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# Introduction

In this contribution, we summarize issues regarding PDSCH/PUSCH enhancements for new SCSs on supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz for the following email discussion in RAN1 #104-e.

[104-e-NR-52-71GHz-05] Email discussion/approval on defining maximum bandwidth for new SCSs, timeline related aspects adapted to each of the new numerologies 480kHz and 960kHz and reference signals with checkpoints for agreements on Jan-28, Feb-02, Feb-05 – Huaming (Vivo)

Note that the scope of agenda 8.2.5 including defining maximum bandwidth for new SCSs, time line related aspects adapted to each of the new numerologies 480kHz and 960kHz, reference signals, scheduling particularly w.r.t. multi-PDSCH/PUSCH with a single DCI, HARQ, etc. In this summary, only issues related to bandwidth for new SCSs, time line related aspects adapted to each of the new numerologies 480kHz and 960kHz and reference signals are summarized. Issues related to scheduling particularly w.r.t. multi-PDSCH/PUSCH with a single DCI, HARQ are not in the scope of this summary.

# PDSCH/PUSCH enhancements for new SCSs

In this section, we provide a summary of issues, observations and proposals related to PDSCH/PUSCH enhancements for new SCSs discussed in the submitted contributions.

As in WID, the related objectives for this summary of agenda 8.2.5 are the following.

* Physical layer aspects including [RAN1]:
	+ In addition to 120kHz SCS, specify new SCS, 480kHz and 960kHz, and define maximum bandwidth(s), for operation in this frequency range for data and control channels and reference signals, only NCP supported.

Note: Except for timing line related aspects, a common design framework shall be adopted for 480kHz to 960kHz

* + Time line related aspects adapted to 480kHz and 960kHz, e.g., BWP and beam switching timing, HARQ timing, UE processing, preparation and computation timelines for PDSCH, PUSCH/SRS and CSI, respectively.
	+ Evaluate, and if needed, specify the PTRS enhancement for 120kHz SCS, 480kHz SCS and/or 960kHz SCS, as well as DMRS enhancement for 480kHz SCS and/or 960kHz SCS.

## 2.1. Maximum and minimum channel bandwidth(s)

### Individual observations/proposals

The following are individual observations/proposals from the contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sources | Observations/proposals |
| [3, ZTE] | Observation 1: Aligned and misaligned channelization show similar performance in coexistence scenario.Proposal 1: The following options are proposed for channelization for Rel-17 NR beyond 52.6 GHz, wherein Option 2 is preferred.* Option 1: Align the channelization of Rel-17 NR with Wi-Fi design at least in unlicensed band (e.g. 57 GHz - 71 GHz)
* Option 1-1: Support a basic unit of 2.16 GHz channel bandwidth
* Option 1-2: Divide X of 400 MHz, Y of 800 MHz and Z of 1600 MHz per 2.16 GHz bandwidth. Where X = 0 to 5, Y = 0 to 2, and Z = 0 to 1.
* In other licensed frequency band (e.g. 52.6 GHz - 57 GHz) or in a controlled environment without Wi-Fi devices, it can be designed uniformly with unlicensed band or independently
* Option 2: No need to align the channelization of Rel-17 NR with Wi-Fi design even in unlicensed band. Support the same bandwidth(s) (e.g. 400/800/1600 MHz) in licensed and unlicensed frequency bands
* Option 2-1: Support a nominal channel bandwidth of 2.16 GHz by the aggregation of above basic bandwidth(s) (e.g. 400/800/1600MHz)
* Option 2-2: No need to support a nominal channel bandwidth of 2.16 GHz

Proposal 2: The maximum channel bandwidth for the new SCSs 480/960 kHz can be defined as 1600 MHz. |
| [5, Huawei] | Proposal 2: For NR operating in 52.6-71 GHz, the supported minimum carrier bandwidth is 200 MHz for 120 kHz and 480 kHz SCS. The minimum carrier bandwidth is 400 MHz with 960 kHz SCS.Proposal 3: The maximum carrier bandwidth depends on the subcarrier spacing:• 400 MHz for 120 kHz SCS• 1600 MHz for 480 kHz SCS• FFS for 960 kHz SCS, e.g. 3200, 2400 or 2000 MHz (ask RAN4) |
| [6, Nokia] | Proposal 1: For operation without CA, support the following CBWs: 400 MHz (120 kHz), 1600 MHz (480 kHz) and 2.16 GHz (960 kHz).Observation 1: Maximum BW for 480 kHz SCS, limited by the number of RBs per carrier, is 1.6 GHz.Observation 2: With 960 kHz SCS, the maximum bandwidth is limited by the sampling rate. Increased sampling rate allows to increase the peak data rate and spectrum efficiency by up-to 6% with 2.16 GHz CBWObservation 3: There are two options available for 960 kHz SCS• Option 1: Don’t support higher sampling rate. Maximum number of PRBs with 960 kHz SCS is 170.• Option 2: Support a higher sampling rate. Maximum number of PRBs is (e.g.) 178 or 180. |
| [7, CAICT] | Proposal 1: The maximum bandwidth for 480 and 960kHz SCS could consider the impact of LBT bandwidth. |
| [8, CATT] | Proposal 1: The maximum system bandwidth should be supported up to 1.6 GHz. The system analysis of supporting more than 1.6 GHz system BW should be supported with the condition of not changing of the value of Tc.  |
| [9, vivo] | Proposal 1: Define the maximum supportive carrier/BWP bandwidths with different numerologies as Table 1, i.e. BW of 400 MHz for SCS of 120 KHz, BW of 1.6 GHz for SCS of 480 KHz, and BW of 2GHz for SCS of 960 KHz.Proposal 9: The basic time unit should be re-defined for 960KHz when operation from 52.6-71GHz and its spec impact should be studied. |
| [12, Intel] | Proposal 1* Minimum supported bandwidth of 400 MHz for any SCS.
* Maximum supported bandwidth of 1600 MHz for 480 kHz SCS.
* Maximum supported bandwidth of 2000 MHz for 960 kHz SCS.
	+ 2000 MHz could be supported without changes to Tc = 1/(480e3 \* 4096) even for 960 kHz.
	+ For 960kHz, up to 170 PRB can be supported without changing Tc. This results 1.9584 GHz which should be sufficiently large enough occupied bandwidth for 2GHz channel. Most likely the actual occupied channel defined by RAN4 will be smaller than 170 PRB.
* The maximum number of PRB that RAN1 considers for 480kHz is 275, and 960kHz is 170. Up to RAN4 to define the exact PRB sizes for each channel bandwidth.
 |
| [14, Spreadtrum] | Proposal 1: Consider the maximum channel bandwidth as shown in the following table for the respective numerologies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subcarrier spacing (numerology μ) | Maximum CC BW size assuming 4096 FFT size |
| 120 kHz (μ = 3) | 400MHz |
| 480 kHz (μ = 5) | 1600MHz |
| 960 kHz (μ = 6) | 3200MHz |

 |
| [15, InterDigital] | Proposal 1: Support multiples of the current NR maximum bandwidth 400 MHz up to 2 GHz in 52.6 – 71 GHz.Proposal 2: Consider potential coexistence issues with other RATs in the spectrum of 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz with 2.16 GHz maximum bandwidth. |
| [16, Sony] | Observation 1: CA (either inter-band or intra-band) can be supported, but we prefer not to rely on CA with maximum bandwidth 400MHz per carrier to achieve 2.16GHz bandwidth.Proposal 1: Maximum bandwidth supported using a 960 kHz SCS should be 2.16 GHz. |
| [17, LG] | Proposal #1: For 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS, 1.6 GHz and 2.16 GHz are supported as maximum bandwidth, respectively. |
| [18, NEC] | Proposal 5: For 120kHz and 240KHz, $Δf\_{max}=480∙10^{3}$ Hz. For 960kHz, $Δf\_{max}=960∙10^{3}$Hz. |
| [20, Samsung] | Proposal 1: Support maximum channel bandwidth as approximate 2 GHz (exact value up to RAN4) and no change to T\_c is needed. |
| [21, Ericsson] | Observation 6 From a RAN1 perspective, it is feasible to define a maximum channel bandwidth in the range B = [2000 .. 2160] MHz for the case of 960 kHz SCS with FFT size 4096.Observation 7 From a RAN1 perspective, it is feasible to define a maximum channel bandwidth B ≈ 1600 MHz for the case of 480 kHz SCS with FFT size 4096. The precise value of B depends on the desired FFT utilization and desired spectral utilization. For example, B = 1635.84 MHz achieves FFT utilization of 75% and spectral utilization ≈ 90%, similar to values achieved in FR2.Proposal 15 Inform RAN4 that from a RAN1 perspective it is feasible to define the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS to be in the range B = [2000 .. 2160 MHz] and for 480 kHz SCS as B ≈ 1600 MHz, using an FFT size of 4096. The precise values of B depend at least on the desired channelization design, the desired spectral utilization value (ratio of transmission BW configuration to channel BW), and a target FFT utilization value. |
| [23, Charter] | Proposal 1: 1.6 GHz channelization is supported for both new SCSs and as the maximum supported bandwidth for 480kHz SCS.Proposal 2: 2.16 GHz is the maximum supported bandwidth for 960kHz SCS. |
| [24, Apple] | Proposal 1: Multiple carrier bandwidths should be specified with carrier bandwidths that are multiples of about 400 MHzProposal 2: The maximum channel bandwidth of about 2.16 GHz should be used for co-existence with the existing 802.11ad/ay channel allocation with no overlap between a single NR channel and multiple 802.11ad/ay channels.Proposal 3: For 120 kHz and 480 kHz, 2 GHz channel bandwidth transmission can be achieved by carrier aggregation. |
| [26, NTT DoCoMo] | Proposal 1: For maximum carrier bandwidth, * 1.6 GHz should be supported with 480 kHz SCS
* At least about 2 GHz should be supported with 960 kHz SCS
	+ Larger than 2.16 GHz can also be discussed further
 |

### Summary on bandwidth(s)

Based on the contributions, there are three sub issues discussed in the contributions, (1) maximum channel bandwidth, (2) minimum channel bandwidth, (3) channelization

#### Maximum channel bandwidth

The following options are proposed from the contributions on the maximum channel bandwidth.

Table 1 Maximum channel/carrier BW with different numerologies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Numerology** | **Maximum channel/carrier bandwidth** |
| (120 K, NCP) | 400MHz |
| (480 K, NCP) | 1600MHz: [3, ZTE], [5, Huawei], [6, Nokia], [8, CATT], [9, vivo], [12, Intel], [17, LG], [23, Charter], [26, NTT DoCoMo], (≈ 1600MHz, [21, Ericsson]) |
| (960 K, NCP) | Option 1: 1600MHz: [3, ZTE], [8, CATT]Option 2: 2000MHz: [9, vivo], [12, Intel], [15, InterDigital], (≈ 2000MHz, [20, Samsung]), [21, Ericsson], (≈ 2000MHz, [26, NTT DoCoMo])Option 3: 2160MHz: [6, Nokia], [16, Sony], [17, LG], [21, Ericsson], [23, Charter], (≈ 2160MHz, [24, Apple])Option 4: 3200MHz: [14, Spreadtrum]Option 5: FFS: [5, Huawei] |

Related to the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS, there’s discussion on the sampling rate/time unit Tc. Currently, Tc is defined as *Tc =*1/(Δ𝑓max ∙ *Nf*), where Δ𝑓max = 480 ∙ 103 Hz and *Nf* = 4096. Without changing Tc definition, a maximum occupied bandwidth of 1.9584 GHz can be achieved ([6, Nokia], [12, Intel], [20, Samsung]) for the maximum channel bandwidth of 2 or 2.16 GHz. On the other hand, better bandwidth utilization and/or larger channel bandwidth can be supported for 960 kHz SCS with increased sampling rate by defining another time unit only applicable for 960 kHz SCS ([6, Nokia], [9, vivo], [18, NEC]).

Moderator’s comment:

Considering the vast majority support of option 2 and 3 for the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS, formulate the following proposal for discussion.

##### Proposal 1-1 for discussion:

* The maximum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz SCS is 400 MHz in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
* The maximum channel bandwidth for 480 kHz SCS is 1600 MHz in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
* Choose one of the following options as the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz
	+ Option 1: 2000 MHz
	+ Option 2: 2160 MHz
* Choose one of the following options for Tc
	+ Option a: Keep Tc unchanged for all SCSs, Tc =1/(Δ𝑓max ∙ Nf), where Δ𝑓max = 480 ∙ 103 Hz and Nf = 4096
	+ Option b: In addition to Tc, define a new Tc2 =1/(Δ𝑓max2 ∙ Nf) and Δ𝑓max2 = 960 ∙ 103 Hz and Nf = 4096, applicable for 960 kHz SCS only

Companies are encouraged to provide comments especially on their preference of the above options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | First two bullets: Support maximum channel bandwidth for 120kHz =400 MHz and 480kHz =1600 MHz.For forth bullet Option a) keep Tc unchanged for all SCS. The restriction on Tc will limit the maximum channel bandwidth correspondingly for 960 kHz SCS. (third bullet). |
| LG Electronics | We support the first two bullets, i.e., 400 MHz and 1600 MHz as maximum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz SCS and 480 kHz SCS, respectively.For the maximum channel bandwidth of 960 kHz and Tc, we prefer Option 2 and Option a.However, it seems that RAN1 need to coordinate these issues with RAN4 before final decision. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the first 2 bullets.For the 3rd bullet, our first preference is 1600MHz, and to select from the 2 options we support Option 1, i.e. 2000MHz.We are a bit confused about the Option a of the 4 th bullet, if maximum channel bandwidth for 960kHz SCS is defined as at least 2000MHz, the N\_f would be larger than 2048, we are not sure how to keep the minimum time unit unchanged.  |
| Ericsson | 120 kHz: Support proposal480 kHz: Support proposal960 kHz: Option 2 (2160 MHz)Tc: This does not require discussion in RAN1. It is only a reference time unit, and it can be left to spec editors how to handle properly.Regarding 960 kHz, it was agreed in the study item to consider maximum bandwidth values up to 2160 MHz. It was also heavily discussed that the motivation for 960 kHz is to achieve as large bandwidth as possible, and to also match IEEE channel bandwidth. Given these two observations, and that RAN4 will decide on a spectral utilization value (and thus guard band size), it makes most sense for RAN1 to recommend 2160 MHz. This will allow for a larger usable bandwidth after factoring in spectral utilization compared to 2000 MHz. |
| Qualcomm | • We think that the bandwidth discussion should be left to RAN 4, which have already an ongoing discussion for the min/max bandwidth for the new band • For 960KHz SCS, Tc should be decided based on the maximum channel bandwidth  |
| DOCOMO | We support the 1st and 2nd bullet. On the 3rd bullet, either options are fine, while we slightly prefer option 2. On the last bullet, since at most 2160 MHz BW is considered now, we support option a.  |
| Samsung | We support the FL’s proposal in general. * For the third bullet, instead of listing 2000 and 2160 as two alternatives, it would be more proper to say “approximate 2 to 2.16 GHz up to RAN4’s decision”.
* For the forth bullet, we support Option a, but ok to leave it as two options to further down-select.
* Add one more bullet “Send an LS to RAN4”
 |
| Nokia/NSB | The supported channel BWs are up to RAN4 decision. From RAN1 point of view maximum CBW can be defined according to Option 2. It provides opportunities for smooth co-existence with WiGig.For Tc, prefer option a, provided that maximum CBW is ~2 GHz. It would mean that the maximum number of RBs for 960 kHz SCS (from RAN1 point of view) would be 170. However, if CBW>2.16 GHz is considered, e.g. CBW= 3.2GHz for scenarios where 2.16 GHz channelization does not need to be followed, it would require option b) |
| Apple | We support the first two bullets. On the third, we are support Samsung’s proposal as the exact value to be specified is a RAN4 decision. For the 4th, ideally we would like to Option a. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with bullets 1 and 2. We think keeping Tc unchanged allows supporting 2000 MHz maximum channel bandwidth with 960 kHz SCS, so this is a sufficiently simply design that meets the large bandwidth target. |
| Intel | In general, we are ok with the suggestions from the moderator.On the aspect about Tc, we are not sure if this is something that needs a RAN1 agreement. This seems to be more of an Editor’s job on how this could be implemented in the specification.From our understanding the Tc value does not dictate the FFT sizes nor does it represent the sampling rates that are used in transceivers of gNBs and UEs. The Tc is purely a construct for specification to provide time units of required operations. It may be even possible to define finer time units (if needed) by using a fraction of the Tc, and this would still be mathematically equivalent to option b. We feel this is Editor’s job to look into the specification and utilize the determine the best means to implement the required changes. For the RAN1 agreements, we believe it should be sufficient to agree on aspects that require smaller time units (if needed), and if so what those time units are, rather than focusing on what to do with Tc value. |
| vivo | Support bullet 1 and 2For bullet 3, either option is fine and we slightly prefer Option 2.For Tc, at least the following aspect is impacted:* OFDM signal generation in Section 5.3 of TS 38.211;
* Timing advanced time calculation in Section 4.2 of TS 38.214;
* Timing requirement such as timing error requirement for SSB in Section 7 of TS 38.133.

Agree that the above second and third part could reuse current Tc value since it is only a time granularity. If there is need to indicate a smaller time granularity, change of the Tc value is needed. However, for the first part, use current Tc for OFDM signal generation will restrict the sampling rate since the maximum number of samples is limited. So, in our view, at least for OFDM signal generation with 960KHz, a new Tc should be defined if the supporting channel bandwidth is larger than 1.9584 GHz. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support first two bullets i.e. 400MHz for 120kHz SCS and 1600MHz for 480kHz.For 960kHz, we support 2160MHz as maximum channel bandwidths (other bandwidth such as 2000MHz can be reached with multiple CCs such as 5 CCs with 400MHz).For fourth bullet, we prefer to keep the Tc unchanged for all SCSs |
| Sony | We support the first two bullets. For 960 kHz SCS, we prefer option 2 (2160 MHz) at least for unlicensed band.For Tc, it should be discussed after maximum bandwidth is determined. |
| Charter | We are fine with the proposal for 120kHz and 480kHz.For 960 kHz: Option 2 (2160 MHz) is preferredFor Tc: Option a, is preferred |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal maximum BW for 120 kHz and 480 kHz SCSFor 960 kHz SCS, we prefer to have the same maximum BW at 1600 MHz. We are OK to accept 2000 MHz if Tc is not changeFor Tc, Option (a). We have strong concern on Option (b). Tc has been used for LTE and NR to define the basic time unit. Tc value was decided in RAN1 during the NR study item for forward compatibility. We don’t see strong motivation in changing the value.  |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Proposal revised below to address comments.Respond to comment on RAN4’s decision:Isn’t RAN1 the WG tasked by the WID to define maximum bandwidth?  |

##### Proposal 1-1a for discussion:

* From RAN1 perspective, for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz SCS is 400 MHz
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 480 kHz SCS is 1600 MHz
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS is approximate 2000 to 2160 MHz
* Send LS to RAN4 on maximum bandwidth

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | We are okay with Proposal 1-1a, but we think it would be more accurate to say “for 960 kHz SCS maximum bandwidth in the range [2000 .. 2160] MHz is feasible” |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal 1-1a. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal, and when we send LS to RAN4 we may need to request RAN4 to define exact value for the maximum bandwidth corresponding to 960 kHz SCS, considering coexistence, Tc, and carrier aggregation. |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal 1-1a.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. Ericsson’s clarification is also fine.  |
| CATT | We are OK for 120 kHz and 480 kHz SCS. If we would define maximum BW for 960 kHz SCS, we would prefer making decision to one value.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally, we agree with the proposal and also agree with LG’s suggestion on LS to RAN4 for defining exact maximum bandwidth value for 960kHz |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | Supportive of moderator proposal 1-1a. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal 1-1a. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Futurewei | Duplicate discussions of the same topic in the B52 threads should be avoided. Agree with proposal in general. Change the third sub-bullet to: “The maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS is as close to 2000MHz without changing the existing maximum sampling rate” |
| Samsung | We support the FL proposal. One editorial change: “Send LS to RAN4 on maximum channel bandwidth” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It should be clarified what we exactly ask RAN4, which is to decide the maximum CBW for 960 kHz SCS, and the corresponding numbers of RBs and spectrum utilization for the maximum CBWs with 480 and 960 kHz SCS. We don’t see the need to mention feasibility as it should be obvious that RAN1 won’t provide values that are not deemed feasible from RAN1 perspective.The consideration for 2016 MHz from Ericsson is to maximize the FFT utilization given a 4096 FFT and a spectrum utilization of 90% (or more), and 2160 MHz allows for a larger number of usable RBs than 2000 MHz. But that’s not the reason why we stopped at 2160 MHz during the study. During the study is was shown that 2160 MHz is not necessary for coexistence purpose. Supporting 2160 MHz in addition to other CBWs that are multiples of 200 or 400 MHz will make the definition of channel rasters complex for the CBWs smaller than 2160, assuming that the raster for 2160 MHz is defined first (and aligned with the Wi-Fi channelization for simplicity). Surely RAN4 will consider the complexity of channelization definition. But from RAN1 perspective, if FFT utilization is the main concern then we could discuss relaxing the SI agreement and allow up to 2400 MHz. 2160 MHz CBW may be feasible from RAN1 perspective, but would likely be more complex to specify across WGs (including RAN1) eventually, than a multiple of 200 or 400 MHz.So our proposal would actually to decide in RAN1 between 2000 MHz and 2400 MHz maximum channel bandwidth with 960 kHz SCS, or to provide these two values as a choice for RAN4 decision. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | With respect to the value of 2400 MHz, suggest to follow the agreement made in SI on the possible range of maximum channel bandwidth. In terms of feasibility of design in RAN1, I don’t see companies question that for either 2000 or 2160 MHz. The exact value (whether it’s 2000 or 2160 or something else) is up to RAN4 to decide.Wording updated into proposal 1-1b. |

##### Proposal 1-1b for discussion:

* From RAN1 perspective, for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz SCS is 400 MHz
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 480 kHz SCS is 1600 MHz
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS is either 2000 or 2160 MHz
* Send LS to RAN4 to inform about RAN1’s agreement of maximum channel bandwidth and ask RAN4 to decide and feedback the exact value of maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS, the corresponding numbers of RBs and spectrum utilization for the maximum channel bandwidth of 480 and 960 kHz SCS

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Samsung | We are ok with FL’s proposal. One minor comment on the last part of the second bullet: the number of RB and spectrum utilization should also be defined for 120 kHz, since the 400 MHz is supported for 120 kHz in FR2.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording updated as commented. |

##### Proposal 1-1c for discussion:

* From RAN1 perspective, for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz SCS is 400 MHz
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 480 kHz SCS is 1600 MHz
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS is either 2000 or 2160 MHz
* Send LS to RAN4 to inform about RAN1’s agreement of maximum channel bandwidth and ask RAN4 to decide and feedback the exact value of maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS, the corresponding numbers of RBs and spectrum utilization for the maximum channel bandwidth of SCS supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal 1-1c.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our earlier comment is still valid but we are ok to discuss it on the GTW if it cannot be resolved by email. If companies agree with Ericsson’s comment that FFT utilization is one important technical consideration from RAN1 in the decision on the maximum channel bandwidth with 960 kHz SCS, then we may add 2400 MHz as a candidate for RAN4 consideration, in addition to 2000 MHz and 2160 MHz. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine the proposal in general.  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal 1-1c |
| Apple | We are fine with proposal 1-1c. |
| Samsung | We support proposal 1-1c.  |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | Generally okay to the proposal, but wouldn't it be more accurate to say that 2000 and 2160 are two feasible options from RAN1 perspective and RAN4 will decide which one. Otherwise it looks like RAN1 is agreeing to support both 2000 and 2160 MHz.Also, from a RAN1 perspective, all that we need to know from RAN4 is (1) what are the agreed maximum bandwidths, and (2) what is the maximum number of usable PRBs for each of those bandwidths. We don't need to ask about precise spectral utilization. That can be derived knowing (1) and (2). |
| Intel | Ok with proposal 1-1c |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording updated in proposal 1-1d to address comments. |

##### Proposal 1-1d for discussion:

* From RAN1 perspective, for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz SCS is 400 MHz
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 480 kHz SCS is 1600 MHz
	+ The maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS is one of the following options
		- 2000 MHz
		- 2160 MHz
* Send LS to RAN4 to inform about RAN1’s agreement of maximum channel bandwidth and ask RAN4 to decide and feedback the exact value of maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS, the corresponding numbers of RBs for the maximum channel bandwidth of SCS supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal, but in the LS to RAN4 I guess we want to know the number of RBs not just for 960 kHz, but also 120 and 480 kHz, right? |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | CATT We are OK for 120 kHz and 480 kHz SCS. If we would define maximum BW for 960 kHz SCS, we would prefer making decision to one value.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Charter Communications | We support the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. NOTE that RAN4 has the following under discussion: 2000 (licensed) / 2160 (unlicensed) |
| Intel | Ok with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Discussion is closed. See chairman’s notes for agreement. |

#### Minimum channel bandwidth

In [5, Huawei], it argues that a small carrier bandwidth has the benefit of maximizing the PSD when the resources are fully utilized, and is also beneficial in spectrum blocks that cannot be exactly divided by relatively large bandwidths such as 400MHz. However, setting a small minimum bandwidth may cause an inefficient implementation due to a low FFT utilization with a small number of PRBs in case of a large SCS, but also leads to a high implementation difficulty of synchronization introduced by many synchronization raster points within the large bands available in this frequency range.

