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# Introduction

This paper summarizes the content of contributions submitted to AI 8.8.1.2 (Study on NR coverage enhancement - Baseline coverage performance using LLS – FR2). Proposals related to simulation assumptions for the study of baseline performance in FR2 included in contributions submitted to AI 8.8.3 are also included.

The material is organized as follows:

* First, the latest version of FL’s proposal on FR2-only open issues is given.
* Second, a summary of the FR2-only open issues related to simulation assumptions, signals and channels configurations prior to RAN1 #102-e is given as a reference. This includes both (i) issues that are not common to both FR1 and FR2, and (ii) common issues which may be solved differently for the two FRs.
  + All other common issues of FR1 and FR2 are included in the **Summary on A.I. 8.8.1.1 baseline coverage performance using LLS for FR1**,and thus are not reported here for the sake of efficiency.
* Third, FR2-only open issues related to evaluation assumptions and metrics will be summarized.
* Fourth, a summary of baseline evaluation results as provided by companies in their contributions is provided.
* Sections 6 to 11, provide some background/reference material, including previous version of FL’s proposals and companies’ comments.

Note that each section carries an additional label, according to the following logic:

* **[H]**: High priority aiming at the discussion/approval on 8/20 (Thu)
  + These items are controversial, impact on other discussion, and/or require 2nd phase discussion
* **[M]**: Medium priority aiming at the discussion/approval on 8/26 (Wed)
  + These items are important for simulations, but have isolated impact to other topics.
* **[L]**: For last check on 8/28 (Fri)
  + These items are binary decision, or less controversial.

# Third round FL’s proposal

## Medium Priority

### Stable

**PUCCH Formats**

**Proposal 1.** *For link level simulations in FR2, only PUCCH format 1 and format 3 are considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

**PUCCH Duration**

**Proposal 2.** *For link level simulations in FR2, only PUCCH duration of 14 OFDM symbols is considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

**DMRS configuration for PUCCH**

**Proposal 3.** *For link level simulations in FR2, consider 4 DMRS symbol for PUCCH Format 3.*

**Number of UE panels in link budget**

***Proposal 4****. Consider only one panel at the UE in link budget in FR2.*

**Downlink Tx power**

***Proposal 5.*** *For link budget calculation in FR2, downlink transmit power is scaled by the occupied bandwidth. The following downlink transmit power vs occupied bandwidth values are considered as baseline for the calculations:*

* *40 dBm for 100 MHz Urban scenario,*
* *23 dBm for 100 MHz Indoor scenario.*

**Uplink Tx power**

**Proposal 6.** *For link budget calculation in FR2, an uplink transmit power of 23dBm is considered for baseline performance evaluations. Other values can be reported by companies.*

## Lower priority

### Stable

**Target throughput for Suburban**

***Proposal 7.*** *Confirm the target throughput values of the REL-17 SID for the suburban scenario:*

* + *DL: 1 Mbps, UL: 50 kbps*

**CP-OFDM for PUSCH**

***Proposal 8.*** *Study performance of PUSCH in FR2 only for DFT-s-OFDM.*

**Target BLER for PDCCH**

***Proposal 9.*** *For link level simulations, only 1% BLER should be considered for baseline performance evaluation of PDDCH in FR2.*

**PUSCH repetition Type B**

***Proposal 10.*** *For link level simulations in FR2, only PUSCH repetition type A is considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

* *Note: companies are not precluded to report results for repetition type B.*

**Prioritization of Suburban scenario**

***Proposal 11.*** *Suburban scenario is deprioritized for NR coverage enhancement SI.*

**Msg1 missed detection probability**

***Proposal 12****. Baseline performance evaluation of msg1 transmission is studied for 1% missed detection probability in FR2.*

**Target BLER for CSI feedback over PUCCH**

**Proposal 13.** *Only 1% BLER target should be considered for baseline performance evaluation of PUCCH in FR2, regardless of whether UCI includes CSI feedback or not.*

**Simulation assumptions for SLS based evaluation**

**Proposal 14.** *Simulation assumptions for SLS in FR2 are up to companies’ reports, i.e., no more clarification is needed, as per agreement during RAN1#101-e.*

# Second round FL’s proposals

## Medium priority

### Under discussion

**Uplink Tx power**

**Proposal 1.** *For link budget calculation in FR2, an uplink transmit power of 23dBm is considered for baseline performance evaluations. Other values can be reported by companies.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal | 8 | Ericsson, Samsung, Intel, DOCOMO, Nokia/NSB, ZTE, OPPO,CATT |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

**FL’s comment**

Current situation is as follows:

* Six companies support 23dBm, one company supports 22dBm;
* Two companies propose to consider 22.4dBm as EIRP limit.
* Two companies propose 16 dBm per TRP and EIRP 26 dBm is used for evaluation.

From FL’s perspective, these values are certainly important to derive the actual value of MIL/MCL/MPL. On the other hand, they appear only in the LB template and are static quantities. Thus, it seems reasonable to consider the values supported by the majority as the baseline, and let companies report other values if they consider it appropriate.

### Stable

**PUCCH Formats**

**Proposal 2.** *For link level simulations, only PUCCH format 1 and format 3 are considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

**PUCCH Duration**

**Proposal 3.** *For link level simulations, only PUCCH duration of 14 OFDM symbols is considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

**DMRS configuration for PUCCH**

**Proposal 4.** *Consider 4 DMRS symbol for PUCCH Format 3.*

**Number of UE panels in link budget**

***Proposal 5****. Consider only one panel at the UE in link budget.*

**Downlink Tx power**

***Proposal 6.*** *For link budget calculation in FR2, downlink transmit power is scaled by the occupied bandwidth. The following downlink transmit power vs occupied bandwidth values are considered as baseline for the calculations:*

* *40 dBm for 100 MHz Urban scenario,*
* *23 dBm for 100 MHz Indoor scenario.*

## Lower priority

### Under discussion

**PUSCH repetition Type B**

***Proposal 7.*** *For link level simulations, only PUSCH repetition type A is considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

* *Note: companies are not precluded to report results for repetition type B.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Samsung, Intel, DOCOMO, Nokia/NSB, ZTE, OPPO,CATT |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson (would like to further check) |

**FL’s comment**: During the second round of email discussions, five companies expressed support to the FL’s proposal while one company wants to further check. The FL’s proposal has been copied here for completeness.

**Prioritization of Suburban scenario**

***Proposal 8.*** *Suburban scenario is deprioritized for NR coverage enhancement SI.*

**FL’s comment**: During the second phase of email discussion, three companies proposed to deprioritize Suburban scenario. No company expressed concerns. FL proposes to confirm this proposal.

Companies are invited to confirm their view below, in the corresponding table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | OPPO, CATT, Intel, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

**Msg1 missed detection probability**

***Proposal 9****. Baseline performance evaluation of msg1 transmission is studied for 1% missed detection probability.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | ZTE, OPPO,CATT, Samsung, Intel, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

**FL’s comment:** During the second round of email discussions, twelve companies expressed support to FL’s proposal while one company expressed concerns, as per table below. FL encourages to continue the discussion, reminding everyone that we have other more controversial aspects at hand, which will arguably require more time to converge. It is also remarked that current formulation does not preclude companies interested in showing performance also for 10% missed detection probability to do so. Keeping a constructive attitude for items where a large majority already exists may be advisable in this context.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | What is the technical justification for only 1% appropriate for PRACH coverage? Multiple PRACH attempts should not be a big problem for a UE. We see for 200m ISD that 1% vs 10% changes performance by 3-4 dB, and so we should have clear justification if we are to eliminate 10%. We are OK to report both 1% and 10%, but are not OK with dropping 10% at this time. |
| ZTE | We don’t think 10% missed detection probability is appropriate. The reason is that, multiple PRACH attempts obviously increases the latency and then could result in outdated DL-UL beam pair. This would impact on the reliability, i.e., the coverage. In addition, this would waste DL resources since for each attempt you need an RAR response. |

**Target BLER for CSI feedback over PUCCH**

**Proposal 10.** *Only 1% BLER target should be considered for baseline performance evaluation of PUCCH in FR2, regardless of whether UCI includes CSI feedback or not.*

Companies are invited to confirm their view below, in the corresponding table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | ZTE, CATT, Samsung, Intel, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

**FL’s comment:** During the second round of email discussions, three companies expressed support to FL’s proposal while one company expressed concerns, as per table below. Proposal has been modified to account for received comment. FL remarks that the current formulation does not preclude companies interested in showing performance also for 10% BLER to do so.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | CSI does not change quickly, and gNB can use a prior CSI report if a report fails to decode. What is the technical rationale for only 1% in a coverage scenario? We are OK to report both 1% and 10%, however. |
| Intel | It is unclear to us why we need “If performance of CSI feedback over PUCCH is tested individually in FR2”. Does this mean for 11 or 22 bit UCI, we only consider CSI report on PUCCH? Suggest to update the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We do not see a clear reason why CSI on PUCCH should be treated differently. If it is about UCI priority, then any discussion on UCI priority should be shifted to URLLC WI. |
| Nokia/NSB (3rd round) | We support the proposal. However, we think that it would be better to align the proposals for FR1 and FR2 since both proposals solve the same issue. |

