**Title:****[Post-117-AIoT-01] Email discussion on remaining Ambient IoT evaluation assumptions**

# Background

[Post-117-AIoT-01] – Xiaodong (CMCC)

Email discussion on remaining Ambient IoT evaluation assumptions from May 29 until June 5 (the weekend is a quiet period)

• Approval of note 1 of the link budget table (highlighted in yellow) in section 9.4.1.1 of R1-2405696.

• Approval of the link level simulation table (highlighted in yellow) in section 9.4.1.1 of R1-2405696.

# Post-117 email discussion proposals

The proposals under discussion are summarized in a document (V001) in section 2, which is now available in draft folder (Please find the link below).

[https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\_ran/WG1\_RL1/TSGR1\_117/Inbox/[Post-117]/[AIoT-01](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_117/Inbox/%5bPost-117%5d/%5bAIoT-01)]

I suggest dividing email discussion into 3 phases.

* Phase 1: Company to input comments to the 2 proposals (May 29 UTC 00:01 ~ May 30 UTC 00:00)
* Phase 2: Update the proposals and provide another round of comments (May 30 UTC 00:01~ May 31 UTC 23:59)
* Phase 3: Update the proposals again and try to stabilize the proposals (June 3 ~ June 5)

## link budget table

### Round 1

**[H][Proposal1-v1]**

Agreement

The link budget table is updated as follows (the yellow parts are not agreed and will be discussed by email),

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Item** | **Reader-to-Device** | **Device-to-Reader** |
| **(0) System configuration** | | | |
| [0A] | Scenarios | D1T1-A1/A2/B/C  D2T2-A1/A2/B/C | D1T1-A1/A2/B/C  D2T2-A1/A2/B/C |
| [0A1] | CW case | N/A | 1-1/1-2/1-4/2-2/2-3/2-4 |
| [0B] | Device 1/2a/2b | Device 1/2a/2b | Device 1/2a/2b |
| [0C] | Center frequency (MHz) | 900MHz (M), 2GHz (O) | 900MHz (M), 2GHz (O) |
| [0D] | Topology/Pathloss model | For D2T2:   * [0D]-Alt1: InF-DL NLOS * [0D]-Alt2: InH-Office LOS   For D1T1:   * InF-DH NLOS | For D2T2:   * [0D]-Alt1: InF-DL NLOS * [0D]-Alt2: InH-Office LOS   For D1T1:   * InF-DH NLOS |
| **(1) Transmitter** | | | |
| [1D] | Number of Tx antenna elements / TxRU/ Tx chains modelled in LLS | For BS:  - 2(M) or 4(O) antenna elements for 0.9 GHz  For Intermediate UE:  - 1(M) or 2(O) | 1 |
| [1E] | Total Tx Power (dBm) | * For BS in DL spectrum for indoor   + [1E]-R2D-Alt1: 33dBm(M),   + [1E]-R2D-Alt2: 38dBm(O),   + [1E]-R2D-Alt3: 24dBm(M)   + Companies to report if PSD constraints are imposed (company to report the condition for applying PSD constraints in Row [5A]: Other notes) * For UL spectrum for indoor,   + [1E]-R2D-Alt4:23dBm (M)   + [1E]-R2D-Alt5:26dBm(O) | * For device 1/2a:   + [1E]-D2R-Alt1: (For scenarios ‘B’)     - The Device Tx Power is calculated by CW received power which can be derived by at least CW2D distance (m) value and other related factors.   + [1E]-D2R-Alt2: (For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’)     - The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. * For device 2b: (For scenarios ‘C’)   + [1E]-D2R-Alt3: -20 dBm(M)   + [1E]-D2R-Alt4: -10 dBm(O) |
| [1E1] | CW Tx power (dBm) | N/A | For scenario ‘A1’, ‘A2’ and ‘B’   * Report a value from the candidate values [1E]-R2D-Alt1/[1E]-R2D-Alt2/[1E]-R2D-Alt3 from [1E]-R2D if CW in DL spectrum * Report a value from the candidate values [1E]-R2D-Alt4/[1E]-R2D-Alt5 from [1E]-R2D if CW in UL spectrum.   Note: only applicable for device 1/2a |
| [1E2] | CW Tx antenna gain (dBi) | N/A | * Company to report, the value equals to   + UE Tx ant gain, or   + BS Tx ant gain   Note: only applicable for device 1/2a |
| [1E3] | CW2D distance (m) | N/A | For scenarios ‘B’   * + D1T1-B:     - 5m,     - 10m,     - 20m     - CW2D distance is derived assuming CW node is located with the same position as ‘R1’ in ‘A1’ scenario   + D2T2-B:     - 5m,     - 10m,   + FFS other values   For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’   * + Calculated (see note 1), (i.e., CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss)   Note: only applicable for device 1/2a  Note: companies to report which value(s) are evaluated. |
| [1E4] | CW2D pathloss (dB) | N/A | Calculated (see note1)  Note: only applicable for device 1/2a |
| [1E5] | CW received power (dBm) | N/A | Calculated (see note1)  Note: only applicable for device 1/2a |
| [1F] | Transmission Bandwidth used for the evaluated channel (Hz) | 180kHz(M),  360kHz(O),  1.08MHz(O) | Refer to LLS table [1a] |
| [1G] | Tx antenna gain (dBi) | * For BS for indoor, 6 dBi(M), 2dBi(M) * For intermediate UE, 0 dBi | * For A-IoT device, 0dBi |
| [1H] | Ambient IoT backscatter loss (dB) due to Modulation factor | N/A | * OOK: 6 dB * PSK: 0 dB * FSK: Y dB   It is applicable for device 1 and 2a  Companies to report and justify their assumptions for Y.  Companies to report in row 3D if they assume any additional related loss. |
| [1J] | Ambient IoT on-object antenna penalty | Not applicable | 0.9dB or 4.7dB |
| [1K] | Ambient IoT backscatter amplifier gain (dB) | N/A | * 10 dB (M) * 15 dB (O)   Note: Only for device 2a |
| [1N] | Cable, connector, combiner, body losses, etc. (dB) | * For BS, X dB, X <=3 to be reported by companies with justification provided in row 5A * For intermediate UE, 1 dB | N/A |
| [1M] | EIRP (dBm) | Calculated (see Note 1)  FFS: any limitation of the EIRP subject to future discussion | Calculated (see Note 1) |
| **(2) Receiver** | | | |
| [2A] | Number of receive antenna elements / TxRU / chains modelled in LLS | Same as [1D]-D2R | Same as [1D]-R2D |
| [2B] | Bandwidth used for the evaluated channel (Hz) | Refer to LLS table [1b] ED bandwidth | Refer to LLS table [2a] [receiver bandwidth?] |
| [2C] | Receiver antenna gain (dBi) | same as [1G]-D2R | Same as [1G]-R2D |
| [2X] | Cable, connector, combiner, body losses, etc. (dB) | N/A | Same as [1N]-R2D |
| [2D] | Receiver Noise Figure (dB) | For RF-ED receiver   * 20dB, Device 2   + FFS other values   For IF/ZIF receiver   * 15dB, Device 2 | For BS as reader   * 5dB   For intermediate UE as reader   * 7dB |
| [2E] | Thermal Noise power spectrum density (dBm/Hz) | -174 | -174 |
| [2F] | Noise Power (dBm) | Calculated (see Note 1) | Calculated (see Note 1) |
| [2G] | Required SNR/CNR | Reported by companies for Budget-Alt2 | Reported by companies for Budget-Alt2 |
| [2H] | Ambient IoT on-object antenna penalty | 0.9dB or 4.7dB | Not applicable |
| [2J] | Budget-Alt1/ Budget-Alt2 | Budget-Alt1/ Budget-Alt2 (see note1) | Budget-Alt2 |
| [2K] | CW cancellation (dB) | N/A | Companies to report for scenario A2/A1/B for BS and intermediate UE.  Note:   * Only applicable for device 1/2a * The value provided is for the unmodulated single-tone CW. The impact of a multi-tone CW, e.g., assuming an [X] dB difference, is FFS |
| [2K1] | Remaining CW interference (dB) | N/A | Calculated (see Note 1)  Note: only applicable for device 1/2a |
| [2K2] | Receiver sensitivity loss(dB) | N/A | Calculated (see Note 1)  Note: only applicable for device 1/2a |
| [2L] | Receiver Sensitivity (dBm) | For Budget-Alt1,   * For device 1 (RF-ED), for example:   + {-30dBm, -36dBm, -40dBm, etc} * For device 2 (RF-ED), for example:   + {-40dBm, -45dBm, etc}   For Budget-Alt2,   * Calculated (see note1) | Calculated (see Note 1)  Note: the receiver sensitivity includes the receiver sensitivity loss [2K2], i.e. after CW cancellation at least if ‘A2’ scenario is used |
| **(3) System margins** | | | |
| [3A] | Shadow fading margin (dB) | For D1T1: 4 dB  For D2T2: 3dB for InH-LOS  7.2dB for InF-DL-NLOS | For D1T1: 4 dB  For D2T2: 3dB for InH-LOS  7.2dB for InF-DL-NLOS |
| [3B] | polarization mismatching loss (dB) | 3 dB | 3 dB |
| [3C] | BS selection/macro-diversity gain (dB) | 0 dB  FFS: other values are not precluded | 0 dB  FFS: other values are not precluded |
| [3D] | Other gains (dB) (if any please specify) | Reported by companies with justification | Reported by companies with justification |
| **(4) MPL / distance** | | | |
| [4A] | MPL (dB) | Calculated (see Note 1) | Calculated (see Note 1) |
| [4B] | Distance (m) | Calculated (see Note 1) | Calculated (see Note 1) |
| **（5）Other** | | | |
| [5A] | Other notes | Companies to report | Companies to report |

*<Editor Notes: Note 1 will be updated once the table has stabilized >*

Note1 (for email discussion): calculated values in the Table XXXX are derived according to the followings,

[1M]:

* For R2D,
  + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] - FFS: [1J]
* For D2R
  + Device 1:
    - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1H] - [1J]
  + Device 2a:
    - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] + [1K] - [1H] - [1J]
  + Device 2b:
    - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]

[2F]:

* [2F] = [2D] + [2E] +*lin2dB*([2B])

[2G]

* For the R2D LLS for ED, CINR/CNR is reported, where CINR/CNR is defined as the ratio of signal power spectral density in the transmission bandwidth to the noise and interference (if any) power spectral density in the device ED channel bandwidth.

[2J]

* For R2D link in the coverage evaluation, for device 1
  + Budget-Alt1 is used (note: receiver architecture is RF ED)
* For R2D link in the coverage evaluation for device 2,
  + *Budget-Alt1* is used if receiver architecture is RF ED
  + *Budget-Alt2* is used if receiver architecture is IF/ZIF ED
* Note1a: this does not preclude to have LLS for device 1 and 2 R2D link with RF-ED if needed.
* Note1b: For device 2 R2D link with RF-ED, *Budget-Alt1* is mandatory, *Budget-Alt2* is optional.
* Note1c: this does not imply all M values are achievable with the sensitivity given by *Budget-Alt1* for RF ED
* Note1d: For device 2 with an RF ED-based receiver on the R2D link, if the receiver sensitivity derived from *Budget-Alt2*, assuming a noise figure of [X dB], exceeds the receiver sensitivity based on *Budget-Alt1*, then *Budget-Alt2* is applied.