[12, Intel] argues that it is quite critical for NR operating in 60 GHz to have a clear differentiating factor compared to NR operating in FR1 or FR2. It is quite difficult to imagine a UE or gNB vendor spending millions of dollars of R&D to support NR operating with 50 or 100 MHz which is better supported by existing FR1 and FR2 deployments. With the understanding of NR operating in 60 GHz should focus on even larger bandwidth that cannot be supported by existing FR1 and FR2 deployment, it proposes to support 400 MHz as the minimum channel bandwidth for all SCSs in this frequency range.

Companies’ views are summarized in the following table.

Table 2 Minimum channel/carrier BW with different numerologies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Numerology** | **Minimum channel/carrier bandwidth** |
| (120 K, NCP) | Option 1-1: 200MHz: [5, Huawei],Option 1-2: 400MHz: [12, Intel], |
| (480 K, NCP) | Option 2-1: 200MHz: [5, Huawei],Option 2-2: 400MHz: [12, Intel], |
| (960 K, NCP) | 400MHz: [5, Huawei], [12, Intel], |

Moderator’s comment:

The following proposal is formulated for discussion.

##### Proposal 1-2 for discussion:

* Choose one of the following options as the minimum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz SCS in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz
	+ Option 1-1: 200 MHz
	+ Option 1-2: 400 MHz
* Choose one of the following options as the minimum channel bandwidth for 480 kHz SCS in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz
	+ Option 2-1: 200 MHz
	+ Option 2-2: 400 MHz
* The minimum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS is 400 MHz in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments especially on their preference of the above options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | While the channelization discussion belongs to RAN4, we prefer for all SCS 120kHz, 480 kHz SCS and 960kHz a min channel BW of 400 MHz for unlicensed spectrum For the licensed spectrum should be decided in RAN4. |
| LG Electronics | We don’t have strong preference on this issue but prefer minimum channel bandwidth at least larger than 50 MHz (which is the minimum channel bandwidth for FR2 below 52.6 GHz). The exact value for the minimum channel bandwidth can be discussed in RAN4. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The minimum channel bandwidth should be decided in RAN4. We don’t have strong preference. |
| Ericsson | It it not within scope for RAN1 to decide on minimum bandwidth; this will be decided by RAN4 when bands are specified for licensed and unlicensed. The WID specifies that RAN1 will decide only on maximum bandwidth.That being said, our preferences are as follows:* 120 kHz: 100 MHz (neither Option 1-1 nor Option 1-2)
* 480 kHz: Open to both Option 2-1 and 2-2
* 960 kHz:
	+ Licensed band: Option 2-2 (400 MHz)
	+ Unlicensed band: 2160 MHz (neither Option 2-1 nor Option 2-2)

The rationale for 960 kHz was to match IEEE; hence only a single bandwidth is needed for 960 kHz in an unlicensed band.  |
| Qualcomm | We think that the bandwidth discussion should be left to RAN 4, which have already an ongoing discussion for the min/max bandwidth for the new band In addition, at least for 120kHz SCS, 100MHz minimum bandwidth should not be excluded from the discussion as it provides better coverage for the unlicensed operation and it will help in leveraging the existing implementations.  |
| DOCOMO | We support option 1-2 and 2-2. For the 3rd bullet, we prefer to consider wider minimum channel bandwidth for 960kHz SCS considering the number of available RBs and sync raster aspects especially if 960 kHz SCS is also supported for initial access case. |
| Samsung | We are in general ok with the proposal, but would like to point out the discussion also take place in parallel in RAN4. So the decision should take into RAN4’s consideration as well. Maybe we can leave as it is and send to RAN4 for final down-selection.  |
| Nokia/NSB | It’s too early to decide minimum CBW yet. We need to see the outcome from AI 8.2.1 first.RAN4 should also be involved in these discussions. |
| Apple | The initial access agenda item will influence this. However, we do not have any strong preference.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For 480 kHz SCS, we support option 2-2 (400 MHz)For 120 kHz SCS, we support option 1-1 (200 MHz)The only work needed for supporting 200 MHz CBW for 120 kHz SCS in addition to 400 MHz is the definition of the raster, which should not be complex based on the raster for 400 MHz. Not supporting 50 MHz and 100 MHz already addresses the issue of the large number of raster points. There isn’t much difference between 400 MHz and 200 MHz, but 200 MHz is an option that allows increasing the coverage, which is important to keep since we already propose not supporting 50 MHz and 100 MHz as a compromise to manage complexity. This consideration is equally applicable for licensed or unlicensed operation. |
| Intel | While we agree that RAN4 ultimately determines channel bandwidth, we strongly believe RAN1 also needs to provide RAN4 input. This is because the minimum bandwidth supported is strongly tied to CORESET#0 PRB sizes that could and should be supported, as well as SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern.If RAN4 chooses some values independently from RAN1 design, there is good chance RAN1 design may need to be revisited. Therefore, we suggest to provide to RAN4 with RAN1 input on the minimum bandwidths (and maximum bandwidths) and ask RAN4 on whether they see any issues with them.So min-max channel bandwidth should really be a join decision between RAN1 and RAN4, where RAN1 should first provide some input for RAN4 to check feasibility and confirm.Within the ranges of the supported min-max channel bandwidth, as long as RAN1 specification can support them, RAN4 can further work on the other supported bandwidths. This was how Rel-15 bandwidth discussions were done, and this should be the same for Rel-17. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | The minimum channel bandwidth is related with initial access aspect. We could discuss this when at least the numerology for initial BWP is decided. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support minimum channel bandwidth of 200MHz for 120kHz, 400MHz for both 480kHz and 960kHz SCS |
| Sony | This discussion could be left to RAN4 decision. |
| CATT | The set of channel BW for each band is determined by RAN4. The minimum channel BW would have impact on the Sync Raster design, which is determined and finalized by RAN4.  |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Several companies commented the minimum bandwidth decision is not in RAN1 scope. While some companies think RAN1 input to RAN4 is necessary regarding the impact of minimum bandwidth to RAN1 specification. With that, the following proposal is formulated focusing on options of minimum bandwidth and their potential impact to RAN1 design and specification. |

##### Proposal 1-2a for discussion:

From RAN1 perspective, for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, the following options on minimum channel bandwidth are identified. Further study their implications on RAN1 design and specification.

* for 120 kHz SCS
	+ Option 1-0: 100 MHz
	+ Option 1-1: 200 MHz
	+ Option 1-2: 400 MHz
* for 480 kHz SCS
	+ Option 2-1: 200 MHz
	+ Option 2-2: 400 MHz
* for 960 kHz SCS
	+ Option 3-1: 400 MHz
	+ Option 3-2: 2160 MHz

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | Ultimately, the decision on minimum bandwidth is for RAN4, and RAN4 may decide on different values depending on if it is a licensed band or an unlicensed band. The WID clearly says that RAN1 should decide on the maximum bandwidth only. However, we understand that there is RAN1 impact, which means we need some feedback from RAN4 as soon as possible. Rather than leaving all of the above options as FFS for RAN1 to discuss, it is better to include the above list of options in the same LS to RAN4 on the maximum bandwidth. In the LS we can simply say, RAN1 has discussed the above options for minimum bandwidth, and would appreciate feedback from RAN4 in a timely manner. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with Ericsson, the minimum channel bandwidth is a RAN4 issue. It is better to investigate the RAN1 impact after RAN4 makes a decision. |
| LG Electronics | We don’t have strong view on the minimum channel bandwidth, but at least Option 3-2 is somehow strange, since the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS is proposed to be approximate 2000 to 2160 MHz in Proposal 1-1a but Option 3-2 here can be larger than that. |
| DOCOMO | We agree this discussion could be held after the progress of AI 8.2.1. Also, we still think it may be beneficial to have aligned number of available RBs across SCSs. Therefore, for further study, we would like to add Option 3-3: 800 MHz for 960 kHz SCS.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We share view with Ericsson. Additionally, the LS should cover connections to the initial access design (AI 8.2.1) |
| CATT | We believe the discussion and decision of minimum channel BW should be in RAN4. For 120 kHz SCS, the minimum channel BW is 50 MHz in Rel-15. We don’t see the motivation to change it.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are okay with the proposal, although we don’t support option 3-2 for 960kHz SCS. And agree with LG’s comment to align this proposal with proposal 1-1a and update option 3-2 as possibly:Option 3-2: 2000MHz to 2160 MHz (exact value to be defined by RAN4) |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We also think that it’s better to send an LS to RAN4 about the options above for them to decide on the exact value of minimum channel bandwidth. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Ericsson proposal  |
| Intel | We are supportive of having 400 MHz as minimum channel BW for at least 120 and 480 kHz. We are also ok with 400 MHz minimum channel BW for 960 kHz, but also ok to consider something bit larger, e.g. 800 MHz, if needed.As for our motivation for the minimum 400 MHz. We strongly believe NR operating in 52.6 ~ 71 GHz should have a clear advantage in terms of supported throughput and also have a clear distinction compared to FR1 and FR2. Supporting smaller minimum channel BW such as 100MHz can be clearly done in FR1 and FR2, and 200 MHz should be something that could be easily considered for FR2, and be met with 2 or 3 CC carrier aggregation in FR1 unlicensed band.In terms of power efficiency, range, clearly spectrum in 52 ~ 71 GHz is at disadvantage compared to FR1 and FR2 operation. Therefore, in order to provide a clear market segmentation that will be difficult to reproduce using FR1 and FR2, the minimum bandwidth should be much higher.We also believe potential co-existence with other RAT technologies could be impacts from supporting the smaller channel BWs. We know that 802.11ad/11ay technologies work with minimum channel BW of 2.16GHz. NR operating with narrow 100 MHz would be far more impactful compared to NR operating 400MHz. Therefore, we should strive to support the largest minimum channel BW possible. Because 120 kHz is mandatory SCS to support, 400 MHz is the largest that could be supported.  |
| InterDigital | We are fine to ask RAN4 on minimum bandwidth issue.  |
| Apple | Discussion should be held after AI 8.2.1. The list for may change given the #RBs for initial access. However, methodology of recommendations to RAN4 is fine with us. Ericsson’s proposal of including it in the same LS makes sense but may delay the communication of the information to RAN4 as we need to wait for AI 8.2.1. |
| Futurewei | We prefer to ask RAN4 for minimum channel bandwidth.  |
| Samsung | In general, we are OK with the proposal itself, but wonder how to precede with the down-selection in future meetings, especially whether some coordination with RAN4 is needed to nail down the final number. Some notes from FL regarding this aspect may be helpful.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the proposal from Ericsson to ask the question in the same LS as for the maximum channel bandwidth. But we also think that the minimum channel bandwidth is not only a RAN4 consideration since there are global impacts on the network performance in particular for coverage. This is why we support 200 MHz minimum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz SCS and not 400 MHz. But we can of course have that discussion in RAN4 to consider RAN4 aspects as well.We agree with LG on the inconsistency between proposal 1-1a and proposal 1-2a for 960 kHz SCS. So it would be better to discuss those two proposals jointly.  |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Proposal revised to address comments. |

##### Proposal 1-2b for discussion:

* From RAN1 perspective, for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, the following options on minimum channel bandwidth are identified.
	+ for 120 kHz SCS
		- Option 1-0: 50 MHz
		- Option 1-1: 100 MHz
		- Option 1-2: 200 MHz
		- Option 1-3: 400 MHz
	+ for 480 kHz SCS
		- Option 2-1: 200 MHz
		- Option 2-2: 400 MHz
	+ for 960 kHz SCS
		- Option 3-1: 400 MHz
		- Option 3-2: 800 MHz
		- Option 3-3: same value as the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS
* Further study in RAN1 the above options’ implications on RAN1 design and specification
* Send LS to RAN4 to inform about RAN1’s identified options of minimum channel bandwidth and ask RAN4 to decide and feedback the minimum channel bandwidth

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Samsung | We don’t support to list 50 MHz as minimum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz. Based on the decision that 120 kHz SSB is already agreed to be supported for initial access, enlarging the minimum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz from FR2 is beneficial for reducing UE complexity, and we believe this is the focus of this discussion in RAN1’s. Adding 50 MHz as one option, then basically we didn’t have any progress at all.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We also don’t support option 1-0: 50MHz for 120 kHz SCS and agree with Samsung. For other options, we are fine. |
| Qualcomm  | We agree with Samsung and Lenovo, Option 1-0 is not needed  |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Samsung. We don’t support Option 1-0. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Proposal revised to address comments. |

##### Proposal 1-2c for discussion:

* From RAN1 perspective, for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, the following options on minimum channel bandwidth are identified.
	+ for 120 kHz SCS
		- Option 1-1: 100 MHz
		- Option 1-2: 200 MHz
		- Option 1-3: 400 MHz
	+ for 480 kHz SCS
		- Option 2-1: 200 MHz
		- Option 2-2: 400 MHz
	+ for 960 kHz SCS
		- Option 3-1: 400 MHz
		- Option 3-2: 800 MHz
		- Option 3-3: same value as the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS
* Further study in RAN1 the above options’ implications on RAN1 design and specification
* Send LS to RAN4 to inform about RAN1’s identified options of minimum channel bandwidth and ask RAN4 to decide and feedback the minimum channel bandwidth

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with continuing the discussion on the options in the 1st bullet above. If we down-select now, our view is to support Option 1-3, 2-2 and 3-2. For 120 kHz SCS, we do not see the motivation to support smaller bandwidth like 100 MHz. For 960 kHz SCS, we prefer to keep the available number of RBs as 480 kHz SCS case.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with proposal 1-2c. We would not insist on 100 MHz as the minimum channel bandwidth with 120 kHz SCS, so we would be ok also removing option 1-1 for 120 kHz SCS. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think that connection to initial access AI (AI 8.2.1) should be mentioned as well since the minimum BW impacts there. For example, the smallest minimum BW options with 480/960 kHz SCS* Can only support CORESET#0 sizes up-to 24 PRBs; and
* Cannot support FDM btw SSB and CORESET#0/PDSCH (RMSI).
 |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with these options and open to further discuss. |
| Apple | We are fine with proposal 1-2c |
| Samsung | We support Proposal 1-2c. Regarding the contend of the LS, it’s suggested to ask the response from RAN4 at their earliest convenience, since this topic has huge impact to RAN1 discussion and should be prioritized at their side.  |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal  |
| Ericsson | Since RAN4 will ultimately decide minimum bandwidth, it is fine to provide a list of options that RAN1 is discussing.In the LS to RAN4, it would be important for the feedback to include whether the min/max bandwidths are the same for licensed and unlicensed, or if there are any differences. |
| Intel | Generally ok with the proposal. Not sure if we need to send LS to RAN4 with the options, but if companies believe it will be useful we will not object.Additionally, in order to make further progress, our suggestion is to remove 1-1:100MHz from the candidate. We do not believe this to be viable candidate given the use cases for 60GHz and significant overlap with existing FR1 and FR2 if 100MHz were to be supported. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. However, given that the minimum BW discussion may impact the discussion of SSB SCS for initial access (too small BW may not support large SCS SSB) we would prefer to have the reply from RAN4 as soon as possible. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | The set of channel BW for each band is determined by RAN4. Our understanding is that the discussion and decision of minimum channel BW should be in RAN4. For 120 kHz SCS, the minimum channel BW is 50 MHz in Rel-15. We don’t see the motivation to change it.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. But, it should be drafted together with any agreement or discussion from AI 8.2.1 initial access . |
| Charter Communications | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Note that RAN4 has 50 MHz, 100 MHz and 400 MHz under discussion.  |
| Moderator | Discussion is closed. See chairman’s notes for agreement. |

#### Channelization

There’re several issues discussed in terms of channelization.

Two sources ([15, InterDigital], [24, Apple]) propose to support multiples of 400 MHz as the carrier bandwidths up to the maximum carrier bandwidth for each SCS.

Companies have diverse views regarding whether to support of channelization that are aligned with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization for coexistence. Recall that alignment of channelization between a NR channel and IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channel in this context refers to a NR channel that is contained within one of the channels defined for IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay and NR channel bandwidth does not cross over channel boundaries of IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay. One source ([3, ZTE]) observes that aligned and misaligned channelization show similar performance in coexistence scenario and proposed no need to align with IEEE 802.11ad/ay. Some other sources ([16, Sony], [17, LG], [23, Charter], [24, Apple]) think it’s beneficial to align NR channelization with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization for coexistence.

Moderator’s comment:

Detailed specification on channelization is in the scope of RAN4. Suggest to discuss the principle of channelization with more RAN1 focus. The following proposal is formulated for discussion.

##### Proposal 1-3 for discussion:

* Support multiples of the minimum channel bandwidth as the channel bandwidths up to the maximum channel bandwidth for each SCS in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz

Companies are encouraged to provide comments and/or suggestions on channelization if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| LG Electronics | In principle, we are supportive of Moderator’s proposal, but this issue also falls into the category that requires coordination with RAN4. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support moderator’s proposal from RAN1 perspective. |
| Ericsson | We do not support the proposal for 2 reasons:* Channelization design is RAN4 responsibility
* This proposal is not compatible with 2160 MHz as the maximum channel bandwidth
 |
| Qualcomm | RAN 4 should discuss and decide the bandwidth not limited to the choice between multiple of the minimum channel bandwidth  |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal.  |
| Samsung | Again, we are ok with the proposal, although this is more like a RAN4 issue.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Channel BW options for the cases with and without CA are in the scope of RAN4. No need for further discussions in RAN1.  |
| Apple | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This proposal seems conditioned on the minimum channel bandwidth being 400 MHz for all supported values of SCS, which is not yet agreed, and for which we have a different proposal (support 200 MHz for 120 kHz SCS). But we agree that all supported channel bandwidths above 400 MHz should only be multiples of 400 (including the maximum channel bandwidth with 960 kHz SCS, i.e. 2000 MHz) |
| Intel | While we don’t have anything specific against the moderator’s proposal. We think RAN1 should focus on channelization aspects that may impact RAN1 design. For example, whether RAN1 believes there is a need to support overlapping channels of the same channel bandwidth. In Rel-16 NR-U, the 5GHz bands did not support many of these overlapping channels, and this allowed RAN1 to work with very few values of SSB to CORESET#0 frequency offset values.It would be good to provide RAN4 with various aspects on channelization that would impact RAN1 design, and if needed provide some guidelines so that RAN4 can takes those into consideration.The moderator’s suggestion might be a good starting point, but we believe there are further discussions to be made here. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal |
| Sony | This discussion could be left to RAN4 decision. |
| Charter | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal since RAN4 would decide the set of channel BW for each band (licensed or unlicensed) for UE to support.  |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Again, several companies commented channelization decision is not in RAN1 scope. While some companies think RAN1 study on the potential impact to RAN1 design is helpful. With that, the following proposal is formulated focusing on issue of channelization and potential impact to RAN1 design. |
|  |  |

##### Proposal 1-3a for discussion:

Further study the impact of at least the following issues of channelization on RAN1 design for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

* multiples of a channel bandwidth unit (e.g., the minimum channel bandwidth for a SCS) as the channel bandwidths
* whether to support overlapping channels of the same channel bandwidth

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | Unlike Rel-16 NR-U, it is fundamentally required that the channel and sync rasters are defined to allow flexible placement of channels (similar to the functionality existing in Rel-15), and this can mean that channels of the same bandwidth overlap (even if not deployed concurrently). Three examples of why such flexibility as needed are as follows:* Licensed IMT portion of the band (57 – 61 GHz)
	+ Flexible channel placement is needed based on the channels that a particular operator may be allocated, and these will certainly not be restricted to the IEEE channel grid.
* Unlicensed allocations in various regions of the world:
	+ To maximize spectrum usage, the channel and sync rasters should be flexible enough to maximize the number of large bandwidth channels (e.g., 1600 MHz) that can fit within the regional allocation, which will lead to misalignment with the IEEE channelization. If it is desired to have flexibility to align with IEEE in some deployments, then the channel/sync rasters need to be flexibly defined to allow either deployment. Clearly, channels of the same bandwidth can overlap (even if not deployed concurrently).
* LBT vs. no LBT operation
	+ As already agreed, both modes are supported, and whether or not to use LBT depends on the region and deployment scenario. In a no LBT scenario, there is no reason to constrain 3GPP channelization from achieving maximum utilization of the available spectrum, e.g., by strictly aligning with IEEE channelization. In LBT channel access mode, the deployment can decide to use an aligned channelization instead of unaligned channelization. Again, channel and sync raster flexibility is needed.

We suggest that RAN1 includes a statement in an LS to RAN4 that it is RAN1 understanding that RAN4 will design flexible channel and sync rasters for supporting  both licensed and unlicensed operation (with and without LBT), and that the flexible design will enable both alignment and misalignment with the IEEE 802.11ad/ay channelization grid depending on the deployment scenario. RAN1 requests feedback from RAN4 on the design, since it has impact on the initial access design, e.g., in terms of CORESET0 bandwidths, needed SSB-CORESET0 offsets, etc. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the updated proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the Proposal 1-3a.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Channel BW options for the cases with and without CA are in the scope of RAN4. No need for further discussions in RAN1.  |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | It’s RAN4’s responsibility to design channelization for licensed band and unlicensed band. From RAN1’s perspective, we can provide information to RAN4 like “Aligned and misaligned channelization shows similar performance” for them to consider. |
| Qualcomm  | We think that this is should be left to RAN4 to discuss and decide without limitations |
| Intel | Ok with moderator’s proposal 1-3a. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with either proposal 1-3a or sending LS to RAN4.  |
| Apple | This should be left to RAN4. We may recommend a mode of operation that allows for alignment.  |
| Futurewei | We are OK with P#1-3a provided that this proposal will be validated by RAN4. Duplicate discussions of the subject in other B52 threads should be avoided. |
| Samsung | We are in general OK with FL’s proposal. For the second bullet (new bullet), it could be possible to support both overlapping or non-overlapping channels, depending on licensed or unlicensed operation. The decision of such channelization was always in RAN4, and if RAN1 only plans to focus on the impact from such decision, an early LS seems necessary to ask for RAN4’s opinion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is not clear what the second bullet means. What is the goal of overlapping the bandwidths of two carriers? If the goal is to support irregular channel bandwidths, then we should leave that discussion to RAN4 since there is a RAN4 study item precisely on that topic. But if the intention is only related to how the channel rasters will be defined, without implying that overlapped carriers would be deployed concurrently, then this is not a matter for RAN1 to discuss. We do not see the need to ask the questions that Ericsson listed to RAN4. RAN4 can consider these aspects on their own and will inform RAN1 of their design on channel raster and sync raster, as usual. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Several companies commented channelization decision is not in RAN1 scope and no need to further study/discuss in RAN1 at all.On the suggested LS to RAN4, formulated the following. |

##### Proposal 1-3b for discussion:

Send LS to RAN4 to requests feedback on their channelization decision.

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Samsung | In general, we are ok with the proposal, and the details of the LS could be discussed late. We believe the key information in the LS is to ask RAN4 tries to prioritize this work and provide feedback at their earliest convenience, since it impacts the progress of RAN1 work. Simply asking for decision on channelization doesn’t help much since anyway this is part of the work RAN4 has to do.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree to send LS to RAN4 and we expect that we have a consolidated details under one LS to RAN4 |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal  |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal 1-3b.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are ok discussing some text on channelization in the LS to RAN4 including the requests from RAN1 on minimum and maximum channel bandwidths, when the LS is being drafted. There seems to be no need to have a separate agreement as in proposal 1-3b, but rather see some text proposal for the part of the LS on channelization from the proponents. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree in principle. However, not sure how much this add value on top of the WID formulation:Specify new band(s) for the frequency range from 52.6GHz-71GHz [RAN4]:Core specifications for UE, gNB and RRM requirements  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | To clarify, RAN1 will not ask specific questions on any of the issues raised in the discussion or on what we need from them on channelization ? |
| Ericsson | We think it is okay to include a statement about channelization in the LS, but we think it should say more than what is in Proposal 1-3b above. From a RAN1 perspective, it is important to know that the sync and channel raster design is flexible enough to support channels that are either not aligned with IEEE (when LBT is not used, or licensed spectrum is used) or aligned with IEEE (if needed when LBT is used). This has RAN1 impact since it affects initial access design. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | While we do not object in sending LS to RAN4 to obtain information. The question posed in proposal 1-3b is too broad and something that all companies can check RAN4 progress internally. So not sure if 1-3b is the best question to ask.We would prefer if the questions are bit more focused to address issues needed for RAN1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal  |
| Futurewei | We are OK in principle to send such LS. However, we would like to see the draft text of the LS, to understand what RAN1 asks from RAN4. Will the RAN4 response to the channelization question implicitly answer the questions of minimum/maximum channel BW and LBT channel BW? |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| vivo | We support the proposal |
| Moderator | Discussion is closed. As we already agreed to send the LS to RAN4 on the maximum/minimum bandwidth, the contents of the LS could be discussed separately including aspects on channelization. |

#### Other issue(s)

In light of the above discussion on a potential LS to RAN4 regarding RAN1’s agreement/discussion on the maximum channel bandwidth and minimum channel bandwidth options, as well as request to RAN4’s feedback on channelization, the following draft text below is for discussion.

