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# Introduction

This thread continues the discussion on 1024QAM link level simulations and BS requirements.

For the link level simulations, there is divergence between the details of the assumptions made by different companies and so the results are not directly comparable. The discussion aims to narrow down to a single agreed set of parameters, which will enable a focussed discussion on the appropriate TX EVM requirement.

For the requirements discussion, some further details of the EVM requirement should be discussed. Also, there is a need to clarify whether the 1024QAM requirements should be made applicable for the WA BS class or not.

# Topic #1: Link level simulations

Several companies have submitted link level simulation results, but there is divergence between the details of the assumptions. Since the link level simulations should provide input to decide on the TX EVM requirement, there is a need for simulations to be comparable. In this topic, it is proposed to narrow down the simulation assumptions to a single agreed set.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2109111 | CATT | **Observation 1: Regarding crossover SNR between 1024QAM and 256QAM for Rank 1, the following is observed:**   * + The crossover SNR for rank 1 with 3%/4% TX/RX EVM in TDL-A is ~35.7dB.   + As TX/RX EVM decreases, crossover SNR for rank 1 also decreases   + For the same TX/RX EVM, the crossover SNR for rank 1 in TDL-D is lower than that in TDL-A.   + When TX/RX EVM is configured down to 2%/1.5%, crossover SNR for rank 1 is less than ~27dB.   **Observation 2: Regarding performance gain of 1024QAM compared to 256QAM for rank 1, the following is observed:**   * + As TX/RX EVM decreases, throughput gain of 1024QAM compared to 256QAM increases, if TX/RX EVM decreases to 3%/3%, the throughput gain of 1024QAM compared to 256QAM for rank 1 in TDL-A is increased by ~19.8%.   + For the same TX/RX EVM, the throughput gain of 1024QAM compared to 256QAM for rank 1 in TDL-D is larger than that in TDL-A.   + When TX/RX EVM is configured down to 2%/1.5%, the throughput gain of 1024QAM compared to 256QAM for rank1 in TDL-A is increased by ~29%. |
| R4-2110141 | Nokia | ***Proposal: Agree simulation assumptions in Table 1 for further work in 1024QAM work item in RAN4.***  ***Observation: Initial simulation results for 1024QAM show higher throughput compared to 256QAM for higher, but still reasonable SNR conditions and reasonable EVM requirements*** |
| R4-2110606 | ZTE | **Observation 1:** with Tx EVM requirement ranging rom 2%-3%, NR 1024QAM could have more than 20% performance gain than NR 256QAM; |
| R4-2110663 | Huawei | **Observation: from link level simulation, 3% TX EVM can provide observed gain for 1024 QAM compared to 256 QAM.** |
| R4-2110482 | Ericsson | **Observation: txEVM considers all components along the transmitter chain for EVM evaluation.**  **Proposal 1:** **Evaluate only total EVM in RAN4 simulation parameters, not individual EVM contributions of individual components**  **Observation: Power efficiency of FR1 LO generation is high in the FR1 frequency range and consequently phase noise levels are low**  **Observation: Even considering different archetiture design choices (distributed vs single LO generation) the impact will not worsen**  **Proposal 2: No need to further consider phase noise as a significant source of impairment when deriving EVM for 1024 QAM in FR1** |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1

Sub-topic description: This topic deals with detailed link level simulation assumptions

**Issue 1-1: How many carrier frequencies to consider**

There is some difference between companies as to which carrier frequencies should be considered. The outcome for this issue should resolve a list of carrier frequencies that all interested companies should cover.

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson): 2GHz, 4GHz
  + Option 2 (Nokia, CATT, Huawei): 2GHz only
  + Option 3 (ZTE): 3.5GHz
* Recommended WF

GTW agreement:

Agreement: Option 2 with 2GHz only

**Issue 1-2: Bandwidth and SCS for 2GHz carrier frequency**

The outcome for this issue is only relevant if it is decided to include 2GHz in issue 1-1.

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (CATT): 20MHz for large EVM, 50MHz for small EVM, 15kHz SCS
  + Option 2 (Nokia, Huawei): 40MHz, 15kHz SCS
  + Option 3 (Ericsson): 20MHz, 15kHz SCS
* Recommended WF

GTW agreement:

Agreement:

40MHz with 15kHz

**Issue 1-3:** **Bandwidth and SCS for 4GHz carrier frequency**

The outcome for this issue is only relevant if it is decided to include 4GHz in issue 1-1.