[2K1]:

* FFS:
  + Alt1: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [2K] or
  + Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K]

[2K2]:

[2L]:

* For R2D and *Budget-Alt2*,
  + [2L] = [2G] - *lin2dB*([2B] / [1F]) + [2F]
  + Note 1e: the term ‘*lin2dB*([2B] / [1F])’ is applied due to scaling from CNR/CINR to SNR/SINR.
* For D2R,
  + [2L] = [2G] + [2F] + [2K2], device 1/2a
  + [2L] = [2G] + [2F], device 2b

[4A]

* [4A]=[1M]+[2C]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D]
* Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,
  + TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,
  + TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]) for device 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which item?** | **Comments** |
| Company A | [1M] | Example….., |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1M] | The [1J] is not relevant to R2D anymore, thus propose the following update:  [1M]:   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2a:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] + [1K] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2b:   [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2G] | [2G] is now agreed as “reported by companies”, not calculated, there is nothing else to discuss, hence it can be removed from this email discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2J] | Similar comments as 2G, [2J] is not calculated by others and just methodology alternatives. Since when to use Alt1/Alt2 have already been agreed and in [2L] there will be details of each Alt1, this item can be removed from this email discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2K1] | We think Alt2 should be the way to proceed, since the CW interference will be used to calculate sensitivity loss. Thus, propose the following update:  [2K1]:   * ~~FFS:~~   + ~~Alt1: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [2K] or~~   Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [4A] | The [4A] calculation is fine but the note seems need to be update  1. To avoid duplicated/contradict to previous agreement, suggest to have some editorial change.  2. Add missing parameters.  The overall updates are as follows:  [4A]   * [4A]=[1M]+[2C]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] * Note 1f: For scenarios ~~‘A1’ and ‘A2’,~~ where ~~T~~the Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,   + ~~TBC~~ For D2R: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]+2\*[3C]+2\*[3D]+2\*[1G]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,   ~~TBC~~ For D2R: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B] +2\*[3C]+2\*[3D]+2\*[1G]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]+[1K]) for device 2a |
| DOCOMO | [1M] | Same comment as HW. |
| OPPO | [1M], [2K1],  [4A] | [1M]: For R2D, “FFS:[1J]” can be removed as [1J] is not applicable for R2D.  [2K1]: Alt 2 should be used.  [4A]: The 2 TBC can be confirmed. But we suggest to add “-[1H]” for the following similar as that for [1M]. “device 2” should be changed to “device 2a”.   * + [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]-[1H]) for device 2a   There seems a typo in [1F]-D2R, it should be “Refer to LLS table [2a1]~~[1a]~~”, maybe we can take this chance to fix it. |
| Spreadtrum | [1M], [2K1] | [1M]: For R2D, “FFS: [1J]” should be removed.  [2K1]: We think Alt2 should be used. |
| vivo | [1M] EIRP (dBm) | For [1M]   * 1. For R2D, [1J] Ambient IoT on-object antenna penalty should be removed, since it has been agreed not applicable to R2D in transmitter side.   2. For D2R, [1N] ‘Cable, connector, combiner, body losses’ should be considered in CW transmission power and which impacts the EIRP of the D2R EIRP for device 1/2a. The calculation should be revised to  |  | | --- | | [1M]:   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] -[1N] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2a:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] -[1N] + [1K] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2b:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J] | |
| vivo | [2K1] Remaining CW interference | For the item [2K1], we think that the receiver antenna gain[2C] and the Cable, connector, body losses[1N] and [2X] also need to be considered.  So, we suggest to update the item[2K1] as follows:  [2K1] = [1E1]( CW Tx power (dBm)) + [1E2] (CW Tx antenna gain (dBi))+ [2C] Receiver antenna gain (dBi) - [1N] Cable… Loss - [2X] Cable… Loss - [2K] CW cancellation (dB)  Antenna gain and cable… loss should be considered twice at least for monostatic case with separated Tx antenna for CW transmission and D2R receiver, and cases where CW tx node is separated from D2R receiving node. |
| vivo | [4A] MPL | The Cable, connector, body losses[1N] and [2X] also need to be considered.  Besides, the item[1H] is also applicable for device2a.  And the calculation is updated as follows:  [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]-[1N]-[2X]) for device 1,  [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]-[1H]-[1N]-[2X]) for device 2  As for the scenario B, the Cable, connector, body losses[1N] and [2X] also need to be considered, duo to the item[1N] is included in the item[1M] . So the item [4A] MPL needs changed as following formula:   * [4A]=[1M]+[2C]-[2X]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] |
| vivo | [2L] for R2D | In our understanding, following conversion for R2D and *Budget-Alt2* is not needed, since noise power within [2B] ED BW have been considered in [2F] calculation.  [2L] = [2G] ~~-~~ *~~lin2dB~~*~~([2B] / [1F])~~ + [2F] |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1M | For R2D,   * + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] - ~~FFS: [1J]~~ [2H]   Comments: For R2D, on object penalty is 2H, instead of 1J. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 2K1 | Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K] |
| CATT | [1M] | Share the similar view with others that [1J] can be removed. We also share the view of ZTE that [2H] needs to be considered for R2D   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] - [2H] |
| CATT | [2G] | It includes “- For the R2D LLS for ED, CINR/CNR is reported, …”. For completeness, suggest adding “ - For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported…” based on the following WA.  Working assumption:   * For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported and it is defined as the ratio of signal power to noise and interference (if any) power in the receiver bandwidth. * FFS: receiver bandwidth * On/off keying backscatter loss is not taken into account in the LLS and is included in link budget table [1H]. |
| CATT | [2K1] | The cable, connector, body losses[1N] and [2X] may also be considered as vivo suggested:   * Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K] – [1N] – [2X] |
| CATT | [4A] | We share the similar view as vivo that body losses[1N] and [2X] may also need to be considered. |
| Ericsson | [1E]  [2J]  [2K1]  [4A] | **[1E]**  For Device 1/2a, for [1E]-D2R-Alt1 (for scenarios ‘B’), perhaps we should add an equation and clarify which losses/gains need to be considered, e.g., as follows?  [1E] = [1E1]+[1E2]-[1E4] -2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[2H]+[2C] (?)  **[2J]**  We think Budget-Alt2 can be optional for Device 1 (as for Device 2)   * For R2D link in the coverage evaluation, for device 1   + Budget-Alt1 is used (note: receiver architecture is RF ED)   + Budget-Alt2 is optional.   **[2K1]**  A question for clarification, why is it that only receiver antenna gain has been considered in Alt2? Shouldn’t we also consider losses?  **[4A]**  Perhaps we should make the following correction?  [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]-[2H]) for device 1,  [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]-[1H]-[2H]) for device 2 |
| Apple | [1M], [2K1] | [1M]: For R2D, remove FFS: [1J]  [2G]: Similar view as Huawei  [2K1]: Support Alt 2 |
| Futurewei | [1M] R2D  [2J]  [2K1]  [4A] | [1M]  For R2D,   * + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~   Remove [1J] since [1J] should only appear in AIoT transmit  [2J]  If [X dB] is not defined, then Note1d is meaningless  [2K1]  Prefer Alt2   * + Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K]   Antenna gain should apply to signal the antenna receives  [4A]   * [4A]=[1M]+[2C]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] * Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,   + TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]+2\*[3C]+2\*[3D]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,   + TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]+ 2\*[3C]+2\*[3D -[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]+[1H]) for device 2 |
| Lenovo | [1M] | For R2D,  [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] - [1J]  We strongly prefer to keep the on-object penalty in the R2D link. There are references available showing the effect of the on-object penalty on R2D link also affecting the received power at the tag.  Reference:   1. Joshua D. Griffin, et. al, Complete Link Budgets for Backscatter-Radio and RFID Systems 2. DILUKA A. LOKU GALAPPATHTHIGE, et. al, Link Budget Analysis for Backscatter-Based Passive IoT |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| QC | 1E4: CW2D pathloss | Description for 1E4 is currently missing.  Pathloss is determined based on pathloss model considered. |
| QC | 1E5: CW received power | Description for 1E5 is currently missing.  [1E5] = [1E1:CW Tx power] + [1E2: CW Tx antenna gain] - [1E4:CW2D pathloss] |
| QC | 1M:EIRP | * For R2D,   + [1M:EIRP] = [1E:Total tx power] + [1G:Tx Antenna gain] - [1N:cable, connector loss] ~~- FFS: [2H]~~   The on-object penalty (2H) is to be included MPL for R2D.   * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M:EIRP] = [1E:Total tx power] + [1G:Tx Antenna gain] - [1H:backscatter loss] - [1J:on-object penalty]   + Device 2a:     - [1M:EIRP] = [1E:Total tx power] + [1G:Tx Antenna gain] + [1K] - [1H:backscatter loss] - [1J:on-object penalty]   + Device 2b:     - [1M:EIRP] = [1E:Total tx power] + [1G:Tx Antenna gain] - [1J:on-object penalty] |
| QC | 2B: Bandwidth used for the evaluated channel | For D2R, Replace “Refer to LLS table [2a] [receiver bandwidth?]” with “Refer to LLS table [2a3].” |
| QC | 2F: Noise Power | The definition of lin2dB needs to be explicitly defined as lin2dB(X) = 10\*log10(X) |
| QC | 2K1: Remaining CW interference | Remaining CW interference is calculated after CW cancellation. Before CW cancellation, there are two contributors for CW.   1. CW leakage/direct interference from CW transmitter to reader 2. Reflected CW from device   These two are combined but 1) could be stronger than 2) in both CW inside and outside topology cases.  Alt2 is preferred to capture receiver antenna gain. For scenario B, pathloss from CW transmitter to reader receiver also needs to be considered for CW outside case.   * + Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1:CW Tx power] + [1E2:CW Tx antenna gain] – [2K0] + [2C:Receiver antenna gain] - [2K:CW cancellation]   [2K0] = pathloss from CW transmitter to reader receiver   * When CW is collocated with reader (A2), [2K0] is 0dB. * When CW is not collocated with reader (B, A1), [2K0] depends on the distance from CW transmitter to reader receiver. Hence, add a new row “[2K0] = pathloss from CW transmitter to reader receiver” |
| QC | 4A:MPL | For scenarios B, C (device 1/2a/2b)  R2D   * [4A] = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2H:on-objent penalty] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] + [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]   D2R   * [4A] = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] + [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]   For scenario A1/A2 (device 1/2a)   * Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,   + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,~~   + For device 1     - R2D: 0.5\*( [1E1:CW Tx power] + [1E2:CW Tx antenna gain] - [3A:shadowing fading margin] - [3B:polarization mismatch] -[2H:on object antenna penalty] -[2L:receiver sensitivity] +[2C:receiver antenna gain] -[1H:backscatter loss])     - D2R: 0.5\*( [1E1:CW Tx power] + [1E2:CW Tx antenna gain] - [3A:shadowing fading margin] - [3B:polarization mismatch] -[1J:on object antenna penalty] -[2L:receiver sensitivity] +[2C:receiver antenna gain] -[1H:backscatter loss])   + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]) for device 2a~~   + For device 2a     - R2D: 0.5\*( [1E1:CW Tx power] + [1E2:CW Tx antenna gain] - [3A:shadowing fading margin - [3B:polarization mismatch] -[2H:on object antenna penalty] - [2L:receiver sensitivity] +[2C:receiver antenna gain] -[1H:backscatter loss] + [1K: backscatter amplifier gain])     - D2R: 0.5\*( [1E1:CW Tx power] + [1E2:CW Tx antenna gain] - [3A:shadowing fading margin - [3B:polarization mismatch] -[1J:on object antenna penalty] - [2L:receiver sensitivity] +[2C:receiver antenna gain] -[1H:backscatter loss] + [1K: backscatter amplifier gain])   @FL, Question: why is 2 multiplied in “-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]”? |