##### Proposal 1-4 (draft LS text to RAN4 on bandwidth/channelization) for discussion:

RAN1 would like to inform RAN4 about RAN1’s agreement on the maximum channel bandwidth for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

[Placeholder for pending RAN1’s agreement on maximum channel bandwidth]

It is RAN1’s understanding that RAN4 will decide the exact value of maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS. RAN1 would like to kindly requests feedback from RAN4 on their decision of the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS and the corresponding number of RBs for the maximum channel bandwidth of each SCS supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

RAN1 has also discussed and identified the following options of the minimum channel bandwidth for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

[Placeholder for pending RAN1’s agreement on minimum channel bandwidth options]

It is RAN1’s understanding that RAN4 will decide the minimum channel bandwidth of each SCS supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. RAN1 would like to kindly requests timely feedback from RAN4 on their decision of the minimum channel bandwidth for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

Additionally, in RAN1’s understanding, RAN4 will decide channelization aspects (including but not limited to channel and sync rasters to support both licensed and unlicensed operation, whether to align and/or not with the IEEE 802.11ad/ay channelization, whether to support the same maximum and/or minimum channel bandwidth for licensed and unlicensed operation) for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. RAN1 would like to kindly requests timely feedback from RAN4 on their decision of channelization.

Note that minimum channel bandwidth and channelization may have impact to RAN1 design and specification and therefore RAN1 would benefit from obtaining RAN4’s decision as early as possible.

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine the LS and just find some editorial updates below:It is RAN1’s understanding that RAN4 will decide the exact value of maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS. RAN1 would like to kindly request~~s~~ feedback from RAN4 on their decision of the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS and the corresponding number of RBs for the maximum channel bandwidth ~~of~~ for each SCS supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.[Placeholder for pending RAN1’s agreement on minimum channel bandwidth options]It is RAN1’s understanding that RAN4 will decide the minimum channel bandwidth ~~of~~ for each SCS supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. RAN1 would like to kindly request~~s~~ timely feedback from RAN4 on their decision of the minimum channel bandwidth for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.  |
| vivo | We support the LS and the editorial updates from Lenovo/Moto |
| LG Electronics | We support the LS in proposal 1-4 and the updates from Lenovo. |
| Ericsson | Regarding channelization, we think that the issue is not whether or not the RAN4 channelization design is aligned with IEEE but, rather *flexibility* to align/not align depending on deployment. A deployment in a licensed band or in an unlicensed band without LBT obviously does not require alignment. Hence, we prefer the following update:Additionally, in RAN1’s understanding, RAN4 will decide channelization aspects (including but not limited to channel and sync rasters to support both licensed and unlicensed operation, ~~whether~~ flexibility to align ~~and/~~or not align with the IEEE 802.11ad/ay channelization depending on deployment, whether to support the same maximum and/or minimum channel bandwidth for licensed and unlicensed operation) for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. RAN1 would like to kindly requests timely feedback from RAN4 on their decision of channelization.  |
| Apple | * Thank you for the LS. A few editorial changes:

It is RAN1’s understanding that RAN4 will decide the exact value of the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS. RAN1 would like to kindly request~~s~~ feedback from RAN4 on their decision of the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS and the corresponding number of RBs for the maximum channel bandwidth of each SCS supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.It is RAN1’s understanding that RAN4 will decide the minimum channel bandwidth of each SCS supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. RAN1 would like to kindly request~~s~~ timely feedback from RAN4 on their decision of the minimum channel bandwidth for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. * One additional element in the channelization aspects.

Additionally, in RAN1’s understanding, RAN4 will decide channelization aspects (including but not limited to channel and sync rasters to support both licensed and unlicensed operation, whether to align and/or not with the IEEE 802.11ad/ay channelization, whether to support the same maximum and/or minimum channel bandwidth for licensed and unlicensed operation, and whether to allow intermediate channel bandwidths between the maximum and minimum bandwidths identified) for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. RAN1 would like to kindly requests timely feedback from RAN4 on their decision of channelization.  |
| Moderator | As we already agreed to send an LS to RAN4 on the maximum/minimum bandwidth, the contents of the LS could be discussed separately including aspects on channelization.To facilitate the discussion and revision tracking on the content of the draft LS, a separate draft LS is uploaded to the sub-folder of 8.2.5/[104-e-NR-52-71GHz-05]/draft-LS. Please make comments and revision over there. |

## 2.2. Timeline

### Individual observations/proposals

The following are individual observations and proposals from the contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sources | Observations/proposals |
| [1, Futurewei] | Proposal 1: The new values for the *beamSwitchTiming* corresponding to SCS {480kHz and 960 kHz} use ENUMERATED {sym14, sym28, sym48, sym224, sym336} as starting point. Proposal 2: Consider using exponential models for selected delays and timeline values as baseline for the discussions of timeline changes corresponding to SCS 480kHz and 960kHz. |
| [2, Lenovo] | Proposal 4: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, following enhancements should be supported to efficiently utilize UE’s limited processing capability to reduce latency and efficiently handle processing/preparation of CSI reports associated with multiple numerologies in parallel:- Same reference symbols duration (possibly the shortest duration corresponding to maximum supported SCS value) could be used for checking CPU availability corresponding to different CSI reports associated with different SCS values |
| [3, ZTE] | Proposal 8: For high frequency, a new UE capability for timeline related aspects should be defined based on slot (or symbol)-group granularity.Proposal 9: Consider the phase noise estimation and compensation time on timeline design when PTRS is configured.Proposal 10: How to interpret k0, k1 and k2 for PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling and HARQ feedback timing indication should be discussed. |
| [5, Huawei] | Proposal 4: The absolute timelines of existing Rel-15/16 features should not be further reduced than those for 120 kHz SCS. The timeline of potential Rel-17 enhancement should be analyzed case by case as per the SCS.Proposal 6: For multi-slot PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI for 480 kHz and 960 kHz:• k0 indicates the gap between the slot of the scheduling DCI and the first slot of the multi-slot PDSCH scheduled by the DCI• k1 indicates the gap between the last slot of the multi-slot PDSCH and the slot carrying the HARQ information feedback corresponding to the multi-slot PDSCHObservation 1: The ranges of k0 and k1 defined in FR2 are not suitable for multi-PDSCH scheduling if the unit of k0 and k1 is one slot of the scheduled SCS, when the scheduled SCS is 480 kHz or 960 kHz SCS.Proposal 7: The unit of k0 and k1 should be defined as multiple slots for multi-PDSCH scheduling for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.Proposal 8: The multi-PUSCH scheduling defined in NR-U Rel-16 can be directly extended to 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. K2 indicates the gap between the slot of the scheduling DCI and the first slot of the multi-slot scheduled PUSCH corresponding to the DCI; The unit of k2 should be defined as multiple slots for multi-PUSCH scheduling for 480 kHz and 960 kHz. |
| [6, Nokia] | Proposal 6: Consider PDSCH processing time and PUSCH preparation time in such that the following scenario can be fulfilled:• contiguous DL/UL transmission • up-to 16 HARQ processes• multi-slot scheduling with 0.125ms scheduling unit size.Proposal 7: NR to support CSI computation delay parameter for SCS of 480kHz and 960kHz. Observation 11: Rel-15/16 schemes for CPU can be reused for 480kHz and/or 960kHz SCS.  |
| [7, CAICT] | Proposal 2: For 480 and 960kHz SCS, processing time line should be based on slot level and multiple slots level processing time line could also be considered. |
| [8, CATT] | Proposal 2: The UE processing time N1/N2 with 480KHz/960KHz SCS could not be determined before the maximum system bandwidth supported is finalized. Proposal 3: Since the maximum system bandwidth expects to increase from 400 MHz, the UE the ranges of k0, k1, k2 values could be finalized before the supported maximum system is determined for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.  |
| [9, vivo] | Proposal 8: The default set of PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator should be adapted to the SCS of PDSCH.Proposal 9: The basic time unit should be re-defined for 960KHz when operation from 52.6-71GHz and its spec impact should be studied. |
| [15, InterDigital] | Proposal 7: Evaluate required UE processing time for higher frequencies considering the differences on antenna/panel structure, narrower beamwidth, BWP size and new subcarrier spacings.Observation 9: Existing processing time determination methods are based on worst case scenarios and may require more redundant processing time for higher frequencies. Proposal 8: Study application of different processing time requirements based on parameters which contribute UE processing time. |
| [17, LG] | Proposal #9: Consider additional UE PDSCH processing procedure time (i.e., N1 symbols) when UE is required to perform both of CPE and ICI compensation, e.g., for 120 kHz SCS and 64 QAM.Proposal #10: Consider CSI processing timeline enhancements for better availability for CPUs for multiple CSI reports associated with different numerologies.  |
| [19, Xiaomi] | Proposal 1: UE processing capability for PDSCH/PUSCH should be defined for SCS 480/960kHz to allow 1 TB of PDSCH/PUSCH per several slots.Proposal 2: For PUSCH scheduled by RAR or by the fallback RAR, Δ value should also be considered for new SCS 480/960kHz.Proposal 3: Specify different default K1 value sets for different SCS, and each K1 set with a maximum number of 8 values to keep the K1 bit field in DCI 1-0 unchanged.Proposal 4: Configure different K1 value sets for different SCS, and each K1 set with a maximum number of 8 values to keep the K1 bit field in DCI 1-1/DCI 1-2 unchanged.Proposal 5: Impacts on PDSCH/PUSCH processing time (N1/N2) may need be considered if defining maximum number of BDs/CCEs for multi-slot span PDCCH monitoring. |
| [20, Samsung] | Proposal 2: RAN1 shall determine proper processing timing values for 480 and 960 KHz with the consideration of reasonable UE complexity, potential latency and impact of signal/channel/physical layer procedures.Proposal 3: Processing time for procedures based on PDCCH reception should take into account the extra complexity/time for a UE when PDCCH Monitoring enhancement methods discussed in 8.2.3 A.I. (eg. Multi-slot span PDCCH monitoring) is configured.Proposal 4: Support SCS-specific K1/K2 by reusing existing default/configured K1/K2 plus a SCS specific offset. |
| [21, Ericsson] | Observation 1 UE PDSCH/PUSCH processing timelines for SCS > 120 kHz need to be further tightened compared to those for 120 kHz SCS to enable high performance NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz. Proposal 1 RAN1 should strive to narrow down the range of UE processing latencies early in the WI phase, particularly those related PDSCH/PUSCH processing (N1, N2, N3), to enable multi-PDSCH/PUSCH design to proceed. |
| [24, Apple] | Proposal 4: Modify the UE processing timelines to account for the 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs. These should be discussed individually. Proposal 5: RAN1 should prioritize the discussion of the critical processing timelines in order of (a) parameter independence (b) priority and (c) sub-agenda item dependence. Proposal 6: investigate the need for enhancements and standardization, of the following processing timelines:• Default PUSCH time Domain resource allocation for normal CP• UE PDSCH reception preparation time with cross carrier scheduling with different subcarrier spacings for PDCCH and PDSCH• SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH, PRACH cancellation with dynamic SFI• ZP CSI Resource set activation/deactivation• Beam Switch Timing for periodic CSI-RS + aperiodic CSI-RS• Beam switch timing for aperiodic CSI-RS• Aperiodic CSI-RS timing offset • Application delay of the minimum scheduling offset restriction• SRS triggering after DCI reception |
| [25, Qualcomm] | Proposal 10: For HARQ timing indication K1, uses the last PDSCH granted in the multi-PDSCH grant as reference slot. |
| [26, NTT DoCoMo] | Proposal 2: For existing parameters related to timeline as below, whether/how to define new values for 480/960 kHz SCS should be discussed.* Value of N1/N2/N3/Z1/Z2/Z3/d parameters shall be defined for new SCSs for supported UE capability(-ies).
	+ Whether to define new timeline values for new SCSs for UE capability #1 and/or UE capability #2, or to introduce new UE capability for new SCSs
* For beam related timeline parameters, value of “*timeDurationForQCL*”, “*beamSwitchTiming*/*beamSwitchTiming-r16*”, “*beamReportTiming*”, “minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching” for new SCSs for supported UE capability(-ies) should be defined.
* Whether/how to consider beam switching gap (i.e., time duration needed to change the beam) should be discussed.
* FFS whether to introduce a larger time gap to apply new beam configuration after receiving BFR response from gNB
* For DRX switching, BWP switching, search space group switching, define values for new SCSs for supported UE capability(-ies).
* For K0/K1/K2 set, consider proper K0/K1/K2 set configuration and define default values for new SCSs.
 |

### Summary on timeline

The following time line related aspects are captured in the TR based on the outcome of SI.

It was identified that support of the new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, will at least require investigation on the need for enhancements and standardization, of the following processing timelines:

- processing capability for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant,

- dynamic SFI and SPS/CG cancellation timing,

- timeline for HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH release/dormancy,

- minimum time gap for wake-up and Scell dormancy indication (DCI format 2\_6),

- BWP switch delay,

- multi-beam operation timing (timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, beam switch gap, beamReportTiming, etc.),

- timeline for multiplexing multiple UCI types,

- minimum of P\_switch for search space set group switching,

- appropriate configuration(s) of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH),

- PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2), HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3),

- CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units,

- any potential enhancements to CPU occupation calculation,

- related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines,

- minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching.

Most of proposals in the contributions for this agenda are high level (i.e., talking about the principles of determining timeline rather than proposals on detailed values of some particular parameter).

#### Timeline unit/granularity

Multiple contributions ([3, ZTE], [7, CAICT], [19, Xiaomi]) proposed to define a new UE capability for timeline related aspects based on slot (or symbol)-group (multiple slot/symbol) granularity. [5, Huawei] also proposed that the unit for k0 and k1should be multi-slots for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

Moderator’s comment:

The UE capability of processing timeline defined may need to consider both slot and multi-slot scheduling. Whether to define a new UE capability timeline unit is for discussion. The following proposal is formulated.

##### Proposal 2-1 for discussion:

* A new UE capability for processing timeline is defined whose unit is multi-slot or multi-symbol for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
	+ FFS for which timeline(s)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| LG Electronics | In principle, we support Moderator’s proposal. But, whether multi-slot (or multi-symbol) based timeline definition is needed or not should be discussed on a case-by-case basis. |
| Xiaomi | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm | The new capability for processing timeline should be discussed not limited to the choice of the units to be multi-slot or multi-symbol |
| DCM | We can understand the motivation for the unit of some parameters (e.g. K0, K1, K2) to based on multi-slot. But why to introduce the new UE capability is not clear. Is granularity difference the only difference between the new UE capability and existing UE capability #1/2? In our view, complementing current UE capability#1/2, i.e. defining values for newly introduced SCSs based on existing UE capability #1/2 is enough for most parameters, e.g. N1/N1/N3/N/Z1/Z2/Z3. |
| Samsung | We are wondering why this should be a new UE capability for processing timeline? If this capability is intended for addressed the impacts of multiple slot scheduling, shouldn’t we just modified the timeline by considering the impacts of “multiple slot scheduling”? Also, we believe it is too early to call whether to define the timeline unit in in multi-slot or multi-symbol. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think that a better approach is to define PDSCH/PUSCH processing times in a way that they apply to both single slot and multi-slot scheduling. We also think that no UE capabilities related are needed – all Ues supporting SCS>120 kHz should support both slot based and multi-slot -based operation |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal but think that it is necessary to address this issue for each processing timeline individually. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The proposal seems ok but it might not be so useful for progress. Perhaps a list of observations of use cases (which timelines/parameters) and benefits for each of the approaches (multi-slot vs. multi-symbol) would be more useful to discuss. |
| Intel | Conceptually, we understand the proposal and we are generally ok with the suggestion. However, similar to LG Electronics’s comments, we may need to clarify further what it means to consider multi-slot or multi-symbol. |
| InterDigital | As mentioned by LGE and Intel, the proposal needs further clarification. We prefer to discuss the details with the parameter to be applied to see a whole picture.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, we are not sure about the benefits of defining such new UE capability. But, we are open to further discuss this. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with moderator’s proposal. |
| Sony | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| CATT | We don’t support the proposal. The processing timeline is specified to allow the same slot scheduling, which PDSCH is transmitted as the same slot of scheduling DCI received. gNB scheduler could decide the TDRA at any slot. If we define the multi-slot UE processing timeline, it will restrict the scheduling flexibility and the principle of processing time in K0, K1, K2 would also be impacted. The proposal would have impact to the HARQ operation, which will impact the UE buffer design.  |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Companies have different views on whether to define a new UE capability with only granularity difference. Some companies think other aspects not limited to time unit of timeline should be discussed. However, no details or proposals on what other aspects were made.The following proposal is formulated. |

##### Proposal 2-1a for discussion:

Further study at least the following aspects of timelines to support both single slot and multi-slot scheduling for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

* Time unit and applicability to selected timelines
* Potential impact on UE capability

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Spreadtrum | We support the updated proposal. |
| DCM | We are generally fine to further study on time unit of timeline related parameters as well as its applicability, value range, etc. to support both single-slot and multi-slot scheduling.It may be possible to clarify that further study on time unit includes possible change of time unit itself and possible change of value range with existing time unit. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think that it’s more important to discuss what are the numerical values (e.g. in microseconds) for different processing timelines and different SCSs .How to illustrate the numerical values in the specifications (e.g. by means of symbols or slots) can be discussed/decided when the numerical values have been agreed. The same holds for the UE capabilities. |
| CATT | We don’t support the proposal of multi-slot scheduling.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm  | We are fine with the updated proposal  |
| Intel | Ok with moderator’s proposal 2-1a. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Apple | We are fine with the new proposal |
| Futurewei | We are OK with proposal. For completion a first bullet should be added:“Identify selected timelines relevant for the support of single/multi slot scheduling for NR” |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine to take this proposal as a conclusion to guide the next steps of the discussion, if we cannot do better at this meeting. |
|  |  |
| Modeartor | Respond to CATT’s comment:Support enhancements for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and HARQ support with a single DCI is in the scope of WID.Respond to Futurewei’s comment:During SI, a list of timelines has already been identified and captured in TR. Seems no need to have a statement on that again.Wording updated to address other comments. |

##### Proposal 2-1b for discussion:

Further study at least the following aspects of timelines to support both single slot and multi-slot scheduling for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

* Time unit and applicability to selected timelines
* Value and/or range of value
* Potential impact on UE capability

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We are fine the proposal  |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with proposal 2-1b |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal/  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal, except to align with the discussion in Seonwook’s sub-agenda item, it should say “…both single PDSCH/PUSCH and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling … |
| Intel | Ok with proposal 2-1b |
|  |  |
| Modeartor | Wording updated in proposal 2-1c below to address comments. |

##### Proposal 2-1c for discussion:

Further study at least the following aspects of timelines to support both single PDSCH/PUSCH and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

* Time unit and applicability to selected timelines
* Value and/or range of value
* Potential impact on UE capability

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal  |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal |
| CATT | WE are OK with the proposal. The baseline assumption of UE processing timeline of PDSCH/PUSCH is based on single slot before we agree on one TB transmitting on more than one slot.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |

#### Methodology

Regarding how to derive the UE processing timeline for new SCSs, several contributions have discussed different approaches.

Both [1, Futurewei] and [21, Ericsson] adopted exponential models whose parameters are obtained based on some simple formulae fitted with the existing Rel-15 processing times. The new values for new SCSs are extrapolated using the fitted formulae. Note that those models are for selected delay and timeline values.

[5, Huawei] and [24, Apple] also looked into the existing timelines and observed that the processing timelines do not always scale proportionally with SCS. Both proposed that the timeline should be analysed case by case per SCS.

In [5, Huawei], it proposed the absolute time duration for all of the timelines should not decrease further due to the implementation complexity to support 120 kHz and one or two of {480 kHz, 960 kHz} for a same UE, especially under certain scenarios involving switching, such as BWP switching, beam switching and antenna switching. However, [6, Nokia] argued that keeping the absolute processing time the same for all SCSs would either considerably increase the amount of HARQ processes needed or reduce the data rate due to HARQ process starvation. On the same topic, [21, Ericsson] also examined the latency of new SCSs if keep the same absolute time as 120 kHz SCS processing and observed that UE PDSCH/PUSCH processing timelines for SCS > 120 kHz need to be further tightened compared to those for 120 kHz SCS to enable high performance NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.

Moderator’s comment:

The following proposal is formulated for discussion based on the above.

##### Proposal 2-2 for discussion:

* RAN1 strives to reduce the absolute time durations of UE processing timelines for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS compared to those for 120 kHz SCS for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Consider using exponential models for selected timelines as baseline for the discussions
	+ At least for N1, N2, N3
	+ FFS for other timelines
	+ FFS model parameters for each selected timeline

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | Support moderator’s proposals, with the amendment in the first bullet “if feasible” for the reduction of UE processing timelines.  |
| LG Electronics | Fine with Moderator’s proposals and Futurewei’s edition. |
| Xiaomi | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support moderator’s proposalIt is important to try to narrow down the range of processing timelines at least for N1, N2, N3 so progress can be made for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| Qualcomm  | -We do not see that the first sentence of the proposal is needed, we suggest using the absolute timeline of 120kHz SCS as an upper bound for the 480 and 960 kHz SCSs- We think that a simple projection (e.g., based on log-linear regression) could be the starting point. Since it is a complicated matter involving lots of implementation and performance aspects, further studies should be conducted before making a conclusion.  |
| DCM | For the first proposal, we think it may be RAN4 perspective, but we are fine with striving to reduce reduce the absolute time durations of UE processing timelines for 480/960k SCS compared to 120k SCS for 52.6 – 71 GHz. For the second proposal, we are fine to discuss the exponential models. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the first bullet. For the second bullet, “exponential models” is unclear. Essentially the values in the tables are highly related to the implementation, so we don’t think a clear “model” can fit all the cases. A case by case study with input from corresponding vendors may be more proper.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal. Exponential models provide a good baseline for defining N1, N2 and N3. For SCS>120 kHz, absolute processing times need to be tightened (c.f. 120 kHz SCS) in order to achieve high performance and to keep the number of HARQ processes reasonable.  |
| Apple | We are not fine with the proposal. On the use of exponential models as a baseline, we feel that it may be too aggressive. As a simple example, consider N1. The value of N1 may have to be adjusted for an increase in the PDCCH monitoring complexity and for the need for ICI compensation. The exponential models do not account for this. Secondly, there are some non-scalable operations that occur that may not be captured when the exponential model is used. We would prefer the statement “RAN1 will use the absolute time duration for 120 kHz SCS as a a starting point/upper bound for the discussion of UE processing timelines for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS”. We are not ready to commit to a reduction at this early stage.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t agree with the proposal, but if those reduced timelines are considered optional then we are open to discuss. Proof of feasibility so far is only available for the timelines defined for 120 kHz SCS. If it is possible to reduce those timelines, it is also possible to at least support the same timeline values as for 120 kHz SCS for all UEs. For N1, N2, N3, what matters first is the absolute time needed for processing, which can then be converted to a number of symbols. There is no point discussing a scaling function for N1, N2 and N3. Eventually, those absolute times might even need to be larger for 480 or 960 kHz SCS than the absolute times required for 120 kHz SCS. |
| Intel | Ok with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the moderator’s proposal |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with moderator’s proposal. |
| Sony | Support moderator’s proposal |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Majority of companies support this proposal as it is. There’re comments on the wording of the 1st bullet and the details of exponential model in the 2nd bullet.Proposal revised to address comments. |

##### Proposal 2-2a for discussion:

* RAN1 use the absolute time duration for 120 kHz SCS as the starting point/upper bound for the discussion of UE processing timelines for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz
	+ RAN1 strives to reduce the absolute time durations from the upper bound if feasible
* FFS how to derive timeline values
	+ Case by case study
	+ FFS: model based approach for selected timelines, e.g. exponential models, projection based on log-linear regression

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | In our view, the upper bound in this proposal is too loose, and there is not much incentive to reduce the values compared to 120 kHz. The 120 kHz values are not compatible with designing high performance NR operation in the 52.6 to 71 GHz range for a wide range of important use cases including, e.g., factory automation and industrial IoT applications. At least we prefer the following:* RAN1 use the absolute time duration for 120 kHz SCS as ~~the starting point/~~upper bound for the discussion of UE processing timelines for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz

RAN1 strives to reduce the absolute time durations from the upper bound ~~if feasible~~ |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Agree to the first bullet. For the second bullet, we don’t have strong preference if the selected derivation approach is reasonable.  |
| DCM | We are fine with the proposal 2-2a. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Ericsson. When considering processing timelines for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs, one should consider multi-PDSCH/PUSCH as the baseline scenario. One goal should be to support contiguous UL or DL transmission with a reasonable number of HARQ processes with multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| CATT | We are OK with the timeline to be discussed after maximum system BW of 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS are decided. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see a need of keeping the first sub-bullet, however its is fine as long as we keep “if feasible” |
| Intel | Ok with moderator’s proposal 2-2a |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Ericsson’s updated version.  |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal and with removing the term “starting point” as Ericsson has proposed. We would like to keep the term “if feasible”. Discussion of numbers and feasibility can occur as the WI progresses. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal, and would like to keep “if feasible” until it is demonstrated that it is feasible to lower the absolute values of the timelines for 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS.Ericsson’s broad statements on the performance of NR for factory automation and industrial IoT applications are questionable, since NR has been enhanced in FR1 and FR2 to address the required latency and reliability for a large range of IioT use cases. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording updated as commented. |

##### Proposal 2-2b for discussion:

* RAN1 use the absolute time duration for 120 kHz SCS as the upper bound for the discussion of UE processing timelines for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz
	+ RAN1 strives to reduce the absolute time durations from the upper bound if feasible
* FFS how to derive timeline values
	+ Case by case study
	+ FFS: model based approach for selected timelines, e.g. exponential models, projection based on log-linear regression

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal  |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with proposal 2-2b |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | We support the proposal |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | We are fine with this proposal. On the FFS, maybe better to be a bit more general in the examples:e.g., exponential models, projection based, etc. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | Ok with proposal 2-2b |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording updated as commented. |

##### Proposal 2-2c for discussion:

* RAN1 use the absolute time duration for 120 kHz SCS as the upper bound for the discussion of UE processing timelines for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz
	+ RAN1 strives to reduce the absolute time durations from the upper bound if feasible
* FFS how to derive timeline values
	+ Case by case study
	+ FFS: model based approach for selected timelines, e.g. exponential models, projection based on log-linear regression, etc.