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson): 100MHz, 30kHz SCS
* Recommended WF
  + 4GHz no longer considered, issue closed

**Issue 1-4: Bandwidth and SCS for 3.5GHz carrier frequency**

The outcome for this issue is only relevant if it is decided to include 3.5GHz in issue 1-1.

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (ZTE): 100MHz, 30kHz SCS
* Recommended WF
  + 3.5GHz no longer considered, issue closed

**Issue 1-5:** **How to apply precoding**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Nokia): Random
  + Option 2 (CATT, Huawei, Ericsson): Follow PMI
* Recommended WF

GTW agreement:

Agreement: Option 2

**Issue 1-6: Number of HARQ transmissions**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (CATT): 4
  + Option 2 (Nokia, Ericsson): 8
    - Moderator question: Maybe 8 refers to the number of HARQ processes not the number of transmissions ? Please clarify
* Recommended WF

Agree assumption is 8 HARQ processes, maximum 4 transmissions.

**Issue 1-7:** **Number of BS TX**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (CATT, Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson, ZTE): 1 and 2
* Recommended WF

From GTW:

Option 1: 1 and 2

Option 2: 8

**Issue 1-8: Number of UE RX**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (): 2 and 4
  + Option 2 (Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson, ZTE, CATT): 4
* Recommended WF
  + Agree 4 RX

**Issue 1-9: PDSCH configuration**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (ZTE): Type A mapping, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 (for D slots)
  + Option 2 (Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson): Type A mapping, Start symbol 1, Duration 13 (for D slots)
  + Option 3 (CATT):
    - Type A mapping, Start symbol 1, Duration 13 (for D slots) for Larger EVM configuraion.
    - Type A mapping, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 (for D slots) for Smaller EVM configuraion.
* Recommended WF

Agreement from GTW:

Agreement: Option 2.

**Issue 1-10: DM-RS configuration**

* Proposals
  + Type 1, single symbol
  + Option 1 (ZTE): One DM-RS symbol
  + Option 2 (CATT, Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson): Two DM-RS symbol
* Recommended WF
  + Agree Two DM-RS symbol

**Issue 1-11: Rank**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (ZTE): One
  + Option 2 (CATT, Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson): One and two
* Recommended WF
  + Agree one and two

**Issue 1-12: Channel model**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (CATT, Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson): TDL-A, 10nsec, 5Hz
  + Option 2 (ZTE): TDL-A, TDL-D, 30nsec
* Recommended WF
  + Agree option 1. Discuss further in 2nd round whether any TDL-D should be added.

**Issue 1-13: TX EVM range**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (CATT):
    - Larger EVM configuraion: txEVM: 2%, 2.5%, 3%
    - Smaller EVM configuraion: txEVM: 1%, 1.5 %, 2%
  + Option 2 (Nokia): 2.5%, 3%
  + Option 3 (ZTE, Huawei, Ericsson): 2%, 2.5%, 3%
* Recommended WF

GTW agreement:

**Agreement: Option 3**

**Issue 1-14: RX EVM range**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (CATT):
    - Larger EVM configuraion: rxEVM: 2%, 3%, 4%
    - Smaller EVM configuration rxEVM: 0.5%, 1%, 1.5%
  + Option 2 (Nokia): 0.5%, 1%, 2%
  + Option 3 (ZTE, , Ericsson): 2%, 3%, 4%
  + Option 4 (Huawei): 1%, 1.5%, 2%
* Recommended WF
  + The common set from all proposals is 0.5%, 1%, 1.5%, 2%, 3%, 4%. Discuss further in 2nd round whether the number of EVM points can be reduced (to reduce the amount of simulations)

**Issue 1-15: Allocated RB**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Nokia, CATT, Huawei, Ericsson): Full allocation
  + Option 2 (ZTE): 273 (200 for data)
* Recommended WF
  + Full allocation

**Issue 1-16: Other parameters**

For the following parameters, there is no divergence between companies proposals. Please comment if you think any of these parameters should be clarified or changed.