**Simulation assumptions for SLS based evaluation**

**Proposal 11.** *Simulation assumptions for SLS are up to companies’ reports, i.e., no more clarification is needed, as per agreement during RAN1#101-e.*

Companies are invited to confirm their view below, in the corresponding table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Samsung, Intel, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

**FL’s comment**: During the second round of email discussions, ten companies expressed support to the FL’s proposal. One company expressed the concern reported in the table below. It is worth observing that SLS is not mandated for baseline performance evaluation. Companies who wish to perform SLS and show correspond results are invited to report their assumptions. In this context, the FL’s recommendation is to follow the majority view.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | Some further clarification within this meeting may be helpful, for example that we target 95% coverage in system simulation. |
| ZTE | We also think it would be helpful to give a guidance on the target performance for SLS, e.g., the following as we discussed in last meeting.  *If optional SLS is performed, the target performance for SLS is determined by the 5th percentile SINR value in CDF curve for different physical channels.* |

### Stable

**Target throughput for Suburban**

***Proposal 12.*** *Confirm the target throughput values of the REL-17 SID for the suburban scenario:*

* + *DL: 1 Mbps, UL: 50 kbps*

**CP-OFDM for PUSCH**

***Proposal 13.*** *Study performance of PUSCH in FR2 only for DFT-s-OFDM.*

**Target BLER for PDCCH**

***Proposal 14.*** *For link level simulations, only 1% BLER should be considered for baseline performance evaluation of PDDCH in FR2.*

### On hold

**FL’s comment**: The following two FL’s proposals are classified as “on hold” since they depend on other agreements on the presence, role and definition of MPL, as per discussion for AI 8.8.1.1. During the second round of email discussions, two companies expressed support for both proposals, while a reasonable concern was expressed by one company. Thus, FL recommend not to discuss these two aspects until the aforementioned agreements are reached for AI 8.8.1.1.

**Shadow fading and penetration margin**

**Proposal 15.** *For link budget calculation in FR2, the following values of shadow fading margin are considered for baseline performance evaluation:*

* *5.2 dB for Indoor scenario;*
* *4.85 dB for Urban O2O scenario;*
* *4.48 dB for Urban O2I scenario;*
* *6.61 dB for Suburban O2O scenario;*
* *6.3 dB for Suburban O2I scenario.*

**Proposal 16.** *For link budget calculation in FR2, the penetration margin of O2O (Urban/Suburban) and Indoor scenarios for baseline performance evaluation are:*

* *O2O (Urban/Suburban): 9 dB;*
* *Indoor: 0 dB.*

*For O2I (Urban/Suburban) scenario, formulas in Section 7.4.3 of TR 38.901 should be used. The penetration margin considered for baseline performance evaluation is:*

* *Urban: 28.1 dB (O2I, d2D-in = 12.5m, 80% of low loss and 20% of high loss as per IMT2020 evaluation assumptions);*
* *Suburban: reported by companies, for a given distribution of low loss and high loss buildings.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | * This should be decided after we have agreed to include shadow fading in the link budget template. Also, if it is decided to include them, we would like some further time to check the values. * Should the suburban scenario be in square brackets, since it may be deprioritized for FR2? |
|  |  |

# Open issues before RAN1 #102-e

## [H] Open issue No.1 – Antenna array gain [FR2-specific observations]

Subitem 2.4 of the **FL Summary on A.I. 8.8.1.1 baseline coverage performance using LLS for FR1** summarizes companies’ position and proposals on antenna array gain modeling for both FR1 and FR2. Given the paramount importance of this issue, FR2-specific proposals are provided herein [verbatim], for the sake of completeness:

* The antenna array gain should be included in LLS based on CDL channel model for FR2. The analog beams used for LLS at the BS and UE should be further studied, and the beam directed to the strongest cluster in the CDL model can be a start point [1].
* For antenna array gain for LLS based methodology for FR2, Option 1 should be preferred, and theoretical calculations may suffice to determine the coverage bottleneck. Hybrid simulation approach to model antenna array gain could be adopted, whenever practically relevant cell radius estimations are necessary [2].
* Antenna array gain is included in the link budget template for TDL channel model. The value of antenna array gain loss need to FFS [8].
* Antenna array gain is included in the link budget template. Adopt the overall antenna gain given by Overall antenna gain G=10log10(M/N α)+ 10log10(N/L), where N, M, L as the number of TXRU, antenna elements and RF chains, respectively and 0<α≤1. [11].
* In FR2, the broadcast BF gain is about 8dB and 5dB lower than unicast BF gain, in urban and indoor scenarios, respectively [3] [17].
* The antenna array gain for unicast channels can be modeled as 10\*log(N/k) + 10\*log(M/N) - Δ, where k, M and N is the number of RF chains, TxRUs and antenna elements, respectively and Δ is the antenna array gain loss, which can be considered as zero or obtained by SLS [4].
* The antenna array gain for broadcast channels can be modeled as 10\*log(min(X, M/N)) - Δ, where X is the number of SSB beams, Δ is the antenna array gain loss, which can be considered as zero or obtained by SLS [4].

Summarizing, the following situation can be observed for FR2:

* At least 4 companies support Option 1 (include the antenna array gain in LB template)
  + At least 3 companies support the theoretical calculation of antenna array gain with a margin/factor to model the imperfection of beamforming.
  + At least 2 companies support the modelling of antenna array gain by SLS.
* One company supports Option 2 (include the antenna array gain in LLS)
* One company supports a fixed gap in beamforming gain for unicast and broadcast channel.

A Moderator’s proposal on this issue, covering both FR1 and FR2, is provided in Subitem 2.4 of the **FL Summary on A.I. 8.8.1.1 baseline coverage performance using LLS for FR1**. Comments/Views on the proposal should be added there.

## [M] Open issue No.2 – PUCCH formats

For link level simulations, the following agreement on PUCCH formats for FR2 was made during RAN1 #101-e.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PUCCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Format | Format 1, 2bits UCI.  Format 3, [4bits (3 bits A/N + 1 bit SR)]/11/22 bits UCI  FFS: Format 0, 2 |

Only one contribution considers PUCCH Formats 0 and 2, given that in the NW operation point of view, PUCCH with long duration may cause large overhead for NW operations [13]. All other contributions consider only Formats 1 and 3, as per agreement. One contribution in particular states that the motivation for PUCCH evaluation with shorter duration in a coverage limited setting is not clear [4].

Companies are invited to input views on this aspect. Moderator’s proposal will be made based on companies’ inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | PUCCH Format 0 and 2 with short duration certainly has worse performance than the PUCCH formats with long duration. We don’t see the necessity to simulate PUCCH format 0 and 2 under the umbrella of coverage enhancement. Overhead is not an issue at all as the long PUCCH is used since LTE and can be proper handled by configuration or scheduling. Short PUCCH is introduced for low latency and is not suitable for the case wherein we intend to identify the maximum coverage. |
| ZTE | We don’t see clear motivation for PUCCH coverage evaluation with shorter duration. We prefer to not consider short PUCCH format at least for evaluation purpose. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Although the PUCCH short format shows the worse performance, we strongly support to consider PUCCH short formats in the SI of coverage enhancement (at least potential techniques for PUCCH short format should not be precluded). In the NW operation point of view, since large number of BS antenna beams would be used in FR2 to compensate coverage performance, PUCCH with long duration may not be appropriate for NW operation in FR2 due to large overhead. Therefore, PUCCH short format should be considered for the baseline coverage performance for FR2 with considering practical NW operation. |
| Intel | We do not see the strong need to evaluate the performance for short PUCCH format. The link budget difference between 2-symbol short PUCCH format and 14-symbol long PUCCH format can be ~8.5dB. This indicates that if long PUCCH format needs repetition due to coverage enhancement, short PUCCH format may need more than 7 times of repetitions to achieve similar coverage. In our view, for UE with enhanced coverage, it is expected that long PUCCH format would be used for proper operation. |
| OPPO | The short PUCCH format has worse performance, and the motivation for PUCCH coverage evaluation with shorter duration is not clear. We prefer to consider formats 1 and 3 for PUCCH. |
| vivo | The evaluation for PUCCH should be based on long PUCCH formats, PF1 and PF3 are preferred. Considering the short time duration in FR2 due to higher SCS, even if using long PUCCH formats does not bring about too much overhead. |
| Samsung | Focus on PUCCH format 1 and 3. We share the view from Intel. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to focus on long PUCCH formats. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same view with the majority. Considering Formats 1 and 3 should be enough for evaluation. |
| Apple | PUCCH format 1 and 3 are enough for evaluation. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | The evaluated PUCCH formats could follow FR1, and Format 0 and 2 are not required. |

## [M] Open issue No.3 – PUCCH duration

For link level simulations, the following agreement on PUCCH duration for FR2 was made during RAN1 #101-e.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PUCCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| PUCCH duration | 14 OFDM symbols  FFS: 4 OFDM symbols |

Only one contribution considers PUCCH duration of 4 OFDM symbols, given that in the NW operation point of view, PUCCH with longer duration may cause large overhead for NW operations [13]. All other contributions consider only 14 OFDM symbols for PUCCH, as per agreement. One contribution in particular states that the motivation for PUCCH evaluation with shorter duration in a coverage limited setting is not clear [4].

