.40 |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.2-3 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 2a - NTN LEO1200

Table 6a.4.2-6 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 2a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACIR dB | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 |
| Ericsson | NA |  |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE | 3.98 | 2.58 | 1.66 |  | 1.06 | 0.67 | 0.43 | 0.27 | 0.17 |  | 0.11 | 0.07 |
| Samsung | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 41.34 | 32.60 | 24.75 |  | 18.1 | 12.76 | 8.73 | 5.83 | 3.83 |  | 2.48 | 1.59 |
| Qualcomm | NaN |  |  | NaN |  |  | NaN |  |  | NaN |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.2-4 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 2a - NTN LEO1200

Table 6a.4.2-7 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 2a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 0.00 |
| ZTE | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 |
| Huawei | 0.00 |
| CATT | 33.95 |
| Qualcomm | 4.10 |

Table 6a.4.2-8 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 2a - NTN LEO1200

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 0.82 |

### 6a.4.3 Scenario 3a: 27GHz NTN UL interfering TN DL

The co-existence results from all concerned options in this scenario were evaluated, and it has been agreed to select the 5% throughput loss NR UL interfering the NR-NTN GEO UL and NR-NTN LEO1200 UL that 25 degrees elevation angl, and deployed in urban environment as the most stringent case.

Table 6a.4.3-1 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 3a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | Company | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | ZTE | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 |
| Samsung | 0.40 | 0.28 | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Qualcomm | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5%-tile | ZTE | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Samsung | 1.16 | 0.76 | 0.54 | 0.33 | 0.22 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| CATT | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Qualcomm | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6a.4.3-2 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 3a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN GEO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| ZTE | 0 |
| Samsung | 0 |
| CATT | 0 |
| Qualcomm | 0 |

Table 6a.4.3-3 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 3a - NTN GEO

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 0 |

Table 6a.4.3-4 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 3a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | ACIR | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | ZTE | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Samsung | 0.41 | 0.29 | 0.21 | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Qualcomm | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5%-tile | ZTE | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Samsung | 1.35 | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.59 | 0.40 | 0.27 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.08 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Qualcomm | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 6a.4.3-5 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 3a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| ZTE | 0 |
| Samsung | 0 |
| CATT | 0 |
| Qualcomm | 0 |

Table 6a.4.3-3 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 3a - NTN LEO1200

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 0 |

### 6a.4.4 Scenario 4a: 27GHz TN DL interfering NTN UL

The co-existence results from all concerned options in this scenario were evaluated, and it has been agreed to select the 5% throughput loss NR UL interfering the NR-NTN GEO UL and NR-NTN LEO1200 UL that 25 degrees elevation angl and deployed in urban environment as the most stringent case.

Table 6a.4.4-1 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 4a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | Company | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | ZTE | 40.55 | 31.82 | 24.02 |  | 17.46 | 12.26 | 8.36 | 5.56 | 3.64 |  | 2.35 | 1.51 | 0.96 |
| Samsung | 59.43 | 50.55 | 41.64 |  | 33.11 | 25.40 | 18.82 | 13.46 | 9.34 |  | 6.32 | 4.19 | 2.73 |
| CATT | 19.4 | 14.1 | 10.0 |  | 6.8 | 4.6 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.3 |  | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Qualcomm | 41.40 |  |  | 23.20 |  |  | 10.70 |  |  | 4.20 |  |  |  |
| 5%-tile | ZTE | 45.23 | 35.74 | 27.12 |  | 19.78 | 13.93 | 9.51 | 6.34 | 4.15 |  | 2.68 | 1.72 | 1.10 |
| Samsung | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 3.50 |  | 1.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Qualcomm | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN |
| CATT | 30.7 | 23.1 | 16.7 |  | 11.7 | 8.0 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 2.2 |  | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 |

Figure 6a.4.4-1 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 4a - NTN GEO