* Proposals
  + Waveform: CP-OFDM
  + RV sequence {0, 2, 3, 1}
  + Antenna correlation: Low
  + MCS:
    - 256QAM: MCS 24 in TS 38.214 Table 5.1.3.1-2: MCS index table 2 for PDSCH, and other MCSs are not precluded
    - 1024QAM: MCS 24 in the following Table accroding to the agreement in RAN1 #104, and other MCSs are not precluded
  + Channel estimation: Practical
  + Receiver: MMSE
* Recommended WF
  + Agree all parameters apart from receiver. For receiver, check in 2nd round if MMSE-IRC (suggested by Intel) is OK for everyone.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub topic 1-1 How many carrier frequencies to consider

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 2  Will the carrier frequencies has any impact to the link simulation results? |
| Nokia | We support option 2, |
| ZTE | Request some operators’ input , in general each freq range might be possible. |
| Ericsson | Since majority of companies is only providing 2GHz we can compromise to down scope and only consider 2 GHz as we do not see any big differences in results due to center frequency. Option 2. |
| CATT | Option 2. |
| Intel | Option 2 is fine. There should be no impact on PDSCH performance in case different CF is considered for FR1 in case we fix Doppler spread for propagation conditions. |

Sub topic 1-2 Bandwidth and SCS for 2GHz carrier frequency

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 2 |
| Nokia | We support option 2, |
| Ericsson | In an effort to down scope a bit we can go with Option 2. |
| CATT | Because the DMRS is configured in full bandwidth, so the performance variation due to bandwidth can be small. So we can accept the option1, option2, and option3. To compare with LTE 1024QAM, 20MHz 15kHz SCS might be possible option. |
| Intel | Agree with CATT comment. To reduce simulation work load we suggest to take Option 2 or 3. |

Sub topic 1-3 Bandwidth and SCS for 4GHz carrier frequency

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | The simulation time for 100 MHz is much longer if no big impact to the link simulation results, we prefer not to do it. |
| Ericsson | Since companies concluded last meeting that due to larger CBW in NR compared to LTE it would be good to study the impact of the larger CBW than there should be an option for the wider channel bandwidth. In which case 30 kHz SCS would be the more sensible numerology. |

Sub topic 1-4 Bandwidth and SCS for 3.5GHz carrier frequency

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| ZTE | We support that. |
| Ericsson | Can this be merged to the view above? Keep same carrier frequency for smaller CBW and larger CBW option? |

Sub topic 1-5 How to apply precoding

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 2. What is the reasoning for applying random precoding? It seems more realistic to apply PMI. |
| CATT | We support option2, which is also used in FR2 256QAM WI. |
| Intel | In case we consider scenarios with number of Tx antennas not higher than 2. Follow PMI does not have big impact on performance. Same time, random PMI simplifies test setup. Therefore, we slightly prefer Option 1 |

Sub topic 1-6 Number of HARQ transmissions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Support Option 2, yes this is 8 processes and the usual RV sequence |
| ZTE | 8 refers to the number of HARQ process |
| Ericsson | This is an error and maximum number of HARQ retransmissions should be 4 transmissions |
| CATT | We support option1. |
| Intel | At current stage, 4 HARQ transmissions and 4 HARQ processes is typical configuration for FR1 FDD. Therefore, we support Option 1. |

Sub topic 1-7 Number of BS TX

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | In RAN1 link-level simulation, 8TX is used which is more suitable for BS, since we already assume 4RX for UE. |
| Nokia | We support option 1 |
| ZTE | Support option 1 |
| Ericsson | Option 1 is ok. |
| CATT | Option 1 |
| Intel | Option 1 is fine |

Sub topic 1-8 Number of UE RX

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 2 |
| Nokia | We support option 2 |
| ZTE | We support option 2 |
| Ericsson | Option 2 is ok. |
| CATT | Option 2 |
| Intel | We can focus on 4 Rx case. Same time, interested companies can check the performance for 2 Rx. |

Sub topic 1-9 PDSCH configuration

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We support option 2. |
| ZTE | We support option 1. |
| Ericsson | Go with majority view Option 2. This is also aligned with RAN1 simulations for this WI. |
| CATT | We can compromise to option 2, it is typical PDSCH configuration. |
| Intel | Option 1 is typical configuration for FR1 scenarios based on TS 38.101-4. Therefore, we support this option. |