Companies are invited to input views on this aspect. Moderator’s proposal will be made based on companies’ inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | Same comments as above. The FFS should be removed. |
| ZTE | Similar comments as above, we prefer to only consider 14 OFDM symbols for evaluation purpose. |
| NTT DOCOMO | If, short PUCCH format is considered, we are fine to remove 4 OFDM symbols for the PUCCH duration. |
| Intel | We suggest to remove FFS. |
| OPPO | We prefer to consider 14 OFDM symbols for PUCCH. |
| vivo | We prefer 14 OFDM symbols. |
| Samsung | Fine to remove 4-symbol PUCCH for evaluation purpose. Note that it does not necessarily exclude the usage of 4-symbol (or even shorter) PUCCH wherever available, e.g., in flexible slot of TDD system. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to only consider 14 OFDM symbols for simulation purpose. |
| Nokia/NSB | Considering only 14 OFDM symbols PUCCH duration for evaluation. |
| Apple | We prefer 14 OFDM symbol PUCCH duration. FFS can be removed. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | The evaluated PUCCH formats could follow FR1, and 4 OS case is not required. |

## [M] Open issue No.4 – DMRS configuration for PUCCH

For link level simulations, the following agreement on DMRS configuration for PUCCH for FR2 was made during RAN1 #101-e.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PUCCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| DMRS configuration for PUCCH | FFS: [4] DMRS symbols for PUCCH Format 3. |

Only one contribution specifically states that no additional DMRS symbol is considered for PUCCH [6] . A larger number of contributions consider 4 DMRS symbols instead [4], [9], [12], [14]. The following tentative proposal is made:

**Moderator’s proposal**

* Consider 4 DMRS symbol for PUCCH Format 3.

Companies are invited to input views on this proposal/aspect.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | Support FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with FL’s proposal. We observed that PUCCH with 4 DMRS symbols can outperform than that with 2 DMRS symbols. |
| OPPO | Support FL’s proposal |
| vivo | Support FL’s proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Apple | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the moderator’s proposal |
| Ericsson | Support |

## [M] Open issue No.5 – Number of UE panels in link budget

For link level simulations, the following agreement on PUSCH and PDSCH for FR2 was made during RAN1 #101-e.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following simulation assumption for eMBB data or VoIP on PUSCH and on PDSCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Number of UE antenna elements | 8, one panel:(M, N, P) = (2,2,2),  FFS: Two panels in link budget, one panel in LLS, 16 for each panel: (M, N, P) = (4,2,2) |

No contribution submitted to AI 8.8.1.2 considers more than one panel in link budget. One contribution specifically proposes not to consider more than one panel in link budget given that it is not clear how to capture the impact of different panels into the link budget [10]. The following tentative proposal is made:

**Moderator’s proposal**

* Consider only one panel at the UE in link budget.

Companies are invited to input views on this aspect.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | Support FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | Support FL’s proposal |
| vivo | Support FL’s proposal |
| Samsung | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the moderator’s proposal |

## [L] Open issue No.6 – Target throughput for Suburban scenario

For link level simulations, the following agreement on the target throughput was made during RAN1 #101-e.

Agreements:

* Adopt the following target data rates for eMBB performance evaluation for FR2.
* Indoor: DL: 25Mbps, UL:5Mbps
* Urban: DL: 25Mbps, UL: 5Mbps
* Suburban: FFS: (DL: 1Mbps, UL: 50kbps)

Both DL and UL target throughput values sur Suburban scenario was left as FFS. Only one contribution submitted to AI 8.8.1.2 consider different values [12]. The following tentative proposal is made:

**Moderator’s proposal**

* Confirm the target throughput values of the REL-17 SID for the suburban scenario:
  + DL: 1 Mbps, UL: 50 kbps

Companies are invited to input views on this proposal/aspect.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | Support FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | Support FL’s proposal |
| vivo | It seems that the parameters in sub-urban scenario, e.g. pathloss model, shadow fading margin is not provided in IMT-2020 evaluation. And this scenario is also absent in TR 38.913. If the definition of sub-urban scenario is not clear, we prefer to down prioritize this scenario. |
| Samsung | Fine with moderator’s proposal |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the moderator’s proposal |

## [L] Open issue No.7 – Repetition type B for PUSCH

For link level simulations, the following agreement on PUSCH repetitions was made during RAN1 #101-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Repetitions for PUSCH | For VoIP, w/ repetition.  The actual number of repetitions is reported by companies.  FFS: Repetition type B |

One contribution discusses this issue and proposes not to use Repetition type B [4], because no performance benefit is foreseen.

Companies are invited to input views on the necessity of repetition type B. Moderator’s proposal will be made based on companies’ inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | We don’t think PUSCH type B is a typical case for coverage enhancement. PUSCH repetition type B pursues low latency instead of better coverage. |
| ZTE | The PUSCH duration is assumed as 14 symbols in LLS. In such case, there is no performance difference between different repetition types. Thus, no need to consider PUSCH repetition Type B specifically for simulation purpose. For enhancement, of course both repetition Type A and Type B could be considered. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We defined to use 14 symbols for PUSCH and DDDSU for TDD pattern, so that it may be hard to apply type B repetition. |
| Intel | Given that PUSCH duration of 14 symbols is assumed in the link level simulations, we do not see the need to consider PUSCH repetition type B. In our view, PUSCH repetition type A would be sufficient. |
| InterDigital | Similar to our comment for FR1, we can let companies choose whether repetition type A or B is used or not, and report the details. |
| OPPO | There is no need to use repetition type B for coverage enhancement. The type B was not intended for coverage enhancement and only capable by URLLC UE. |
| Vivo | Agree with CATT. Type-A PUSCH repetition with 14 symbol PUSCH duration is preferred. |
| Samsung | (This is the same comment for both FR1 and FR2 and we also pointed out in FR1 email discussion) We suggest for each company to report the repetition type evaluated. It is desirable to utilize the available UL resources in flexible slot of TDD system in the context of coverage enhancement. |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not consider PUSCH repetition type B for evaluation. |
| Apple | We prefer only repetition type A is considered in the simulation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For 14OS scheduling as evaluation baseline, we should focus on only one of the two types to reduce unnecessary workload since the performances are the same. |

## [L] Open issue No.8 – CP-OFDM for PUSCH

For link level simulations, the following agreement on the waveform to consider for PUSCH (and PDSCH) was made during RAN1 #101-e.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for eMBB data or VoIP on PUSCH and on PDSCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Waveform | DFT-s-OFDM for PUSCH, CP-OFDM for PDSCH  FFS: CP-OFDM for PUSCH |

No contribution considered CP-OFDM for the evaluation, thus the following tentative proposal is made.

**Moderator’s proposal**

* Study performance of PUSCH in FR2 only for DFT-s-OFDM.

Companies are invited to input views on this proposal/aspect.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | Support FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | Support FL’s proposal |
| Vivo | Support FL’s proposal |
| Samsung | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the moderator’s proposal |

## [L] Open issue No.9 – Msg1 missed detection probability

For link level simulations, the following agreement on the BLER target for PRACH was made during RAN1 #101-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance metric | 0.1% false alarm, 1% miss-detection  FFS: 10% missed detection. |

Of all the contributions studying this aspect, only one considers both 1% and 10% missed detection probability [12]. All others consider 1%. The following tentative proposal is made.

**Moderator’s proposal**

* Study performance of PRACH for msg1 for 1% missed detection probability only.

Companies are invited to input their views on this proposal/aspect.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | Support FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | Support FL’s proposal |
| vivo | For PRACH evaluation, the requirement is determined based on 1% PRACH miss detection probability. Meanwhile, the false alarm rate should not be greater than 0.1%.  The FFS should be removed. |
| Samsung | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |

## [L] Open issue No.10 – Target BLER for CSI feedback over PUCCH

For link level simulations, the following agreement on the BLER target for CSI feedback over PUCCH was made during RAN1 #101-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BLER for PUCCH | …  FFS: BLER for CSI (10% or 1%) |

Of all the contributions presenting performance analysis of CSI feedback over PUCCH, only one considers 10% BLER value for CSI feedback over PUCCH [12]. The following tentative proposal is made.

**Moderator’s proposal**

* Study performance of CSI feedback over PUCCH in FR2 only for 1% BLER.