Figure 6a.4.4-2 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 4a - NTN GEO

Table 6a.4.4-2 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 4a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN GEO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| ZTE | 13.32 |
| Samsung | 17.20 |
| CATT | 12.22 |
| Qualcomm | 14.38 |
| Huawei | <6 (3.5% @ 6) |

Table 6a.4.4-3 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 4a - NTN GEO

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 14.3 |

Table 6a.4.4-4 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 4a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | ACIR(dB) | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 5 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 26 | 28 | 30 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | Ericsson | 81.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 36.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  | 0.7 |
| ZTE | 59.80 | 50.62 | 41.41 |  | 32.65 | 24.78 | 18.11 | 12.77 | 8.74 |  | 5.84 | 3.83 | 2.48 | 1.59 | 1.01 | 0.64 | 0.41 | 0.26 |
| Samsung | 45.76 | 37.89 | 30.40 |  | 23.59 | 17.69 | 12.83 | 9.03 | 6.18 |  | 4.14 | 2.72 | 1.77 | 1.14 | 0.73 | 0.46 | 0.29 | 0.19 |
| CATT | 38.6 | 30.6 | 23.5 |  | 17.4 | 12.5 | 8.7 | 5.9 | 3.9 |  | 2.6 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Qualcomm | 28.10 |  |  | 14 |  |  | 5.8 |  |  | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5%-tile | ZTE | 59.77 | 50.60 | 41.39 |  | 32.63 | 24.77 | 18.09 | 12.76 | 8.73 |  | 5.83 | 3.83 | 2.48 | 1.59 | 1.01 | 0.64 | 0.41 | 0.26 |
| Samsung | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |
| Huawei |  |  |  |  | 0.33 |  | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 52.93 | 43.69 | 34.77 |  | 26.65 | 19.65 | 13.98 | 9.64 | 6.47 |  | 4.26 | 2.77 | 1.78 | 1.14 | 0.72 | 0.46 | 0.29 | 0.18 |
| Qualcomm | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |

Figure 6a.4.4-3 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 4a - NTN LEO1200

Figure 6a.4.4-4 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 4a - NTN LEO1200

Table 6a.4.4-5 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 4a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 22.60 |
| ZTE | 16.83 |
| Samsung | 15.10 |
| CATT | 15.33 |
| Qualcomm | 11.10 |
| Huawei | <6 (0.33@6) |

Table 6a.4.4-3 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 4a - NTN LEO1200

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 16.2 |

### 6a.4.5 Scenario 5a: 17GHz TN DL interfering NTN DL

The co-existence results from all concerned options in this scenario were evaluated, and it has been agreed to select the 5% throughput loss NR UL interfering the NR-NTN GEO UL and NR-NTN LEO1200 UL that 25 degrees elevation angl, 2.5dB noise figure and deployed in urban environment as the most stringent case.

Table 6a.4.5-1 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 5a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | Company | 18 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 38 | 40 | 42 | 44 | 45 | 46 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | Ericsson |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.60 | 6.70 | 4.80 |  | 3.50 |
| ZTE | 37.95 | 31.05 | 24.79 | 19.32 |  | 14.68 | 10.89 | 7.88 | 5.57 | 3.86 |  | 2.62 | 1.74 | 1.15 |  |  |  |  |
| Samsung | 9.10 | 6.84 | 5.07 | 3.72 |  | 2.70 | 1.95 | 1.40 | 1.01 | 0.73 |  | 0.52 | 0.38 | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 34.9 | 28.8 | 23.3 | 18.5 |  | 14.3 | 10.9 | 8.1 | 5.9 | 4.2 |  | 3.0 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 |  | 0.4 |
| Qualcomm |  | 75.60 |  |  | 61.40 |  |  | 45.50 |  |  | 30.90 |  |  | 19.30 |  |  | 11.2 |  |
| 5%-tile | Ericsson |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | NA | NA | NA |  | NA |
| ZTE | 75.46 | 66.03 | 57.64 | 46.11 |  | 39.06 | 28.22 | 19.15 | 12.53 | 10.13 |  | 4.57 | 2.31 | 1.91 |  |  |  |  |
| Samsung | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN |  |  |  |  |
| Huawei |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 57.2 | 50.5 | 43.9 | 37.3 |  | 31.0 | 25.0 | 19.6 | 14.8 | 10.8 |  | 7.6 | 5.2 | 3.5 | 2.29 | 1.49 |  | 0.95 |
| Qualcomm | NaN | NaN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.5-1 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 5a - NTN GEO