Sub topic 1-10 DM-RS configuration

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We support option 2. |
| ZTE | If all companies are supporting 2 DMRS, it might be also fine for us. |
| Ericsson | Two DM-RS symbol has been the parameter used in past for EVM simulations it’s suggested to also keep it. Option 2. |
| CATT | Support option 2. |
| Intel | Option 2 |

Sub topic 1-11 Rank

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We support option 2. |
| Ericsson | From out simulation results, rank 2 does not reach the maximum throughput. We suggest prioritizing rank 1 one, but companies can bring the results with rank 2. |
| CATT | Support option 2. |
| Intel | Option 2 |

Sub topic 1-12 Channel model

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1 is ok. |
| CATT | Support option 1. |
| Intel | We can focus on TDL-A. Same time, interested companies can bring analysis for TDL-D. |

Sub topic 1-13 TX EVM range

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 3: : 2%, 2.5%, 3% |
|  |  |
| Nokia | We support option 2. |
| ZTE | We support option 3 |
| Ericsson | It would be good to narrow down the amount of simulation parameters as much as possible. Could we add 1.5% to Option 3 as a compromise with Option 1?  txEVM = 1.5%, 2%, 2.5%, 3% |
| CATT | We can accept Option 3. |
| Intel | Option 3 is fine for us. |

Sub topic 1-14 RX EVM range

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 4: 1%, 1.5%, 2% |
| Nokia | We support option 2. |
| ZTE | support option 3. |
| Ericsson | It would be good to keep one EVM configuration considerations (i.e. not larger/smaller EVM distinguishing). rxEVM = 1%, 2%, 3%, 4% |
| CATT | Either option 2 or option 4 |
| Intel | Support Option 3. Based on our understanding, the UE EVM should be not less than BS EVM, because it rather challenging to achieve very low EVM at the UE side. |

Sub topic 1-15 Allocated RB

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We support option 1. |
| ZTE | If all companies are fine to use 273, it might be also fine for us. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |
| CATT | Support option1. |
| Intel | Support Option 1 |

Sub topic 1-16 Other parameters

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Support the moderators recommended WF. |
| CATT | Support the recommended WF. |
| Intel | Most of parameters are fine for us. We would like to clarify the receiver type. For DL requirements, the baseline receiver is MMSE-IRC (i.e. not just MMSE). Therefore, we suggest to consider MMSE-IRC receiver. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

No CRs or TPs

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  The following agreements are tentatively reached for the link level simulations   * + 2 GHz carrier frequency   + Bandwidth 40MHz   + SCS 15kHz   + PMI: Follow PMI   + 8 HARQ processes   + maximum 4 HARQ transmissions   + 4 RX antennas   + PDSCH configuration: Type A mapping, Start symbol 1, Duration 13 (for D slots)   + Two DM-RS symbols   + Rank: One and two   + Channel model: At least TDL-A, 10nsec, 5Hz   + TX EVM: 2%, 2.5%, 3%   + All RB allocated   + Waveform: CP-OFDM   + RV sequence {0, 2, 3, 1}   + Antenna correlation: Low   + MCS:     - 256QAM: MCS 24 in TS 38.214 Table 5.1.3.1-2: MCS index table 2 for PDSCH, and other MCSs are not precluded     - 1024QAM: MCS 24 in the following Table accroding to the agreement in RAN1 #104, and other MCSs are not precluded   + Channel estimation: Practical   *Candidate options:*  For the assumption on number of BS TX   * Option 1: 1 and 2 * Option 2: 8   For the channel model: Whether to also consider TDL-D  For the RX EVM: Whether some values in the following list can be downselected: 0.5%, 1%, 1.5%, 2%, 3%, 4%  Confirm in 2nd round MMSE-IRC receiver is OK  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Discuss and attempt to resolve the issues listed in “candidate options” |

### CRs/TPs

No CRs or TPs

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

Issue 1: Number of BS TX

Option 1: 1 and 2

Option 2: 8

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

Issue 2: TDL-D channel model

Option 1: Also consider TDL-D, 30ns

Option 2: Only use TDL-A

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

Issue 3: RX EVM

Companies are requested to provide views on whether the following list of RX EVM can be downselected: .05%, 1%, 1.5%, 2%, 3%, 4%