Companies are invited to input views on this proposal/aspect.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | Don’t see the necessity to simulate CSI individually considering we already simulate both 11 bits UCI and 22 bits UCI. Maybe proponents can provide more information. |
| ZTE | Share with CATT. |
| Intel | We prefer 1% for CSI on PUCCH. |
| OPPO | If, CSI feedback is considered, we support removing 10% BLER. |
| vivo | Due to HARQ-ACK may be multiplexed with CSI, 1% BLER should be used for evaluation. |
| Samsung | Support moderator’s proposal (the same comment for FR1, i.e., 1% BLER) |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. In fact, this proposal aims to clarify the BLER target for the case of CSI on PUCCH. Companies may or may not provide evaluation results for this scenario. |
| Apple | We share the same view as CATT and ZTE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Echo CATT’s comments: motivation is required given PUCCH format 3 is evaluated already. |

## [L] Open issue No.11 – Target BLER for PDCCH

For link level simulations, the following agreement on the BLER target for PDCCH was made during RAN1 #101-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BLER for PDCCH | 1% BLER  FFS: 10% BLER |

One contribution considers this aspect and proposes not to consider 10% BLER for PDCCH [4]. Companies are invited to input their views on this aspect. Moderator’s proposal will be made based on companies’ inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | Don’t see the motivation of 10% BLER for PDCCH. Remove 10% BLER. |
| ZTE | No need to consider 10% BLER for PDCCH.  A low target BLER for PDCCH will have a great impact on system efficiency. Because once PDCCH is missed, a UE will be not aware of whether there is DL/UL transmission. Corresponding PDSCH/PUSCH re-transmission cannot be triggered in PHY layer. In addition, it will impact on PUCCH resource determination. This will decrease the HARQ-ACK BLER down to around 10%, meaning 1% target BLER for HARQ-ACK cannot be guaranteed. |
| Intel | We don’t see the need of 10% BLER for PDCCH performance evaluation. The FFS should be removed. |
| OPPO | Support removing 10% BLER. |
| vivo | Remove 10% BLER for PDCCH |
| Samsung | Remove 10% BLER (commented the same for FR1) |
| Qualcomm | Remove 10% BLER |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same view with the majority on this aspect. The FFS can be removed. |
| Apple | Remove 10% BLER |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Only 1% BLER is taken as the target. |

# Other issues related to evaluations

## [M] Downlink Tx power

Three contributions proposed values for DL Tx power in FR2 scenarios.

* 40 dBm for Urban and Suburban [1].
* The total transmit power for DL channels is based on the occupied BW and power spectrum density. PSD of 36 dBm/MHz for urban/suburban and 23 dBm/MHz for indoor scenario [4].
* 26 dBm for all scenarios in FR2 [13].

This is a new issue. Companies are encouraged to share views on these proposals. Moderator’s proposal will be made based on companies’ inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | We think the PSD for DL should be constant. The available power for DL transmission should be determined by the constant PSD and the occupied bandwidth. |
| ZTE | The PSD for DL should be decided because the actual DL transmission power is based on the occupied BW and PSD.  After a further check, we prefer to reuse the values defined in TR 38.802. That is 40 dBm per 80MHz for urban/suburban and 23 dBm per 80MHz for indoor. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support to use 26 dBm based on ITU-R assumptions. |
| Intel | In the link budget analysis, constant PSD in DL should be assumed. It is more appropriate to assume that gNB transmits DL signals/channels within the system bandwidth. |
| OPPO | We slightly preferred that the PSD method is more realistic for the evaluation. |
| vivo | The DL Tx power in ITU-R M.2412 can be considered as baseline, i.e.   * 40dBm for 80MHz for Urban * 23dBm for 80MHz for indoor   The transmission power can be linearly scaled with the channel bandwidth. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer 40 dBm for Urban and Suburban and 23 dBm for Indoor. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think a more intuitive way to model the Tx power used by gNB could be to set a constant EPRE value and obtain the total Tx power by scaling the EPRE by the occupied BW. However, we are also fine to use the IMT2020 values. |
| Apple | For DL , constant PSD is preferred, the transmission power is scaling according to the allowed bandwidth for the channel. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 40 dBm in ITU-R M.2412-0 should be used. |

## [M] Uplink Tx power

Three contributions proposed values for UL Tx power in FR2 scenarios.

* 16 dBm for all scenarios in FR2 (EIRP of 26 dBm) [1].
* UE transmission EIRP is 22.24 dBm [3].
* 22 dBm for all scenarios in FR2 [13].

This is a new issue. Companies are encouraged to share views on these proposals. Moderator’s proposal will be made based on companies’ inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| ZTE | Prefer 23 dBm as defined in TR 38.802. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support to use 22 dBm based on ITU-R assumptions. |
| Intel | We prefer 23dBm for uplink Tx power. |
| vivo | We suggest to use the MPE defined by RAN4 as baseline, i.e. 22.4dBm. We are open to the exact values if it can be provided by FR2 UE vendors. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer EIRP limit of 22.4 dBm. |
| Nokia/NSB | 23 dBm |
| Apple | 23dBm is preferred. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | TRP 16 dBm and EIRP 26 dBm is used for evaluation |

## [L] Shadow fading margin

Two contributions proposed values of shadow fading for FR2 scenarios which can be summarized as follows.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Indoor hotspot | Urban Macro | Suburban |
| [1] | 5.2 dB | O2O: 4.85 dB  O2I: 6.41 | O2O: 6.61  O2I: 6.3 |
| [6] | * For 95% ACR: 2.96 dB (LOS) & 8.5 dB(NLOS) * For 90% ACR: 1.69 dB (LOS) & 5.17 dB (NLOS) | * For 95% ACR: 9.04 dB (O2I) & 6.11 dB (O2O, LOS) & 8.03 dB (O2O NLOS) * For 90% ACR: 5.6 dB (O2I) & 3.36 dB (O2O, LOS) & 4.79 dB (O2O NLOS) |  |

Companies are invited to provide initial views on these proposals. Moderator’s proposal will be made based on companies’ inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia/NSB | The numbers we used for our contribution are almost the same as what provided by [1] except the number for Urban O2I, which should be 4.48 dB, same value as for Urban in FR1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Values in RP-191527 can be taken as a start. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## [L] Penetration margin

Three contributions proposed values of penetration margin for FR2 scenarios which can be summarized as follows.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Indoor hotspot | Urban Macro | Suburban |
| [1] | - | 41.55 dB (derived according to high loss model defined in TS 38.901) | 41.55 dB (derived according to high loss model defined in TS 38.901) |
| [6] | 0 dB | 26.02 dB (O2I) & 9 dB (O2O) |  |
| [4] | 0 dB | 17.83 dB (high loss)/37.95 dB (low loss)/27.89 dB (50% high + 50% low loss) |  |

Companies are invited to provide initial views on these proposals. Moderator’s proposal will be made based on companies’ inputs.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | | Comment | |
| CATT | | The penetration calculation depends on the distribution of UE, 41.55dB may be the most pessimistic UE distribution, i.e. all the UEs are indoor. Maybe a moderate UE distribution can be used for calculating the penetration margin. | |
| ZTE | We suggest using the models defined in TR 38.901. Assuming  is a uniformly distributed variable between 0 and 25 m, the values for different models are updated as follows. Note that,  is not considered in the values captured above from [4], therefore we update here.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Urban/Suburban | | | | High | Low | 50% High +50% Low  (A direct average in dB) | | 44.2 | 24.08 | 34.14 | | |
| Nokia/NSB | | The values for 28GHz Urban and Suburban should be 28.1 dB for O2I and 9 dB for O2O (in car) following the calculation in TR 38.901, Section 7.4.3. | |
|  | |  | |
|  | |  | |
|  | |  | |

## [L] Simulation assumptions for SLS based evaluation

SLS based evaluation has been agreed as an optional method for coverage analysis. The detailed simulation assumptions are provided by one company [18].

Table 2 SLS specific parameters

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameters | Urban/Indoor scenario for FR2 |
| Layout | Urban: Single layer - Macro layer: Hex. Grid  Indoor: 12BSs per 120m x 50m |
| Channel model | UMa in TR 38.901  Indoor-office in TR 38.901 |
| Min distance of UE2gNB | 35m for urban  0m for indoor |

The following was proposed:

* For SLS based methodology, the target performance for SLS is determined by the 5th percentile SINR value in CDF curve for different physical channels.

**Comment from the Moderator:** In RAN1#101-e, it was noted that “[…] the simulation assumptions for SLS are up to companies’ reports”. Given that SLS is not supported by the majority as a tool for coverage analysis, determining simulation assumptions for SLS does not seem a paramount step to take in the study. Therefore, the following tentative moderator proposal is made.

**Moderator’s proposal:**

* Simulation assumptions for SLS are up to companies’ reports, i.e. no more clarification is needed, as per agreement during RAN1#101-e.