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal  |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal |
| CATT | We have concern on this proposal. UE processing timeline would depend on the maximum system bandwidth supported for the given SCS. The proposal maximum BW for 120 kHz SCS is different to that of 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS. We don’t see the proposal is very clear  |
| Moderator | Respond to CATT:Current UE processing timeline is defined in number of slots/symbols. For 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS, the slot/symbols time is much shorter than that of 120 kHz SCS. This proposal is about absolute time duration of UE processing timeline. In what aspect, this proposal is not clear?If you are referring to your repeated comment that timelines should be discussed after maximum system BW of 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS are decided, it seems no other companies share your concern/understanding. I don’t understand why maximum system bandwidth is relevant here. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Discussion is closed. See chairman’s notes for agreement. |

#### Dependence and order of discussion

Several contributions mentioned the dependence of determining some UE processing timeline with some related discussions.

[8, CATT] thought the UE processing time N1/N2, the ranges of k0, k1 and k2 values with 480KHz/960KHz SCS could not be determined before the maximum system bandwidth supported is finalized.

[3, ZTE] and [17, LG] proposed to consider the phase noise estimation and compensation time on timeline design.

[19, Xiaomi] and [20, Samsung] proposed that impacts on PDSCH/PUSCH processing time (N1/N2) and/or PDCCH processing timeline may need to consider maximum number of BDs/CCEs for multi-slot span PDCCH monitoring.

[21, Ericsson] proposed that RAN1 should strive to narrow down the range of UE processing latencies early in the WI phase, particularly those related PDSCH/PUSCH processing (N1, N2, N3), to enable multi-PDSCH/PUSCH design to proceed.

[24, Apple] suggested an order for discussion with three groups, (1) independently specified, (2) dependent on the values of group 1, (3) dependent on progress in other sub-agenda items.

Moderator’s comment:

It is true that some UE processing timelines may depend on progress of discussions in other sub-agenda items. On the other hand, the decision on possible range of some UE processing timelines may facilitate the discussion for other timeline determination as well as for other enhancements in this WI.

##### Proposal 2-3 for discussion:

* The following UE processing timelines are prioritized for discussion
	+ PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2), HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	+ CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units

Companies are encouraged to provide comments and/or suggestions if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | In principle we agree with moderator’s proposal. However, it needs to be clarified if these are prioritized over other timelines discussions. In addition, some of the timelines may be dependent on the multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling discussion. |
| LG Electronics | Support Moderator’s proposal.  |
| Xiaomi | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Agree that N1, N2, and N3 are first priority to discuss. CSI-related timelines can be discussed later. |
| Qualcomm | We agree on prioritizing the discussions for these timeline aspects as a starting point |
| DCM | Support. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the FL’s proposal.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | k0, k1 and k2 should also be discussed with priority. |
| Intel | Support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal with Huawei’s update.  |
| Vivo | Support Moderator’s proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with the proposal |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with moderator’s proposal. |
| Sony | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| CATT | We are OK with the timeline to be discussed after maximum system BW of 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS are decided. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Most companies support this proposal as it is. Two companies (Huawei and InterDigital) proposed to add k0, k1 and k2 into the priority list.Proposal 2-3a formulated for discussion. |
|  |  |

##### Proposal 2-3a for discussion:

The following UE processing timelines are prioritized for discussion

* PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2), HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
* CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
* configuration(s) of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments especially toward the added 3rd bullet.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | We think that the 3rd bullet is higher priority than the 2nd |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the updated proposal. |
| DCM | We are fine with Proposal 2-3a. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Ericsson. CSI processing time to be discussed later. |
| CATT | We are OK with the timeline to be discussed after maximum system BW of 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS are decided. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm  | We agree with Ericsson, we can start with the first and third bullets  |
| Intel | Supportive of moderator’s proposal 2-3a. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. The second bullet may be less important, but needs to be supported anyway.  |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Futurewei | We support moderator’s proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the FL’s proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with proposal 2-3a. It is not clear that the order of the bullets means a priority ordering. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording update based on comments. |

##### Proposal 2-3b for discussion:

* The following UE processing timelines are prioritized for discussion
	+ PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2), HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	+ configuration(s) of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH)
	+ CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
	+ Note: the order of the above sub-bullets represents the priority for discussion in descending order
* Companies are encouraged to provide preferred values/ranges of timelines for discussion

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| Qualcomm  | We are fine the proposal  |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We are generally fine with the proposal.For the second sub-bullet of “K0/K1/K2”，we think not only value configurations need to be discussed, but also default values for K0/K1/K2 need to be discussed. We suggest the proposal to be modified as:* The following UE processing timelines are prioritized for discussion
	+ PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2), HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	+ configuration(s)/default values of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH)
	+ CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
	+ Note: the order of the above sub-bullets represents the priority for discussion in descending order
* Companies are encouraged to provide preferred values/ranges of timelines for discussion
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with proposal 2-3b, and ok with Docomo’s updates. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | We support the proposal |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm  | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Ok with proposal 2-3b |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording update based on comments. |

##### Proposal 2-3c for discussion:

* The following UE processing timelines are prioritized for discussion
	+ PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2), HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	+ configuration(s)/default values of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH)
	+ CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
	+ Note: the order of the above sub-bullets represents the priority for discussion in descending order
* Companies are encouraged to provide preferred values/ranges of timelines for discussion

Please provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal  |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal to be discussed after the maximum system BW is determined |
| Moderator | Respond to CATT:In what way, the priority among timelines depending on maximum system bandwidth? You have repeated your comment that timelines should be discussed after maximum system BW of 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS are decided. It seems no other companies share your understanding.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | Support |

#### Additional processing timelines

[24, Apple] proposed to investigate the need for enhancements and standardization, of the following processing timelines:

• Default PUSCH time Domain resource allocation for normal CP

• UE PDSCH reception preparation time with cross carrier scheduling with different subcarrier spacings for PDCCH and PDSCH

• SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH, PRACH cancellation with dynamic SFI

• ZP CSI Resource set activation/deactivation

• Beam Switch Timing for periodic CSI-RS + aperiodic CSI-RS

• Beam switch timing for aperiodic CSI-RS

• Aperiodic CSI-RS timing offset

• Application delay of the minimum scheduling offset restriction

• SRS triggering after DCI reception

Moderator’s comment:

The above proposal seems just encouraging to investigate the need of enhancements for the listed sub-bullets. In this case, it seems no need to have an agreement.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | We think that we should strive to keep the same timeline for beam switching, see our reply for 2.2.2.5 |
| Xiaomi | For the first bullet, what’s the motivation of defining default PUSCH time Domain resource allocation? |
| Qualcomm  | The beam related timeline aspects should be discussed in the Beam management item 8.2.4.Using the discussion on N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z2 and Z3 as a baseline, we should revisit the remaining timeline aspects. |
| DCM | Beam related timeline parameters also need to considered:- Whether/how to consider beam switching gap (i.e., time duration needed to change the beam) should be discussed.- FFS whether to introduce a larger time gap to apply new beam configuration after receiving BFR response from gNB |
| Samsung | OK with FL’s assessment.  |
| Nokia/NSB | RAN4 should be involved in defining timelines for many of these timelines |
| Apple | In response to Xiaomi’s question, in 38.214, Section 6.1.2.1.1, the Default PUSCH time Domain resource allocation for normal CP (Table 6.1.2.1.1-2) includes a parameter “j” that is dependent on the SCS (Table 6.1.2.1.1.1-4).As mentioned in our contribution, we can classify these into different groups as follows:Table  Description automatically generatedTo Moderator: can this list be captured in a note in the chairman’s notes so that we have a record in addition to the items we have in the TR ? Or added as an update to the TR ? |
| vivo | OK with moderator’s assessment. Maybe which timeline should be discussed in beam management agenda need to be made clear. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Ok with moderator’s views |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with Qualcomm. Beam management related issues (e.g. aperiodic CSI-RS) should be discussed in the agenda item 8.2.4. |
| CATT | We are OK with moderator’s proposal and Qualcomm’s comments.  |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to Apple’s comment: Whether to capture the list in the chairman’s notes or to update the TR requires RAN1 agreement. Your contribution proposed to investigate the need of enhancements and standardization for the listed timelines. Proposal 2-4 formulated as commented to see if companies agree these FFS points.Note that bullets related to beam management timelines are not included as commented (also see proposal 2-5 in section 2.2.2.5 for scope clarification). |

##### Proposal 2-4 for discussion:

FFS the need for enhancements and standardization, of the following additional processing timelines:

• Default PUSCH time Domain resource allocation for normal CP

• UE PDSCH reception preparation time with cross carrier scheduling with different subcarrier spacings for PDCCH and PDSCH

• SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH, PRACH cancellation with dynamic SFI

• ZP CSI Resource set activation/deactivation

• Application delay of the minimum scheduling offset restriction

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| DCM | We are fine with the proposal 2-4 except for the first bullet. For the first bullet, we think “default PUSCH time Domain resource allocation” is related with K2 in Proposal 2-3a. |
| CATT | We are Ok with the proposal since they are FFS |
| Intel | Generally ok with moderator’s suggestion.Among the listed issues, we think cross carrier operation is something that should be definitely supported for Rel-17 NR 52 ~ 71GHz. So timing aspects related to cross carrier operation should be discussed. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. We agree with DCM that the first bullet is implicitly addressed by k2 in proposal 2-3a and can be removed. This also agrees with our thinking that this is a priority 1 issue.  |
| Futurewei | We OK with updated proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the FL’s proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with the list of FFS points |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording updated as commented. |

##### Proposal 2-4a for discussion:

FFS the need for enhancements and standardization, of the following additional processing timelines:

* UE PDSCH reception preparation time with cross carrier scheduling with different subcarrier spacings for PDCCH and PDSCH
* SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH, PRACH cancellation with dynamic SFI
* ZP CSI Resource set activation/deactivation
* Application delay of the minimum scheduling offset restriction
* timing aspects related to cross carrier operation

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with proposal |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with proposal  |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with proposal |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with proposal 2-4a |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | We support the proposal |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Ok with proposal 2-4a |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal  |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Vivo | We support the proposal |
| Ericsson | Support |

#### Proposals on some specific timelines

[1, Futurewei] proposed the new values for the beamSwitchTiming corresponding to SCS {480kHz and 960 kHz} use ENUMERATED {sym14, sym28, sym48, sym224, sym336} as starting point.

[3, ZTE] proposed to discuss how to interpret k0, k1 and k2 for PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling and HARQ feedback timing indication.

[5, Huawei] proposed the definitions of k0 and k1 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

[6, Nokia] argued that in Rel-15, N\_CPU is independent from numerology, and proposed that the existing specification can be reused for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS

[19, Xiaomi] proposed to specify different default K1 value sets for different SCS, and each K1 set with a maximum number of 8 values to keep the K1 bit field in DCI 1-0/1-1/1-2 unchanged.

[20, Samsung] proposed to support SCS-specific K1/K2 by reusing existing default/configured K1/K2 plus a SCS specific offset.

[21, Ericsson] proposed to increase the range of K0/K1/K2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

[25, Qualcomm] proposed that for HARQ timing indication K1, uses the last PDSCH granted in the multi-PDSCH grant as reference slot.

[26, NTT DoCoMo] proposed that for K0/K1/K2 set, consider proper K0/K1/K2 set configuration and define default values for new SCSs.

Moderator’s comment:

For those proposals on some specific timelines, suggest to discuss more.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments and/or suggestions on agreeable proposals if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | We think that we should strive to keep the same timeline for beam switching ENUMERATED {sym14, sym28, sym48, sym224, sym336} even for larger SCS. Discuss if for larger values {sym224, sym336} are other factors such as RF/antenna limit that need to be considered. It may require keeping the absolute time values constant while adapting the symbol numbers. |
| LG Electronics | In our view, some issues can be discussed in other sub-agenda, e.g., AI 8.2.4. |
| Qualcomm  | In multi-PDSCH grant, the HARQ timing indication K1, uses the last granted PDSCH as a reference slot.   |
| Apple | The values of Kx may depend on the values of Ny and on the PDCCH monitoring complexity (as a lower bound). As for the beamSwitchTiming, it may be more appropriate to discuss this and other beam based parameters in the beam management sub agenda item.  |
| Vivo | OK with moderator’s assessment. Maybe which timeline should be discussed in beam management agenda need to be made clear. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Regarding CPU availability, the availability is on symbol basis, where the symbol duration is based on the corresponding CSI numerology. Therefore, it is depending on numerology. Now with 480kHz and 960kHz, the symbol duration is quite wide in case of multiple CSI associated with multiple numerologies. Therefore, we propose to define a reference symbol duration applicable to check CPU availability for all CSI (regardless of numerology) |
| Convida Wireless | We share the same view with Qualcomm. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Multiple companies proposed to clarify which agenda item to discuss beam management related timelines. Formulate the following proposal to clarify. |
| Moderator 2 | Added another two bullets to proposal 2-5 to clarify which agenda item to discuss k0/k1/k2 related issues. |

##### Proposal 2-5 for notes:

* Multi-beam operation related timelines (timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, beam switch gap, beamReportTiming, etc.) are to be discussed in agenda item 8.2.4.
* The definitions of k0/k1/k2 (i.e., how to interpret them) are to be discussed along with scheduling/HARQ aspects in agenda item 8.2.5
* The value range of k0/k1/k2 and how to configure them are to be discussed along with other timelines aspects in agenda item 8.2.5

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| DCM | Support to discuss beam related parameters in 8.2.4. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the 1st bullet. For the 2nd and 3rd bullets, would like clarification on how we reconcile moving the study of k0.k1 and k2 to another AI with proposal 2-3a that will study the k0/k1/k2 timelines with high priority ?  |
| Futurewei | Support the moderator’s proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We support the updated proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the FL’s proposal.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| Moderator | Respond to Apple’s comment:The 2nd bullet says the definitions of k0/k1/k2 are to be discussed along with scheduling/HARQ and the 3rd bullet says the values of k0/k1/k2 are to be discussed along with other timelines. I don’t see any conflict with discussion priority proposal on k0/k1/k2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with proposal 2-5 |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | To moderator: thank youWe support the proposal |
| Qualcomm  | We support the proposal |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Ok with proposal 2-5 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | We support the proposal |

#### Other issue(s)

Please provide comments if any on any missed issue(s) about timeline.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.3. PTRS

### Individual observations/proposals

The following are individual observations/proposals from the contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sources | Observations/proposals |
| [1, Futurewei] | Observation 4: With ICI cancellation for SCS 120kHz, 480kHz, and 960kHz, block-PTRS does not offer BLER performance gain over comb-PTRS across the entire SNR range. Reducing PTRS density from K=2 to K=4 leads to a BLER performance loss up to 1dB. Proposal 6: With higher SCSs employed, a comprehensive evaluation of the effect of frequency-selectivity on the accuracy of channel estimation, and on the link performance is necessary.Proposal 7: With ICI cancellation for SCS 120kHz, 480kHz, and 960kHz, the comb-PTRS with sufficient frequency-domain is recommended. Study the block-DMRS enhancement and other efficient DMRS structures that could lead to comparable performance with the ½ comb-DMRS.Observation 5: The advantage of block structure of PTRS is smaller than having PTRS tones as spread as possible for ICI cancellation. Proposal 8: Reuse the comb-PTRS structure for NR-U 52.6 to 71GHz and not to pursue either single or multi-block PTRS.  |
| [3, ZTE] | Observation 2: ICI compensation based on legacy PTRS can achieve similar or better performance compared with block PTRS and hybrid PTRS under the same PTRS overhead.Observation 3: The calculation complexity of ICI compensation based on legacy PTRS, block PTRS and hybrid PTRS is similar.Proposal 4: Reuse the Rel-15 legacy PTRS pattern for 52.6GHz~71GHz. |
| [5, Huawei] | Proposal 1: Reuse the physical design and framework defined in FR2 for 120 kHz, except PTRS.• From RAN1 specification perspective, 120 kHz SCS can be supported in 52.6-71 GHz with no specification change by simply extending FR2 up to 71 GHz.Observation 3: Both theoretical analysis and simulation results show that ICI compensation for 960 kHz with high MCS is necessary. Based on the theoretical analysis of the relationship between equivalent ICI and SCS, the same observation applies to the SCS smaller than 960 kHz, like 120 kHz and 480 kHz.Observation 4: Block PTRS sequence with constant modulus in time domain provides better performance than distributed PTRS.Observation 5: Block PTRS has more versatility in different scenarios than distributed PTRS, including power boosting and UE with narrow scheduled bandwidth.Proposal 10: Support block PTRS with ZC sequence for 120 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS with CP-OFDM.Observation 6: With the PTRS pattern defined in Rel-15 for DFT-s-OFDM, BLER performance of 64QAM with 120 kHz SCS reaches a floor above 10-2 due to the longest interpolation range, and it can be improved by using a new pattern with more PTRS groups.Proposal 11: A new PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol should be considered to allow scheduling over large bandwidth.Observation 7: Due to Rx timing shift, (at least part of) a PTRS group placed at the tail of the transmitter’s DFT-s-OFDM symbol, may wrap-around to the head of the symbol from the receiver’s perspective, thus spoiling the original intention of the design and unnecessarily increasing Rx complexity, as well as deteriorating PN compensation performance.Proposal 12: For PTRS with $N\_{sample}^{group}=4$, the mapping of last PTRS group should consider potential Rx timing shift and avoid the last X pre-DFT symbol(s).  |
| [6, Nokia] | Observation 12. Existing PTRS configurations provide good allocation flexibility to achieve good performance for any bandwidth, SCS, or MCS.Observation 13. Existing PTRS configurations provide the best performance for CPE compensation, and increasing frequency density does not provide any gain.Observation 14. CPE compensation cannot provide reasonable performance for 120kHz SCS with 400MHz bandwidth when 64-QAM is used.Observation 15. CPE compensation cannot provide reasonable performance for 480kHz SCS with 1600MHz bandwidth when 64-QAM is used.Observation 16. CPE compensation provides good performance for 960kHz SCS with 2000MHz bandwidth even when 64-QAM is used.Observation 17. Existing PTRS configurations provide the best performance for ICI compensation, and increasing frequency density does not provide any gain.Observation 18. Phase noise compensation is an implementation specific aspect.Proposal 8. Use existing PTRS configurations for CP-OFDM.Observation 19. PUSCH performance of DFT-s-OFDM may be improved by increasing the maximum number of PTRS groups with well affordable PTRS overhead.Observation 20. New PTRS configurations can give many dBs performance gains for high order modulations.Proposal 9. Consider increasing number of PTRS groups for DFT-s-OFDM to make high order modulations robust to phase noise when a large number of PRBs is used. |
| [9, vivo] | Proposal 2: Reuse Rel-15 PTRS structure based on OFDM for NR operation from 52.6GHz to 71GHz. |
| [10, Mitsubishi] | Observation 1: In bands above 52.6GHz, the ICI component of the phase noise becomes predominant on CPE.Observation 2: Distributed PT-RS pattern shows poor performance results with CPE phase noise estimation regardless of the PT-RS pattern density.Observation 3: For a distributed PT-RS pattern, de-ICI Wiener filtering outperforms CPE in all cases, but high MCS still not reach FER=0.1.Observation 4: Distributed PT-RS patterns are not robust enough to ensure system performance in bands above 52.6GHz.Observation 5: For a similar overhead, block PT-RS (with any ordinary sequence) is outperformed by distributed PT-RS pattern when a same de-ICI Wiener filter is used at the receiver side.Observation 6: Block PT-RS with cyclic sequence significantly outperforms the distributed PT-RS pattern with ICI compensation.Observation 7: Block PT-RS with cyclic sequence requires lower complexity phase noise compensation filtering than the de-ICI filter needed for the distributed PT-RS pattern.Proposal 1: Support block PT-RS with cyclic sequence for OFDM waveform.Proposal 2: A PT-RS sequence for OFDM waveform composed of KP samples includes a cyclic prefix of floor(KP/2) samples.Proposal 3: Support density extension of current Rel.15 PT-RS for DFTsOFDM waveform. |
| [11, MediaTek] | Observation 1: When ICI equalizer is used at the receiver, R-15 PTRS & DMRS design could support normal NR operation with 120 KHz SCS and high MCS at 60 GHz band.Proposal 1: No DMRS and PTRS enhancements are needed for NR operating at 60 GHz band with 120 KHz SCS. |
| [15, InterDigital] | Observation 8: Enhanced PT-RS does not show significant performance benefits for 480 kHz and 960 kHz.Proposal 6: PT-RS enhancement for 480 kHz and 960 kHz is not considered for NR 52.6 – 71 GHz. |
| [17, LG] | Observation #1: ICI compensation is required at least for 120 kHz SCS to reduce the performance degradation at high MCS.Observation #2: The performance gap between the absence of phase noise (PN) and the PN compensation is still observed (about 1 dB at 10% PDSCH BLER) for all SCSs, where phase noise compensation is performed with the least-square (de-ICI filtering) or CPE only compensation.Proposal #8: PT-RS enhancements can be further considered for all SCSs and high MCS (e.g., 64QAM). |
| [20, Samsung] | Proposal 12: Consider increasing the frequency domain PT-RS density for smaller RB allocation. - For Rel-15 PT-RS design, consider K=1 as a valid configuration. - Chunk based PT-RS design offers more flexibility for increasing the frequency domain density of PT-RS.Proposal 13: For higher data rate (MCS28) with 120kHz SCS, investigate chunk based PT-RS patterns approach when UE complexity is a concern. |
| [21, Ericsson] | Observation 3 Enhanced PT-RS structure with 1 PT-RS symbol every RB (K = 1) does not provide additional performance gain over the existing Rel-15 PT-RS structure (K = 2).Observation 4 Clustered PT-RS structure can frequently collide with existing NR reference symbols (such as CSI-RS and TRS) with no simple avoidance solution.Observation 5 A clustered PT-RS structure does not offer a performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PT-RS structure.Proposal 13 Retain the same Rel-15 distributed PT-RS design for OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz. Increasing the frequency domain density of PTRS compared to Rel-15 does not provide gains. |
| [22, CEWiT] | Proposal 1: Support for new PT-RS design for NR above 52.6GHz at least for 120KHz SCS.Proposal 2: Support Block-PTRS as one of the candidates for new PTRS design for NR above 52.6GHz.Observation 1: The specification impact due to the introduction of new PTRS design should be carefully studied. Proposal 3: Time density based on MCS, as in FR1 and FR2, is supported. |
| [24, Apple] | Proposal 12: RAN1 should support frequency domain power boosting for PTRS where regulations allow and new PTRS patterns to mitigate time varying phase noise with each symbol. |
| [25, Qualcomm] | Observation 1: With a block PTRS pattern and ICI compensation algorithm,• The performance of block PTRS improves as the number of clusters increases, due to the higher frequency diversity.• For the same block PTRS pattern, Algorithm 1 (direct de-ICI filtering) outperforms Algorithm 2 (ICI filter approximation).• For the same ICI compensation algorithm, the legacy PTRS pattern outperforms the block PTRS pattern.Proposal 1: As PTRS enhancement for assisting ICI compensation, increasing the frequency domain PTRS density for small RB allocation can be considered. New PTRS patterns other than the Rel-15 design, such as the block PTRS patterns, are not necessary.Observation 2: For ICI compensation (direct de-ICI filtering) with the legacy PTRS pattern,• The performance improves with the increasing number of de-ICI filter taps (3 to 5 taps).• With a fixed transport block size, the performance improves as the PTRS overhead decreases.* The performance loss due to increased effective code rate is more pronounced at higher MCSs.