### Round 2

Based on the comments from round 1, a summary is provided as follows,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Item** | **Companies’ comments** | **FL comments** |
| FL | [1E3][1E4][1E5] |  | It is said that [1E3][1E4][1E5] is calculated. But the formular is missing.  For [1E4] scenarios ‘A1/A2’, the following relation holds when assume CW2D pathloss = R2D pathloss,  [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](CW2D) – [1E4] + [2C] (CW2D) – [2H](CW2D) - [3A] - [3B] + [3C](CW2D) + [3D](CW2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] – [1E4] - [3A] - [3B] + [2C] – [2X] + [3C] + [3D] = [2L]  Hence,  [1E4] =0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N]( CW2D) + [2C] (CW2D) – [2H]( CW2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](CW2D) + [3D](CW2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + [3C] + [3D] )  Note that [1N](CW2D), [2C] (CW2D), [2H](CW2D), [3C](CW2D), [3D](CW2D) using the same assumption as for R2D  The proposals are as follows,  Proposals  Note 1:  …  [1E3]   * For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, [1E3] is derived by assuming pathloss [1E4] using pathloss formula as agreed.   [1E4]   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to path loss formula by assume distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + [3C] + [3D] )   [1E5]   * [1E5]=[1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D]( R2D) |
| Ericsson | [1E] | **[1E]**  For Device 1/2a, for [1E]-D2R-Alt1 (for scenarios ‘B’), perhaps we should add an equation and clarify which losses/gains need to be considered, e.g., as follows?  [1E] = [1E1]+[1E2]-[1E4] -2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[2H]+[2C] (?) | Based on E///’s suggestion, added [1E] in note 1 for both For scenarios ‘B’ and For scenarios ‘A1/A2’ and add a sentence in [1E]-D2R see note 1.  FL’s suggestion, no need to consider [3A][3B] twice for [1E]. Since [1E] is the D2R Tx power.  [1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](CW2D) + [2C] (CW2D) – [2H](CW2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](CW2D) + [3D](CW2D) + [1K] – [1H]  Note that [1K] and [1H] is considered in [1E], then no need to account that in [1M] D2R again. [1J] and [1G] are accounted in [1M].  And [1N](CW2D), [2C] (CW2D), [2H](CW2D), [3C](CW2D), [3D](CW2D) using the same assumption as for R2D  The proposals are as follows,  [1E]   * [1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N]( R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H]( R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C]( R2D) + [3D]( R2D) + [1K] – [1H] * [1K] is only for device 2a |
| OPPO | [1F] | There seems a typo in [1F]-D2R, it should be “Refer to LLS table [2a1]~~[1a]~~”, maybe we can take this chance to fix it. | Will update accordingly in next version. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1M] | The [1J] is not relevant to R2D anymore, thus propose the following update:  [1M]:   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2a:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] + [1K] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2b:   [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J] | Remove [1J] in [1M]-R2D. [1M]-R2D is the transmitter side, so no need to add -[2H] for [1M] here. –[2H] will be accounted in calculation of [4A]. Please see FL’s update of [4A] formula.  Regarding vivo’s comment, calculation of [1E] has already considered the [1N] if any. Please see FL’s update of [1E] formula. As suggested by Ericsson to add [1E] to clarify this.  The proposals are as follows,  [1M]:   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] ~~- [1H]~~ - [1J]   + Device 2a:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] ~~+ [1K] - [1H]~~ - [1J]   + Device 2b:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J] |
| DOCOMO | [1M] | Same comment as HW. |
| OPPO | [1M], | [1M]: For R2D, “FFS:[1J]” can be removed as [1J] is not applicable for R2D. |
| Spreadtrum | [1M] | [1M]: For R2D, “FFS: [1J]” should be removed. |
| vivo | [1M] EIRP (dBm) | For [1M]   * 1. For R2D, [1J] Ambient IoT on-object antenna penalty should be removed, since it has been agreed not applicable to R2D in transmitter side.   2. For D2R, [1N] ‘Cable, connector, combiner, body losses’ should be considered in CW transmission power and which impacts the EIRP of the D2R EIRP for device 1/2a. The calculation should be revised to  |  | | --- | | [1M]:   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] -[1N] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2a:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] -[1N] + [1K] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2b:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J] | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1M | For R2D,   * + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] - ~~FFS: [1J]~~ [2H]   Comments: For R2D, on object penalty is 2H, instead of 1J. |
| CATT | [1M] | Share the similar view with others that [1J] can be removed. We also share the view of ZTE that [2H] needs to be considered for R2D   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] - [2H] |
| Apple | [1M], | [1M]: For R2D, remove FFS: [1J] |
| Futurewei | [1M] R2D | [1M]  For R2D,   * + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~   Remove [1J] since [1J] should only appear in AIoT transmit |
| Lenovo | [1M] | For R2D,  [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] - [1J]  We strongly prefer to keep the on-object penalty in the R2D link. There are references available showing the effect of the on-object penalty on R2D link also affecting the received power at the tag.  Reference:   1. Joshua D. Griffin, et. al, Complete Link Budgets for Backscatter-Radio and RFID Systems 2. DILUKA A. LOKU GALAPPATHTHIGE, et. al, Link Budget Analysis for Backscatter-Based Passive IoT |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2G] | [2G] is now agreed as “reported by companies”, not calculated, there is nothing else to discuss, hence it can be removed from this email discussion. | Regarding [2G], adding the following sentences (as agreed) in note 1. We may not discuss the agreement in email discussion.  [2G]   * For the R2D LLS for ED, CINR/CNR is reported, where CINR/CNR is defined as the ratio of signal power spectral density in the transmission bandwidth to the noise and interference (if any) power spectral density in the device ED channel bandwidth. * For R2D ZIF receiver, report the same metrics (i.e., CNR/CINR, signal transmission bandwidth, ED bandwidth) as agreed for RF-ED/IF receiver. * For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported and it is defined as the ratio of signal power to noise and interference (if any) power in the receiver bandwidth. * On/off keying backscatter loss is not taken into account in the LLS and is included in link budget table [1H]. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2G] | [2G] is now agreed as “reported by companies”, not calculated, there is nothing else to discuss, hence it can be removed from this email discussion. |
| CATT | [2G] | It includes “- For the R2D LLS for ED, CINR/CNR is reported, …”. For completeness, suggest adding “ - For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported…” based on the following WA.  Working assumption:   * For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported and it is defined as the ratio of signal power to noise and interference (if any) power in the receiver bandwidth. * FFS: receiver bandwidth * On/off keying backscatter loss is not taken into account in the LLS and is included in link budget table [1H]. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2J] | Similar comments as 2G, [2J] is not calculated by others and just methodology alternatives. Since when to use Alt1/Alt2 have already been agreed and in [2L] there will be details of each Alt1, this item can be removed from this email discussion. | Regarding [2J], which alternative to use has some dependence to other items. So FL suggest to keep these dependence in the note 1. And we may not need to discuss the agreement in the email discussion.  [2J]   * For R2D link in the coverage evaluation, for device 1   + Budget-Alt1 is used (note: receiver architecture is RF ED) * For R2D link in the coverage evaluation for device 2,   + *Budget-Alt1* is used if receiver architecture is RF ED   + *Budget-Alt2* is used if receiver architecture is IF/ZIF ED * Note1a: this does not preclude to have LLS for device 1 and 2 R2D link with RF-ED if needed. * Note1b: For device 2 R2D link with RF-ED, *Budget-Alt1* is mandatory, *Budget-Alt2* is optional. * Note1c: this does not imply all M values are achievable with the sensitivity given by *Budget-Alt1* for RF ED * Note1d: For device 2 with an RF ED-based receiver on the R2D link, if the receiver sensitivity derived from *Budget-Alt2*, assuming a noise figure of [X dB], exceeds the receiver sensitivity based on *Budget-Alt1*, then *Budget-Alt2* is applied. |
| Ericsson | [2J] | **[2J]**  We think Budget-Alt2 can be optional for Device 1 (as for Device 2)   * For R2D link in the coverage evaluation, for device 1   + Budget-Alt1 is used (note: receiver architecture is RF ED)   + Budget-Alt2 is optional. |
| Futurewei | [2J] | [2J]  If [X dB] is not defined, then Note1d is meaningless |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2K1] | We think Alt2 should be the way to proceed, since the CW interference will be used to calculate sensitivity loss. Thus, propose the following update:  [2K1]:   * ~~FFS:~~   + ~~Alt1: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [2K] or~~   Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K] | Majority companies prefer Alt2.  Regarding Ericsson and CATT’s comment, FL make further revision to Alt 2.  [2K1]:   * [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] -[1N](CW2D) + [2C] - [2X] - [2K]   Note that [1N](CW2D) using the same assumption as for R2D  The proposals are as follows,  [2K1]:   * [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] -[1N](R2D) + [2C] - [2X] - [2K] |
| OPPO | [2K1], | [2K1]: Alt 2 should be used. |
| Spreadtrum | [2K1] | [2K1]: We think Alt2 should be used. |
| vivo | [2K1] Remaining CW interference | For the item [2K1], we think that the receiver antenna gain[2C] and the Cable, connector, body losses[1N] and [2X] also need to be considered.  So, we suggest to update the item[2K1] as follows:  [2K1] = [1E1]( CW Tx power (dBm)) + [1E2] (CW Tx antenna gain (dBi))+ [2C] Receiver antenna gain (dBi) - [1N] Cable… Loss - [2X] Cable… Loss - [2K] CW cancellation (dB)  Antenna gain and cable… loss should be considered twice at least for monostatic case with separated Tx antenna for CW transmission and D2R receiver, and cases where CW tx node is separated from D2R receiving node. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 2K1 | Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K] |
| CATT | [2K1] | The cable, connector, body losses[1N] and [2X] may also be considered as vivo suggested:   * Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K] – [1N] – [2X] |
| Ericsson | [2K1] | **[2K1]**  A question for clarification, why is it that only receiver antenna gain has been considered in Alt2? Shouldn’t we also consider losses? |
| Apple | [2K1] | [2K1]: Support Alt 2 |
| Futurewei | [2K1] | [2K1]  Prefer Alt2   * + Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K]   Antenna gain should apply to signal the antenna receives |
| vivo | [2L] for R2D | In our understanding, following conversion for R2D and *Budget-Alt2* is not needed, since noise power within [2B] ED BW have been considered in [2F] calculation.  [2L] = [2G] ~~-~~ *~~lin2dB~~*~~([2B] / [1F])~~ + [2F] | Since R2D use CNR [2G] which are defined as the ratio of signal power spectral density in the transmission bandwidth to the noise and interference (if any) power spectral density in the device ED channel bandwidth. However, [2F] is across the whole RF-ED BW, so scaling is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [4A] | The [4A] calculation is fine but the note seems need to be update  1. To avoid duplicated/contradict to previous agreement, suggest to have some editorial change.  2. Add missing parameters.  The overall updates are as follows:  [4A]   * [4A]=[1M]+[2C]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] * Note 1f: For scenarios ~~‘A1’ and ‘A2’,~~ where ~~T~~the Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,   + ~~TBC~~ For D2R: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]+2\*[3C]+2\*[3D]+2\*[1G]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,   ~~TBC~~ For D2R: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B] +2\*[3C]+2\*[3D]+2\*[1G]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]+[1K]) for device 2a | [1E] has been updated and add a formular to derive its value for the following cases,   * For device 1/2a:   + [1E]-D2R-Alt1: (For scenarios ‘B’)     - The Device Tx Power is calculated by CW received power which can be derived by at least CW2D distance (m) value and other related factors.   + [1E]-D2R-Alt2: (For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’)     - The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss.   [1M] is derived from [1M]. And by using [1M], only the receiver-side gains/penalties are accounted for deriving [4A]. The following formular can be used.  The proposals are as follows,  proposals  [4A]   * [4A]=[1M]+[2C]-[2X]-[2H]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] * ~~Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,~~    + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,~~   + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]) for device 2~~ |
| OPPO | [4A] | [4A]: The 2 TBC can be confirmed. But we suggest to add “-[1H]” for the following similar as that for [1M]. “device 2” should be changed to “device 2a”.   * + [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]-[1H]) for device 2a |
| vivo | [4A] MPL | The Cable, connector, body losses[1N] and [2X] also need to be considered.  Besides, the item[1H] is also applicable for device2a.  And the calculation is updated as follows:  [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]-[1N]-[2X]) for device 1,  [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]-[1H]-[1N]-[2X]) for device 2  As for the scenario B, the Cable, connector, body losses[1N] and [2X] also need to be considered, duo to the item[1N] is included in the item[1M] . So the item [4A] MPL needs changed as following formula:   * [4A]=[1M]+[2C]-[2X]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] |
| CATT | [4A] | We share the similar view as vivo that body losses[1N] and [2X] may also need to be considered. |
| Ericsson | [4A] | **[4A]**  Perhaps we should make the following correction?  [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]-[2H]) for device 1,  [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]-[1H]-[2H]) for device 2 |
| Futurewei | [4A] | [4A]   * [4A]=[1M]+[2C]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] * Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,   + TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]+2\*[3C]+2\*[3D]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,   + TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]+ 2\*[3C]+2\*[3D -[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]+[1H]) for device 2 |

In summary, the table and note1 is revised as follows,

**[H][Proposal1-v2]**

Update [1E] as follows,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [1E] | Total Tx Power (dBm) | * For BS in DL spectrum for indoor   + [1E]-R2D-Alt1: 33dBm(M),   + [1E]-R2D-Alt2: 38dBm(O),   + [1E]-R2D-Alt3: 24dBm(M)   + Companies to report if PSD constraints are imposed (company to report the condition for applying PSD constraints in Row [5A]: Other notes) * For UL spectrum for indoor,   + [1E]-R2D-Alt4:23dBm (M)   + [1E]-R2D-Alt5:26dBm(O) | * For device 1/2a: (see note 1)   + [1E]-D2R-Alt1: (For scenarios ‘B’)     - The Device Tx Power is calculated by CW received power which can be derived by at least CW2D distance (m) value and other related factors.   + [1E]-D2R-Alt2: (For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’)     - The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. * For device 2b: (For scenarios ‘C’)   + [1E]-D2R-Alt3: -20 dBm(M)   + [1E]-D2R-Alt4: -10 dBm(O) |

Update note 1 in link budget table as follows,

Note1 (for email discussion): calculated values in the Table XXXX are derived according to the followings,

[1E3]

* For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, [1E3] is derived by assuming pathloss is [1E4] and use the pathloss formula as agreed.