Companies are invited to provide views on this proposal/aspect.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | Support FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | For SLS, most of the simulation assumptions can reuse that of defined for LLS. For the remaining very few SLS specific parameters, it’s fine for us to only note but not agree on detailed assumptions.  But, for the target performance of SLS, we believe this should be discussed together with the target performance for LLS based methodology. Actually it is once discussed in last meeting and seems no objections received at that time.  **Proposal:**  Identify the target performance and coverage bottlenecks based on target performance metric for FR1.   * FFS: the target performance metric and potential down selection. * Option 1: The target path loss is considered as the target performance.   + Alt1: Derived from the target ISD.   + Alt2: Relative MPL. * Option 2: ~~The target MCL~~ An MCL or MCL based metric is considered as the target performance.   + Alt1: Derived from the target ISD, considering shadow fading margin, penetration loss, etc.   + Alt2: Fixed target MCL, e.g. 147dB for VoIP to achieve better performance than other RAT(s).   + Alt3: Relative MCL * If optional SLS is performed, the target performance for SLS is determined by the 5th percentile SINR value in CDF curve for different physical channels * Other target performance metrics are not precluded. |
| Intel | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | Support FL’s proposal |
| vivo | Support FL’s proposal |
| Samsung | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |

## [L] Others

Additional proposals related to evaluations have been made in [12].

* **(Item 1) Beamforming implementation constraints**
  + Constraints imposed by certain beamforming implementation, such as the possibility to simultaneously receive or transmit with maximum gain in more than one direction, should be neglected as a starting point.
* **(Item 2) Phase noise models and compensation algorithms**
  + PTRS overhead and compensation algorithms should be neglected.

Companies are invited to input views on items 1 and 2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Updated link budget analyses

Companies have updated the link budget analyses. Results can be summarized in the following table (ISD value for which bottleneck is identified, when applicable, is included for the sake of completeness).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | PUSCH | | PDSCH | PUCCH | PDCCH |
| eMBB | VoIP |  |  |  |
| Suburban NLOS | O2I | **(5)** Huawei/HiSilicon (1732m ISD), OPPO (500m ISD), Samsung (400m ISD), Ericsson | **(2)** OPPO (500m ISD), Samsung (400m ISD), | **(4)** Huawei/HiSilicon (1732m ISD), Samsung (400m ISD), Ericsson | **(2)** OPPO (500m ISD), Samsung (400m ISD) | **(1)** Samsung (400m ISD) |
| O2O | **(6)** Huawei/HiSilicon (1732m ISD), CATT, Intel, Ericsson, Qualcomm |  | **(3)** Huawei/HiSilicon (1732m ISD), Ericsson | **(1)** Samsung (400m ISD) | **(1)** Qualcomm (broadcast PDCCH) |
| Urban  NLOS | O2I | **(10)** Huawei/HiSilicon (400/500m ISD), vivo, ZTE (200m ISD), OPPO (500m ISD), Samsung (150m ISD), CMCC, Ericsson, Nokia/NSB | **(2)** OPPO (500m ISD), Samsung (150m ISD) | **(4)** Huawei/HiSilicon (400/500m ISD), Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO | **(5)** vivo, ZTE (200m ISD), OPPO (500m ISD), Samsung (150m ISD), NTT DOCOMO |  |
| O2O | **(13)** Huawei/HiSilicon (400/500m ISD), vivo, ZTE (200m ISD), CATT, Intel, OPPO (500m ISD), Samsung (150m ISD), Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB |  | **(2)** Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO | **(3)** vivo, ZTE (200m ISD), NTT DOCOMO | **(1)** Qualcomm (broadcast PDCCH) |
| Indoor | | **(2)** Intel, Qualcomm |  |  |  | **(1)** Qualcomm (broadcast PDCCH) |

In addition, one contribution states that RACH procedure in FR2 (including Msg1, Msg2 and Msg3) should be enhanced [14].

**Comment from the moderator:** Performance metrics have not been agreed yet. Some open issues are also to be addressed. For these reasons, further detailed comments on the performance analyses reported by companies are not reported and can be found in the corresponding contributions. Having said this, it can be observed that at least PUSCH is labelled as bottleneck in most of the considered scenarios and propagation conditions.

Companies are encouraged to check the summary and provide additional views to the following table, if any:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Our results for VoIP (suburban NLOS O2I and O2O, urban NLOS O2I and O2O, and Indoor) and Indoor (PUSCH, PUCCH, PDSCH, PDCCH) are available in [9]. Need to reflect in above summary table. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Comment from the moderator:** The table has been updated to address the comment. It should be noted that the table above aims at summarizing channels and scenarios that need enhancement based on proposals/observations from companies. Indeed, it does not provide a comprehensive summary of all the channels and scenarios that have been evaluated by companies, whose details can be found in corresponding contributions.

# Summary of the proposals on high priority items

No high priority proposal was identified for FR2. Please refer to Section 5 of the **FL Summary on A.I. 8.8.1.1 baseline coverage performance using LLS for FR1** where a Moderator proposal on antenna array gain modeling for both FR1 and FR2 is detailed.

# Summary of the proposals on medium priority items

## PUCCH formats

During the first round of email discussions, a large majority of companies stated their support for the FL’s proposal. On the other hand, one company (NTT Docomo) has concerns about not considering short PUCCH formats for this study, due to the large overhead long PUCCH formats may cause for NW operation in FR2 when large number of BS antenna beams is used. In response to this concern, it has been argued that:

* Link budget difference between 2-symbol short PUCCH format and 14-symbol long PUCCH format can be ~8.5dB. This indicates that if long PUCCH format needs repetition due to coverage enhancement, short PUCCH format may need more than 7 times of repetitions to achieve similar coverage (Intel);
* Considering the short time duration in FR2 due to higher SCS, even if using long PUCCH formats does not bring about too much overhead (vivo).

Based on the above, the first version of the FL’s proposal seems to reflect the view of a super-majority of companies and thus is proposed unchanged.

**FL’s Proposal**

* *For link level simulations, only PUCCH format 1 and format 3 are considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson, Samsung, Intel, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  | DOCOMO |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We still think short PUCCH format is necessary for our NW operation for FR2, but we may accept the group consensus for the evaluation assumption. |

## PUCCH duration

Based on the comments received during the first round of email discussions, the following proposal is made:

**FL’s Proposal**

*For link level simulations, only PUCCH duration of 14 OFDM symbols is considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

* *Note: shorter PUCCH, e.g., 4 OFDM symbols, can be assumed to be scheduled during a flexible slot of TDD systems.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Samsung, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson (but OK if note is removed), Intel (Do not need the note, not needed for simulation) |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | We are in general OK with the proposal, but we would like to understand why the note is needed for coverage evaluation. So we prefer it is removed unless it is further clarified. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. We are also fine to remove the note. |

## DMRS configuration for PUCCH

The FL proposal has received support from all companies who commented during the first round and is thus considered as stable, as follows.

**FL’s proposal**

*Consider 4 DMRS symbol for PUCCH Format 3.*

A summary of the situation after the first round of discussions is given below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal | 11 | Apple, Intel, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, CATT, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, Hisilicon, Ericsson |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

## Number of UE panels in link budget

The FL proposal has received support from all companies who commented during the first round and is thus considered as stable, as follows.

**FL’s proposal**

*Consider only one panel at the UE in link budget.*

A summary of the situation after the first round of discussions is given below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal | 12 | Apple, Intel, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, CATT, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Qualcomm, Huawei, Hisilicon |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | We are OK to simulate one panel in the link simulations. However, it is well understood that commercial FR2 UEs typically use multiple panels, so system simulations and antenna gain values somehow need to take this into account for accurate link budget calculations. Multiple panels were also used in the IMT-2020 work, so it seems odd to exclude them here given the high interest in building on IMT-2020 from some companies. We fail to see why more accurate modeling should be precluded in system simulation. Can we instead have  **Proposal:**   * 1 UE panel is used in link simulations * Companies report if 1 or 2 panels is used in antenna array gain value determination and/or system simulation. |
|  |  |

## Downlink Tx power

In the first round of email discussions, eleven companies provided comments on this issue. The majority supports a constant PSD and scaling transmit power according to the occupied BW, with IMT2020 values as a baseline. The following FL’s proposal is formulated based on the comments.

**FL’s Proposal**

*For link budget calculation in FR2, downlink transmit power is scaled by the occupied bandwidth. The following downlink transmit power vs occupied bandwidth values are considered as baseline for the calculations:*

* *40 dBm for 80MHz for Urban scenario,*
* *23 dBm for 80MHz for Indoor scenario.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson (80 MHz should be removed). Intel, DOCOMO |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | We are OK with 40 dBm for the gNB, but the agreement for bandwidth is 100 MHz [400 MHz] at present, so the ‘for 80 MHz’ should be removed. |
| Intel | We share similar view as Ericsson that we do not need to mention 80MHz. For urban scenario, we assume 43dBm in our analysis.  In addition, it may be good to also decide the EIRP limit for both gNB and UE side. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We may fine if 80 MHz is removed, so that 23 dBm for Indoor and 40 dBm for Urban for 100 MHz. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are also fine to apply directly the value for 80 MHz to 100 MHz and mention it in the proposal. However, it is ambiguous if the corresponding occupied BW is completely removed from the proposal. |

## Uplink Tx power

In the first round of email discussions, ten companies provided comments on this issue. Five companies support 23dBm, one company supports 22dBm, two companies propose to consider 22.4dBm as EIRP limit. Two companies propose 16 dBm per TRP and EIRP 26 dBm is used for evaluation. The following FL’s proposal is formulated based on the comments.