• With a fixed effective code rate, the performance slightly improves as the PTRS overhead increases.Observation 3: When ICI compensation is applied to 120kHz SCS,• At MCSs 22 and 24, 120kHz SCS with ICI compensation performs almost equal to 960kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation.• At MCS 26, 120kHz SCS with ICI compensation suffers from residual ICI and is outperformed by 960kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation.Proposal 2: For SCS 120kHz, supporting the MCSs that require ICI compensation should be based on the UE capabilities.  |

### Summary on PTRS

#### For CP-OFDM

As required by the WID regarding whether there’s a need for PTRS enhancement, the following sources evaluated and compared CPE and/or ICI PN compensation performance using the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure against new PTRS patterns.

[1, Futurewei] evaluated PDSCH with CP-OFDM performance for all SCSs between comb- and block-PTRS with optimal number of de-ICI filter taps for each SCS. It is observed block-PTRS does not offer BLER performance gain over comb-PTRS across the entire SNR range. (Moderator’s note, it showed ~0.5 dB loss for block-PTRS). It further evaluated multi-block-PTRS, i.e., the PTRS tones in each symbol are separated into a designated number of blocks and observed again no gain for block-PTRS.

[3, ZTE] evaluated PDSCH with CP-OFDM performance with the legacy PTRS, block PTRS and hybrid PTRS for 120 and 480 kHz SCS for 64QAM. It is observed that ICI compensation based on legacy PTRS can achieve similar or better performance compared with block PTRS and hybrid PTRS under the same PTRS overhead.

[5, Huawei] compared BLER performance of 120 kHz SCS with Rel-15 PTRS and block PTRS in CDL- D 20ns delay spread for MCS 22. It is observed a small performance loss (~0.2 dB) for block PTSR compared to Rel-15 PTRS. It reported a slight BLER performance gain (~ 0.3 dB) of block PTRS for 10% BLER target when a sequence with constant modulus in time domain is used with block PTRS. It further observed that with power boosting, the block PTRS performs a little better (~ 0.3 dB) than distributed PTRS, even with the sequence defined in Rel-15.

[6, Nokia] evaluated both CPE and ICI performance and observed that existing PTRS configurations provide the best performance for CPE and ICI compensation, and increasing frequency density does not provide any gain. It is also observed that phase noise compensation in general (including ICI filtering) is an implementation issue.

[9, vivo] evaluated CP-OFDM performance for CPE with Rel-15 PTRS, direct de-ICI filter with Rel-15 PTRS and ICI filter approximation with a clustered PTRS for all SCSs. It is observed that CPE or de-ICI filter with Rel-15 PTRS perform better than ICI filter approximation with a clustered PTRS.

[10, Mitsubishi] compared phase noise compensation performance for the following four cases: CPE-based with Rel-15 PTRS, de-ICI with Rel-15 PTRS, de-ICI with block PTRS and ICI filtering with block PTRS with cyclic sequence for 120 kHz SCS. It is observed that for a similar overhead, block PTRS is outperformed by Rel-15 distributed PTRS patterns when a same de-ICI Wiener filter is used at the receiver side. It also observed that the PN compensation with block-based PTRS and cyclic sequence outperforms de-ICI Wiener filtering with Rel-15 distributed PTRS.

[11, MediaTek] evaluated ICI performance with Rel-15 PTRS and reported that with a ICI equalizer at the receiver side, it is able to provide performance very close to the case when there is no phase noise.

[15, InterDigital] evaluated PN compensation performance for different PTRS density of Rel-15 PTRS and observed that the increased PTRS density does not show significant performance benefits with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.

[17, LG] evaluated CPE and ICI performance with Rel-15 PTRS. It observed performance improvement of ICI compared to CPE at least for 120 kHz SCS and a performance gap (about 1 dB at 10% PDSCH BLER) between the absence of phase noise (PN) and the PN compensation for all SCSs.

[21, Ericsson] first compared CPE and de-ICI filtering performance for all SCSs with Rel-15 PTRS and increased PTRS density. It observed that increased PTRS density does not provide additional performance gain over Rel-15 PTRS. It also compared de-ICI and ICI filter approximation performance based on Rel-15 PTRS and single and multiple clusters of PTRS. It is observed that clustered PT-RS structure does not offer a performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PT-RS structure.

[25, Qualcomm] compared CPE and ICI performance for different PTRS. It is observed that for the same ICI compensation algorithm, the legacy Rel-15 PTRS pattern outperforms the block PTRS pattern.

In addition to BLER performance, some other aspects of PTRS are also discussed.

[5, Huawei] argued that block PTRS is better suited than Rel-15 PTRS when power boosting is applied and/or UE with narrow scheduled bandwidth. [24, Apple] also proposed to support frequency domain power boosting for PTRS where regulations allow.

Both ([10, Mitsubishi], [20, Samsung]) proposed to consider block/chunk based PTRS for ICI filter approximation due to better UE complexity than direct de-ICI filter. However, on the same topic, [3, ZTE] showed a comparable computation complexity for different ICI algorithms and [9, vivo] showed that ICI filter approximation has less complex multiplication and less complex addition but much more matrix inverse operation than de-ICI filter.

It is observed in [21, Ericsson] that clustered PTRS structure can frequently collide with existing NR reference symbols (such as CSI-RS and TRS) with no simple avoidance solution.

[20, Samsung] and [25, Qualcomm] argued that ICI compensation algorithms require larger PT-RS Res than CPE only compensation algorithm. Therefore, they proposed to consider higher frequency domain PTRS density when the allocated RBs is small.

Companies’ views regarding whether to support new block/chunk/cluster PTRS pattern for CP-OFDM are summarized below.

Yes: [5, Huawei], [10, Mitsubishi], [17, LG], [20, Samsung], ([22, CEWiT] at least for 120 kHz), [24, Apple]

No: [1, Futurewei], [3, ZTE], [6, Nokia], [9, vivo], [11, MediaTek], [15, InterDigital], [21, Ericsson], [25, Qualcomm]

Moderator’s comment:

Looking at these extensive evaluation results from all contributions, companies have different views regarding whether there is significant performance gain of new PTRS patterns compared to existing PTRS. Hence, there’s no consensus with respect to the need of PTRS enhancement.

##### Proposal 3-1 for discussion:

* Use existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| Mitsubishi | We do not agree with Moderator’s view. As briefly discussed online today, we saw in our evaluations that clustered PT-RS with cyclic sequence significantly outperforms Rel.15 pattern + de-ICI filter, while clustered PT-RS (single or multi-block) with non-cyclic sequence doesn’t. Most of the contributing companies have only simulated the latter case, and the lack of improvement they rightfully see comes from the non-cyclic sequence, and not from the clustered pattern. We do not agree on concluding to keep Rel.17 pattern based on these partial results. We propose to further investigate clustered/multi-block PTRS with cyclic sequence, shown to bring gain by several companies.  |
| Xiaomi | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support moderator’s proposal.We do see some companies’ results show that block PTRS with cyclic sequence shows better performance than legacy PTRS, but most companies show that ICI compensation based on legacy PTRS could also work well even for 120kHz, so we don’t see the need to further enhance the PTRS pattern. |
| Ericsson | Support moderator’s proposalWe found from extensive evaluation, that enhancements that increase the density of PTRS result in a net loss in performance and/or throughput. This is because the gain of potentially better phase noise mitigation does not make up for the loss of coding gain due to higher PTRS overhead, particularly for the higher MCS modes. |
| Qualcomm  | * The clustered PTRS patterns do not provide performance enhancements compared with legacy PTRS patterns, and they are more vulnerable to frequency selective fading. Therefore, we support reusing the legacy pattern for 52-71GHz band.
* To enable ICI compensation for small RB allocation, enough number of PTRS tones is needed for filter coefficients calculations, thus increasing the density to K=1 for small RB allocation is needed.
* For 120KHz, an MCS capability should be defined for the new band as the phase noise ICI compensation may affect the current processing timeline.
 |
| DOCOMO | We support the moderator’s proposal.  |
| Samsung | We are inclined to keep PTRS enhancement like blocked PTRS as an option. As shown in [5][10], the later provides benefits when with additional modifications like cyclic sequence and power boost.We observed that most of the evaluation seems based on full or near full RB allocation. The conclusion that existing PTRS design is enough seems to ignore the low RB allocated case, which the training of de-ici filter may not converge. Are we not going to support lower frequency allocation case in 52.6 to 71GHz? |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal. Evaluations shows little gain from the new PTRS structure.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We disagree with the proposal and we agree with the comment from Mitsubishi.Observations from companies who propose no enhancement on performance and complexity are based on evaluations or analysis that did not consider the use of cyclic sequences. With the use of cyclic sequences, such as with a circular mapping of a ZC sequence, a reasonable gain is observed. Our evaluations only slightly increased the PTRS overhead (16/(12\*64)=>17/(12\*64)), and gains in spectral efficiency were still observed.Companies should go back and evaluate enhancement PTRS with cyclic sequences before a conclusion can be drawn. We suggest to discuss the evaluation assumptions and candidate PTRS to evaluate for this study with results to be provided for RAN1#104b.At least the following should be considered for further evaluations:1. Use of cyclic sequences, such as with a circular mapping of a ZC sequence, which ensures low complexity of ICI estimation, where matrix inversion can be avoided by matrix multiplication.
2. Block PTRS can maintain the merits of power boosting when ICI estimation is needed.
3. Block PTRS can be used as a common RS to address the problem of ICI estimation with small scheduled bandwidth
 |
| Intel | While we should not change existing features, such as PT-RS, unless there is strong need to do so, we think some further considerations could be beneficial, especially for MCS above 22 (which were not typically simulated during SI), and with higher Rank transmissions.We may also need to factor into account receiver complexity required to make transmissions work well and potential ways to help reduce receiver complexity.So we would prefer this to be baseline for further study, and would not like to close the door down at this time. With this said, if the agreement is to simply state we will support existing PT-RS patterns for NR operating in 52~71GHz, we are supportive. However, in this case, we are not sure if we need an explicit agreement. We assumed unless there is an explicit agreement, existing NR features would be inherited unless they are inherently broken for this band. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with moderator’s proposal. |
| Sony | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| CEWiT | We agree with Mitsubishi and Huawei’s views. We propose to further investigate block PTRS with both cyclic and non-cyclic sequences before drawing a conclusion. |
| CATT | We support Moderator’s proposal |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Several companies disagree with the proposal and propose to further study. Proposal revised below on FFS points |

##### Proposal 3-1a for discussion:

Further study on the need of potential PTRS enhancement for at least the following aspects with respect to phase noise compensation performance:

* PTRS density and sequence
* Frequency domain power boosting
* Different RB allocation
* Different MCS
* Different Rank transmission
* Receiver complexity

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | For performance comparison between two designs with different PTRS overhead, the same TBS must be used such that performance takes into account different effective coding rates. Similarly, for performance between boosting/no boosting, the same total power must be considered for both cases. |
| Mitsubishi | To avoid repeating the same situation in the next meeting, some guidance on the patterns/sequences would be useful. From this perspective, I would like to cite explicitly the cyclic sequence candidate shown beneficial in several contributions, and the candidate patterns, so we could rely on more aligned simulation settings in the next meeting. Regarding Ericsson’s comment, the point is valid, but we don’t necessarily have to endorse fixed TBS to fix this. To reflect the overhead and effective coding rate impact, presenting spectral efficiency results can also solve the problem for example. I propose thus the following amendments to FL’s proposal:Further study on the need of potential PTRS enhancement for at least the following aspects with respect to phase noise compensation performance:* PTRS ~~density,~~ pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence, including cyclic sequence
* PTRS overhead and impact on effective coding rate
* Frequency domain power boosting
* Different RB allocation
* Different MCS
* Different Rank transmission
* Receiver complexity
 |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We are ok to further study for common understanding from several companies. In this case, it may be helpful to use the same evaluation assumptions (e.g., the same set of number of RBs are recommended for performance comparison of different RB allocations). |
| DOCOMO | We are ok with the Proposal 3-1a.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Before we are going to agree on the new proposal, it is better to check the temperature on proposal 3-1. Ericsson’s proposal looks fine. PTRS power boosting will reduce PDSCH SNR and impact to PDSCH to DMRS EPRE value. All the aspects should be considered.  |
| CATT | We don’t see the need of this proposal since the performance depends on the receiver algorithm in UE implementation  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to further study the need for PT-RS enhancements |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Although we are fine to further evaluate block PTRS with new sequence, we’d like to remind that the original intention for the PTRS enhancement is that, for lower SCS(e.g.120kHz) and high MCS(e.g.64QAM), phase noise in 60GHz shows significant impact on the decoding accuracy. Therefore, we think the simulation purpose should be that, first evaluate whether legacy PTRS could handle the phase noise impact or not, if yes, we don’t see the necessity to further study new PTRS pattern. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Ericsson comment. Also, we support the methodology suggested by ZTE, as we do not need to introduce a new PTRS pattern unless we observe a dramatic performance degradation of the legacy pattern with ICI compensation algorithms for 120KHz SCS |
| Intel | Supportive of moderator’s suggestion.Similar to what was done for PUCCH, maybe we can also try to work out additional evaluation setup for this conclusion? The evaluation methodology from SI could be the baseline and we could build on top of this. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Ericsson and ZTE. |
| Apple | We are fine with the updated proposal but agree with Ericsson that the comparisons should be fair i.e. (coding\_rate, TBS\_pattern) = constant and total power= constant.  |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal including Ericsson’s note. We will support a new PTRS only if provides substantial performance improvement. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the FL’s proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Mitsubishi’s update of the proposal. We are ok to discuss how to ensure overhead and power boosting and properly taken into account in the evaluations, to align results for the next meeting. We also think that showing spectral efficiency provides solves those issues.We see no point to continue discussing proposal 3-1 since comments have been made and the “temperature on proposal 3-1” is clear, it is not agreeable at this time. Further study is needed as proposed by the moderator.  |
|  |  |
| Moderator | There’re several companies commented against further study. Formulated the following proposal 3-1b to keep the door open for potential PTRS enhancement. |

##### Proposal 3-1b for discussion:

* Existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Further study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance. If needed, further study at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ PTRS overhead and impact on effective coding rate
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH SNR and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Different RB allocation
	+ Different MCS
	+ Different Rank transmission
	+ Receiver complexity

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Moderator | To companies proposed further study on PTRS enhancement, please provide details of enhancement as well as evaluation assumptions so that I can summarize for future discussion. |
| Mitsubishi | Concerning the first bullet point, I don’t see much point in bringing it back to the table and repeating the discussion from 3-1 all over again, this was already discussed, and it is clearly not agreeable for us at this point. Endorsing Rel.15 based on currently partial results either compromises the chances of optimizing the performance of above 52.6 GHz, or engages us on the slippery slope of double design. None of these perspectives seems a positive one, so we would like to have the first bullet point removed.Concerning the second bullet point, it looks generally fine, so we are overall supportive. As a general comment, most of the evaluations were performed at 60GHz. Since that phase noise is significantly stronger at 70GHz, adding “***Different carrier frequencies***” to the list of sub-bulets might be useful for guidance. As a further minor comment, I don’t see the intention of “if needed, further study” (we cannot know whether it’s needed or not unless we further study) so “***considering at least the following aspects***” should be enough.Concerning the request from the moderator, we found in our contribution R1-2100553 that multi-block PT-RS with cyclic sequence, all in using a less complex detector, is outperforming both distributed PT-RS and multi-block PT-RS with non-cyclic sequence (decodable by de-ICI or ICI estimation filters). We tested 16QAM2/3 and 64QAM1/2 with large allocation at 60GHz and 70GHz. Performance gap, already important at 60GHz, is extremely significant at 70GHz.  |
| Samsung | We also share Mitsubishi’s concern on the first bullet and think it is not needed now. Existing PTRS patterns will automatically be the default one once any results from “further study” are not convincing enough.We are generally fine with second bullet. To better align with results in “further study” and avoid the same situation, could we have an additional evaluation setup like Intel suggested in 3-1a? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine the moderator’s proposal |
| Qualcomm | We are fine the moderator’s proposal.  |
| LG Electronics | For the 1st bullet, we have the same view with Mitsubishi and Samsung.For the 2nd bullet, we are fine the proposal. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to Mitsubishi’s comment:I don’t understand how endorsing existing PTRS (the 1st bullet) will compromises the chances of optimizing the performance of above 52.6 GHz. Isn’t the whole purpose of the 2nd bullet of this proposal opening the door for performance optimization? Both bullets are put into one proposal for discussion and a possible agreement together.Talking about double design and opposing the 1st bullet, is the intention of Mitsubishi to say “existing PTRS for CP-OFDM should not be supported in 52.6 to 71 GHz at all”? If that’s the case, I’d like to understand the reason/justification. There’re more than 10 evaluation results captured in TR 38.808 and multiple evaluation results submitted in this meeting proved/verified extensively on the performance of existing PTRS design in 52.6 to 71 GHz. Respond to Samsung’s comment:Seems to me, Samsung implied existing PTRS is supported automatically. If that’s the understanding, it’d be better to make it explicit and clear by having the 1st bullet rather than relying on implicit understanding/assumption.On simulation setup, proposal 5-1 is formulated in section 2.5 for evaluation of potential RS enhancement.Several sub-bullets of the 2nd bullet related to evaluation assumptions were removed here and addressed in proposal 5-1. Wording updated into Proposal 3-1c. |

##### Proposal 3-1c for discussion:

* Existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Further study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH SNR and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share the views of Mitsubishi, Samsung and LG Electronics on the first bullet point. This decision can be made later once further evaluations are available, so that we have a global view of the PTRS design for 52.6-71 GHz suitable for both CPE compensation and ICI compensation. It is premature to have the proposal in the first bullet, although it is of course a possibility that eventually we may support both the existing PTRS design and an enhanced PTRS design.The proposal in the second bullet is agreeable, but it should be understood as a strong recommendation to evaluate PTRS according to the examples (e.g. cyclic sequence) for companies who have so far only evaluated other types of enhancements, if we want to be able to draw meaningful conclusions at the next meeting.To address Ericsson’s earlier comment on PTRS overhead, we suggest adding one note.Therefore, we propose the following update to proposal 3-1c:* Further study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence is recommended to be evaluated)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH SNR and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results
 |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. Additional note from HW is fine.  |
| Mitsubishi | To respond to Moderator’s question, as Samsung and HW also explained, it is premature to endorse Rel.15 design based on the current results. Besides the performance of Rel.15 scheme, we need to get a clear view of the performance of the proposed enhancements labelled “FFS” in order to decide if we support one scheme, both schemes, a configurable pattern (which may or not include a distributed and/or a clustered pattern), or no enhancement at all (which is automatically equivalent to sticking with the current pattern anyhow). We are therefore opposed to endorsing bullet 1 in this meeting.Concerning 2nd bullet point, both updated proposal and update from HW are fine, as long as the remaining sub-bullets from 3-1b are addressed in the LLS simulation assumptions. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with Huawei’s update |
| Samsung | Respond to Moderator’s question: No, we mean existing PTRS is the default option if none of the further evaluation shows convincing results. Since we leave the door opened in 2nd bullet see more evaluation results, 1st bullet actually eliminates some of the possible outcomes like Mitsubishi addressed above. So we prefer not to have bullet 1 endorsed in this meeting, and Huawei’s update looks good to us. For 2nd bullet, both updated proposal and HW’s modification are fine for us. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal and support keeping the first bullet  |
| Ericsson | We would prefer to keep the first bullet; however, we should definitely not have two designs. Hence if companies are not willing to down-select to the first bullet and need more time to evaluate, then the proposal can be re-structured as follows:* RAN1 to further study, then down-select to one of the following two alternatives for PTRS for CP-OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz
	+ Alt-1: Existing PTRS design from Rel-15/16
	+ Alt-2: Enhanced PTRS design
* The following aspects can be considered in the study
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH SNR and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate

Specification impact could be another item to add to the list of study considerations.Wouldn’t it be more accurate to say “…impact to PDSCH performance ~~SNR~~ and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE”? |
| Intel | General ok with proposal. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Proposal updated into 3-1d below. |

##### Proposal 3-1d for discussion:

* RAN1 to further study, then down-select to one of the following two alternatives for PTRS for CP-OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz
	+ Alt-1: Existing PTRS design from Rel-15/16
	+ Alt-2: Potential enhanced PTRS design
* A least the following aspects are considered on the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We and several other companies were ok with proposal 3-1c without the first bullet and with some revisions. The latest proposal from Ericsson is again an attempt to anticipate the discussion that we can only have at the next meeting based on new evaluations and additional analysis, including analysis of whether supporting both the existing DMRS and enhanced DMRS is a viable option. So we don’t agree with proposal 3-1d, in particular we don’t agree with the first bullet and the two sub-bullets, unless we add Alt-3: support both existing PTRS design from Rel-15/16 and enhanced PTRS design. In Alt-3 “potential” should be deleted since if agreed the enhanced DMRS is no longer potential.For the second bullet, it seems companies were ok with the proposed revision “(e.g. cyclic sequence is recommended to be evaluated).”* RAN1 to further study, then down-select to one of the following two alternatives for PTRS for CP-OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz
	+ Alt-1: Existing PTRS design from Rel-15/16
	+ Alt-2: enhanced PTRS design
	+ Alt-3: support both PTRS design from Rel-15/16 and enhanced PTRS design
* A least the following aspects are considered on the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer to have the original first bullet since anyway the existing design should be the default choice if no convincing results show that the exsiting design cannot mitigate the phase noise in above 52.6GHz. We are open to further evaluate the enhanced PTRS pattern as shown in the second bullet, but the specification impact should be considered and listed.* + Specification impact
 |
| InterDigital | We prefer proposal 3-1c as we think that existing PTRS should be supported regardless of whether enhanced PTRS is supported or not. We are fine to include “specification impact” as ZTE commented.  |
| Futurewei | We support the original proposal 3-1c, and agree with Interdigital that existing PTRS should be supported regardless the outcome of the enhanced PTRS discussions. |
| LG Electronics | For the 2nd bullet, we don’t agree with HW’s comment to add the wording “(e.g. cyclic sequence is recommended to be evaluated)”. We think that not all companies should evaluate the performance of PTRS with cyclic sequence. Current wording is sufficient. |
| Qualcomm  | We support proposal 3-1c. As ZTE, IDCC and FW mentioned the legacy pattern should be supported for the new band, anyway there many scenarios based on SCS and MCS where the CPE is enough to achieve good performance. The specification impact should be taken into consideration as ZTE pointed out  |
| CATT | We support Alt-1. The PT-RS and related PDSCH decoding performance depends on the receiver algorithm in UE implementation |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We support proposal 3-1c. I don’t understand the reason against the first bullet of 3-1c since it is already validated it could work well by existing evaluation results. So the baseline is the existing PT-RS design for operation from 52.6-71GHz. From HW’s comments on 3-1d, it seems they are also OK to support existing PT-RS design. Then I think there is no problem on 3-1c, i.e. existing PT-RS is supported and further study the need of enhancement. Proposal 3-1c doesn’t preclude the possibility of PT-RS enhancement. |
| Mitsubishi | I disagree with vivo’s comment. We saw in our results presented in our contribution that Rel.15 pattern’s performance is at least debatable at 60Ghz and clearly insufficient at 70Ghz. At this point I am under the impression that we are repeating all over again the same debate as for points 3-1 and 3-1c, which doesn’t bring us any forward. We are strongly opposed to explicitly supporting the current pattern at this meeting based on the current results, for all the reasons that I won’t repeat once again because they were already stated before by several companies.Our preference is to remove the first bullet point altogether, which means that further study is to be conducted and doesn’t mean that Rel.15 pattern is not supported, which should hopefully be agreeable for all parties. As a last compromise solution and having in mind that a double design is always the last resort, we could also live with HW’s proposal for the sake of progress. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine in general. We don’t need to discuss on support of existing PT-RS. The first bullet can be modified as:* RAN1 to further study whether/how to support enhanced PTRS in addition to Rel-15/16 PTRS for CP-OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz

The applicability can be discussed as UE capability. |
| Ericsson | We agree with comments from various companies that Rel-15/16 PTRS works just fine, so there is no reason not to support it. The question is if whether or not enhancements on top of that are additionally supported. In that sense, we realize our previous suggestion with only Alt-1 and Alt-2 precluded support of both Rel-15/16 + enhancements to Rel-15/16.With that in mind, our first preference is still Proposal #3-1c (or Nokia's update of Proposal #3-1d above). As a second preference, we could also accept Huawei's update of Proposal #3-1d which includes Alt-1,2,3. |
| Apple | We prefer Proposal #3-1c. |
| Intel | We agree with HW’s proposal. Our first preference is to keep the door open for both combining Rel-15/16 PTRS with an enhanced PTRS design (Alt-3) and supporting an enhanced design only (Alt‑2). It could be beneficial to support enhanced design for some specific scenarios (e.g. MCSs) while using Rel-15/16 PTRS for the rest (Alt-3). In case the evaluation shows the enhanced design gives clear benefits for all the scenarios, having a unified enhanced design should also be allowed (Alt-2).As a second preference, we are okay with Nokia’s proposal that precludes Alt-2 and is generally equivalent to Proposal #3-1c. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Majority of companies indicated they prefer discussing proposal 3-1c. Wording updated into proposal 3-1e with red font highlight the revision to make it clear that potential enhancement is still viable and further study is encouraged.Summary of status so far: 15 companies (Futurewei, Xiaomi, ZTE, Ericsson, Qualcomm, DOCOMO, Nokia, Intel, InterDigital, vivo, Lenovo, Convida, Sony, CATT, Apple) indicated their support of existing PTRS for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz during multiple rounds of discussion.4 companies (Mitsubishi, Huawei, Samsung and LG) indicated their opposing to endorse existing PTRS for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz in this meeting.On further study of potential enhancement, at least one company (CATT) opposed further study alone without endorsing support of existing PTRS. |

##### Proposal 3-1e for discussion:

* At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ Specification impact
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As long as it is understood that a decision to support both the existing PTRS and enhanced PTRS is allowed at the next meeting, then we can accept the proposal.But this means it will not be acceptable to say at the next meeting that two PTRS designs should not be supported because of complexity or specification impact of support 2 PTRS designs vs. 1 PTRS design.So we propose to delete the bullet on specification impact and to add this note: whether or not to support enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of complexity of supporting two PTRS designs or specification impact of supporting two PTRS designs.* At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ ~~Specification impact~~
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate
* Note: potential support of enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of complexity of supporting two PTRS designs or specification impact of supporting two PTRS designs.
 |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal |
| Mitsubishi | Concerning bullet point 2, its contents seem stable and, together with proposal 5-1a, give a clear guidance on how to proceed for the next meeting. We are supportive of both guidance for enhancements (second bullet point) and simulation assumptions (5-1), that could be merged together since they serve the same purpose.Concerning the first bullet point, I still have to voice some serious concerns. The performance of Rel.15 scheme is still unclear in some cases raised by different companies, such as at 70GHz, with small BW allocation, with high MCS, with power boosting. As per the WID description (“Evaluate, and if needed, specify the PTRS enhancement “) I believe it is clear for everybody, since spelled in all letters, that enhancements will be specified only if proven necessary, and if no enhancement is proven necessary than Rel.15 design stays in place. Not endorsing Rel.15 design right now is a no-risk situation, it’s crystal clear that Rel.15 pattern as fallback solution is already in place if enhanced patterns don’t bring clear gain, and that it might be part of the solution even if enhancements are supported.On the other hand, if at the next meeting PT-RS enhancements are indeed proven to bring clear gain, it is pretty clear that having Rel.15 “as is” already endorsed would be damaging. We will have to deal with a double design and all the shortcomings that it involves, without being able to go back and decide, based on a global technical view, if a unique design, a unified design (including e.g. Rel.15 or a direct extension of it), or a double design is the best way to proceed, and in which scenario. We are taking an unnecessary risk by rushing into explicitly supporting Rel.15 “as is” right now, and I think HW’s note is quite enlightening to this respect.Starting from HW’s proposal, I would prefer to replace 1st bullet point by a note that would hopefully be agreeable by Rel.15 proponents without compromising the chances of having a clean design in the next meeting* ~~At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.~~
* Note: Supporting Rel.15 PTRS design as unique solution or in combination with enhanced PTRS design is not precluded.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ ~~Specification impact~~
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate
* Note: potential support of enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of complexity of supporting two PTRS designs or specification impact of supporting two PTRS designs.
 |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to Mitsubishi:Appreciate your valuable input to the discussion. As you mentioned, there may be some cases where performance improvement may be possible. At least for all other cases, there’re extensive evaluation results during SI which are already captured in the TR and in this meeting to support endorsing existing PTRS design. Agreeing the 1st bullet moves us forward so that we can focus on the area/cases where potential PTRS enhancement may be needed and study then specify that. Your proposed note in place of the 1st bullet still leaves the whole discussion open which may engage us redo everything we had already done in terms of evaluation and debate. That does not seem to move us forward.On your suggestion of merge with Proposal 5-1a, my understanding is that Proposal 5-1a is for all potential RS enhancement evaluation, no need to bundle with this proposal.Respond to Huawei:Thanks for your willingness to compromise. On your suggested note, given receiver complexity is one aspect to be considered for potential enhancement, I suggest some wording change to the note to avoid any potential misunderstanding.Wording updated into proposal 3-1f. |

##### Proposal 3-1f for discussion:

* At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate
* Note: potential support of enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of specification effort of supporting two PTRS designs.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Qualcomm | The added note needs more clarifications, this should be contingent on observing significant performance enhancement from the new patterns, if the two patterns performances are almost the same, then it makes sense to avoid spec changes  |
| Mitsubishi | Respond to Moderator’s comments:The contents of the 2nd bullet point have been stable since version 3-1b and they are complementary to Proposal 5-1a (no risk of confusion, the wording clearly indicated that it refers to PTRS and not to DMRS part). If the Moderator prefers not to bundle with Proposal 5 it’s fine also, but following the same reasoning and given that this study needs to be performed regardless of the decision on Rel.15 pattern, the 2nd bullet point is agreeable as is and it shouldn’t remain bundled with the discussion on the remaining details of 1st /3rd bullet point either.Concerning the Moderator’s comment on the note, Proposal 5 discusses the complexity of the receiver of each given scheme. My reading of HW’s note is that it refers to the complexity of a receiver needing to support 2 PT-RS decoders instead of one (caused by the potentially double design), which is very different. From that perspective I am supportive of the original wording from HW and not supportive of the current version from the Moderator.Regarding the 1st bullet point, if we really have to go down that path at this meeting, I prefer to have it as a working assumption, which would leave some margin to check if the performance vs complexity tradeoff will cause serious issues or not.Proposal 3-1-1* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate

Proposal 3-1-2* [Working assumption] At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Note: potential support of enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of complexity of supporting two PTRS designs or specification impact of supporting two PTRS designs.
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The intent of the note is as understood by Qualcomm. What we want to clarify is that if sufficient performance gain is observed that justifies the introduction of enhanced PTRS, the introduction of enhanced PTRS should not be precluded just by the argument that it increases receiver complexity (to support a receiver for two DMRS patterns) and because it impacts the specification to support an additional PTRS pattern, otherwise agreeing to the legacy DMRS pattern would again preempt the technical discussion at the next meeting. Below I suggested some wording for clarification (in green), also addressing the question of complexity.Mitsubishi’s proposal to take the existing PTRS design as working assumption makes sense at this stage.Proposal 3-1-1* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate

Proposal 3-1-2* [Working assumption] At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Note: potential support of enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of specification effort of supporting two PTRS designs, and will not be precluded by consideration of complexity for a receiver to support two PTRS patterns, but should be justified by performance benefits.
 |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to Qualcomm:My understanding, the added note only says that specification effort consideration will not be the determining factor to preclude potential enhancement.All other aspects including performance improvement, complexity, overhead etc. will be considered together when we have further evaluation results to decide on any potential enhancement. Respond to Mitsubishi and Huawei:Thank you for your willingness to compromise.On the suggestion to separate the 1st and 2nd bullet, as I summarized, there’re companies opposed to further study alone without endorsing existing PTRS. Bundle those 2 bullets in one proposal is already a compromise to move us forward in terms of further study and then toward some potential enhancement.On the suggestion of working assumption, I think your concern is valid. I also trust companies in RAN1 share the same intention/understanding when we say “at least”. On the wording suggestion from Huawei on the note, it can be interpreted that receiver complexity will not be the deciding factor at all. I don’t think we can decide potential enhancement without considering receiver complexity but with only performance benefits as justification. It should be well understood that there’s tradeoff between complexity and performance. I made wording changes to make it clear that aspects related to supporting both existing and potential PTRS enhancement are included as part of receiver complexity study.  |

##### Proposal 3-1g for discussion:

* [Working assumption] At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity, including possible aspects related to supporting both existing PTRS design and potential PTRS enhancement
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate
* Note: potential support of enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of specification effort of supporting two PTRS designs.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We cannot accept the note. Two PTRS designs do require large amount of specification effort, we don’t know why this is not considered. If block PTRS shows similar performance or slightly better performance, we also need to spend much effort on supporting 2 PTRS designs? It’s not reasonable.So we suggest to remove the note and add ‘specification effort’ bullet back.  |
| Ericsson | We have a serious concern of making the first bullet a working assumption. If the words "at least" are there, why do we need a working assumption? It seems open the door for NOT supporting existing PTRS design, and we cannot accept that. This would require throwing away legacy implementations, and that is a serious concern. We note that there were numerous results from the study item to show that Rel-15 PTRS pattern works well in most, if not all, scenarios of interest. In fact in our contribution we show that when comparing different designs (Rel-15, Rel-15 + increased density (K=1), single cluster, and multi-cluster), the enhanced designs are at best equal in performance to the Rel-15 design, and on average, worse than Rel-15. Based on this, it is not right to completely throw away the legacy design.My concern on this is confirmed by David's (Huawei) understanding of Proposal 3-1g:If receiver complexity becomes a serious concern for supporting two PTRS designs, and assuming the enhanced PTRS provide sufficient benefits, then our understanding based on proposal 3-1g is that it will be possible to discuss selecting between the legacy PTRS and the enhanced PTRS. If there is no such serious receiver complexity concern, then both PTRS could end up being supported.In summary, we cannot accept the "working assumption" wording. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Summary of status so far:Ericsson cannot accept proposal 3-1g with working assumption for the 1st bullet.ZTE cannot accept the added note “Note: potential support of enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of specification effort of supporting two PTRS designs.” and hence cannot accept proposal 3-1g and 3-1f. It seems no chance to have consensus on proposal 3-1g and proposal 3-1f. I suggest to rollback to proposal 3-1e. The same content as in proposal 3-1e is copied into proposal 3-1h below for discussion.Previously, 4 companies (Mitsubishi, Huawei, Samsung and LG) indicated their opposing to endorse existing PTRS for CP-OFDM in this meeting.Now LG indicated they are ok with proposal 3-1e. Huawei said “As long as it is understood that a decision to support both the existing PTRS and enhanced PTRS is allowed at the next meeting, then we can accept the proposal.” toward proposal 3-1e. Can Huawei confirm whether they are okay with proposal 3-1h as it is?Given Mitsubishi and Samsung indicated their opposing to endorse existing PTRS for CP-OFDM previously, I’d like to ask Mitsubishi and Samsung whether they still oppose proposal 3-1h. |

##### Proposal 3-1h for discussion:

* At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ Specification impact
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Moderator | Huawei said “As long as it is understood that a decision to support both the existing PTRS and enhanced PTRS is allowed at the next meeting, then we can accept the proposal.” toward proposal 3-1e. Can Huawei confirm whether they are okay with proposal 3-1h as it is?Given Mitsubishi and Samsung indicated their opposing to endorse existing PTRS for CP-OFDM previously, I’d like to ask Mitsubishi and Samsung whether they still oppose proposal 3-1h. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our concern with proposal 3-1h (3-1e) is that specification impact for having both existing PTRS and enhanced PTRS is necessarily larger than having just existing PTRS. We should acknowledge this now and agree that supporting both PTRS designs is an acceptable outcome at the next meeting, of course pending justification by performance evaluations.Our concern is confirmed by ZTE’s response: “Two PTRS designs do require large amount of specification effort, we don’t know why this is not considered.”In this case, we are worried that no matter the performance showed for the enhanced PTRS at the next meeting, some companies will object only due to specification effort. Therefore we added the last note, which should be kept in proposal 3-1h. This is not different than agreements saying “choose between supporting Alt1 or Alt1+Alt2”, which acknowledge that specification effort is no longer a criterion in selecting Alt2.With the last note added, with additional clarification to address Qualcomm’s concern, we can agree with proposal 3-1h (as we did with proposal 3-1e). Changes are shown in green below.* At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ ~~Specification impact~~
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate
* Note: potential support of enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of specification effort of supporting two PTRS designs, and should be justified by sufficient performance benefit over existing PTRS.
 |
| Mitsubishi | @ZTE/Sanechips, if block PTRS shows similar performance the WID wording “specify if needed” solves the issue, we will certainly not specify another pattern with similar performance. I think this was addressed by Moderator’s answer to Qualcomm in 3-1f.@Ericsson, in our contribution we saw the same effects as the ones that you mention with a block PTRS with non-cyclic structure. We did see, on the other hand, better results with a block PTRS with cyclic structure, which was only evaluated by a couple of companies. The purpose of bullet 2 is to confirm or infirm the performance of the cyclic structure by a larger number of companies and clarify the performance of Rel.17 in some scenarios pointed out to be problematic (70GHz, high MCS, with power boosting, with small allocations).We cannot accept proposal 3-1h, which in my point of view is not a compromise. Removing the working assumption and the note leads us straight back to the case where, if in the next meeting the block pattern with cyclic sequences is indeed confirmed to have significantly better performance, it will be challenged on grounds of the complexity of the double design, since we will already have a less performing sequence agreed. This is far from being a compromise, since the enhanced pattern will clearly not get a fair treatment.To respond to Ericsson’s concern and as a step forward towards compromise, I propose the following on top of HW’s proposal, with the purpose of having some options between a full double design and some hybrid approach (each pattern would apply to specific cases)* At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
	+ FFS Whether/how to combine with the enhanced PTRS sequence, if supported
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity
	+ ~~Specification impact~~
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate
* Note: potential support of enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will not be precluded by consideration of specification effort of supporting two PTRS designs, and should be justified by sufficient performance benefit over existing PTRS.
 |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal and removing “Specification impact”. The technical value of solution should always come first, besides, if such bullet is added here it should be added to any other proposal, Therefore, we support removal. We think that Mitsubishi first sub-bullet should be in the second bullet. Companies should be encouraged to look into this issue but not required to. Therefore, we suggest either to delete it or move it under the second bullet. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to Huawei, Mitsubishi and Futurewei:If potential PTRS enhancement is agreed, the specification impact need to be identified, which is the intention of “how to combine with the enhanced PTRS sequence, if supported” as proposed by Mitsubishi.Respond to Huawei and Mitsubishi:On the added note, it seems to me companies have different understanding on the wording of “not be precluded by”. If the concern from Huawei and Mitsubishi is that an argument on specification effort alone may dispute potential enhancement, I revised the wording of the note which also took into account the concern from ZTE based on their previous comment.Wording updated in below in proposal 3-1i. |

##### Proposal 3-1i for discussion:

* At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity, including possible aspects related to supporting both existing PTRS design and potential PTRS enhancement
	+ Possible specification impact of supporting potential PTRS enhancement in addition to existing PTRS design
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate
* Note: the decision on supporting potential enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will be made based on performance benefit, receiver complexity and specification effort aspects together and not on any single aspect alone.

Please provide comments only if serious concern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

##### Proposal 3-1j for discussion:

* At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
	+ PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
	+ Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
	+ Receiver complexity, including possible aspects related to supporting both existing PTRS design and potential PTRS enhancement
	+ Possible specification impact of supporting potential PTRS enhancement in addition to existing PTRS design
	+ Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate
* Note: the decision to support potential enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will be made based on performance benefit, receiver complexity and specification effort aspects of enhanced PTRS design together and not purely on the considerations of the complexity/specification effort caused by supporting potential enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design.

Please provide comments only if serious concern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| LG Electronics | Support the updated proposal |
| Ericsson | We are okay with the proposal with the following change, since it is not clear if "complexity" means "receiver complexity" or "specification complexity". Receiver complexity must factor into the decision.* Note: the decision to support potential enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design will be made based on performance benefit, receiver complexity and specification effort aspects of enhanced PTRS design together and not purely on the considerations of the ~~complexity/~~specification effort caused by supporting potential enhanced PTRS design in addition to existing PTRS design.
 |
|  |  |

#### For DFT-s-OFDM

As required by the WID regarding whether there’s a need for PTRS enhancement, the following two sources evaluated PTRS enhancement for DFT-s-OFDM.

[5, Huawei] evaluated a new PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within on DFT-s-OFDM symbol. It is observed that for the same overhead, BLER performance of 64QAM with 120 kHz SCS can be improved by using a new pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol.

[6, Nokia] compared PUSCH performance of DFT-s-OFDM with different PTRS configurations and showed performance improvement of 64QAM with 120 kHz SCS by increasing the maximum number of PTRS groups and keeping the same number of samples per group (i.e. with increased total PTRS overhead).

Although there’s no evaluation results for DFT-s-OFDM, [10, Mitsubishi] also proposed density extension of current Rel.15 PTRS for DFT-s-OFDM waveform.

[5, Huawei] brought up another issue of PTRS group placement for PTRS with $N\_{sample}^{group}=4.$ It observed that due to Rx timing shift, (part of) a PTRS group placed at the tail of the transmitter’s DFT-s-OFDM symbol, may wrap-around to the head of the symbol from the receiver’s perspective, thus deteriorating PN compensation performance.

Moderator’s comment:

Compared to CP-OFDM, there’re much less evaluation results on the performance of PTRS enhancements for DFT-s-OFDM. Two contributions showed performance gain only for a limited case (64QAM with 120 kHz SCS) which is hard to tell whether the enhancement should be applied to DFT-s-OFDM in general to all SCSs under all conditions. Companies are encouraged to evaluate other cases and clarify their proposal(s) in order to reach agreement on PTRS enhancements for DFT-s-OFDM.

##### Proposal 3-2 for discussion:

* FFS: PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol when a large number of PRBs is scheduled for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Mitsubishi | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Moderator’s proposal, this may need more evaluations. |
| Qualcomm  | More evaluations are needed to justify increasing the PTRS total number of samples |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the FFS above.  |
| Samsung | We are ok with FL’s proposal.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Moderator’s proposal.  |
| Apple | Support the moderator’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A more constructive proposal would be preferable rather than just an FFS point. We would suggest that the proposal includes the moderator’s proposal from the summary that companies are encouraged to evaluate PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol especially with large bandwidth allocation, in order to reach agreement on whether to specify PTRS enhancements for DFT-s-OFDM.If clarification is still needed on the proposal, we propose the PT-RS enhancements with DFT-s-OFDM for all values of SCS (120, 480, 960). We suggest companies to evaluate the following:* PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol especially with large bandwidth allocation
* PTRS pattern without mapping PTRS to the last X pre-DFT symbol(s) with $N\_{sample}^{group}=4$
 |
| Intel | Ok to further study. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | Support the moderator’s proposal  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Sony | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To briefly reiterate our early comment, we would prefer a more constructive proposal to encourage companies to evaluate PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol especially with large bandwidth allocation. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording updated based on comments. |

##### Proposal 3-2a for discussion:

Companies are encouraged to study at least the following aspects for potential PTRS enhancement for DFT-s-OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz

* The need of potential PTRS enhancement
* PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol when a large number of PRBs is scheduled

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Mitsubishi | OK with the updated proposal |
| Samsung | OK with the updated proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are ok with proposal 3-2a |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Ok with proposal 3-2a |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | We support the proposal |
| Apple | We are ok with the proposal |

#### Other issue(s)

Please provide comments if any on any missed issue(s) about PTRS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Apple | Given that we may be using an analog beamformer, it may be impossible to share power across antenna ports and not allow power boosting. RAN1 should investigate the frequency domain power boosting. |
| Moderator | Respond to Apple’s comment:Point added in proposal 3-1a. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Qualcomm  | Supporting the MCSs that require ICI compensation should be based on the UE capability  |
| Moderator | Respond to Qualcomm:It’d be better to discuss UE capability related issues once the PTRS enhancement discussion is concluded and we know more about corresponding PN compensation aspects.  |

## 2.4. DMRS

### Individual observations/proposals

The following are individual observations/proposals from the contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sources | Observations/proposals |
| [1, Futurewei] | Observation 1: With larger SCSs and higher channel frequency-selectivity, the number of DMRS symbols within the coherence bandwidth of the channel is significantly decreased; thus, channel estimation with comb-DMRS and interpolation may be subject to excessive error.Observation 2: Under larger DS values, the BLER performance for SCSs 480kHz and 960kHz degrades from the performance of the Rel-15 compliant comb-DMRS structure with FD interpolation. The proposed non-interpolation method with no FD averaging almost always leads to the best performance among the four CE methods. For lower SCS 120kHz, the comb-DMRS offers desirable performance. Proposal 3: With higher SCSs employed, a comprehensive evaluation of the effect of high frequency-selectivity on the accuracy of channel estimation, and in turn, the link performance is necessary.Proposal 4: Study if block-DMRS can be further enhanced or if there are other DMRS structures that lead to comparable performance with the ½ comb-DMRS. Proposal 5: The necessity of recommending a dedicated DMRS format for different MCS values is not supported by the current evaluation.Observation 3: Performance losses are observed when the type-2 DMRS over type-1 DMRS are used, especially for the higher SCS. |
| [2, Lenovo] | Observation 3: For higher SCS values such as 480kHz and 960kHz, BLER performance difference between the ideal channel estimation and real channel estimation varies for different SCS values, where, as the subcarrier spacing is increasing, the performance degradation with real channel estimation also increases which could be attributed to the performance of DM-RS configuration with different SCS values.Proposal 3: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, new DM-RS configurations should be supported with following criterion:* High frequency density of the DM-RS for high SCS for better channel estimation when channel coherence bandwidth is less than the configured SCS
* Reduced number of DM-RS ports as the performance gain of high rank MIMO channels is expected to be limited in this FR
 |
| [3, ZTE] | Observation 4: Rel-15 DMRS Type 1 pattern and the new DMRS pattern that fully occupied in frequency domain show comparable performance.Proposal 5: Reuse the Rel-15 legacy DMRS pattern for 52.6GHz~71GHz.Proposal 6: Consider to relax the restriction on DMRS ports for PUSCH and PDSCH when PTRS is configured.Proposal 7: Consider the impact of phase noise on port number of other reference signals and control signals.  |
| [4, OPPO] | Proposal 4: Enhancements to DMRS pattern for 480kHz and 960kHz SCSs in the new frequency range should be supported. |
| [5, Huawei] | Observation 2: To provide enough accuracy of channel estimation, DMRS of multiple slots should be combined for channel estimation for multi-PDSCH scheduling, which increases the delay of channel estimation if only one FL-DMRS symbol is used per scheduled slot.Proposal 9: Support multiple consecutive symbols of FL-DMRS for the multi-slot scheduling, whose absolute time duration is same as that of 120 kHz. |
| [6, Nokia] | Proposal 5: Study the solution to support time-domain PRB bundling when multi-PDSCH scheduling is supported. The existing DMRS time-domain pattern is reused unless any critical performance degradation is identified.Observation 21: Existing RAN1 specification provides support for flexible configuration of different DMRS antenna ports belonging into same or different CDM groups for rank-1 and rank-2.Observation 22: For rank-1, type-1 and new type (“comb-1”) w/o OCC-2 can achieve better BLER performance of PDSCH compared with the type-2 DMRS w/o OCC-2 with SCSs =480 and 960 kHz.Observation 23: For rank-2, both type-1 and type-2 DMRS w/o OCC-2 outperfom other DMRS types in BLER performance with SCSs=480 and 960 kHz.Observation 24: Type-1 w/o OCC-2 outperforms in BLER performance other DMRS types in the most of the considered cases.Observation 25: It is reasonable to provide a specification support for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH to be optimized only up to rank-2 in Rel-17 for at higher carrier frequencies (>52.6 GHz).Observation 26: New DMRS type (irrespective of rank 1 or rank 2) does not provide any possibility for multiplexing of it with any other type of signal/RS/channel into same OFDM symbol. Observation 27: Due to additional RS overhead associated with the new DMRS type, the usage of new DMRS type leads to reduced achievable PUSCH/PDSCH throughput in comparison with type-1 DMRS w/o OCC.Observation 29: It is not feasible to introduce new DMRS type for PUSCH/PDSCH in Rel-17 for above 52.6 GHz.Proposal 10: No additional DMRS pattern is supported in Rel-17 for above 52.6 GHz. |
| [9, vivo] | Proposal 3: Retain DMRS OCC in frequency domain based on OFDM for NR 52.6GHz to 71GHz. |
| [11, MediaTek] | Observation 1: When ICI equalizer is used at the receiver, R-15 PTRS & DMRS design could support normal NR operation with 120 KHz SCS and high MCS at 60 GHz band.Proposal 1: No DMRS and PTRS enhancements are needed for NR operating at 60 GHz band with 120 KHz SCS. |
| [12, Intel] | Proposal 5: Indicate to UE that CDM groups, signaled in scheduling DCI, do not contain potential co-scheduled DMRS. |
| [15, InterDigital] | Observation 6: Type-2 DM-RS shows performance loss due to insufficient RS density in frequency domain. Observation 7: Type-1 DM-RS shows performance loss due to FD-CDM in nonconsecutive Res. Proposal 5: Support proposed DM-RS pattern for PDSCH and PUSCH with larger SCSs. |
| [16, Sony] | Proposal 9: DMRS mapping in the frequency domain should be redesigned for new SCS At least 2 DMRS configurations for large and small delay spread environments should be specified. For large delay spread environment, high frequency dense DMRS mapping should be considered. |
| [21, Ericsson] | Proposal 14 Support a configuration of DMRS Type-1 that disables frequency domain CDM (FD-CDM) within the same comb (CDM group) for 480/960 kHz. This results in the following restrictions:• For single-symbol DMRS: Rank 3,4 not supported• For double-symbol DMRS: Ranks 5 – 8 not supported |
| [22, CEWiT] | Proposal 4: Support for a new DMRS design for NR above 52.6GHz to improve channel estimation accuracy. |
| [23, Charter] | Proposal 3: High-density PDSCH DMRS (12 Res per PRB), should be considered for further enhancing performance of NR beyond 52.6 GHz. |
| [24, Apple] | Proposal 11: To account for transmission with large SCSs in low coherence BW channels, • turn on or off the FD-OCC based on the scenario the channel is in • configure the UE with a DMRS pattern based on the new SCSs and the coherence bandwidth of the channel |
| [25, Qualcomm] | Observation 4: For channels with larger DS, the main reason of performance degradation with the larger SCS is the loss of orthogonality, and the gain from increasing the frequency density of the DMRS tones is limited, i.e., the performances of Config.1 with no CDMing and the new configuration with no CDMing are very close to each other. Proposal 3: For DMRS enhancement for high SCSs, while communicating over channel with large DS, for rank 1, a single port should be used from one CDM group and the remaining ports from the same group should not be assigned to other Ues. This information should be signaled to the UE via the scheduling DCI.Proposal 4: Study DMRS bundling for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH transmission, at least for the case when there is no gap between transmissions.Proposal 5: Study DMRS overhead reduction for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH transmission, at least for the case when there is no gap between transmissions. |
| [26, NTT DoCoMo] | Proposal 3: Denser DMRS pattern in frequency domain should be supported for new SCSs. |

### Summary on DMRS

Three aspects of DMRS enhancements are discussed in the contributions.