[1E4]

* For scenarios ‘B’
  + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3]
* For scenarios ‘A1/A2’
  + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + [3C] + [3D] )

[1E5]

* [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)

[1E]

* [1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H]
* [1K] is only for device 2a

[1M]:

* For R2D,
  + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~
* For D2R
  + Device 1:
    - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - ~~[1H]~~ - [1J]
  + Device 2a:
    - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] ~~+ [1K] - [1H]~~ - [1J]
  + Device 2b:
    - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]

[2F]:

* [2F] = [2D] + [2E] +*lin2dB*([2B])

[2G]

* For the R2D LLS for ED, CINR/CNR is reported, where CINR/CNR is defined as the ratio of signal power spectral density in the transmission bandwidth to the noise and interference (if any) power spectral density in the device ED channel bandwidth.
* For R2D ZIF receiver, report the same metrics (i.e., CNR/CINR, signal transmission bandwidth, ED bandwidth) as agreed for RF-ED/IF receiver.
* For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported and it is defined as the ratio of signal power to noise and interference (if any) power in the receiver bandwidth.
* On/off keying backscatter loss is not taken into account in the LLS and is included in link budget table [1H].

[2J]

* For R2D link in the coverage evaluation, for device 1
  + Budget-Alt1 is used (note: receiver architecture is RF ED)
* For R2D link in the coverage evaluation for device 2,
  + *Budget-Alt1* is used if receiver architecture is RF ED
  + *Budget-Alt2* is used if receiver architecture is IF/ZIF ED
* Note1a: this does not preclude to have LLS for device 1 and 2 R2D link with RF-ED if needed.
* Note1b: For device 2 R2D link with RF-ED, *Budget-Alt1* is mandatory, *Budget-Alt2* is optional.
* Note1c: this does not imply all M values are achievable with the sensitivity given by *Budget-Alt1* for RF ED
* Note1d: For device 2 with an RF ED-based receiver on the R2D link, if the receiver sensitivity derived from *Budget-Alt2*, assuming a noise figure of [X dB], exceeds the receiver sensitivity based on *Budget-Alt1*, then *Budget-Alt2* is applied.

[2K1]:

* ~~FFS:~~
  + ~~Alt1: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [2K] or~~
  + ~~Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K]~~
* [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] -[1N](R2D) + [2C] - [2X] - [2K]

[2K2]:

[2L]:

* For R2D and *Budget-Alt2*,
  + [2L] = [2G] - *lin2dB*([2B] / [1F]) + [2F]
  + Note 1e: the term ‘*lin2dB*([2B] / [1F])’ is applied due to scaling from CNR/CINR to SNR/SINR.
* For D2R,
  + [2L] = [2G] + [2F] + [2K2], device 1/2a
  + [2L] = [2G] + [2F], device 2b

[4A]

* [4A]=[1M]+[2C] -[2X]-[2H]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D]
* ~~Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,~~ 
  + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,~~
  + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]) for device 2~~

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which item?** | **Comments** |
| MTK | [1E4]  [1E] | **[1E4]**  The formula is OK, some updates are suggested considering the following observations/considerations:  Observations/considerations:   * At least for the items appear twice, suggest to add a subscript to distinguish whether the value in R2D column or D2R column is used, e.g., [2C](R2D) or [2C](D2R). * Considering [1K], i.e., ambient IoT backscatter amplifier gain, is only for device 2a, and [3C], i.e., BS selection/macro-diversity gain, is only for the case of BS as CW node, suggest to add two corresponding notes.   Suggestions   * The suggested updates for [1E4] are marked in blue as below:   [1E4]   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G](D2R) – [1J](D2R) + [2C](D2R) – [2X](D2R) – [2L] + [3C](D2R) + [3D](D2R) )   + [1K] is only for device 2a   + [3C] is only for the case of BS as CW node   **[1E]**  Observations/considerations:   * Seems [1E4], i.e., CW2D pathloss is missed for calculating [1E]? * Similar, we think it would be better to use “[1E](D2R)” here because the intention for [1E] here is for total Tx power at device side.   Suggestions   * The suggested updates for [1E] are marked in blue as below:   [1E](D2R)   * [1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) – [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] * [1K] is only for device 2a |
| vivo | [1E] | Current [1E] for D2R for device 1/2a does not contain the impact of CW2D pathloss, and suggest the following revision  [1E] for device 1 or device 2a   * [1E] = [1E5] + [1K] – [1H]   [1K] is only for device 2a |
| vivo | [4A] | Since ‘on object antenna penalty’[1H] has been included in [1E], and [1E] is included in [1M]. [2H] is not needed here. Hence, we suggest the following revision.   * [4A] = [1M]+[2C] -[2X]~~-[2H]~~-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E3] | For scenario D1T1-B when CW2D distance is derived assuming CW node is located with the same position as ‘R1’ in ‘A1’ scenario, it is also derived by CW2D pathloss. Thus, we suggest the following update:  [1E3]   * For scenarios where CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss ~~‘A1’ and ‘A2’~~, [1E3] is derived by assuming pathloss is [1E4] and use the pathloss formula as agreed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E4] | Similar comment as above to [1E3]. And we see other editorial changes are also needed. Thus, we suggest the following update:  [1E4]   * ~~For scenarios ‘B’~~   + ~~[1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3]~~ * For scenarios where CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss ~~‘A1/A2’~~   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C](R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G](D2R) – [1J] + [2C](D2R) – [2X](D2R) – [2L](D2R) + [3C](D2R) + [3D](D2R) ) * Otherwise   + [1E4] is derived by CW2D distance in [1E3] according to pathloss formula as agreed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E5] | We are fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E] | We would like to clarify this [1E] calculation is only for Device1/2a since Device 2b will use pre-defined values as agreed.  It seems the [1E4] is missing in the equation thus propose to add back ‘- [1E4]’. And to avoid duplicated definition, we also suggest to consider using [1E5] to simply the equation since [1E5] is already calculated. For the note ‘[1K] is only for device 2a’ since it is already stated in that cell of link budget template, seems no need to repeat here otherwise needs to repeat every time when [1K] present.  1st preference:  [1E]   * [1E] = ~~[1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~[1E5] + [1K] – [1H] * ~~[1K] is only for device 2a~~   Also acceptable:  [1E]   * [1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] * ~~[1K] is only for device 2a~~ |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1M] | We are fine with the proposal with the following observation:  Since now [1H] and [1K] already defined in [1E], seems no need to distinguish different equation for devices because the equation of [1M] for D2R is same for all devices as ‘[1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]’. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2G] | There is nothing else to discuss since these were agreements. We would like to suggest to add preface with “As agreed:” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2J] | There is nothing else to discuss since these were agreements. We would like to suggest to add preface with “As agreed:” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2K1] | We suggest the following editorial update to make it clear:  [2K1]:   * [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] -[1N](R2D) + [2C](D2R) - [2X] - [2K] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2K2] | We are fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2L] | We are fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [4A] | We think the equation should be separately for R2D and D2R, otherwise it will cause double counted issue. Thus we propose the following update:  [4A]   * [4A](R2D) =[1M]+[2C] ~~-[2X]~~-[2H]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] * [4A](D2R) =[1M]+[2C] -[2X]~~-[2H]~~-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [4B] | [4B] also need calculation. Maybe adding a simple sentence similar as used in [1E3]  [4B]   * [4B] is derived by assuming pathloss is [4A] and use the pathloss formula as agreed. |
| OPPO | [1E] | We are not sure the formula for [1E] is correct as it is supposed to be calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. As [1E5] is clear, it seems simpler to derive [1E] based on it:  [1E]   * [1E] = ~~[1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ [1E5]+ [1K] – [1H] |
| QC | 1E4:  CW2D pathloss | CW2D pathloss is independent from R2D and D2R.   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [~~3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + ~~[3C] + [3D]~~ )   3C and 3D could be removed for now since it is not clear its role. |
| QC | 1E5:CW received power | We can remove 3C and 3D. It is not clear how/why use them for CW received power calculation.   * [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] ~~+ [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ |
| QC | 1E:Total Tx power | Since we already computed 1E5 CW received power, we can use it in defining 1E for device 1/2a.  Minor update: 1E4 need to be considered in 1E (so 1E5 already include 1E4). 1J needs to be considered.   * [1E] = ~~[1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~  1E5 + [1K] – [1H]. * [1K] is only for device 2a |
| QC | 2K1: Remining CW interference | [2K1] = [1E1:CW Tx power] + [1E2:CW Tx antenna gain] -[1N:cable loss](R2D) – [2K0] + [2C:Receiver antenna gain] - [2X:Cable, connector loss] - [2K:CW cancellation],  where [2K0] = pathloss from CW transmitter to reader receiver   * When CW is collocated with reader (A2), [2K0] is 0dB.   When CW is not collocated with reader (B, A1), [2K0] depends on the pathloss from CW transmitter to reader receiver. Hence, add a new row “[2K0] = pathloss from CW transmitter to reader receiver” |
| QC | 4A | For scenarios B, C (device 1/2a/2b)  D2R have different equation than R2D since on-object penalty 1J is already included in 1M for D2R.  R2D   * [4A] = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2X:body loss] -[2H:on-object penalty] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] + [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]   D2R   * [4A] = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2X:calbe loss] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] + [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]   **@FL, we wonder why TBC:4A were removed for A1, A2 case.**  For scenario A1/A2 (device 1/2a)   * Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,   + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,~~   + For device 1     - 0.5\*( [1E1] + [1E2] – [1N:cable loss] + [2C: **R2D** receiver antenna gain] – [2H:on-object antenna penalty] – [3A] – [3B] + [1G] – [1H:backscatter loss] – [1J:on-object antenna penalty] + [2C: **D2R** receiver antenna gain] – [2X:body loss] – [2L:**D2R** receiver sensitivity] – [3A] – [3B])   + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]) for device 2a~~   + For device 2a     - 0.5\*( [1E1] + [1E2] – [1N:cable loss] + [2C: R**2D** receiver antenna gain] – [2H:on-object antenna penalty] – [3A] – [3B] + [1G] – [1H:backscatter loss] – [1J:on-object antenna penalty] + [2C: D**2R** receiver antenna gain]– [2X:body loss] – [2L:**D2R** receiver sensitivity] – [3A] – [3B] + [1K: backscatter amplifier gain]) |
| CATT | [1E4] | [1E4]   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assuming distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C](D2R) – [2X] – [2L] + [3C](D2R) + [3D](D2R) )   We are fine to remove [3C] as QC suggested. |
| CATT | [1E] | Since [1E] is derived using CW received power [1E5], it is cleaner to have:   * [1E] = [1E5] + [1E4] + [1K] – [1H] * [1K] is only for device 2a |
| CATT | [1M] | With the modified [1E], the formula for [1M] is the same for all devices.  For R2D,   * + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J] |
| ZTE, Sanechips | [1E4]  [1E]  [1M] | For [1E4], add a supplement as below:  [1E4]   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + [3C] + [3D] )   + [1K] is only for device 2a   For [1E], for D2R and scenario A1/A2/B, the device Tx power [1E] equals to received CW power [1E5], so we have the following modifications:  [1E]   * ~~[1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H]~~ * ~~[1K] is only for device 2a~~ * For D2R,   + Device 1/2a:     - [1E] = [1E5]   For [1M], the D2R signal transmitted by device 1/2a will experience backscatter loss [1H] and reflection amplifier [1K], so these two components should not be removed.   * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2a:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] + [1K] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2b:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]   Actually, for scenarios A1/A2, the balance coverage distance can directly be calculated based on [1E4] and pathloss model. The steps from 1E4 to 1E5 to 1M to 4A are equivalent to redundant calculations. |
| Spreadtrum | [1E] | CW2D pathloss[1E4] is missed in [1E] calculation.  [1E]   * [1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) –[1E4]+ [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] * [1K] is only for device 2a |
| Ericsson | [1E] | [1E]: The CW2D path loss is missing in the expression, as commented by, e.g., MTK, Vivo, etc. |
| Samsung | [1E],  [2G] | [1E], [1M]  @FL,  For the sake of clarification, regarding the comments you made below, could you explain the reason for the assumed relation? (the relation itself)  For [1E4] scenarios ‘A1/A2’, the following relation holds when assume CW2D pathloss = R2D pathloss,  [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](CW2D) – [1E4] + [2C] (CW2D) – [2H](CW2D) - [3A] - [3B] + [3C](CW2D) + [3D](CW2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] – [1E4] - [3A] - [3B] + [2C] – [2X] + [3C] + [3D] = [2L]  Additionally, we think that it is more appropriate to consider backscatter loss and amplification gain in 1M rather than 1E. Also, based on our understanding, [1E5], which is CW received power, can be total Tx power for device 1/2a. Therefore, we would like to suggest the following:  [1E5]   * [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) * [1K] is only for device 2a * [3C] is only for BS as CW node.   [1E]   * [1E] = [1E5]   [1M]:   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - ~~[1H]~~ - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2a:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] ~~+ [1K] - [1H]~~ +[1K]-[1H]- [1J]   [2G]  For the final note, we would also like to mention that DC offset loss is not taken into consideration in the LLS.   * On/off keying backscatter loss and DC removal loss are not taken into account in the LLS and are included in link budget table [1H]. |
| Apple | [1E] | Similar to other companies, CW2D pathloss is missing |
| Lenovo | [4A]  [1E5]  [2L] [3C]  [3D] | Separate the [4A] formula for R2D and D2R  Diversity gain [3C] is not needed as [2L] already includes SNR that includes the diversity gain based on the number of antenna used in the LLS:  [3D] is not clear for us – let make it as FFS.  [4A] (R2D) = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2X:body loss] -[2H:on-object penalty] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] ~~+ [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]~~  [4A] (D2R) = [4A] = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2X:cable loss] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] ~~+ [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]~~  To avoid this confusion of duplicating, on-object penalty loss can be included as part of 1M for R2D and D2R.  In [1E5], [3C] and [3D] is not needed.  [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] |