**FL’s Proposal**

*For link budget calculation in FR2, an uplink transmit power of 23dBm is considered for baseline performance evaluations. Other values can be reported by companies.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson, Samsung, Intel, DOCOMO, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

# Summary of the proposals on lower priority items

## Target throughput for Suburban scenario

The FL proposal has received support from all companies who commented during the first round and is thus considered as stable, as follows.

**FL’s proposal**

* *Confirm the target throughput values of the REL-17 SID for the suburban scenario:*
  + *DL: 1 Mbps, UL: 50 kbps*

A summary of the situation after the first round of discussions is given below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal | 12 | Apple, Intel, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, CATT, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Qualcomm, Huawei, Hisilicon, DOCOMO |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

One company (vivo) reported that the parameters of sub-urban scenario, e.g. pathloss model, shadow fading margin are not provided in IMT-2020 evaluation. Moreover, this scenario is also absent in TR 38.913. It is proposed to deprioritize this scenario. Given that this item has been labelled as medium priority, for which proposals are due on 8/28 at the latest, companies are invited to express their views on this aspect in the table below. A FL’s proposal will be formulated accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Sub-urban scenario should be deprioritized |  | Ericsson, Intel (can be considerd as optional), DOCOMO |
| Sub-urban scenario should have the same priority as other scenarios for FR2 |  |  |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | The suburban scenario shows the same bottlenecks as e.g. the urban scenario, and so we are OK with making this an optional scenario. |
|  |  |

## Repetition type B for PUSCH

The following proposal is formulated based on the comments received during the first round or email discussions.

**FL’s Proposal**

*For link level simulations, only PUSCH repetition type A is considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

* *Note: companies are not precluded to report results for repetition type B.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Samsung, Intel, DOCOMO, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson (would like to further check) |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | We would like to check further that type B does not have benefit for TDD coverage before precluding it as a baseline. So we would prefer further discussion on this point before excluding type B. |
|  |  |

## CP-OFDM for PUSCH

The FL proposal has received support from all companies who commented during the first round and is thus considered as stable, as follows.

**FL’s proposal**

* *Study performance of PUSCH in FR2 only for DFT-s-OFDM.*

A summary of the situation after the first round of discussions is given below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal | 12 | Apple, Intel, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, CATT, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Huawei, Hisilicon, DOCOMO |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

## Msg1 missed detection probability

The FL proposal has received support from all companies who commented during the first round and is thus considered as stable, as follows.

**FL’s proposal**

*Study performance of PRACH for msg1 for 1% missed detection probability only.*

One company (vivo) added that the false alarm rate should not be greater than 0.1%. This agreement was already achieved during RAN1 #101-e and is not changed by the proposal above, which concerns only missed detection probability.

A summary of the situation after the first round of discussions is given below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal | 12 | Apple, Intel, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, CATT, Samsung, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, Hisilicon |
| Do not support above FL proposal | 1 | Ericsson |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | What is the technical justification for only 1% appropriate for PRACH coverage? Multiple PRACH attempts should not be a big problem for a UE. We see for 200m ISD that 1% vs 10% changes performance by 3-4 dB, and so we should have clear justification if we are to eliminate 10%. We are OK to report both 1% and 10%, but are not OK with dropping 10% at this time. |
|  |  |

## Target BLER for CSI feedback over PUCCH

The first FL’s proposal has received support from nine companies who commented during the first round and is thus considered as stable. A summary of the situation after the first round of discussions is given below. On the other hand, three companies (CATT, ZTE, Apple) question the necessity to simulate CSI individually, considering that both 11 bits UCI and 22 bits UCI are already simulated. They invite companies interested in this specific type of study to provide more information about its necessity. A tentative updated FL proposal follows.

**FL’s proposal**

*If performance of CSI feedback over PUCCH is tested individually in FR2, only 1% BLER should be considered for baseline performance evaluation.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Samsung, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | CSI does not change quickly, and gNB can use a prior CSI report if a report fails to decode. What is the technical rationale for only 1% in a coverage scenario? We are OK to report both 1% and 10%, however. |
| Intel | It is unclear to us why we need “If performance of CSI feedback over PUCCH is tested individually in FR2”. Does this mean for 11 or 22 bit UCI, we only consider CSI report on PUCCH? Suggest to update the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We do not see a clear reason why CSI on PUCCH should be treated differently. If it is about UCI priority, then any discussion on UCI priority should be shifted to URLLC WI. |

## Target BLER for PDCCH

The following proposal is formulated based on the comments received during the first round or email discussions.

**FL’s Proposal**

*For link level simulations, only 1% BLER should be considered for baseline performance evaluation of PDDCH in FR2.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson, Samsung, Intel, Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  |  |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | Reporting both 1% and 10% BLER allows us to understand a little better how sensitive the PDCCH is to a change in SINR, and so can be informative. Furthermore, there has been no discussion within this study of what an optimum PDCCH BLER is in a coverage limited scenario; why is 1% an ideal number? All that said, we do not insist that 10% is a mandatory value to simulate, and we do understand the wish to reduce the number of parameter settings to report upon. |
|  |  |

## Shadow fading margin

Two companies provided comments on this issue in the first round of email discussions. The following FL’s proposal is then formulated.

**FL’s Proposal**

*For link budget calculation in FR2, the following values of shadow fading margin are considered for baseline performance evaluation:*

* *5.2 dB for Indoor scenario;*
* *4.85 dB for Urban O2O scenario;*
* *4.48 dB for Urban O2I scenario;*
* *6.61 dB for Suburban O2O scenario;*
* *6.3 dB for Suburban O2I scenario.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | * This should be decided after we have agreed to include shadow fading in the link budget template. Also, if it is decided to include them, we would like some further time to check the values. * Should the suburban scenario be in square brackets, since it may be deprioritized for FR2? |
|  |  |

## Penetration margin

Four companies provided comments on this issue in the first round of email discussions, three of which propose to calculate penetration loss by using formulas in TR 38.901. The following FL’s proposal is then formulated.

**FL’s Proposal**

*For link budget calculation in FR2, the penetration margin of O2O (Urban/Suburban) and Indoor scenarios for baseline performance evaluation are:*

* *O2O (Urban/Suburban): 9 dB;*
* *Indoor: 0 dB.*

*For O2I (Urban/Suburban) scenario, formulas in Section 7.4.3 of TR 38.901 should be used. The penetration margin considered for baseline performance evaluation is:*

* *Urban: 28.1 dB (O2I, d2D-in = 12.5m, 80% of low loss and 20% of high loss as per IMT2020 evaluation assumptions);*
* *Suburban: reported by companies, for a given distribution of low loss and high loss buildings.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal |  | Nokia/NSB |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | * This should be decided after we have agreed to include penetration margin in the link budget template. Also, if it is decided to include them, we would like some further time to check the values. * Should the suburban scenario be in square brackets, since it may be deprioritized for FR2? |
|  |  |

## Simulation assumptions for SLS based evaluation

Eleven companies provided comments on this issue, in the first round of email discussions. Eight expressed support to FL’s proposal. One company (ZTE) proposed to discuss target performance of SLS together with target performance for LLS based methodology. On the other hand, target performance discussion for both FR1 and FR2 is carried out for a separate item in the FL summary for AI 8.8.1.1. Therefore, given that the proposal is supported by the majority and the comment from one company is not directly related to the proposal, the first FL proposal is confirmed as follows.

**FL’s Proposal**

*Simulation assumptions for SLS are up to companies’ reports, i.e., no more clarification is needed, as per agreement during RAN1#101-e.*

Companies are invited to confirm their views below, in the corresponding row.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **No. companies** | **Companies** |
| Support above FL proposal | 10 | CATT, Intel, OPPO, vivo, Samsung, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, Hisilicon, DOCOMO |
| Do not support above FL proposal |  | Ericsson |

Additional comments to first moderator summary:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | Some further clarification within this meeting may be helpful, for example that we target 95% coverage in system simulation. |
|  |  |

## Others

No comment was made on the issues in this subsection during the first round of email discussions. Since this subsection is considered as low priority, no proposal is added.

# Summary of RAN1 #102-e agreements for AI 8.8.1.2

To be populated later.
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# Annex – Agreements made during RAN1#101e

Update on 6/1: to check 6/2

Update from 6/4 GTW:

Agreements:

* Adopt the following target data rates for eMBB performance evaluation for FR1.
* Urban scenario: DL 10Mbps, UL 1Mbps
* Rural scenario: DL 1Mbps, UL 100kbps
* Rural with long distance scenario: DL 1Mbps, UL 100kbps, ~~[~~30kbps~~]~~ (optional)

**Agreements:**

* For VoIP performance evaluation based on link-level simulation for FR1.
* A packet size of [320] bits with 20ms data arriving interval is adopted.
* ~~FFS~~TBD: TBS for SIP invite message. Payload of 1500 bytes can be a starting point.