#### Frequency domain density and number of DMRS port

As required by the WID regarding whether there’s a need for DMRS enhancement for 480 and 960 kHz SCS, the following sources evaluated and compared BLER performance using the existing comb DMRS pattern against some new DMRS patterns.

[1, Futurewei] compared the PDSCH BLER performance based on existing comb-DMRS with different channel estimation methods against a block-DMRS of the same overhead. It is observed that non-interpolation method with no FD averaging as channel estimation based on comb-DMRS performs better than block DMRS for 480 and 960 kHz SCS under MCS7/16/22. It also compared performance of existing type-1 and type-2 DMRS and observed performance loss for type-2 DMRS for high SCS.

[2, Lenovo] also evaluated BLER performance of DMRS mapped to each RE in frequency domain and showed about 1 dB gain for 960 kHz SCS compared to existing type-1 DMRS. It also proposed to reduce number of DM-RS ports as the performance gain of high rank MIMO channels is expected to be limited in this FR.

It is observed in [3, ZTE] that for 480kHz and 960kHz, new DMRS pattern with higher DMRS density is slightly better (less than 0.5dB gain) than Rel-15 DMRS Type 1, both in low delay spread and high delay spread when ideal PN estimation and compensation is assumed.

[4, OPPO] compared performance among Type-1 DMRS pattern, Type-2 DMRS pattern and a new DMRS pattern for all SCSs under MCS16. It observed similar performance between the new FDM pattern and Type-1 FDM pattern. It also observed performance gain (0.8 dB for 480 kHz and about 1.5 dB for 960 kHz SCS) of the new CDM pattern compared to existing CDM patterns.

[6, Nokia] compared BLER performance of rank-1 and rank-2 PDSCH for different DMRS configuration options w/ and w/o OCC-2 (i.e. Rel-15 type-1, Rel-15 type-2 and new type (“comb-1”) ) without any phase noise impairments for 480 and 960 kHz SCS. It is observed that new type DMRS does not outperform Type-1 w/o OCC-2.

[15, InterDigital] compared BLER and throughput performances of Rank 2 with MCS 7 and 16 for 480 and 960 kHz SCS. It observed performance gain of an enhanced DMRS pattern with increased density.

[21, Ericsson] compared BLER performance of rank-1 PDSCH for type-1 DMRS with that of an ideal channel estimation for 480 and 960 kHz SCS. It is observed that for MCS 22/24/26/28 the gap in performance between genie/practical channel estimators is insignificant (< 0.9 dB) for all DS evaluated. In other words, there is little room for improvement using an enhanced DMRS design.

[23, Charter] compared PDSCH performance of higher-density DMRS (12 Res per PRB) with that of Rel-15 DMRS for 960 kHz SCS. It observed 0.2~0.3 dB gain for MCS22 and 1.3 dB gain for MCS26.

[25, Qualcomm] compared PDSCH performance of a new DMRS pattern featured by high frequency density (i.e., every RE) and 2-FD-OCC across adjacent Res with existing type-1 and type-2 DMRS patterns with 960kHz SCS for TDL-A channels with DS 20ns. It is observed that the gain from increasing the frequency density of the DMRS tones is limited (e.g., < 0.2 dB when CDM is off for MCS22/24/26).

[26, NTT DoCoMo] have evaluated PDSCH BLERs with 480 and 960 kHz SCS for three DMRS types with two-layer transmission, (a) Rel-15 DMRS type 1, (b) type 2, and (c) a new DMRS type with DMRS on every RE in the symbol containing DMRS. It observed about 0.5 to 1 dB gain of full-density DMRS compared to Type 1 for 480 and 960 kHz SCS in TDL-A with 10ns DS.

In addition to BLER performance, other aspects of block DMRS including the possibility for multiplexing of it with any other type of signal/RS/channel into same OFDM symbol, extra overhead and computational complexity of channel estimation are discussed in [6, Nokia].

In summary, multiple contributions ([2, Lenovo], [4, OPPO], [15, InterDigital], [23, Charter], [26, NTT DOCOMO]) showed performance gain of new DMRS patterns with increased frequency domain density while other contributions ([1, Futurewei], [3, ZTE], [6, Nokia], [21, Ericsson], [25, Qualcomm]) showed that insignificant gain or performance loss of new DMRS pattern over existing DMRS pattern.

Moderator’s comment:

In light of the available evaluation results from all contributions, it seems companies have different views and there’s no consensus regarding whether there is significant performance gain and hence the need of new DMRS patterns with increased frequency domain density compared to existing DMRS.

##### Proposal 4-1 for discussion:

* Use existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Xiaomi | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Qualcomm  | We support the proposal as there is no need to introduce a new DMRS configuration for the new band, sending the DMRS over every RE does not provide a significant performance enhancement compared with using DMRS configuration type 1 with no CDMing |
| DOCOMO | We agree the existing DMRS patterns would work in some cases. In this sense, we are ok with the moderator’s proposal. On the other hand, quite some companies including DOCOMO have the evaluation results showing the benefit of increased DMRS density. We think this point should be discussed further. Thus, we propose to add “FFS: whether to introduce different DMRS pattern than the existing ones in Rel-15/16”.  |
| Samsung | We are ok with FL’s proposal.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | We are okay with the FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is difficult to understand how the proposal relates to frequency domain density and number of DMRS ports. The proposal is too general and should be reformulated to focus on these topics, otherwise it preempts the entire discussion of section 2.4 including proposals 4-2 and DMRS aspects related to multi-slot scheduling.Proposal (revised):* DMRS frequency domain density (in unit of number of subcarriers) is reused from FR2.
* The number of DMRS ports supported is the same as in FR2.
 |
| Intel | If DMRS pattern here refers the Res utilized for transmission of DMRS modulated symbols, yes, we support the proposal. It might be good to clarify this. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Docomo’s proposal.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, at least one of the following options should be considered for DM-RS enhancements:Option 1: Design new DMRS pattern with increased density in frequencyOption 2: Restrict the number of DM-RS ports with current configurations to reduce the impact of OCC in frequency.Option 2 is related to Proposal 4-2. So, we can agree to not support new DMRS patterns only if at least the main bullet for Proposal 4-2 can be agreed i.e. OCC can be turned off for current pattern |
| Convida Wireless | We support moderator’s proposal. |
| Sony | We agree with Docomo’s proposal. |
| CEWiT | Phase noise introduces ICI effects for frequencies above 52.6 GHz. Since channel estimates and ICI coefficients cannot be separated, employing the same DMRS pattern may lead to incorrect channel estimates. Therefore, we propose to consider new DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6–71 GHz. |
| Charter | We agree using the existing DMRS patterns. A further study on new DMRS pattern could be beneficial. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Several companies propose to further study instead of concluding this topic in this meeting. Proposal revised below on FFS points |

##### Proposal 4-1a for discussion:

Further study on whether to introduce different DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | For performance comparison between two designs with different DMRS overhead, the same TBS must be used such that performance takes into account different effective coding rates.  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We think the updated proposal is still unclear. As Huawei and Intel pointed out for Proposal 4-1, it would be good to revise the proposal with separate two issues: 1) whether to support of DMRS ports same as FR1/FR2, and 2) whether to introduce different DMRS pattern in frequency domain for single DMRS port. We agree to further study for both aspects. |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal 4-1a.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We see the original proposal is supported by big majority. It is better to try the original proposal for making progress.  |
| CATT | We don’t support this proposal. The channel estimation performance of DM RS density in frequency domain had been studied intensively in Rel-8 LTE and Rel-15 NR. Since it is baseband processing, there would not have much different in performance when NR operations are in 52.6-71 GHz. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer the original proposal, and we are also fine to further evaluate the comparison between legacy DMRS pattern and new DMRS pattern. |
| Qualcomm | We think that this design was considered in several companies contributions and most of them concluded there is no need to introduce a new pattern as long as we support the ON/OFF FD OCC for the legacy configurations  |
| Intel | Ok with moderator’s suggestion. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We also prefer the original proposal although if there are companies that want to demonstrate a gain we are not opposed to this. Note that as Ericsson has said, we may need to account for different coding rates i.e. (coding\_rate, TBS\_pattern) = constant. |
| Futurewei | We are OK to further study different DMRS patterns. We prefer the original proposal though. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the FL’s proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are ok to study as proposed in 4-1a.  |
|  |  |
| Moderator | There’re several companies commented against further study. Formulated the following proposal 4-1b to keep the door open for potential DMRS enhancement. |

##### Proposal 4-1b for discussion:

* Existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Further study on whether to introduce different DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz
* Further study on whether to support the same number of DMRS ports as in FR2

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Moderator | To companies proposed further study on DMRS enhancement, please provide details of enhancement as well as evaluation assumptions so that I can summarize for future discussion. |
| Samsung | Although we are not in favor of supporting enhancement for DM-RS, fairly speaking, we may not need the first bullet due to same reason as for PT-RS.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For the first bullet, could we add a sub-bullet, FFS: Further restrictions ?Since we are discussing restrictions in terms turning off OCC, limiting number of DMRS ports. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine the moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Regarding the DMRS port on the 3rd bullet, it would be better to use more general wording like DMRS port configuration instead of the number of DMRS ports. We recommend the following rewording: * Further study on whether to support the same DMRS port configuration (e.g., the number of DMRS ports) as in FR2.
 |
| Moderator | Respond to Samsung’s comment:Again, it’d be better to make it explicit and clear for all companies by having the 1st bullet rather than relying on implicit understanding/assumption.Respond to Lenovo’s comment:I believe the 3rd bullet is addressing your concern and no need to duplicate that by having a sub-bullet under the 1st bullet. Respond to LG’s comment:Wording updated.Evaluation assumptions for potential DMRS enhancement study are in proposal 5-1 in section 2.5 now. |

##### Proposal 4-1c for discussion:

* Existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Further study on whether to introduce different DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz
* Further study on whether to support the same DMRS port configuration (e.g., the number of DMRS ports) as in FR2

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal 4-1c. In our evaluation results in [26] , the same TBS and coding rate is used among the evaluated DMRS patterns.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This proposal comes from observations on DMRS for 480 and 960 kHz SCS, so this should be made clear in the proposal. Based on that, our understanding is that the first bullet only applies to 120 kHz SCS.There we suggest the following revision:* Existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 120 kHz SCS.
* Further study on whether to introduce different DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS.
* Further study on whether to support the same DMRS port configuration (e.g., the number of DMRS ports) as in FR2

One other question is whether the DMRS evaluations are to be conducted with multi-slot scheduling or single-slot scheduling with 480 and 960 kHz SCS? |
| Nokia/NSB | Third bullet needs to be clarified. Whether it is intended for limiting the number of DMRS ports in 52-71GHz. If then, it can be handled by UE capability.  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with Huawei’s updated proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with Huawei’s update. For the second bullet, can we say this implicitly indicates that the DMRS pattern with the existing frequency domain density is the baseline ? |
| Samsung | We are fine with Huawei’s update.  |
| Qualcomm  | We are fine with the proposal in general and agree with Nokia about adding more clarification to the third bullet |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Huawei’s updated proposalRegarding single vs. multi-slot, we think that companies should report what they have simulated. |
| Intel | Ok with proposal 4-1c. We also agree with Nokia that capability discussion might be needed on supported number of port from the UE. The discussion could be focused on what the specification supports. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording updated as commented. |

##### Proposal 4-1d for discussion:

* Existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 120 kHz SCS.
* Further study on whether to introduce different DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Further study on whether and how to restrict DMRS port configuration (e.g., the number of DMRS ports) as in FR2 for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We think that the third bullet needs more clarification.  |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| CATT | We are Ok with the proposal  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We support the proposal |
| Charter Communications | We are fine with the proposal. Our updated results in R1-2101958 indicate that denser DMRS is necessary for reaching 10% BLER in MCSs 26 and above. |
| Apple | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Intel | Ok with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | OK with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are with the proposal |
| InterDigital | We propose to update proposal 4-1d in the same level with proposal 3-1f as shown below:* At least existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 120 kHz SCS.
* Further study on whether to introduce different DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Further study on whether and how to restrict DMRS port configuration (e.g., the number of DMRS ports) as in FR2 for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Note: potential support of enhanced DMRS pattern in addition to existing DMRS pattern will not be precluded by consideration of specification effort of supporting two DMRS patterns.
 |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to InterDigital:According the WID, “Evaluate, and if needed, specify …DMRS enhancement for 480kHz SCS and/or 960kHz SCS”, there’s no other choice other than existing DMRS for 120 kHz SCS. If your intention is to say ‘at least’ for 480 and 960 KHz SCS where potential DMRS enhancement is possible, then I suggest the following wording in proposal 4-1e. |

##### Proposal 4-1e for discussion:

* Existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 120 kHz SCS.
* At least existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Further study on whether to introduce different DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Further study on whether and how to restrict DMRS port configuration (e.g., the number of DMRS ports) as in FR2 for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Note: potential support of enhanced DMRS pattern in addition to existing DMRS pattern will not be precluded by consideration of specification effort of supporting two DMRS patterns.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Qualcomm | Again, the added note needs more clarifications, this should be contingent on observing significant performance enhancement from the new patterns, if the two patterns performances are almost the same, then it makes sense to avoid spec changes  |
| Moderator | Respond to Qualcomm:My understanding, the added note only says that specification effort consideration will not be the determining factor to preclude potential enhancement.All other aspects including performance improvement, complexity, overhead etc. will be considered together when we have further evaluation results to decide on any potential enhancement.  |
| Moderator | The last note is removed due to the same concern raised toward proposal 3-1g/3-1f. Wording updated into proposal 4-1f below. |
|  |  |

##### Proposal 4-1f for discussion:

* Existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 120 kHz SCS.
* At least existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Further study on whether to introduce different DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Further study on whether and how to restrict DMRS port configuration (e.g., the number of DMRS ports) as in FR2 for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support the updated proposal |
| Ericsson | We don't believe the DMRS density needs to be increased; however, it seems companies wish to study further. So we are okay with the proposal in that sense. |
|  |  |

#### Frequency domain OCC

[6, Nokia] compared BLER performance of rank-1 and rank-2 PDSCH for different DMRS configuration options w/ and w/o OCC-2 (i.e. Rel-15 type-1, Rel-15 type-2 and new type (“comb-1”) ) without any phase noise impairments. It is observed that Type-1 w/o OCC-2 outperforms other DMRS configurations.

[9, vivo] compared PDSCH BLER performance of type-1 DMRS with and without OCC for 480KHz and 960 KHz SCS with 64QAM, while the phase noise is compensated with CPE only approach. It observed no obvious gain for 480 kHz and small gain (< 0.8 dB) for 960 kHz SCS of type-1 DMRS without OCC only at large delay spread.

[12, Intel] evaluated PDSCH performance with and without frequency domain OCC being enabled for DMRS. For higher order modulation such as 64QAM (MCS 22), it observed the performance drop when OCC is enabled.

[21, Ericsson] compared BLER performance of rank-2 PDSCH for type-1 DMRS with and without FD-CDM against that of an ideal channel estimation for 480 and 960 kHz SCS. It is observed that for MCS 22/24/26/28, there’s performance gain without FD-CDM especially for large DS and very high MCS.

[24, Apple] evaluated PDSCH performance of type-1 DMRS with and without FD-OCC for 960 kHz SCS. It observed that at high frequency selectivity (low coherence bandwidth for large delay spread) there is a benefit in turning off the FD-OCC and at lower frequency selectivity (high coherence bandwidth with small delay spread), there is no difference in the performance.

[25, Qualcomm] compared PDSCH performance of a new DMRS pattern featured by high frequency density (i.e., every RE) and 2-FD-OCC across adjacent Res with existing type-1 and type-2 DMRS patterns with 960kHz SCS for TDL-A channels with DS 20ns. It is observed that for channels with larger DS, the main reason of performance degradation with the larger SCS is the loss of orthogonality. It showed performance gain without CDM for MCS22/24/26.

Based on the evaluation results, multiple sources [12, Intel], [21, Ericsson], [24, Apple], [25, Qualcomm] proposed to support a configuration of Type-1 DMRS where FD-CDM can be turned off, that is for rank 1, a single port should be used from one CDM group and the remaining ports from the same group should not be assigned to other Ues. [12, Intel] and [25, Qualcomm] further proposed to indicate this to UE via DCI.

Moderator’s comment:

Four sources ([12, Intel], [21, Ericsson], [24, Apple], [25, Qualcomm]) explicitly proposed to turn off FD-OCC, while one source ([9, vivo]) suggested to retain OCC. The following proposal is formulated based on the above for discussion.

##### Proposal 4-2 for discussion:

* Support a configuration of DMRS where OCC can be turned off within the same CDM group for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS in 52.6 to 71 GHz
* The indication when OCC is off is signaled to UE via DCI.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | We support the first bullet. For the second one we think that should be FFS at this time. |
| LG Electronics | Same view with Futurewei. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the first bullet. We think that OCC can be switched by the the MCS or the density of PTRS, e.g. if time domain density of PTRS is L=1 or 2, which means that MCS is quite large and PTRS is needed, then OCC can be turned off.  |
| Ericsson | We support the first bullet for the case of Type-1 DMRS pattern. It is questionable whether Type-2 DMRS pattern is usable at 480/960 kHz due to the larger gap between different CDM groups which causes difficulty in interpolation for dispersive channels.It seems a bit early to conclude on the 2nd bullet.Hence we recommend the following rewording (note that OCC’s are always applied within a CDM group, so no need to qualify that)Revised Proposal:* Support configuration of DMRS Type-1 in which FD-CDM is disabled for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS
* FFS: Details on whether and how to indicate that FD-CDM is disabled
 |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal.* An adaptive DMRS port scheduling is needed to allow scheduling the UE with a port from a CDM group and indicating that the remaining ports from the same group are not used by another UE, based on the channel conditions and MCS.
* The indication can be explicit by using the reserved entries in the DMRS configuration tables or introducing the new bit to indicate the presence/absence of the other DMRS ports with the CDM group
* For rank 2 transmission, two DMRS ports, each for a different CDM group, e.g. port 0 and port 2, from configuration type one, while the remaining ports from the CDM groups are not assigned to another UE
 |
| DOCOMO | We support the 1st bullet. For the 2nd bullet, although we are ok with turing on/off via DCI, it may be premature to say so at this moment.  |
| Samsung | We believe it’s premature to conclude the enhancement is needed. Comparing to the evaluation results for PTRS and DMRS configuration, we didn’t observe a larger gain for turning off OCC. More discussion is needed for this issue.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support. Rel-15/16 already support DMRS pattern without FD-OCC with antenna port mapping of {0, 2} in DCI. Assuming rank 2 is the most practical case in 60GHz, we don’t see the necessity of further enhancement.Regarding to inter-UE interference, we think MU-MIMO pairing is very difficult in higher frequency due to narrow beam. No additional signaling to indicate MU-MIMO transmission is required.  |
| Apple | We support the FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Perhaps the proposal could just provide a list of candidates for the time-being as it seems from the feedback that more study is needed on whether OCC needs to be turned off or is needed at all.  |
| Intel | We are supportive of the first bullet.For the second bullet on whether this should be dynamically signaled in DCI, or RRC configured, or just fixed in specification, we believe this merits further discussions.For the dynamically signaled method, this can potentially have some implications on the UE, as it might mean UE is expected to handle both cases regardless of the situation. Because of this we think further discussion is needed. |
| InterDigital | We are not fine with the proposal. We agree with Nokia that DMRS without FD-OCC can be achieved by indicating antenna port {0,2} by gNB implementation. However, we don’t think that MU-MIMO pairing is very difficult as inter-UE interference reduces due to high pathloss and narrow beam.  |
| Vivo | We think further study and evaluation is needed to verify that this enhancement is needed. From our observation, no much gain is achieved by turning off OCC. However, the loss is obvious on UE multiplexing capacity. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with the first bullet, but further discussion is needed on exactly how to turn of OCC. One method is explicit signaling a suggested in second bullet. Other method could be implied based on maximum number of ports that are allowed to be used with 1-symbol and 2-symbol DM-RS |
| Sony | We support first bullet. Second bullet needs to be discussed further. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Several companies propose to further study instead of conclude this topic in this meeting. Proposal revised below on FFS points |

##### Proposal 4-2a for discussion:

Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement with respect to FD-OCC:

* whether to support a configuration of DMRS in which FD-OCC is off for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS
	+ Applicability to Type-1 and/or Type-2 DMRS
	+ Details on whether and how to indicate when FD-OCC is off
* UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | Support proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We agree to further study for having a common view on whether turning off FD-OCC can achieve the performance gain. And, if so, detailed method of indication can be specified. |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal 4-2a.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Need clarification. DCI based turn-off is already supported (Index 11 below for type 1, and type 2 also has similar port mapping). Is the proposal disabling DCI indication but RRC-configuration instead? We think this is up to network scheduling. Also, MU-MIMO in higher frequency is not practical, and because up to 4 ports are supported when PT-RS is enabled, implantation-based solution (e.g. IRC receiver) can solve the issue.  Table 7.3.1.2.2-1: Antenna port(s) (1000 + DMRS port), *dmrs-Type*=1, *maxLength*=1 (DCI 1\_1)

|  |
| --- |
| **One Codeword:****Codeword 0 enabled,****Codeword 1 disabled** |
| **Value** | **Number of DMRS CDM group(s) without data** | **DMRS port(s)** |
| 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 0,1 |
| 3 | 2 | 0 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 7 | 2 | 0,1 |
| 8 | 2 | 2,3 |
| 9 | 2 | 0-2 |
| 10 | 2 | 0-3 |
| 11 | 2 | 0,2 |
| 12-15 | Reserved | Reserved |

 |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal. In response to Nokia’s comment, we agree that for rank 2 transmission, the current specs, as mentioned allow the UE to assume no OCC if it scheduled with index 11. However, we do not believe there is a similar rule or way to indicate such information to the UE if it was scheduled with rank 1 transmission  |
| Intel | Ok with moderator’s suggestion. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the further study, however, we believe that this study should focus Type-1 DMRS. As FD-OCC of Type-2 DMRS is allocated in consecutive REs in frequency domain, the performance degradation is low. In addition, for Qualcomm’s comment, we believe that there’s no need to indicate such information. Anyway, current CDM group indication does not restrict the usage on CDM group(s) without data which can be used for other UEs or emptied for power boosting. Based on our comments, we propose following: For Type-1 DMRS, further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement with respect to FD-OCC:* whether to support a configuration of DMRS in which FD-OCC is off for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS
* UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO
 |
| Apple | We support the proposal.  |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the FL’s proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are ok to study as proposed in 4-2a.  |
| Moderator | Respond to InterDigital’s comment on applicability to Type-1 DMRS only:Given applicability to Type-1 and/or Type-2 is part of FFS, suggest conclude after the studyRespond to Nokia and InterDigital’s comment on indication:Companies have different views on whether indication is needed or already supported for some case in current specification. Let’s keep this aspect as part of FFS. |
| Nokia/NSB | Understand QC’s clarification. It is better to clarify the condition which is rank 1 transmission. Proposal 4-2a for discussion: Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement with respect to FD-OCC:* whether to support a configuration of DMRS in which FD-OCC is off for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS
	+ Applicability to Type-1 and/or Type-2 DMRS
	+ Details on whether and how to indicate when FD-OCC is not applied to DM-RS port with co-scheduled UE
* UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO
 |
| Ericsson | Regarding the following FFS:* + Details on whether and how to indicate when FD-OCC is off

We think it is better to just leave this open now to give companies time to check all possible scenarios. |
| Intel | Generally ok with the proposal. We suggest to make the modification from Nokia bit generic (as suggested below)Proposal 4-2a for discussion: Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement with respect to FD-OCC:* whether to support a configuration of DMRS in which FD-OCC is off for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS
	+ Applicability to Type-1 and/or Type-2 DMRS
	+ Details on whether and how to indicate when FD-OCC is ~~off~~ not applied to DM-RS port ~~with co-scheduled UE~~
* UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO
 |
| LG Electronics | We support Ericsson’s comment of keeping the 2nd sub-bullet of the 1st bullet intact. However, if there is a need to update the wording, we prefer Intel’s text.  |
| vivo | We support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | OK with Intel’s clarification. Hope QC’s confirmation to my question.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with the modifications from Intel |
| InterDigital | We request further clarification on UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO. As we already clarified, DMRS ports 0,2 can be supported by gNB implementation and what aspects should be further studied on this is unclear to us. In addition, sentences in the proposal are not aligned, so we propose following update. Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement with respect to FD-OCC:* whether to support a configuration of DMRS in which FD-OCC is not applied for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS
	+ Applicability to Type-1 and/or Type-2 DMRS
	+ Details on whether and how to indicate that FD-OCC is ~~off~~ not applied to DM-RS port ~~with co-scheduled UE~~
* UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO
 |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to InterDigital:My understanding of the bullet of UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO is to study the impact to UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO when FD-OCC is not applied in DMRS port. With that, I moved this bullet to be the 3rd sub-bullet in proposal 4-2b and updated wording as commented. |

##### Proposal 4-2b for discussion:

Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement with respect to FD-OCC:

* whether to support a configuration of DMRS in which FD-OCC is not applied for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS
	+ Applicability to Type-1 and/or Type-2 DMRS
	+ Details on whether and how to indicate that FD-OCC is not applied to DMRS port
	+ Impact to UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support the updated proposal |
| Ericsson | Support |

#### Multi-slot DMRS

In [5, Huawei], it proposed multiple consecutive symbols of FL-DMRS for the multi-slot scheduling. Similar considerations are mentioned in [25, Qualcomm] to study DMRS bundling and DMRS overhead reduction for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH transmission, at least for the case when there is no gap between transmissions. On the same topic, [6, Nokia] proposed to use the existing DMRS time-domain pattern for multi-slot scheduling unless any critical performance degradation is identified.