Figure 6a.4.5-2 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 5a - NTN GEO

Table 6a.4.5-2 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 5a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN GEO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 43.8 |
| ZTE | 35.8 |
| Samsung | 22.1 |
| CATT | 38.2 |
| Qualcomm | 51.2 |
| Huawei | >20 (100@20) |

Table 6a.4.5-3 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 5a - NTN GEO

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 39.2 |

Table 6a.4.5-4 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 5a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | Company | 18 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 38 | 40 | 42 | 44 | 45 | 46 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | Ericsson |  | 89.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 55.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 21.9 |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE | 61.19 | 53.45 | 45.65 | 38.06 |  | 30.97 | 24.63 | 19.15 | 14.54 | 10.80 |  | 7.84 | 5.57 | 3.88 |  |  |  |  |
| Samsung | 13.72 | 10.66 | 8.20 | 6.21 |  | 4.66 | 3.45 | 2.53 | 1.84 | 1.32 |  | 0.94 | 0.66 | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 41.7 | 34.7 | 28.3 | 22.6 |  | 17.7 | 13.5 | 10.1 | 7.4 | 5.3 |  | 3.8 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 0.8 |  | 0.5 |
| Qualcomm |  | 81.50 |  |  | 68.4 |  |  | 52.90 |  |  | 36.9 |  |  | 23.5 |  |  | 13.7 |  |
| 5%-tile | Ericsson |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE | 100.00 | 100.00 | 85.54 | 78.45 |  | 68.55 | 54.72 | 43.78 | 40.13 | 30.75 |  | 20.65 | 17.19 | 11.77 |  |  |  |  |
| Samsung | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN | NaN |  | NaN | NaN | NaN |  |  |  |  |
| Huawei |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 60.1 | 53.1 | 45.9 | 38.9 |  | 32.1 | 25.7 | 19.9 | 14.9 | 10.8 |  | 7.5 | 5.1 | 3.4 | 2.2 | 1.4 |  | 0.9 |
| Qualcomm | NaN | NaN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 6a.4.5-3 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 5a - NTN LEO1200

Figure 6a.4.5-4 Simulation results for 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 5a - NTN LEO1200

Table 6a.4.5-5 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 5a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | >40 (118.2@40) |
| ZTE | 38.8 |
| SAMSUNG | 25.8 |
| CATT | 41.5 |
| Qualcomm | 52.0 |
| Huawei | >20 (100@20) |

Table 6a.4.5-6 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 5a - NTN LEO1200

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 42.9 |

### 6a.4.6 Scenario 6a: 17GHz NTN DL interfering TN DL

The co-existence results from all concerned options in this scenario were evaluated, and it has been agreed to select the 5% throughput loss NR UL interfering the NR-NTN GEO UL and NR-NTN LEO1200 UL that 25 degrees elevation angl and deployed in urban environment as the most stringent case.

Table 6a.4.6-1 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 6a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | Company | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | Ericsson | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CATT | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Qualcomm | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5%-tile | Ericsson | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Qualcomm | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6a.4.6-2 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 6a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN GEO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 0 |
| ZTE | 0 |
| Samsung | 0 |
| Huawei | 0 |
| CATT | 0 |

Table 6a.4.6-3 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 6a - NTN GEO

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 0 |

Table 6a.4.6-4 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 6a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | Company | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | Ericsson | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |
| ZTE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CATT | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Qualcomm | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5%-tile | Ericsson | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |
| ZTE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Qualcomm | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6a.4.6-5 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 6a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 0 |
| ZTE | 0 |
| SAMSUNG | 0 |
| Huawei | 0 |
| CATT | 0 |

Table 6a.4.6-6 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 6a - NTN LEO1200

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 0 |

### 6a.4.7 Scenario 7a: 17GHz NTN DL interfering TN UL

The co-existence results from all concerned options in this scenario were evaluated, and it has been agreed to select the 5% throughput loss NR UL interfering the NR-NTN GEO UL and NR-NTN LEO1200 UL that 25 degrees elevation angl and deployed in urban environment as the most stringent case.

Table 6a.4.7-1 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 7a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | Company | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | Ericsson | 0.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CATT | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5%-tile | Ericsson | 2.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Table 6a.4.7-2 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 7a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN GEO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 0 |
| ZTE | 0 |
| Samsung | 0 |
| Huawei | 0 |
| CATT | 0 |

Table 6a.4.7-3 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 7a - NTN GEO

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 0 |

Table 6a.4.7-4 Simulation results for average and 5%-tile throughput loss for Scenario 7a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | | Company | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| Throughput Loss | Average | ZTE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CATT | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5%-tile | ZTE | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 6a.4.7-5 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 7a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 0 |
| ZTE | 0 |
| Samsung | 0 |
| Huawei | 0 |
| CATT | 0 |

Table 6a.4.7-6 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 7a - NTN LEO1200

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 0 |

### 6a.4.8 Scenario 8a: 17GHz TN UL interfering NTN DL

The co-existence results from all concerned options in this scenario were evaluated, and it has been agreed to select the 5% throughput loss NR UL interfering the NR-NTN GEO UL and NR-NTN LEO1200 UL that 25 degrees elevation angl, 2.5dB noise figure and deployed in urban environment as the most stringent case.

Table 6a.4.8-1 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 8a - NTN GEO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 |
| Ericsson | 8.20 |  |  |  |  | 2.60 |  |  |  |
| ZTE | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 4.98 | 3.61 | 2.57 | 1.81 | 1.25 | 0.86 | 0.58 | 0.39 | 0.26 |
| CATT | 7.5 | 5.7 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.5 |

Figure 6a.4.8-1 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 8a - NTN GEO

Table 6a.4.8-2 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 8a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN GEO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| Ericsson | 5.70 |
| ZTE | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 0.00 |
| CATT | 3.00 |

Table 6a.4.8-3 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 8a - NTN GEO

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 2.2 |

Table 6a.4.8-4 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 8a - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Required ACIR [dB] | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 |
| ZTE | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 7.69 | 5.80 | 4.30 | 3.13 | 2.23 | 1.56 | 1.07 | 0.72 | 0.48 |
| CATT | 9.3 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 3.9 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 |

Figure 6a.4.8-2 Simulation results for average throughput loss for Scenario 8a - NTN LEO1200

Table 6a.4.8-5 Interpolated ACIR values for Scenario 8a to meet the 5% throughput loss criteria - NTN LEO1200

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Interpolated required ACIR |
| ZTE | 0.00 |
| Samsung | 3.10 |
| CATT | 4.40 |

Table 6a.4.8-6 Averaged ACIR of 5%-tile values in the above worse case for Scenario 8a - NTN LEO1200

|  |
| --- |
| Averaged required ACIR |
| 2.5 |

<End of Change 1>

---Avoid Unchanged part ---

<Start of Change 2>

Annex C:  
Summary of NR-NTN co-existence study

All NR-NTN co-existence study results have been captured in the list. Please see attachment Summary of NR-NTN co-existence study.

[Editor note: see attachment Summary of NR-NTN coexistence study\_r1]

<End of Change 2>