Agreements:

* The basic evaluation methodology is based on link-level simulation for FR1.
* Step 1: Obtain the required SINR for the physical channels under target scenarios and service/reliability requirements.
* Step 2: Obtain the baseline performance based on required SINR and link budget template.
* Note: asepcts related to identifying target performance and coverage bottlenecks based on target performance metric is to be handled separately
* ~~FFS:~~ The evaluation methodology based on system-level simulation is optional for FR1.
* Note: The simulation assumptions for SLS are up to companies’ reports.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PUSCH and PUCCH for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Scenario and frequency | Urban: 4GHz (TDD), 2.6GHz (TDD)  Rural: 4GHz (TDD), 2.6GHz (TDD), 2GHz (FDD), 700MHz (FDD)  Rural with long distance: 700MHz (FDD), 4GHz (TDD) |
| Frame structure for TDD | DDDSU (S: 10D:2G:2U) only for 4GHz  DDDSUDDSUU (S: 10D:2G:2U) only for 4GHz  DDDDDDDSUU (S: 6D:4G:4U) only for 2.6GHz  Other frame structures can be reported by companies. |
| Pathloss model (select from LoS or NLoS) | Urban: NLoS  Rural: NLoS and LoS |
| BWP | 100MHz for 4GHz and 2.6GHz.  20MHz for 2GHz (FDD  20MHz (optional for 10MHz) for 700MHz. (FDD) |
| SCS | 30kHz for TDD, 15kHz for FDD. |
| Channel model for link-level simulation | TDL-C for NLOS, TDL-D for LOS.  [CDL] |
| UE velocity | Urban: 3km/h for indoor  Rural: 3km/h for indoor, 120km/h (optional 30km/h) for outdoor |
| Frequency hopping | w/ or w/o ~~Intra-slot~~ frequency hopping for PUSCH  w/ frequency hopping for PUCCH ~~is enabled~~. |

* FFS whether there are any additional simulation considerations for the extreme coverage scenarios (e.g., rural)

Update on 6/5:

Agreement:

* Down selection on the following options for the link budget template for FR1 in next meeting.
* Option 1: Adopt single link budget template based on IMT-2020 self-evaluation with necessary revisions, including adding/removing/revising some parameters.
  + FFS: The template provided by FL in Tdoc [R1-2005005](file:///C:\Users\maso\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\Docs\R1-2005005.zip).
* Option 2: Adopt both templates, i.e. link budget template in IMT-2020 self-evaluation and link budget template in TR 36.824.
* Option 3: Adopt single link budget template in TR 36.824 with necessary revisions, including adding/revising some parameters.

Agreement:

Down selection on the following options for antenna array gain for LLS based methodology for FR1 in next meeting.

* Option 1: Antenna array gain is included in the link budget template.
* FFS: array gain = 10 \* 1og10 (number of antenna elements/number of TxRUs)
* FFS: For TDL channel model
* FFS: Values reflective of realistic implementation and network operation.
* Option 2: Antenna array gain is included in LLS.
* FFS: For CDL channel model

Agreement:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PDSCH for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameters | Values |
| Waveform | CP-OFDM |
| PRBs/MCS/TBS | Reported by companies. |
| PDSCH duration | 12 OS |
| Other parameters | FFS |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt following TBS for Msg3 for FR1
* 56 bits

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, the packet size of VoIP for FR2 is the same as FR1.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, TBS of Msg3 for FR2 is the same as FR1.

Agreements:

* The evaluation methodology for FR2 is the same as FR1.

Agreements:

* The link budget template for FR2 is the same as FR1.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PUSCH and PDSCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Scenario and frequency | 28GHz |
| Frame structure for TDD | DDDSU (S: 10D:2G:2U)  DDSU (S: 11D:3G:0U)  Other frame structures can be reported by companies. |
| Subcarrier Space | 120kHz |
| UE velocity | Indoor scenario:3km/h  Urban scenario: 3km/h for indoor, 30km/h for outdoor.  Suburban scenario: 3km/h for indoor, 30km/h, (optional: 120km/h) for outdoor. |
| Occupied channel bandwidth for | 100MHz, [400MHz] |
| Frequency hopping for PUSCH | w/ or w/o frequency hopping |

Final summary in R1-2005004.

**//Update on 6/7, post e-Meeting additional email approval**

**[101-e-Post-NR-Cov-Enh] Email discussion/approval focusing on remaining evaluation assumptions till 6/17 – Jianchi (CT)**

* **Focusing on high priority proposals first, target 6/11 for early approvals**
* **Followed by medium priority/low priority proposals**

Update on 6/11: check on 6/12 for potential agreements

Update on 6/12:

Agreements

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PUSCH for eMBB data or VoIP for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| BLER for PUSCH | For eMBB,  w/ HARQ, 10% iBLER;  w/o HARQ, 10% iBLER.  For VoIP, 2% rBLER. |
| Number of UE transmit chains for PUSCH | 1，2 (optional) |
| DMRS configuration for PUSCH | For 120km/h, (Optional: 30km/h): Type I, 2 or 3 DMRS symbol, no multiplexing with data.  For frequency hopping: Type I, 1 or 2 DMRS symbol for each hop, no multiplexing with data.  PUSCH mapping Type and DMRS position are reported by companies.  Working assumption:  For 3km/h: Type I, 1 or 2 DMRS symbol, no multiplexing with data. |
| Waveform for PUSCH | DFT-s-OFDM,  CP-OFDM (optional) |
| Repetitions for PUSCH | For eMBB,  w/o repetition as baseline,  w/ repetition (optional).  For VoIP, w/ repetition.  The actual number of repetitions is reported by companies.  FFS: Repetition type B |
| HARQ configuration for PUSCH | For eMBB, whether HARQ is adopted is reported by companies.  For VoIP, w/ HARQ.  The maximum number of HARQ transmission (limited by frame structure and latency requirements) can be reported by companies. |
| Latency requirements for voice | 50ms/100ms |
| PUSCH duration | 14 OS |

Agreements

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PUCCH for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| PUCCH format type | Format 1, 2bits UCI.  Format 3, [4bits (3 bits A/N + 1 bit SR)]/11/22 bits UCI |
| BLER for PUCCH | For PUCCH format 1:  DTX to ACK probability: 1%. NACK to ACK probability: 0.1%.  ACK missed detection probability: 1%.  For PUCCH format 3:  BLER for Ack/Nack, SR: 1%  FFS: BLER for CSI (10% or 1%) |
| Number of PRBs for PUCCH | 1 PRB |
| Number of UE transmit chains for PUCCH | 1 |
| Number of repetitions for PUCCH | w/ repetition (optional), w/o repetition for PUCCH.  The maximum number of repetitions is 8. |
| PUCCH duration | 14 OS |
| DMRS configuration for PUCCH | FFS: number of DMRS symbols for PUCCH Format 3. |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for eMBB data or VoIP on PUSCH and for PUCCH for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Number of ~~receive~~ antenna elements for BS | Urban: 192 antenna elements for 4GHz and 2.6GHz,  (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (12,8,2,1,1)  (optional) 128 antenna elements for 4GHz,  (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,8,2,1,1)  Rural: 64 antenna elements for 4GHz and 2.6GHz  (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,4,2,1,1)  32 antenna elements for 2GHz  (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,2,2,1,1)  16 antenna elements for 700MHz  (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (4,2,2,1,1) |
| Number of ~~receive~~ TxRUs for BS | ~~TBD~~  gNB architectures to study ~~for TDL~~:   * 2 or 4 TXRUs for 2GHz, 700 MHz * 64TxRUs for 2.6 and 4 GHz. * Optional: 32 TXRUs at 2 GHz   ~~[~~gNB modeling in LLS for TDL:   * Option 1: 2 or 4 gNB receive chains in LLS ~~(as starting point)~~. FFS: correlation * Option 2: Number of gNB receive chains = number of TXRUs in LLS. FFS: correlation.~~]~~   [gNB architectures to study for CDL:   * Urban: 64 receive chains for 2.6 and 4 GHz in LLS * Rural: 8 receive chains for 4GHz and 2.6GHz in LLS * 4 receive chains for 2GHz and 700MHz in LLS.]   [gNB modeling in LLS for CDL:   Number of gNB receive chains = number of TXRUs in LLS.] |
| Delay spread | Urban: 300ns  Rural: 300ns  Rural with long distance: 30ns |
| PRBs/TBS/MCS for eMBB for PUSCH | Any value of PRBs, and corresponding MCS index, reported by companies will be considered in the discussion. Companies are encouraged to use 30 PRBs for 1Mbps, 4 PRBs for 100kbps, 1 PRB for 30kbps as a starting point.  TBS can be calculated based on e.g. the number of PRBs, target data rate, frame structure and overhead. |
| PRBs/MCS for VoIP for PUSCH | [4 PRBs] for VoIP as starting point.  Other values of PRBs can be reported by companies.  QPSK, pi/2 BPSK (optional) |

Note: For TDL models, companies report whether antenna array gain, ~~obtained from mapping antenna elements to TXRU,~~ is included in LLS or link budget template. Array gain calculation method and how channel estimation is accounted for is reported by companies

Agreements:

* Adopt the following target data rates for eMBB performance evaluation for FR2.
* Indoor: DL: 25Mbps, UL:5Mbps
* Urban: DL: 25Mbps, UL: 5Mbps
* Suburban: FFS: (DL: 1Mbps, UL: 50kbps)

Other proposals?