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

Issue 4: MMSE-IRC receiver

Option 1: Confirm

Option 2: Not confirm. Please state which receiver should be assumed instead if you prefer this option

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

# Topic #2: BS requirements

This topic deals with BS requirements capturing some more discussion points for EVM and the question of the applicable BS class.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2110481 | Ericsson, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Verizon, KDDI, SoftBank, NTT DOCOMO | **Observation 1: Higher over modulation can be used as opportunistic when channel conditions are favorable.**  **Observation 2: Deployment scenarios would change from LTE to NR if 1024 QAM does not support same BS classes in both generations.**  **Observation 3: 5G should not be less maximum throughput compared to 4G when similar technology basis is concerned.**  **Proposal:** Define 1024QAM RF requirements for all BS classes |
| R4-2109112 | CATT | **Proposal 1: Phase noise does not need to be considered in the link level simulation.**  **Proposal 2: Option 1 (do not define 1024QAM for WA BS) is preferred unless a performance gain for 1024-QAM in WA deployment scenario is observed.** |
| R4-2110607 | ZTE | **Proposal 1:** to start with scenarios (LA, MR) where no coverage issue or power back off is not needed to support 1024QAM firstly.  **Proposal 2**: propose the EVM requirement for NR 1024QAM as 2.5%. |
| R4-2110664 | Huawei, HiSilicon, CMCC, China Unicom | **Observation 1**: for Macro scenarios, 1024-QAM cannot provide notable performance gain  **Observation 2**: for Macro scenarios, few UEs can use 1024-QAM MCS  **Proposal 1:** it is proposed that 1024-QAM RF requirements is not defined for Macro BS.  **Proposal 2:** 3% TX EVM is proposed for DL 1024 QAM |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 2-1: EVM

Sub-topic description: Some further issues for deciding EVM

**Issue 2-1: Whether to consider phase noise when deciding EVM**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (CATT, Ericsson): No
  + Option 2: Yes
* Recommended WF
  + For issue 2-1 and issue 2-2, discuss in the 2nd round if the following conclusion is suitable (or how it should be modified):
    - EVM not needed for link level simulations
    - Companies should propose EVM for the entire TX chain. The proposed values for EVM should be justified. No need to separate individual components e.g. PN from entire budget.

**Issue 2-2: Evaluate EVM components individually or not**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson): Evaluate only total EVM in RAN4 simulation parameters, not individual EVM contributions of individual components
  + Option 2:
* Recommended WF
  + Close this issue and merge to 2-1

**Issue 2-3: EVM requirement**

One company has proposed an EVM requirement value. Please comment on whether it is agreeable, or alternative proposals, or whether more analysis is needed to decide (and if so, which analysis).

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Huawei): 3%
  + Option 2 (ZTE): 2.5%
* Recommended WF
  + Do not decide EVM this meeting; close this issue in this meeting.

### Sub-topic 2-2 BS class applicability

This topic addresses the question of whether to apply the 1024QAM requirements to the WA BS class. The moderator has attempted to briefly summarize the arguments for/against. In responding, please try to comment on why you propose the option you do or why you do not support the other option.

**Issue 2-4: BS class applicability**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Verizon, KDDI, SoftBank, NTT DOCOMO): Applicable for all BS classes
    - 1024QAM can be used opportunistically for high SNR
    - Deployment scenario possibilities should be the same as for LTE
    - 5G maximum throughput should not be inferior to 4G
  + Option 2 (Huawei, HiSilicon, CMCC, China Unicom, CATT, ZTE (initially)): Not applicable for WA BS class
    - 1024QAM cannot provide significant performance gain for macro
    - 1024QAM not often used by UEs in simulation
    - Power back-off needed but WA is for coverage
* Recommended WF

WF from GTW:

Further discuss the simulation assumption of SLS and LLS evaluation in this meeting, encourage companies to bring evaluation results for comparison in August RAN4 meeting; make decision on August RAN4 meeting for wide area BS class applicability.