Moderator’s comment:

With limited input on this topic, suggest companies to study further and have more concrete proposals to discuss.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments and/or suggestions on agreeable proposals if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Futurewei | We support further DMRS enhancements for multi-slot scheduling if they provide performance benefits. |
| LG Electronics | In our view, there’s no strong motivation to study more about it now. |
| Xiaomi | Open to discuss if it shows considerable benefits from simulation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think that combined estimation of DMRS in different slots doesn’t have spec impact. As for new time domain DMRS pattern, we don’t see the necessity at this moment. |
| Qualcomm  | * DMRS bundling and overhead reduction should be studied for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH grants, as well as the requirements of maintaining phase continuity, and the impact on the processing timeline.
* With a smaller number of DMRS symbols, it may be beneficial to introduce new reference signals to track and estimate the bursty interference. The new signals can be used for interference covariance ($R\_{nn}$) estimation to enhance the demodulation
 |
| Samsung | We agree to further investigate the DMRS overhead reduction (e.g. DMRS bundling).  |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine to study time domain PRB bundling for multi-slot scheduling. But, we don’t support DMRS overhead reduction.  |
| Apple | Agree that the combined DMRS estimation using the existing time domain pattern is an implementation issue. Would need to see improved performance benefits to support a change in the TD pattern. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The topic of multi-slot DMRS relates to whether to allow cross-slot channel estimation (note that this is an objective for PUSCH coverage enhancement in the NR coverage enhancement WI), which also relates to whether DMRS are present in every slot of a multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH allocation, since with fewer slots carrying DMRS may require a solution for recovering channel estimation performance e.g. by bundling consecutive DMRS symbols and/or allowing joint channel estimation across slots.A more critical point to note for further discussion is whether DMRS (including front-loaded DMRS) should be mapped to every slot of a multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH allocation. The problem with mapping DMRS to every slot is that channel estimation cannot start until the last slot of the allocation, which would leave way too little time for PDSCH processing after the end of the allocation with SCS 480 and 960 kHz SCS, or would not allow fast HARQ feedback, because the slot duration is very short with 480 and 960 kHz SCS. One solution to consider is that DMRS may only be mapped to the first few slots only. So the discussion on processing timeline for PDSCH and PUSCH should be discussed together.We propose to progress on the issues that need to be further discussed in relation to potential DMRS enhancements: For potential DMRS enhancements for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, consider the following issues:* Available processing timeline and HARQ feedback delay if DMRS is mapped to every slot of a multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH allocation vs. if DMRS is mapped only to a limited set of slots from the start of the allocation
* Availability of joint channel estimation over DMRS across multiple slots
* Need to improve channel estimation quality if DMRS is not mapped to every slot
 |
| InterDigital | We don’t support DMRS overhead reduction as performance benefits are not identified.  |
| Vivo | Seems no strong motivation to do this in this release  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, similar DMRS enhancements are already considered in other work item such as Coverage Enhancements. So not necessary to discuss them here, but open to it. |
| CATT | We don’t see the need of further discussion |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Companies have different views on this. Formulated some FFS points below. |

##### Proposal 4-3 for discussion:

Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling:

* The need of potential DMRS enhancement
* DMRS overhead reduction
* DMRS bundling

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We don’t see the need to increase the UE implementation complexity with negligible overhead reduction |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal  |
| Intel | Ok with moderator’s suggestion. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the FL’s proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are ok to study, but in fact we have no DMRS design for multi-slot scheduling, so what is there to enhance? But we would be ok with the proposal 4-3, even if it is not completely accurate, with the addition of a bullet:* Whether DMRS should be present in every slot of a multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH allocation, considering the impact on the UE/gNB processing timeline.

The main bullet point should be limited to 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Proposal revised as commented. |

##### Proposal 4-3a for discussion:

Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 and 960 kHz SCS:

* The need of potential DMRS enhancement
* DMRS overhead reduction
* DMRS bundling
* Whether DMRS should be present in every slot of a multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH allocation
* The impact on the UE/gNB processing timeline
* Channel estimation performance

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Samsung | In general, we are ok with the proposal, but we are wondering which comment is the basis to add the last two bullets (they are not like proposals for DMRS enhancement, but aspects to consider when evaluating the need for enhancement, so not sure whether they should be listed in parallel).  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with proposal, although lot of these aspects such as DMRS bundling, DMRS overhead reduction are overlapping with coverage enhancements WI.Also, in above proposal, DMRS overhead reduction is mainly about reduction in time-domain ? Not sure about the intention of this. Already there is a bullet “Whether DMRS should be present in every slot of a multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH allocation” that is related to DMRS overhead reduction in time. |
| Qualcomm  | We are fine the moderator’s proposal; we want also to add the capability of maintaining phase coherency as FFS  |
| LG Electronics | As Lenovo commented, DMRS bundling and DMRS overhead reduction seem to overlap with coverage enhancements WI. We are fine to further study on other aspects, excluding the overlap with other WI. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to Samsung’s comment:The proposal is to study “aspects” related to potential enhancement, not just enhancement itself. Respond to Lenovo’s comment:Based on companies’ comment to original proposal 4-3, I believe Huawei think “Whether DMRS should be present in every slot of a multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH allocation” is different from “DMRS overhead reduction”.Respond to Qualcomm’s comment:A bullet is added on phase coherency in proposal 4-3b below.Respond to Lenovo and LG’s comment:Note added in proposal 4-3b. |

##### Proposal 4-3b for discussion:

Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 and 960 kHz SCS:

* The need of potential DMRS enhancement
* DMRS overhead reduction
* DMRS bundling
* Whether DMRS should be present in every slot of a multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH allocation
* The impact on the UE/gNB processing timeline
* Channel estimation performance
* Whether to maintain phase coherency across DMRS symbols in different slots
* Note: As per usual procedure, duplication of work between work items in Rel-17 should be avoided

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with proposal 4-3b |
| Nokia/NSB | The listed issues are much overlapped. For DMRS overhead reduction, I think this is covering DMRS-less slot. Also, phase coherency can be covered by multi-slot DMRS bundling.Proposal 4-3b for discussion: Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 and 960 kHz SCS:* DMRS overhead reduction (e.g. DMRS-less slot)
* Multi-slot DMRS bundling
* The impact on the UE/gNB processing timeline
* Note: As per usual procedure, duplication of work between work items in Rel-17 should be avoided
 |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Qualcomm  | We are fine with the proposal  |
| Ericsson | Generally we are negative to introduce these large changes, hence we would prefer not to have a proposal on this at all. However, if there must be a proposal to study, then we think the scope should be clearly described. We agree with removing bullets as suggested by Nokia; however, if the first bullet is removed, then the main bullet should say “Further study whether or not to support additional DMRS enhancement …”We suggest to add the word additional, since Proposal 4-1c and 4-2a also are about enhancement. |
| Intel | We are ok with proposal 4-3b. We are also ok with Nokia’s updates. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Wording updated to address comments. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the latest proposal. |

##### Proposal 4-3c for discussion:

Further study whether or not to support additional potential DMRS enhancement for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS considering at least the following aspects:

* DMRS overhead reduction (e.g. DMRS-less slot)
* Multi-slot DMRS bundling
* The impact on the UE/gNB processing timeline
* Note: As per usual procedure, duplication of work between work items in Rel-17 should be avoided

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal 4-3c.  |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal of further study. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| CATT | We don’t see the need to increase the UE implementation complexity since the proposed enhancement depends on the receiver algorithm in UE implementation |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal  |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | We share a similar view with CATT.Regarding DMRS overhead reduction, we see that potential gains in throughput are very limited (a few %) and limited only to high SNR.More importantly, multi-slot DMRS bundling has an impact on gNB implementation in terms of maintaining phase coherence across slots. The same issue has been discussed in prior releases in the context of SRS transmission from the UE, and it was commonly stated that maintaining phase coherence across slots is very difficult.So, we do not agree to include "Multi-slot DMRS bundling" |

####  Other issue(s)

Please provide comments if any on any missed issue(s) about DMRS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.5. LLS assumptions for potential RS enhancement study

During the discussion, one issue was raised regarding the assumptions of evaluation for potential RS enhancement study as required by one of the objectives of the WID.

To align evaluation results between companies, it will be useful to agree on a common set of link level evaluation assumptions. Table 3 below provides a set of link level simulation settings to be used for determining the required SNR to achieve PDSCH/PUSCH BLER of 10%. This table is a simplified version of the link level evaluation assumptions Table A.1-1 from TR 38.808, adapted for potential RS enhancement evaluation/study.

##### Proposal 5-1 for discussion:

For evaluation purpose, LLS assumptions in Table 3 are used for potential RS enhancement study for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.

Table 3 LLS assumptions for potential RS enhancement study for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz

| Assumptions | Value |
| --- | --- |
| Carrier Frequency [GHz] | 60 GHz Optional: 70 GHz |
| Subcarrier Spacing [kHz] | 120, 480, 960 kHz |
| Number of RB | 256 for 120 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~400 MHz carrier BW)256 for 480 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~1600 MHz carrier BW)160 for 960 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~2000 MHz carrier BW) Optional: Companies to report if other values are evaluated |
| Waveform | For PDSCH:CP-OFDMFor PUSCH:CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM |
| CP Type | Normal CP |
| Channel Model | TDL model as defined in of TR38.901 Clause 7.7.2:- TDL-A (5ns, 10ns, 20ns DS) - optional DS for consideration: 40ns DS Optional: CDL model as defined in of TR38.901 Clause 7.7.1:- CDL-B (20ns, 50ns DS)- CDL-D (20ns, 30ns DS) with K-factor = 10 dB- optional DS for consideration: 100ns DS Note: for TDL/CDL model, the delay spread (DS) value mentioned is the delay spread scaling value (i.e. corresponding to normalized delay of 1.0). |
| Antenna Configuration (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) | For TDL model:- 2x2For optional CDL model:Configuration 1:- (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,8,16,2) BS with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)- (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,4,4,2) UE with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)Configuration 2:- (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,4,8,2) BS with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)- (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,2,2,2) UE with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH) |
| Mobility | 3 km/hr |
| PA Model | None |
| gNB TRP PN Model | TR38.803 example 2 BS PN profile |
| UE PN Model | TR38.803 example 2 UE PN profile |
| Pre-loaded Tx EVM | 0% |
| Additive Rx EVM | 0% |
| I-Q Imbalance | None |
| Frequency Offset | 0 ppmOptional:- 0.1 ppm |
| Channel Estimation | Realistic channel estimation |
| Transmission Rank | Rank 1Optional: Rank 2Note: companies are asked to provide information the precoding scheme (including granularity) used in the evaluations. |
| PDSCH SLIV | (S=2, L=12)Note: Starting symbol, S, (indexed from 0) and length, L. |
| DMRS Configuration | 1 DMRS symbol (front loaded), or 2 DMRS symbols at (2,11) symbol indexCompanies are asked to report details of DMRS enhancement if evaluatedNote: no data multiplexing is assumed in DMRS symbols |
| PTRS Configuration | For CP-OFDM:(K = 4, L = 1) or (K = 2, L = 1)Note: PTRS per K number of PRBs, and PTRS every L number of OFDM symbolsCompanies are asked to report details of PN compensation method(s) with corresponding receiver complexity and PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM if evaluatedFor DFT-s-OFDM:(Ng = 2, Ns = 2, L = 1)(Ng = 2, Ns = 4, L = 1)(Ng = 4, Ns = 2, L = 1)(Ng = 4, Ns = 4, L = 1)(Ng = 8, Ns = 4, L = 1)Note: Ng number of PT-RS groups, Ns number of samples per PT-RS group, and PTRS every L number of DFT-s-OFDM symbolsCompanies are asked to provide the PTRS configuration used for DFT-s-OFDM simulation and details of PTRS enhancement for DFT-s-OFDM if evaluated |
| CSI-RS / TRS | CSI-RS/TRS is assumed to be off (for RS overhead) |
| MCS/TBS | From MCS Table 1 (TS38.214):- MCS 7 (QPSK),- MCS 16 (16QAM),- MCS 22 (64QAM),Optional:- MCS 26 (64QAM) from MCS Table 1 (TS38.214),- MCS 27 (256QAM) from MCS Table 2 (TS38.214),Assume NohPRB = 0 for MCS calculations.Note: Companies to provide actual code rate used in the evaluations. |
| Performance metric | Report value of SNR in dB achieving PDSCH/PUSCH BLER of 10%Optional: companies can report spectrum efficiency in addition to required SNR |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| DOCOMO | We propose to consider realistic EVM values. For example, 3% and 5% for Pre-loaded Tx and Additive Rx EVM can be considered respectively.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We propose the following update for PTRS configuration:For CP-OFDM:For distributed PTRS (as in Rel-15): (K = 4, L = 1) or (K = 2, L = 1)Note: PTRS per K number of PRBs, and PTRS every L number of OFDM symbolsFor block-based PTRS: detailed PTRS pattern and density to be provided with the evaluations, e.g. the number of PTRS blocks per OFDM symbol, the number of PTRS REs per block, and the placement of PTRS blocks in each OFDM symbol.Companies are asked to report details of PN compensation method(s) with corresponding receiver complexity and PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM if evaluatedWe propose to add 1% BLER to the performance metric for which the achievable SNR is to be reported. |
| Mitsubishi  | The tables look generally fine. I support HW’s proposal on PTRS configuration, which is clearer on how patterns are set. I would also like to point out that phase effects introduced by HPA and CFO have an important influence on performance, especially at high MCS. It would be more realistic to have a CFO of 0.1ppm as baseline (and 0ppm as optional) rather than the opposite. We would like to include HPA modelling at least as an optional feature. |
| Apple | This looks fine to us.  |
| Samsung | We are fine with Huawei’s update. |
| Qualcomm  | We prefer to keep the BW the same for all SCS in case of comparing the performance of different SCS, i.e., 400MHz* 256 for 120 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~400 MHz carrier BW)
* 64 for 480 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~400 MHz carrier BW)
* 32 for 960 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~400 MHz carrier BW)

  |
| Ericsson | Regarding Tx/Rx EVM and frequency offset, we think that can be optionally evaluated.Huawei’s changes on the PTRS pattern description are okay.Propose the following editorial correction:Note: Companies to provide ~~actual~~ effective code rate used in the evaluations.Regarding Qualcomm’s suggestion for keeping BW the same, we prefer that this is not the baseline. If companies want to evaluate that as an optional scenario, it is okay. |
| Intel | For the PN models, we suggest to add the two other models in RAN4 LS on phase noise as options for the UE.TR38.803 example 2 UE PN profileOptional:* UE PN model presented in R4-2016533
* UE PN model presented in R4-2014976

For MCS, suggest to ask companies to provide NohPRB values instead of stating it is set to 0 for calculation. The overhead value changes on which MCS could be used. One possibility to state, Noh = 0, and as optional other values 6, 8, 12.For the # of RB, while it is stated other values are optional, in order to get somewhat aligned results among companies, it would be good to explicitly state some optional values.256 for 120 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~400 MHz carrier BW)256 for 480 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~1600 MHz carrier BW)160 for 960 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~2000 MHz carrier BW) Optional: * 4, 16, 64 PRBs for all SCS
* Companies to report if other values are evaluated

========================================= |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Updated proposal into 5-1a below to address comments. Red font to highlight the changes. |

##### Proposal 5-1a for discussion:

For evaluation purpose, LLS assumptions in Table 4 are used for potential RS enhancement study for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.

Table 4 LLS assumptions for potential RS enhancement study for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz

| Assumptions | Value |
| --- | --- |
| Carrier Frequency [GHz] | 60 GHz Optional: 70 GHz |
| Subcarrier Spacing [kHz] | 120, 480, 960 kHz |
| Number of RB | 256 for 120 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~400 MHz carrier BW)256 for 480 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~1600 MHz carrier BW)1. for 960 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~2000 MHz carrier BW)

 Optional:- 4, 16, 64 RBs for all SCS- Companies to report if other values are evaluated |
| Waveform | For PDSCH:CP-OFDMFor PUSCH:CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM |
| CP Type | Normal CP |
| Channel Model | TDL model as defined in of TR38.901 Clause 7.7.2:- TDL-A (5ns, 10ns, 20ns DS) - optional DS for consideration: 40ns DS Optional: CDL model as defined in of TR38.901 Clause 7.7.1:- CDL-B (20ns, 50ns DS)- CDL-D (20ns, 30ns DS) with K-factor = 10 dB- optional DS for consideration: 100ns DS Note: for TDL/CDL model, the delay spread (DS) value mentioned is the delay spread scaling value (i.e. corresponding to normalized delay of 1.0). |
| Antenna Configuration (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) | For TDL model:- 2x2For optional CDL model:Configuration 1:- (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,8,16,2) BS with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)- (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,4,4,2) UE with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)Configuration 2:- (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,4,8,2) BS with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)- (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,2,2,2) UE with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH) |
| Mobility | 3 km/hr |
| PA Model | NoneOptional: Companies to report used PA modelling (in lieu of pre-loaded Tx EVM) |
| gNB TRP PN Model | TR38.803 example 2 BS PN profile |
| UE PN Model | TR38.803 example 2 UE PN profileOptional:- UE PN model presented in R4-2016533- UE PN model presented in R4-2014976 |
| Pre-loaded Tx EVM | 0%Optional:- 3% at Tx (In lieu of PA model),- If other values are used, companies are asked to provide information on the values selected for simulation. |
| Additive Rx EVM | 0%Optional:- 5% at Rx,- If other values are used, companies are asked to provide information on the values selected for simulation. |
| I-Q Imbalance | None |
| Frequency Offset | 0 ppmOptional:- 0.1 ppm |
| Channel Estimation | Realistic channel estimation |
| Transmission Rank | Rank 1Optional: Rank 2Note: companies are asked to provide information the precoding scheme (including granularity) used in the evaluations. |
| PDSCH SLIV | (S=2, L=12)Note: Starting symbol, S, (indexed from 0) and length, L. |
| DMRS Configuration | 1 DMRS symbol (front loaded), or 2 DMRS symbols at (2,11) symbol indexCompanies are asked to report details of DMRS enhancement if evaluatedNote: no data multiplexing is assumed in DMRS symbols |
| PTRS Configuration | For CP-OFDM:For PTRS as in Rel-15: (K = 4, L = 1) or (K = 2, L = 1)Note: PTRS per K number of PRBs, and PTRS every L number of OFDM symbolsCompanies are asked to report details of PN compensation method(s) with corresponding receiver complexity and details of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM if evaluated. For example, for block-based PTRS enhancement, the number of PTRS blocks per OFDM symbol, the number of PTRS REs per block, and the placement of PTRS blocks in each OFDM symbol are required to be provided if evaluated.For DFT-s-OFDM:(Ng = 2, Ns = 2, L = 1)(Ng = 2, Ns = 4, L = 1)(Ng = 4, Ns = 2, L = 1)(Ng = 4, Ns = 4, L = 1)(Ng = 8, Ns = 4, L = 1)Note: Ng number of PT-RS groups, Ns number of samples per PT-RS group, and PTRS every L number of DFT-s-OFDM symbolsCompanies are asked to provide the PTRS configuration used for DFT-s-OFDM simulation and details of PTRS enhancement for DFT-s-OFDM if evaluated |
| CSI-RS / TRS | CSI-RS/TRS is assumed to be off (for RS overhead) |
| MCS/TBS | From MCS Table 1 (TS38.214):- MCS 7 (QPSK),- MCS 16 (16QAM),- MCS 22 (64QAM),Optional:- MCS 26 (64QAM) from MCS Table 1 (TS38.214),- MCS 27 (256QAM) from MCS Table 2 (TS38.214),Assume NohPRB = 0 for MCS calculations. Optional: NohPRB = 6, 8, 12. Companies are asked to report value of NohPRB used in the evaluations.Note: Companies to provide effective code rate used in the evaluations. |
| Performance metric | Report value of SNR in dB achieving PDSCH/PUSCH BLER of 10%Optional: - Report value of SNR in dB achieving PDSCH/PUSCH BLER of 1%- companies can report spectrum efficiency in addition to required SNR |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine with the assumptions.For PTRS configuration, we prefer to also define some mandantory values for block PTRS density, e.g. same overhead as (K = 4, L = 1) or (K = 2, L = 1) in Rel-15 PTRS, then we can have a more straightforward comparison among companies.For realistic EVM/CFO/HPA, we prefer to set them as optional. |
| DOCOMO | We are ok with the assumption.  |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. Because the PTRS block design is just one of the methods for PN compensation, we do not see the need to define mandatory PTRS block configurations  |
| Ericsson | Okay with the updated proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are generally fine with the assumptions.For the number of RB, we suggest to be modified as,

|  |
| --- |
| 256 for 120 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~400 MHz carrier BW)256 for 480 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~1600 MHz carrier BW)1. for 960 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~2000 MHz carrier BW)

 Optional:~~- 4, 16, 64 RBs for all SCS~~- Companies to report if other values are evaluated (e.g., 4, 16, 64 RBs for all SCS) |

 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are okay with the proposed simulation assumptions |
| vivo | We are fine with the simulation assumption |
| Mitsubishi | OK with the current version |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with Moderator’s proposal.We suggest adding the following note to PTRS Configuration section:

|  |
| --- |
| For CP-OFDM:For PTRS as in Rel-15: (K = 4, L = 1) or (K = 2, L = 1)Note: other K values are not precluded for PTRS enhancement evaluations |

 |
| Moderator | Respond to LG:The numbers are already optional; I see no difference list as example or not.Respond to Intel:I believe it’s commonly understood that anything not as in Rel-15 (e..g, other K values) is considered as PTRS enhancement and companies are requested to report if evaluated. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal, including Intel’s suggestion. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with proposal and share the same understanding as the moderator, i.e., any PTRS enhancements can be evaluated and reported  |

# Conclusion

TBD
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