* # Number of receive TxRUs for BS – 6/15
* Others?

Update on 6/17

Regarding # Number of receive TxRUs for BS – see the update of the agreement above.

Agreements:

* ~~For link level simulation, adopt the following table for SSB for FR1.~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **~~Parameters~~** | **~~Values~~** |
| ~~Periodicity~~ | ~~20ms~~ |
| ~~Performance metric~~ | ~~Combination of 4 SSBs in 80ms.~~ |
| ~~Other parameters~~ | ~~Reported by companies.~~ |

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for Msg.3 for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Number of PRBs | 2 |
| Waveform | DFT-s-OFDM |
| Number of DMRS symbol | w/o frequency hopping: 3,  w/ frequency hopping: 2 for each hop |
| PUSCH duration | 14 OS |
| Other parameters | Reported by companies. |

Other proposals 6/18

Update on 6/18:

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PDCCH for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Aggregation level | 16 |
| Payload | 40 bits |
| CORESET size | 2 symbols, 48 PRBs |
| Tx Diversity | Reported by companies |
| BLER for PDCCH | 1% BLER  FFS: 10% BLER |
| Number of SSB for broadcast PDCCH of Msg.2 | Reported by companies |
| Other parameters | Reported by companies |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for SSB for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Periodicity | 20ms |
| Performance metric | Combination of 4 SSBs in 80ms.  Note: UE is not assumed to know the SS/PBCH block index |
| Other parameters | Reported by companies. |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PRACH for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Format | Format 0, Format B4, or Format C2 |
| SCS | Reported by companies. |
| Performance metric | 1% missed detection at 0.1% false alarm probability  FFS: 10% missed detection. |
| Other parameters | Reported by companies. |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, for PDSCH of Msg.4 for FR1.
  + Reuse the following simulation assumption for PDSCH
    - Waveform, [PDSCH duration]
  + FFS: Payload size: [3000bits].
  + Other parameters: Reported by companies.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, for SSB, PDCCH, PDSCH and PDCCH of Msg.2, PDSCH of Msg.4 and PDSCH for FR1.
  + Reuse following simulation assumptions agreed for PUSCH.
    - Scenario and frequency, frame structure, SCS, pathloss model, channel model, delay spread, UE velocity, number of antenna elements and TxRUs for BS.
  + The number of UE receive chains: ~~is 2.~~
    - 4 for 4GHz/2.6GHz
    - 2 or 4 for 2GHz
    - 2 for 700MHz
  + For PDSCH, reuse ~~DM-RS configuration,~~ BLER, HARQ, Latency requirements for voice agreed for PUSCH.
    - Reuse DM-RS configuration agreed for PUSCH except that 3 DMRS symbols is used for Msg2.
* For link level simulation, for PRACH and Msg.3 for FR1.
  + Reuse following simulation assumptions agreed for PUSCH
    - Scenario and frequency, frame structure, pathloss model, channel model, delay spread, UE velocity, number of antenna elements and TxRUs for BS and Number of UE transmit chains.
  + For Msg.3, reuse SCS, HARQ configuration, frequency hopping agreed for PUSCH.

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for eMBB data or VoIP on PUSCH and on PDSCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| BLER | For eMBB,  w/ HARQ, 10% iBLER, Optional: companies report rBLER.  w/o HARQ, 10% iBLER.  For VoIP, 2% rBLER. |
| DMRS configuration | For 30km/h (optional: 120km/h): Type I, 2 or 3 DMRS symbol, no multiplexing with data.  For frequency hopping for PUSCH: Type I, 1 or 2 DMRS symbol for each hop, no multiplexing with data.  PUSCH/PDSCH mapping Type and DMRS position are reported by companies.  Working assumption:  For 3km/h: Type I, 1 or 2 DMRS symbol, no multiplexing with data. |
| Waveform | DFT-s-OFDM for PUSCH, CP-OFDM for PDSCH  FFS: CP-OFDM for PUSCH |
| Repetitions for PUSCH/PDSCH | For eMBB,  w/o repetition as baseline,  w/ repetition (optional).  For VoIP, w/ repetition.  The actual number of repetitions is reported by companies.  FFS: Repetition type B for PUSCH. |
| HARQ configuration for PUSCH/PDSCH | For eMBB, whether HARQ is adopted is reported by companies.  For VoIP, w/ HARQ.  The maximum number of HARQ transmission (limited by frame structure and latency requirements) can be reported by companies. |
| PUSCH/PDSCH duration | 14 OS for PUSCH, 12 OS for PDSCH |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for eMBB data or VoIP on PUSCH and on PDSCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Number of antenna elements for BS | Indoor scenario: 128  (M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (8, 8, 2, 1, 1)  Urban/suburban scenario:  256, (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (4, 8, 2, 2, 2)  Optional: 512, (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,8,2,2,2) |
| Number of TxRUs for BS | 2  Note: Analog beamforming is assumed. |
| Number of UE Tx/Rx chains | 1T2R, 2T2R |
| Channel model for link-level simulation | CDL- A, TDL-A, [urban/suburban: TDL-C]  Note: company can provide simulation results based on either TDL channel or CDL model |
| Delay spread | Indoor scenario: 30ns  Urban scenario: 100ns  Suburban scenario: 100ns |
| Latency requirements for voice | 50ms/100ms |
| PRBs/TBS/MCS for eMBB for PUSCH/PDSCH | Any value of PRBs, and corresponding MCS index, reported by companies will be considered in the discussion. Companies are encouraged to use [30] PRBs for 5Mbps for PUSCH and full bandwidth for 25Mbps for PDSCH as a starting point.  TBS can be calculated based on e.g. the number of PRBs, target data rate, frame structure and overhead. |
| PRBs/MCS for VoIP for PUSCH/PDSCH | [4 PRBs] for VoIP as starting point. Other values of PRBs can be reported by companies.  QPSK for PDSCH/PUSCH  Optional: pi/2 BPSK for PUSCH |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following simulation assumption for eMBB data or VoIP on PUSCH and on PDSCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Number of UE antenna elements | 8, one panel:(M, N, P) = (2,2,2),  FFS: Two panels in link budget, one panel in LLS, 16 for each panel: (M, N, P) = (4,2,2) |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PUCCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Format | Format 1, 2bits UCI.  Format 3, [4bits (3 bits A/N + 1 bit SR)]/11/22 bits UCI  FFS: Format 0, 2 |
| BLER for PUCCH | The same as FR1 |
| Number of PRBs for PUCCH | The same as FR1 |
| Number of UE transmit chains for PUCCH | The same as FR1 |
| Number of repetitions for PUCCH | The same as FR1 |
| PUCCH duration | 14 OFDM symbols  FFS: 4 OFDM symbols |
| DMRS configuration for PUCCH | FFS: [4] DMRS symbols for PUCCH Format 3. |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PDCCH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Aggregation level | 16 |
| Payload | 40 bits |
| CORESET size | 2 symbols, 48PRBs |
| Tx Diversity | Reported by companies |
| BLER for PDCCH | 1% BLER.  FFS: 10% BLER |
| Number of SSB for broadcast PDCCH of Msg.2 | Reported by companies |
| Other parameters | Reported by companies |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, adopt the following table for PRACH for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Format | Format B4, (Optional: Format C2) |
| SCS | Reported by companies. |
| Performance metric | 0.1% false alarm, 1% miss-detection  FFS: 10% missed detection. |
| Number of SSB beams | Reported by companies |
| Other parameters | Reported by companies. |

Agreements:

* For link level simulation, for SSB, PDCCH, PDSCH and PDCCH of Msg.2, PDSCH of Msg.4 for FR2.
  + Reuse following simulation assumptions for PDSCH
    - Scenario and frequency, frame structure, SCS, channel model, delay spread, UE velocity, number of antenna elements and TxRUs for BS, number of UE Tx/Rx chains and UE antenna elements.
* For link level simulation, for PUCCH, PRACH and Msg.3 for FR2.
  + Reuse following simulation assumptions for PUSCH
    - Scenario and frequency, frame structure, channel model, delay spread, UE velocity, number of antenna elements and TxRUs for BS, number of UE antenna elements for PUSCH.
  + For PRACH and Msg.3, reuse number of UE Tx chains for PUSCH.
  + For PUCCH, reuse SCS for PUSCH.
  + For Msg.3, reuse SCS, HARQ configuration, frequency hopping for PUSCH.

Final summary in R1-2005192.