* FFS whether SLS evaluation needed or not to conclude this issue

2nd round will include discussion points on SLS assumptions and necessity of SLS to conclude.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub topic 2-1 Whether to consider phase noise when deciding EVM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | We do not quite understand the question. Phase noise may not need to be considered in the link simulation but it of course need to be considered in the EVM budget. |
| Ericsson | All impairments should be considered as total budget of EVM there is no need to separate PN as it does not contribution as a large significant compared to other impairments. |
| CATT | Option 1. The impact is not as obvious as for FR2. |

Sub topic 2-2 Evaluate EVM components individually or not

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | In the link simulation we make assumption for the total TX EVM and total RX EVM |
| Ericsson | EVM should be considered as total txEVM and total rxEVM. |

Sub topic 2-3 EVM requirement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | Option 1: 3% |
| Huawei | Option 1 |
| CATT | FFS. |

Sub topic 2-4 BS class applicability

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Option 1. The BS class should not be limited as the performance benefits of 1024QAM should be achievable in high-SNR areas with WA BS class. NR performance in the same operating frequency range should not be diminished when migrating from LTE to NR. |
| CMCC | We can accept Option2, and we expect to see some performance gain analysis for WA BS |
| Huawei | We support Option 2  Comments to the arguments for option 1:   * 1024QAM can be used opportunistically for high SNR   Huawei: The possibility to schedule 1024QAM is low from our simulation results. And also from the perspective of field deployments, the use case of 1024QAM are limited. It is also questionable that single layer MIMO with 1024 QAM will be more optimal than 2 layer 256 QAM. The additional power back-off is needed for 1024 QAM which will cause many issues.   * Deployment scenario possibilities should be the same as for LTE   Huawei: this is not an issue since 1024QAM WA BS is not commercially deployed in LTE   * 5G maximum throughput should not be inferior to 4G   Huawei: from the perspective of satisfying the KPI, such as 20Gbps peak data rate, 1024QAM with only 2 layer in the downlink cannot bring the KPI even higher. The throughput for 1024QAM with 2-layer would be less than 256QAM with 3-layer or 4-layer actually. |
| Nokia | We don’t see further arguments to limit 1024QAM modulation only to some BS classes, if for LTE we don’t have limitation and 1024QAM is available for all BS classes than in NR this should be allowed. |
| SoftBank | Support option 1 mainly for the second and third items. And is there a reason that 1024QAM could be agreed in LTE-A but not in NR? |
| CU | Option 2.  From the current simulation results, we saw limited gain and some performance loss on average throughput under different traffic models for Urban Macro scenarios. Some more analyses could be carried out for other assumptions.  And in our commercial network, we can find 16QAM operating but modulation scheme of 64QAM and higher are very rarely observed. So we prefer to keep the 1024QAM under small cell scenario, where they are more likely to be used. |
| ZTE | For wide area BS, maybe we could have more time to check its performance gain in the practice. |
| CATT | Performance evaluation might be needed. If no performance gain, we prefer not to have unnecessary for WA BS. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

No CRs or TPs

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | Tentative agreements:  None  Candidate options:   * EVM not needed for link level simulations * Companies should propose EVM for the entire TX chain. The proposed values for EVM should be justified. No need to separate individual components e.g. PN from entire budget.   Recommendations for 2nd round:  Check if the proposed conclusion is acceptable |
| **Sub-topic#2** | Tentative agreements:  Further discuss the simulation assumption of SLS and LLS evaluation in this meeting, encourage companies to bring evaluation results for comparison in August RAN4 meeting; make decision on August RAN4 meeting for wide area BS class applicability.   * FFS whether SLS evaluation needed or not to conclude this issue   Candidate options:   * + Proposed SLS assumptions   + Whether SLS evaluation needed or not to conclude   Recommendations for 2nd round:  Interested companies are requested to provide proposals for SLS assumptions. Once proposals are provided, companies are asked to comment on whether they are agreeable or not.  Companies are requested to provide further input on whether SLS evaluation is needed to conclude. |

### CRs/TPs

No CRs / TPs

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

Issue 1: System level simulation parameters

* Interested companies please provide proposals for parameters
* Other companies please comment on whether the proposals are agreeable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

Issue 2: Whether SLS evaluation is needed to conclude or not

* Please outline your view, explaining why

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on Link level simulation assumptions | CATT |  |
| WF on BS requirements, class applicability and system simulatins | Moderator (Ericsson) |  |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

All input contributions for this topic to be noted.

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-210xxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents