* Comments on ‘Draft LS-v000’

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | Because we mention on asks RAN4 to confirm RAN1’s understandings/assumptions, it isn’t necessary to keep ““Send LS to RAN4 to confirm RAN1’s understanding.” In agreement-1/2/3/4.  |
| Moderator | Closed |

* Comments on ‘Draft LS-v001’

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Moderator | I updated the agreement-3 as below in v001. If companies are OK with this, in next GTW session, I will report to chair to update the chairman’s notes accordingly.**Agreement-3**For SLS in RAN1, if both large scale fading and small scale fading are modelled for gNB-gNB co-channel channel model, the inter-site gNB-gNB co-channel inter-subband CLI signal across all Rx chains at UL RB $n$ at victim gNB can be modeled as $I\_{Inter-Site-CLI}^{\left(n\right)}=I\_{leakage}^{\left(n\right)}+I\_{selectivity}^{},$ where,* $I\_{leakage}^{\left(n\right)}=H\_{CLI}^{\left(n\right)}Wy^{\left(n\right)}$ is the first part of inter-site gNB-gNB co-channel inter-subband CLI across all Rx chains at UL RB $n$, caused by power leakage at aggressor gNB,
	+ $H\_{CLI}^{\left(n\right)}$ is the $N\_{R}×N\_{T}$ channel matrix between aggressor gNB and victim gNB at UL RB $n$, the beamforming of the aggressor gNB and the victim gNB can be taken into account by $H\_{CLI}^{\left(n\right)}$,
	+ $y^{\left(n\right)}=\left[\begin{matrix}y\_{0}^{\left(n\right)},&y\_{1}^{\left(n\right)},&\begin{matrix}…,&y\_{N\_{T}-1}^{\left(n\right)}\end{matrix}\end{matrix}\right]^{T}$ is the unwanted emission across all Tx chains at UL RB $n$ at aggressor gNB,
		- $N\_{T}$ is the number of Tx chains at aggressor gNB,
		- $y\_{k}^{\left(n\right)}\~N\left(0,σ\_{y,n}^{2}\right)$, $k=0,1,…,N\_{T}-1$, is modelled as white Gaussian noise,
		- $σ\_{y,n}^{2}=\frac{P\_{tx}^{per-RB}\*N\_{used-DL-RB}^{}}{ACLR\_{BS}^{}}\*$ $\frac{1}{N\_{DLRB}^{}}$ is the total leakage power at UL RB $n$ at aggressor gNB,
		- $P\_{tx}^{per-RB}$ is the DL power transmitted across all Tx chains at one DL RB at aggressor gNB,$P\_{tx}^{per-RB}=P\_{tx}^{max}/N\_{DLRB}^{}$,
		- $N\_{used-DL-RB}^{}$ is the number of DL RBs scheduled for DL transmission by aggressor gNB,
		- $N\_{DLRB}$ is the total number of DL RBs in the DL subbands
	+ $W$is the $N\_{T}×N\_{T}$ normalized identity matrix with unit norm, $\left‖W\right‖\_{F}=1$,
		- FFS whether $W$ can be other values and corresponding conditions
* FFS for $I\_{selectivity}$
* Note:$ACLR\_{BS}^{}$ and $ACS\_{BS}^{}$ are in linear scale. In RAN4 reply LS, gNB ACLR (i.e., $ACLR\_{BS}^{}$) is provided as the candidate for TX leakage, and gNB ACS (i.e., $ACS\_{BS}^{}$) is provided as the candidate for Receiver impairment.
* Note: the model is based on the assumption that the same transmission power across different DL RBs are used in SLS. This does not prevent companies to use other DL power allocation schemes in SLS.
* Note: This model is not applicable to the RBs in the guardband.
* Send LS to RAN4 to confirm RAN1’s understanding.

@ New H3C, regarding your comment, although there are some redundancy, I think it is no harm to keep them. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the draft LS and the updated agreement-3. One minor comment is ACSBS is can be further removed since we delete the details on **Iselectivity**.  |
|  |  |