### Round 3

Based on the comments from round 2, a summary is provided as follows,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which item?** | **Comments** | **FL Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E3] | For scenario D1T1-B when CW2D distance is derived assuming CW node is located with the same position as ‘R1’ in ‘A1’ scenario, it is also derived by CW2D pathloss. Thus, we suggest the following update:  [1E3]   * For scenarios where CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss ~~‘A1’ and ‘A2’~~, [1E3] is derived by assuming pathloss is [1E4] and use the pathloss formula as agreed. | **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  Update [1E3] in the link budget table  For scenarios ‘B’   * + D1T1-B:     - 5m,     - 10m,     - 20m     - CW2D distance is derived assuming CW node is located with the same position as ‘R1’ in ‘A1’ scenario (see note 1)   + D2T2-B:     - 5m,     - 10m,   + FFS other values   For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’   * + Calculated (see note 1), (i.e., CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss)   Note: only applicable for device 1/2a  Note: companies to report which value(s) are evaluated.  Update note 1 in link budget table as follows,  Note1:  [1E3]   * For scenarios where CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss ~~‘A1’ and ‘A2’~~, [1E3] is derived by assuming pathloss is [1E4] and use the pathloss formula as agreed. |
| MTK | [1E4] | **[1E4]**  The formula is OK, some updates are suggested considering the following observations/considerations:  Observations/considerations:   * At least for the items appear twice, suggest to add a subscript to distinguish whether the value in R2D column or D2R column is used, e.g., [2C](R2D) or [2C](D2R). * Considering [1K], i.e., ambient IoT backscatter amplifier gain, is only for device 2a, and [3C], i.e., BS selection/macro-diversity gain, is only for the case of BS as CW node, suggest to add two corresponding notes.   Suggestions   * The suggested updates for [1E4] are marked in blue as below:   [1E4]   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G](D2R) – [1J](D2R) + [2C](D2R) – [2X](D2R) – [2L] + [3C](D2R) + [3D](D2R) )   + [1K] is only for device 2a   + [3C] is only for the case of BS as CW node | To MTK:  [1E4] is only for D2R, so unless explicit stated, all the items in the formula is provided from D2R. Only the items not from D2R is marked with R2D.  Add the following sub-bullet as suggested by MTK in [1E4]   * + [1K] is only for device 2a   + [3C] is only for the case of BS as CW node   To Huawei  The suggested editorial changes are incorporated.  To Qualcomm, CATT  As suggested by Qualcomm, [3C] and [3D] is removed from CW2D link.  To ZTE  Add description saying [1K] is only for device 2a  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  [1E4]   * ~~For scenarios ‘B’~~   + ~~[1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3]~~ * For scenarios where CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss ~~‘A1/A2’~~   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] ~~+ [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + [3C] + [3D] )   + [1K] is only for device 2a   + [3C] is only for the case of BS as CW node * Otherwise   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E4] | Similar comment as above to [1E3]. And we see other editorial changes are also needed. Thus, we suggest the following update:  [1E4]   * ~~For scenarios ‘B’~~   + ~~[1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3]~~ * For scenarios where CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss ~~‘A1/A2’~~   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C](R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G](D2R) – [1J] + [2C](D2R) – [2X](D2R) – [2L](D2R) + [3C](D2R) + [3D](D2R) ) * Otherwise   + [1E4] is derived by CW2D distance in [1E3] according to pathloss formula as agreed. |
| QC | 1E4:  CW2D pathloss | CW2D pathloss is independent from R2D and D2R.   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [~~3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + ~~[3C] + [3D]~~ )   3C and 3D could be removed for now since it is not clear its role. |
| CATT | [1E4] | [1E4]   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assuming distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C](D2R) – [2X] – [2L] + [3C](D2R) + [3D](D2R) )   We are fine to remove [3C] as QC suggested. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | [1E4] | For [1E4], add a supplement as below:  [1E4]   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + [3C] + [3D] )   + [1K] is only for device 2a |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E5] | We are fine with the proposal | To Lenovo and Qualcomm  As suggested, [3C] and [3D] is removed from CW2D link.  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  [1E5]   * [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] ~~+ [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ |
| Lenovo | [1E5] | In [1E5], [3C] and [3D] is not needed.  [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] |
| QC | 1E5:CW received power | We can remove 3C and 3D. It is not clear how/why use them for CW received power calculation.   * [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] ~~+ [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ |
| MTK | [1E] | **[1E]**  Observations/considerations:   * Seems [1E4], i.e., CW2D pathloss is missed for calculating [1E]? * Similar, we think it would be better to use “[1E](D2R)” here because the intention for [1E] here is for total Tx power at device side.   Suggestions   * The suggested updates for [1E] are marked in blue as below:   [1E](D2R)   * [1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) – [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] * [1K] is only for device 2a | To all,  Apologies, it appears that [1E4] is missing from the final proposal. And as suggested by many companies, [1E] can be derived from [1E5]. So, it is suggested to be revised as follows,  To Samsung and ZTE  [1E5] is ‘CW received power’ at device. [1E] is the Tx power. [1E5] and [1E] should be different. So I suggest not to set [1E] = [1E5] as suggested by Samsung.  Regarding whether [1K] – [1H] is included in [1E] or included in [1M], after I reviewing the item [1K] and [1H], it says [1K] is backscatter amplifier gain, [1H] is backscatter loss. So, it is related to the Tx power [1E]. So I suggest to include [1K] – [1H] in [1E].  Note that irrespective [1K] – [1H] is included in [1E] or in [1M], it does not change the calculated results for [1M], as well as the coverage results.  I am open to hear any additional opinions.  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  [1E]   * [1E] = ~~[1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ [1E5]+ [1K] – [1H] * [1K] is only for device 2a |
| vivo | [1E] | Current [1E] for D2R for device 1/2a does not contain the impact of CW2D pathloss, and suggest the following revision  [1E] for device 1 or device 2a   * [1E] = [1E5] + [1K] – [1H]   [1K] is only for device 2a |
| OPPO | [1E] | We are not sure the formula for [1E] is correct as it is supposed to be calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. As [1E5] is clear, it seems simpler to derive [1E] based on it:  [1E]   * [1E] = ~~[1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ [1E5]+ [1K] – [1H] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E] | We would like to clarify this [1E] calculation is only for Device1/2a since Device 2b will use pre-defined values as agreed.  It seems the [1E4] is missing in the equation thus propose to add back ‘- [1E4]’. And to avoid duplicated definition, we also suggest to consider using [1E5] to simply the equation since [1E5] is already calculated. For the note ‘[1K] is only for device 2a’ since it is already stated in that cell of link budget template, seems no need to repeat here otherwise needs to repeat every time when [1K] present.  1st preference:  [1E]   * [1E] = ~~[1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~[1E5] + [1K] – [1H] * ~~[1K] is only for device 2a~~   Also acceptable:  [1E]   * [1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] * ~~[1K] is only for device 2a~~ |
| QC | 1E:Total Tx power | Since we already computed 1E5 CW received power, we can use it in defining 1E for device 1/2a.  Minor update: 1E4 need to be considered in 1E (so 1E5 already include 1E4). 1J needs to be considered.   * [1E] = ~~[1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~  1E5 + [1K] – [1H]. * [1K] is only for device 2a |
| CATT | [1E] | Since [1E] is derived using CW received power [1E5], it is cleaner to have:   * [1E] = [1E5] + [1E4] + [1K] – [1H] * [1K] is only for device 2a |
| Spreadtrum | [1E] | CW2D pathloss[1E4] is missed in [1E] calculation.  [1E]   * [1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) –[1E4]+ [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] * [1K] is only for device 2a |
| Ericsson | [1E] | [1E]: The CW2D path loss is missing in the expression, as commented by, e.g., MTK, Vivo, etc. |
| Apple | [1E] | Similar to other companies, CW2D pathloss is missing |
| Samsung | [1E], | [1E], [1M]  @FL,  For the sake of clarification, regarding the comments you made below, could you explain the reason for the assumed relation? (the relation itself)  For [1E4] scenarios ‘A1/A2’, the following relation holds when assume CW2D pathloss = R2D pathloss,  [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](CW2D) – [1E4] + [2C] (CW2D) – [2H](CW2D) - [3A] - [3B] + [3C](CW2D) + [3D](CW2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] – [1E4] - [3A] - [3B] + [2C] – [2X] + [3C] + [3D] = [2L]  Additionally, we think that it is more appropriate to consider backscatter loss and amplification gain in 1M rather than 1E. Also, based on our understanding, [1E5], which is CW received power, can be total Tx power for device 1/2a. Therefore, we would like to suggest the following:  [1E5]   * [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) * [1K] is only for device 2a * [3C] is only for BS as CW node.   [1E]   * [1E] = [1E5] |
| ZTE, Sanechips | [1E] | For [1E4], add a supplement as below:  [1E4]   * For scenarios ‘B’   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3] * For scenarios ‘A1/A2’   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + [3C] + [3D] )   + [1K] is only for device 2a   For [1E], for D2R and scenario A1/A2/B, the device Tx power [1E] equals to received CW power [1E5], so we have the following modifications:  [1E]   * ~~[1E] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H]~~ * ~~[1K] is only for device 2a~~ * For D2R,   + Device 1/2a:     - [1E] = [1E5] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1M] | We are fine with the proposal with the following observation:  Since now [1H] and [1K] already defined in [1E], seems no need to distinguish different equation for devices because the equation of [1M] for D2R is same for all devices as ‘[1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]’. | To Samsung and ZTE,  As I explained in [1E], [1K]-[1H] has been already accounted. So no need to be included in [1M] again.  To Huawei and CATT,  With the modified [1E], the formula for [1M] is the same for all devices for D2R.  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  [1M]:   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]   + ~~Device 1:~~     - ~~[1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1H] - [1J]~~   + ~~Device 2a:~~     - ~~[1M] = [1E] + [1G] + [1K] - [1H] - [1J]~~   + ~~Device 2b:~~     - ~~[1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]~~ |
| Samsung | [1M] | [1M]:   * For R2D,   + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - ~~[1H]~~ - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2a:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] ~~+ [1K] - [1H]~~ +[1K]-[1H]- [1J] |
| ZTE, Sanechips | [1M] | For [1M], the D2R signal transmitted by device 1/2a will experience backscatter loss [1H] and reflection amplifier [1K], so these two components should not be removed.   * For D2R   + Device 1:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2a:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] + [1K] - [1H] - [1J]   + Device 2b:     - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]   Actually, for scenarios A1/A2, the balance coverage distance can directly be calculated based on [1E4] and pathloss model. The steps from 1E4 to 1E5 to 1M to 4A are equivalent to redundant calculations. |
| CATT | [1M] | With the modified [1E], the formula for [1M] is the same for all devices.  For R2D,   * + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~ * For D2R   + - [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2G] | There is nothing else to discuss since these were agreements. We would like to suggest to add preface with “As agreed:” | The description is copy and paste from the agreements. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2J] | There is nothing else to discuss since these were agreements. We would like to suggest to add preface with “As agreed:” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2K1] | We suggest the following editorial update to make it clear:  [2K1]:   * [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] -[1N](R2D) + [2C](D2R) - [2X] - [2K] | [2K1] is for D2R, so every item in the formula is from D2R |
| QC | 2K1: Remining CW interference | [2K1] = [1E1:CW Tx power] + [1E2:CW Tx antenna gain] -[1N:cable loss](R2D) – [2K0] + [2C:Receiver antenna gain] - [2X:Cable, connector loss] - [2K:CW cancellation],  where [2K0] = pathloss from CW transmitter to reader receiver   * When CW is collocated with reader (A2), [2K0] is 0dB.   When CW is not collocated with reader (B, A1), [2K0] depends on the pathloss from CW transmitter to reader receiver. Hence, add a new row “[2K0] = pathloss from CW transmitter to reader receiver” | The current agreement stipulates that [2K] accounts cover all CW cancellations, including those due to spatial separation. If we need to separate it for particular cases (such as scenario B and A1), we need an additional agreement. This seems to be a big change that need more discussion. FL suggests to keep the current way as it is considering we are in the email discussion stage. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2K2] | We are fine with the proposal |  |
| Samsung | [2G] | [2G]  For the final note, we would also like to mention that DC offset loss is not taken into consideration in the LLS.   * On/off keying backscatter loss and DC removal loss are not taken into account in the LLS and are included in link budget table [1H]. | It seems the Samsung’s proposal is aligned with the discussion during the meeting. FL made the following proposals and open to hear additional comments,  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  [2G]   * For the R2D LLS for ED, CINR/CNR is reported, where CINR/CNR is defined as the ratio of signal power spectral density in the transmission bandwidth to the noise and interference (if any) power spectral density in the device ED channel bandwidth. * For R2D ZIF receiver, report the same metrics (i.e., CNR/CINR, signal transmission bandwidth, ED bandwidth) as agreed for RF-ED/IF receiver. * For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported and it is defined as the ratio of signal power to noise and interference (if any) power in the receiver bandwidth. * On/off keying backscatter loss and DC removal loss is not taken into account in the LLS and is included in link budget table [1H]. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2L] | We are fine with the proposal |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [4A] | We think the equation should be separately for R2D and D2R, otherwise it will cause double counted issue. Thus we propose the following update:  [4A]   * [4A](R2D) =[1M]+[2C] ~~-[2X]~~-[2H]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] * [4A](D2R) =[1M]+[2C] -[2X]~~-[2H]~~-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] | To Huawei, vivo, Lenovo and Qualcomm  Applicability of [2X] and [2H] has already been described in the table. So, it should be very clear. However, it would not be detrimental to describe R2D and D2R separately as suggested by Huawei and Qualcomm.  To Qualcomm  There is already a uniform formula for [4A]. [1E4] is an indirect variable in the [4A] formula. There is different calculation of [1E4] for different cases.  Removal of **TBC:4A were removed for A1, A2 case** is because we already have a formula of [4A]. By substitution [1M] with the proposed formulas, it should result into the same results as you suggested.  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  [4A]   * ~~[4A]=[1M]+[2C] -[2X]-[2H]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D]~~ * ~~Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,~~    + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,~~   + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]) for device 2~~ * For R2D,   + [4A]=[1M]+[2C] -[2H]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] * For D2R,   + [4A]=[1M]+[2C] -[2X]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] |
| vivo | [4A] | Since ‘on object antenna penalty’[1H] has been included in [1E], and [1E] is included in [1M]. [2H] is not needed here. Hence, we suggest the following revision.   * [4A] = [1M]+[2C] -[2X]~~-[2H]~~-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D] |
| QC | 4A | For scenarios B, C (device 1/2a/2b)  D2R have different equation than R2D since on-object penalty 1J is already included in 1M for D2R.  R2D   * [4A] = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2X:body loss] -[2H:on-object penalty] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] + [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]   D2R   * [4A] = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2X:calbe loss] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] + [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]   **@FL, we wonder why TBC:4A were removed for A1, A2 case.**  For scenario A1/A2 (device 1/2a)   * Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,   + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,~~   + For device 1     - 0.5\*( [1E1] + [1E2] – [1N:cable loss] + [2C: **R2D** receiver antenna gain] – [2H:on-object antenna penalty] – [3A] – [3B] + [1G] – [1H:backscatter loss] – [1J:on-object antenna penalty] + [2C: **D2R** receiver antenna gain] – [2X:body loss] – [2L:**D2R** receiver sensitivity] – [3A] – [3B])   + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]) for device 2a~~   + For device 2a     - 0.5\*( [1E1] + [1E2] – [1N:cable loss] + [2C: R**2D** receiver antenna gain] – [2H:on-object antenna penalty] – [3A] – [3B] + [1G] – [1H:backscatter loss] – [1J:on-object antenna penalty] + [2C: D**2R** receiver antenna gain]– [2X:body loss] – [2L:**D2R** receiver sensitivity] – [3A] – [3B] + [1K: backscatter amplifier gain]) |
| Lenovo | [4A] | Separate the [4A] formula for R2D and D2R  Diversity gain [3C] is not needed as [2L] already includes SNR that includes the diversity gain based on the number of antenna used in the LLS:  [3D] is not clear for us – let make it as FFS.  [4A] (R2D) = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2X:body loss] -[2H:on-object penalty] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] ~~+ [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]~~  [4A] (D2R) = [4A] = [1M:EIRP] + [2C:rcv ant gain] -[2X:cable loss] -[2L:rcv sensitivity] -[3A:shadowing fading margin] -[3B:polarization mismatch] ~~+ [3C:Bs selection/macro gain] + [3D:other gain]~~  To avoid this confusion of duplicating, on-object penalty loss can be included as part of 1M for R2D and D2R. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [4B] | [4B] also need calculation. Maybe adding a simple sentence similar as used in [1E3]  [4B]   * [4B] is derived by assuming pathloss is [4A] and use the pathloss formula as agreed. | As suggested by Huawei, the following is proposed,  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  [4B]   * [4B] is derived by assuming pathloss is [4A] and use the pathloss formula as agreed. |

**[H][Proposal1-v3]**

Update [1E] and [1E3] as follows,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [1E] | Total Tx Power (dBm) | * For BS in DL spectrum for indoor   + [1E]-R2D-Alt1: 33dBm(M),   + [1E]-R2D-Alt2: 38dBm(O),   + [1E]-R2D-Alt3: 24dBm(M)   + Companies to report if PSD constraints are imposed (company to report the condition for applying PSD constraints in Row [5A]: Other notes) * For UL spectrum for indoor,   + [1E]-R2D-Alt4:23dBm (M)   + [1E]-R2D-Alt5:26dBm(O) | * For device 1/2a: (see note 1)   + [1E]-D2R-Alt1: (For scenarios ‘B’)     - The Device Tx Power is calculated by CW received power which can be derived by at least CW2D distance (m) value and other related factors.   + [1E]-D2R-Alt2: (For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’)     - The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. * For device 2b: (For scenarios ‘C’)   + [1E]-D2R-Alt3: -20 dBm(M)   + [1E]-D2R-Alt4: -10 dBm(O) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [1E3] | CW2D distance (m) | N/A | For scenarios ‘B’   * + D1T1-B:     - 5m,     - 10m,     - 20m     - CW2D distance is derived assuming CW node is located with the same position as ‘R1’ in ‘A1’ scenario. (see note 1)   + D2T2-B:     - 5m,     - 10m,   + FFS other values   For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’   * + Calculated (see note 1), (i.e., CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss)   Note: only applicable for device 1/2a  Note: companies to report which value(s) are evaluated. |

Update note 1 in link budget table as follows,

Note1 ~~(for email discussion)~~: calculated values in the Table XXXX are derived according to the followings,

[1E3]

* For scenarios where CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss ~~‘A1’ and ‘A2’~~, [1E3] is derived by assuming pathloss is [1E4] and use the pathloss formula as agreed.

[1E4]

* ~~For scenarios ‘B’~~
  + ~~[1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3]~~
* For scenarios where CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss ~~‘A1/A2’~~
  + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] ~~+ [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + [3C] + [3D] )
  + [1K] is only for device 2a
  + [3C] is only for the case of BS as CW node
* Otherwise
  + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3]

[1E5]

* [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] ~~+ [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~

[1E]

* [1E] = ~~[1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) –[3A] – [3B] + [3C](R2D) + [3D](R2D)~~ [1E5]+ [1K] – [1H]
* [1K] is only for device 2a

[1M]:

* For R2D,
  + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1N] ~~- FFS: [1J]~~
* For D2R
  + [1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]
  + ~~Device 1:~~
    - ~~[1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1H] - [1J]~~
  + ~~Device 2a:~~
    - ~~[1M] = [1E] + [1G] + [1K] - [1H] - [1J]~~
  + ~~Device 2b:~~
    - ~~[1M] = [1E] + [1G] - [1J]~~

[2F]:

* [2F] = [2D] + [2E] +*lin2dB*([2B])

[2G]

* For the R2D LLS for ED, CINR/CNR is reported, where CINR/CNR is defined as the ratio of signal power spectral density in the transmission bandwidth to the noise and interference (if any) power spectral density in the device ED channel bandwidth.
* For R2D ZIF receiver, report the same metrics (i.e., CNR/CINR, signal transmission bandwidth, ED bandwidth) as agreed for RF-ED/IF receiver.
* For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported and it is defined as the ratio of signal power to noise and interference (if any) power in the receiver bandwidth.
* On/off keying backscatter loss and DC removal loss is not taken into account in the LLS and is included in link budget table [1H].

[2J]

* For R2D link in the coverage evaluation, for device 1
  + Budget-Alt1 is used (note: receiver architecture is RF ED)
* For R2D link in the coverage evaluation for device 2,
  + *Budget-Alt1* is used if receiver architecture is RF ED
  + *Budget-Alt2* is used if receiver architecture is IF/ZIF ED
* Note1a: this does not preclude to have LLS for device 1 and 2 R2D link with RF-ED if needed.
* Note1b: For device 2 R2D link with RF-ED, *Budget-Alt1* is mandatory, *Budget-Alt2* is optional.
* Note1c: this does not imply all M values are achievable with the sensitivity given by *Budget-Alt1* for RF ED
* Note1d: For device 2 with an RF ED-based receiver on the R2D link, if the receiver sensitivity derived from *Budget-Alt2*, assuming a noise figure of [X dB], exceeds the receiver sensitivity based on *Budget-Alt1*, then *Budget-Alt2* is applied.

[2K1]:

* ~~FFS:~~
  + ~~Alt1: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [2K] or~~
  + ~~Alt2: [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] + [2C] - [2K]~~
* [2K1] = [1E1] + [1E2] -[1N](R2D) + [2C] - [2X] - [2K]

[2K2]:

[2L]:

* For R2D and *Budget-Alt2*,
  + [2L] = [2G] - *lin2dB*([2B] / [1F]) + [2F]
  + Note 1e: the term ‘*lin2dB*([2B] / [1F])’ is applied due to scaling from CNR/CINR to SNR/SINR.
* For D2R,
  + [2L] = [2G] + [2F] + [2K2], device 1/2a
  + [2L] = [2G] + [2F], device 2b

[4A]

* ~~[4A]=[1M]+[2C] -[2X]-[2H]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D]~~
* ~~Note 1f: For scenarios ‘A1’ and ‘A2’, The Device Tx Power is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss. i.e.,~~ 
  + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]-[1H]) for device 1,~~
  + ~~TBC: [4A] = 0.5\*([1E1]+[1E2]-2\*[3A]-2\*[3B]-[1J]-[2L]+[2C]+[1K]) for device 2~~
* For R2D,
  + [4A]=[1M]+[2C] -[2H]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D]
* For D2R,
  + [4A]=[1M]+[2C] -[2X]-[2L]-[3A]-[3B]+[3C]+[3D]

[4B]

* [4B] is derived by assuming pathloss is [4A] and use the pathloss formula as agreed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which item?** | **Comments** |
| Company A | [1M] | Example….., |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E3]  [1E]  [1M]  [2K1]  [2K2]  [2L]  [4A]  [4B] | We are supportive of the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E4] | We understand FL’s clarification that [1E4] is only for D2R, so unless explicit stated, all the items in the formula is provided from D2R. In that sense, we are fine with the way as FL clarified.  We are fine to either keep or remove ‘[3C](R2D)’ since it is agreed as zero by default. And if it is removed as suggested by FL, the note can also be removed.  But the reason to remove ‘[3D](R2D)’ is unclear to us, seems reasonable to keep it (as agreed in the table, company to report, it can be zero if no other gain is identified) to match the logic of the agreed table.  Suggest updates to [1E4] based on FL’s proposal  [1E4]   * For scenarios where CW2D distance is calculated by assuming CW2D pathloss = D2R pathloss   + [1E4] = 0.5\* ( [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – 2\*[3A] – 2\*[3B] ~~+ [3C](R2D)~~ + [3D](R2D) + [1K] – [1H] + [1G] – [1J] + [2C] – [2X] – [2L] + [3C] + [3D] )   + [1K] is only for device 2a   + ~~[3C] is only for the case of BS as CW node~~ * Otherwise   + [1E4] is derived according to pathloss formula by assume distance is [1E3] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1E5] | Similar comment to ‘[3D](R2D)’ as above, thus suggest updates to [1E5]  [1E5]   * [1E5] = [1E1] + [1E2] - [1N](R2D) - [1E4] + [2C] (R2D) – [2H](R2D) – [3A] – [3B] ~~+ [3C](R2D)~~ + [3D](R2D) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2G] | For the added DC removal loss, we see the intention based on the discussion.  Our observation is OOK backscatter loss 6dB (as agreed in link budget table) already covers. So we don’t see problems without adding this, but open to hear more. |

## link level simulation table

### Round 1

It is suggested to discuss the following link level simulation table. The text is marked red/green compared to the agreements in RAN1#116bis are for information.

Note: The green part is agreement in RAN1#117. The red part is revised text after RAN1#116bis.

And moderator suggest let’s focused on the text with red color.

**[H][Proposal2-v1]**

The link level simulation table is updated as follows,

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Parameters** | | **Assumptions** | **Company result1** | **Company result 2** |
|  | **R2D/D2R common parameters** | | |  |  |
| **[0a]** | Carrier frequency | | Refer to link budget template |  |  |
| **[0b]** | SCS | | 15 kHz as baseline |  |  |
| **[0c]** | Block structure | | Blocks as agreed in 9.4.2.3, or other blocks reported by companies |  |  |
| **[0d]** | Channel model | | <Editor’s Note: will be updated according to the agreements made for channel model> |  |  |
| **[0e]** | Delay spread | | ~~[30, 150] ns~~   * An RMS delay spread of 30 ns and [150] ns is considered for TDL-A channel model. * An RMS delay spread of 30 ns is considered for TDL-D channel model. |  |  |
| **[0f]** | Device velocity | | 3 km/h |  |  |
| **[0g]** | Number of Tx/Rx chains for Ambient IoT device | | 1 |  |  |
| **[0h1]** | BS | Number of antenna elements | 2 or 4 |  |  |
| **[0h2]** | Number of TXRUs | 2 or 4 |  |  |
| **[0j1]** | Intermediate UE | Number of antenna elements | 1 or 2 |  |  |
| **[0j2]** | Number of TXRUs | 1 or 2 |  |  |
| **[0m]** | Reference data rate | | ~~[0.1, 1, 5] kbps~~  [0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M), [7] kbps (O), [large value] (O) |  |  |
| **[0n]** | Message size | | {20 bits, 96 bits, 400 bits} are considered for message size.   * Note: companies to report the M value and chip length used for each message size |  |  |
| **[0p]** | BLER target | | 1%, 10% |  |  |
| **[0q]** | Sampling frequency | | ~~<Editor’s Note: will be updated according to the agreements made for Sampling frequency >~~  Sampling frequency is 1.92 Msps.  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm ~~for device 1, reported by company~~ * ~~[0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^4 ppm for device 2, reported by company~~   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.  FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for device 2.  FFS: CFO for device 2b.  Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design. |  |  |
| **[0r]** | Device 1/2a/2b | | Options are as follows,   * Device 1, RF-ED * Device 2a, RF-ED * Device 2b, RF-ED/IF-ED/ZIF   <Editor’s Note: will be updated according to agreements from 9.4.1.2> |  |  |
|  | **R2D specific parameters** | | |  |  |
| **[1a]** | Transmission bandwidth | | 180 kHz as baseline |  |  |
| **[1b]** | ~~FFS:~~ ED bandwidth | | The ED bandwidth is the bandwidth for calculating the noise/interference (if any) power:  For evaluations, the value(s) of ED bandwidth is 20 MHz for RF-ED, [180] kHz for IF/ZIF receiver.  Note: this does not imply that a A-IoT device supports sampling clock rate as large as RF ED bandwidth. |  |  |
| **[1c]** | ~~FFS:~~ BB LPF | | [X]-order Butterworth/RC filter with cutoff frequency at ~~[Y] kHz,~~ half of R2D transmission bandwidth.  Companies to report X = {3, 5}. |  |  |
| **[1d]** | Waveform | | OOK waveform generated by OFDM modulator |  |  |
| **[1e]** | Modulation | | OOK  Companies to report, e.g., OOK-1, OOK-4 with M chips per OFDM symbol |  |  |
| **[1f]** | Line code | | Companies to report, e.g., Manchester, PIE |  |  |
| **[1g]** | FEC | | No FEC as baseline |  |  |
| **[1h]** | ADC bit width | | 1-bit for device 1  4-bit for device 2 |  |  |
| **[1j]** | Detection/decoding method for Line code | | Companies to report |  |  |
|  | **D2R specific parameters** | | |  |  |
| **[2a1]** | Transmission bandwidth ~~(w.r.t. D2R data rate)~~ | | ~~[FFS: 15kHz, 180kHz]~~   * **[2a1]-Alt1:**    + DSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for two sidebands, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * **[2a1]-Alt2:**    + SSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * The value of X ~~and Y~~ is as follows, to be down-select from alternative 1 and 2   + Alternative 1:     - X = {15 (M), 180 (O)}     - ~~Y =180~~   + Alternative 2:     - X ~~and Y~~ reported by companies,       * the value may be related to, e.g.,         + Reference data rate         + Coding scheme         + Repetition         + With or without SFS         + SSB or DSB |  |  |
| **[2a2]** | [OOK/BPSK/BFSK chip rate] | | Companies to report |  |  |
| **[2a3]** | Receiver bandwidth | | D2R receiver bandwidth is the bandwidth used at the reader side to filter out the D2R signals for calculating noise and interference (if any) power.   * Assume the receiver matches the transmitter's modulation, i.e., to receiver uses SSB when transmitter uses SSB, receiver uses DSB when transmitter uses DSB.   Companies to report the value. |  |  |
| **[2b]** | Waveform (CW) | | Companies to report waveform, e.g., unmodulated single tone, multi-tone(multiple unmodulated single tone) |  |  |
| **[2d]** | Modulation | | Companies to report modulation, e.g., OOK, BPSK, BFSK |  |  |
| **[2e]** | Line code | | Companies to report, e.g., Manchester encoding, FM0 encoding, Miller encoding, no line coding |  |  |
| **[2g]** | FEC | | Companies to report, e.g., CC, No FEC |  |  |
| **[2h]** | ADC bit width | | Companies to report, e.g., 11-bit |  |  |
| **[2j]** | D2R receiver | | ~~FFS: Reader receiver, e.g., coherent receiver / non-coherent receiver~~  Companies to report, e.g., coherent receiver / non-coherent receiver |  |  |
|  | **Other assumptions** | | |  |  |
| **[3a]** | Other assumptions | | To be reported by company |  |  |
| **[3b]** | Note: Companies to report required SINR/SNR/CINR/CNR according to BLER target. | | |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which item?** | **Comments** |
| Company A | [0m] | Example….., |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0m] | We are fine with the proposal in general and would like to clarify our understanding that the intention of this LLS table is for coverage evaluation (in relation to Budget-Alt2). In that sense, we think focus on small values (0.1 kbps, 1 kbps) is enough for coverage evaluation. Further we understand data rate in link level simulation may not be achieved exactly same as reference data rate defined here in the table due design aspects of line coding chip length, FEC, repetition etc. Thus the simulation may be just approximately close to the data rate. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0q] | We are supportive of the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1c] | We are supportive of the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2a1] | We are supportive of [2a1]-Alt1 since for D2R we understand DSB should be the choice which can be supported by all devices. We are also supportive of Alternative 1, since Alternative 2 is not a full list and will be derived from other design agenda items. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2a2] | We are fine to add [2a2] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2a3] | We are fine with the proposal and as we stated above, we think DSB should be the choice for D2R. |
| DOCOMO | [0q] | Comment #1:  For the timing drift, “Fe” can be the SFO corresponds to after clock calibration and it should be clarified, per our understanding. Therefore, we prefer to add the following note.  The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.  Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.  Comment #2:  For the first FFS, we prefer to add “at least” for device 2 as follows.  FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration at least for device 2.  Comment #3:  As commented by companies at the online session, the note can be simplified as follows.  Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. ~~A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |
| DOCOMO | [2a1] | Comment#1:  In our understanding, alternatives in the 3rd main bullet does not correspond to [2a1]-Alt1 and [2a1]-Alt2, i.e., regardless of [2a1]-Alt1 or [2a1]-Alt2, alternatives in the 3rd bullet can be selected.  Comment#2:  The applicable device type of each [2a1]-Alt1 and [2a1]-Alt2 can be further clarified.  Comment#3:  For Alt.2 in the 3rd main bullet, it is unclear for us how repetition would affect to the transmission bandwidth. |
| OPPO | [0q], [2a1], [2a2] | [0q]: we suggest agreeing one value for “CFO for device 2b” as this value is needed for evaluation of D2R of device 2b. In the last meeting 2 options were provided in FL summary, maybe we can use the intersection of the 2 options, i.e. (200ppm, 0.1ppm/s) , as baseline, and other values is up to companies to report. We also support to simplify the Note as proposed by DCM.  [2a1]-Alt 1 should be mandatory, and [2a1]-Alt 2 optional.  We support to report chip rate (i.e. [2a2]). Given that, alternative 2 in [2a1] should be used, as the chip rate and transmission bandwidth are relevant to each other and should be derived from same sets of factors, i.e., reference data rate, DSB/SSB, repetition, … |
| Spreadtrum | [2a1] | We prefer Alt1 in [2a1].  We are OK with [0q], [2a2] and [2a3]. |
| vivo | [0m] Reference data rate | We would like the clarify of the meaning of reference data rate here.  1, the reference data rate may have the following understanding   * opt-1: Raw data rate, which considers only data rate for the coded/uncoded information bits, without considering overhead for CRC, midamble, postamble, if reported. For example, for R2D M=1, and Manchester code is used, which means 2 OFDM symbol is used for each information bits, and data rate for the information bits is 7kbps for this case. (This is how 7kbps come from in our understanding, which may not applicable for D2R in our understanding). * opt-2: data rate in physical channel, the data rate also considers overhead for CRC, midamble, postamble, FEC, repetition, if reported. For this case, it may be difficult to achieve the accurate data rate value, companies may need to adjust the configuration of CRC/midamble/postamble/FEC/repetition to achieve the data rate close to the agreed data rate value? |
| vivo | [1c] BB LPF | We are OK to assume a certain BW value for BB LPF (e.g., [90] kHz), while we don’t think it is related to half of transmission bandwidth. Instead, BB LPF BW depends on data rates. Even for Tx bandwidth of 1.08MHz(O), 90kHz for BB LPF is enough for a low data rate e.g., 7kbps.  Besides, the BB LPF in circuit of the receiver cannot be flexibly adjusted to different data rate and/or transmission BW, a fixed BB LPF BW can be assumed for different data rates/Tx bandwidth. |
| vivo | [2a1] Transmission bandwidth | Prefer [2a1]-Alt1, consider two sidebands. Receiver of D2R signal should be able to employ both sidebands.  We prefer Alternative 2 for transmission BW X, i.e., up to company report. And the BW may relate to line coding scheme, data rate, etc. We are not sure whether company have aligned Tx BW value even if for the same signal generation. Since this value is not used in link budget calculation, the X value can be up to company report, and the details e.g., data rate, coding scheme, repetition are reported together in the link level simulation template. |
| vivo | [2a3] Receiver bandwidth | A limited received BW value(s) for evaluation purpose are needed to ensure same SINR definition across companies, since we have working assumption that ‘For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported and it is defined as the ratio of signal power to noise and interference (if any) power in the receiver bandwidth.’  The Rx BW may include Tx BW + potential guard bands in our understanding. We are not sure whether companies would have the same Rx BW for the same D2R signal. If [2a3] receiver bandwidth is totally up to company report, it implies companies would have different SINR definition even for the same D2R transmission signal, if reported ‘receiver BW’ is not aligned across companies. |
| vivo | **[0q]** Sampling frequency | Regarding this item, there is sampling frequency of 1.92Msps, it seems parameter for R2D receiver? We would like to clarify the assumption for initial SFO is also applicable to D2R transmitter. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 0m | Okay.  For the small data rate, such as 0.1kbps, 1kbps are the data rate required by RAN SI, which needs to be evaluated. We are also okay to include a larger data rate for evaluation, such as 7kbps. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 0q | Comments are as below.   |  | | --- | | Sampling frequency is 1.92 Msps. |   [ZTE, Sanechips] okay with the sampling frequency.   |  | | --- | | Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm ~~for device 1, reported by company~~ * ~~[0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^4 ppm for device 2, reported by company~~ |   [ZTE, Sanechips]  We think different devices with different architectures and capabilities should be equipped with different SFO accuracy.  For device 1, we are okay with the SFO up to 10^5ppm.  However, for device 2a, the implementation with large frequency shift is being discussed. If the SFO is up to 10^5ppm, for a frequency shift gap of 50MHz, the frequency shift uncertainty is 10MHz (50MHz\*0.1\*2), which may exceed the frequency range of FDD UL spectrum. Therefore, to enable the possibility of large frequency shift of device 2a, a higher frequency accuracy than device 1 is needed. Therefore, we think at least 10^4ppm is needed.  For device 2b, the impact of frequency uncertainty is more serious considering the carrier frequency is 900MHz or 2GHz. In this case, we think the model used in LP WUS can be reused for device 2b.  Moreover, we think the SFO value is the max value, not fixed. Hence, the actual SFO can be a random value between 0 and 10^5ppm/10^4ppm/10^2ppm depending on device type.  Therefore, our suggestion is:  **Suggestion:**  Maximum Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1~~, reported by company~~ * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^4 ppm for device 2a~~, reported by company~~ * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^2 ppm for device 2b  |  | | --- | | The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T. |   [ZTE, Sanechips] We agree with DoCoMo that the timing drift should be modeled after clock synchronization,instead of using initial sampling offset. Moreover, it seems the model above assume that the clock offset is fixed over the the time duration T. However, if clock drift is considered, the time offset per chip may be varied.  The suggestion is as below:  **Suggestion:**  The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fr~~e~~ \* T. where Fr is clock offset after synchronization. FFS other models.   |  | | --- | | FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for device 2. |   [ZTE, Sanechips] We think device 1 can also implement clock synchronization. Similar as RF ID tag, the device can count the number of samples during preamble detection. And then using the counted sample numbers to derive the required samples for the follow-up transmission. Therefore, the following is suggested:  **Suggestion:**  FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for device 1 and 2.   |  | | --- | | Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design. |   [ZTE, Sanechips] This is for evaluation discussion, instead of detailed design. The following is suggested.  **Suggestion:**  Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. ~~A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1c | okay |
| CATT | **[0q]** | For the initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe),  • [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm  we would like clarification on its meaning. Does it indicate that the maximum SFO can be selected within the range of [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm, or does it mean that the maximum SFO is 10^5 ppm, and a value between [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm can be randomly selected for each LLS?  For the “Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design”, considering that not only SFO, but some other values (e.g., the order of Butterworth/RC filter) in the table are also defined for evaluation purposes, but not design parameters, it might be simpler to add a new row, e.g., [3c], and stating that the values in the table are for evaluation purposes. |
| Ericsson | [0q] | Regarding **sampling frequency**, we don’t think there is strong technical reason why the sampling frequency should be 1.92 Msps. Our understanding is that if the maximum data rate is 7 kbps and RF-ED, the sampling rate can be much smaller than that. For example, the sampling frequency could be 56 kHz (2 times the Nyquist rate corresponding to a data rate of 7 kbps).  We think sampling frequency can be up to companies to report.  Regarding **initial SFO**, we support the suggestion from ZTE. Alternatively, we can do coverage evaluation with different sampling frequencies for all device types, e.g., 10^5 ppm (M), 10^3 ppm (O), and 10^2 ppm (O).  Note that oscillators with very large errors will increase synchronization time with the network, resulting in higher energy consumption at the device and increasing complexity for synchronization (time/frequency error correction). |
| Apple | [0m] | We are fine with values being considered, but additionally would prefer to add 2kbps as well. It can be optional |
| Apple | [0q] | Support |
| Apple | [2a1] | Support and prefer Alt1 |
| Apple | [2a3] | Fine |
| Futurewei | [0m] | Ok with the proposed text |
| Futurewei | [0n] | We understand that the message size does not include CRC bits. We propose to add a note to clarify it. |
| Futurewei | [0q] | Sampling frequency is 1.92 Msps.  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm ~~for device 1, reported by company~~ * ~~[0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^4 ppm for device 2, reported by company~~   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.  FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for device 2.  FFS: CFO for device 2b.  Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.  Propose to use [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm as mandatory for device 1 and 2a. In addition, companies can report an optional value for device 2a for Fe. |
| Futurewei | [1c] | Ok with the proposed text. |
| Futurewei | [2a1] | * **[2a1]-Alt1:**    + DSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for two sidebands, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * **[2a1]-Alt2:**    + SSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~.   ***Proposal: select DSB over SSB for device 1/2a in back scattering***.  Devices will need additional hardware to support SSB and consume additional energy.   * The value of X ~~and Y~~ is as follows, to be down-select from alternative 1 and 2   + Alternative 1:     - X = {15 (M), 180 (O)}     - ~~Y =180~~   + Alternative 2:     - X ~~and Y~~ reported by companies,       * the value may be related to, e.g.,         + Reference data rate         + Coding scheme         + Repetition         + With or without SFS         + SSB or DSB   We select Alternative 1 so the results can be compared easily among companies. |
| Futurewei | [2a2] | Ok with the proposed text |
| Futurewei | [2a3] | Ok with the proposed text |
| Futurewei | [3b] | ok |
| LGE | [0q], [2a1] | [0q]: In our view, since all types of device 2 may not support clock calibration, we prefer to remove first FFS. Additionally, we prefer to remove second FFS to minimize device specific evaluation. For initial SFO and timing drift, we are okay with the proposal.  [2a1]: In our view, Alt1 should be considered since all types of AmIoT devices may not have capability to isolate one side band. Since the device architecture is not guaranteed, Alt1 should be considered as a baseline for LLS and Alt2 can be optional. Additionally, determining the value of X, we prefer Alternative 1 as a baseline for simplicity. |
| QC | 0e | [150] ns is too large for indoor. The longest delay we see is 59ns for indoor environment. |
| QC | 0m | 0.1kbps, 1kbps it too much low. This is unrealistic. It takes 4sec to send 400bits at 0.1kbps. Real A-IoT system should not support such low data rate.  7kbps is more realistic than other numbers. Note that minimum D2R data rate of RFID is 40kbps (FM0), 20kbps (MMS M=2), 10kbps (MMS M=4), and 5kbps (MMS M=8).  Our suggestion is to remove 0.1kbps and 1kbps.    ~~[0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M),~~ [7] kbps (~~O~~M), [large value] (O) |
| QC | 0q | **We don’t need sampling frequency specified. This is not necessary.** Companies can report their assumed value. Since OOK data rate is quite low, the sampling rate could be also low. The sampling frequency and clock rate does not necessarily need to be the same.  **Clock could be calibrated after initial sync (i.e., preamble detection).** This could be either done in the form of clock adjustment or equivalently internal counter adjustment.  All devices can utilize clock sync signal, and clock information from Manchester coding. Post clock sync accuracy should be “<10^4” for device for sampling clock  **Last sentence in the note is not necessary.**  Companies to report assumed sampling frequency **~~is 1.92 Msps~~.**  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm ~~for device 1, reported by company~~ * ~~[0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^4 ppm for device 2, reported by company~~   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.  ~~FFS:~~ Accuracy after ~~clock~~ calibration of **sampling clock** for device 1 and device 2 is <10^4ppm. Companies to report assumed value.  ~~FFS:~~ After calibration, CFO for device 2b for carrier frequency generation is 10^2ppm.  Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. ~~A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |
| QC | 1c: BB LPF | Companies to report X and Y.  [X]-order Butterworth/RC filter with cutoff frequency at [Y] kHz, ~~half of R2D transmission bandwidth~~.  Companies to report X = {3, 5}. |
| QC | 2a1 | 2a1-Alt1 DSB could be baseline for device 1/2a.  2a1-Alt2 SSB could be baseline for device 2b.  So, we need both.   * **[2a1]-Alt1:**    + DSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for two sidebands, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * **[2a1]-Alt2:**    + SSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for **SSB**~~DSB~~ is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~.   For value X, we prefer Alternative 2 – companies to report. |

### Round 2

Based on the comments from round 1, a summary is provided as follows,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Item** | **Companies’ comments** | **FL comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0m] | We are fine with the proposal in general and would like to clarify our understanding that the intention of this LLS table is for coverage evaluation (in relation to Budget-Alt2). In that sense, we think focus on small values (0.1 kbps, 1 kbps) is enough for coverage evaluation. Further we understand data rate in link level simulation may not be achieved exactly same as reference data rate defined here in the table due design aspects of line coding chip length, FEC, repetition etc. Thus the simulation may be just approximately close to the data rate. | Some companies [vivo][Huawei] think the data rate in link level simulation may not be achieved exactly same as reference data rate defined here in the table due design aspects of line coding chip length, FEC, repetition.  FL added some notes to clarify these.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **[0m]** | Reference data rate | ~~[0.1, 1, 5] kbps~~  [0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M), [2] kbps (O), [7] kbps (O), [large value] (O)   * Note1: companies to report the exact data rate. * Note 2: the exact data rate is close the values listed above. * Note 3: The data rate is calculated by dividing the total message size by the total transmission time. * Note 4: the data rate may be related to coding scheme, repetition and etc. | |
| vivo | [0m] Reference data rate | We would like the clarify of the meaning of reference data rate here.  1, the reference data rate may have the following understanding   * opt-1: Raw data rate, which considers only data rate for the coded/uncoded information bits, without considering overhead for CRC, midamble, postamble, if reported. For example, for R2D M=1, and Manchester code is used, which means 2 OFDM symbol is used for each information bits, and data rate for the information bits is 7kbps for this case. (This is how 7kbps come from in our understanding, which may not applicable for D2R in our understanding).   opt-2: data rate in physical channel, the data rate also considers overhead for CRC, midamble, postamble, FEC, repetition, if reported. For this case, it may be difficult to achieve the accurate data rate value, companies may need to adjust the configuration of CRC/midamble/postamble/FEC/repetition to achieve the data rate close to the agreed data rate value? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 0m | Okay.  For the small data rate, such as 0.1kbps, 1kbps are the data rate required by RAN SI, which needs to be evaluated. We are also okay to include a larger data rate for evaluation, such as 7kbps. |
| Apple | [0m] | We are fine with values being considered, but additionally would prefer to add 2kbps as well. It can be optional |
| Futurewei | [0m] | Ok with the proposed text |
| Futurewei | [0n] | We understand that the message size does not include CRC bits. We propose to add a note to clarify it. | Add a note2   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | [0n] | Message size | {20 bits, 96 bits, 400 bits} are considered for message size.   * Note 1: companies to report the M value and chip length used for each message size * Note 2: CRC is not included for the message size | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0q] | We are supportive of the proposal. | To [vivo], the sampling frequency here is for device (e.g., 1.92 Msps). However, there is no specific mention of the reader's sampling frequency. It can be as high as possible, with the assumption left to the companies. Given that the bandwidth is not so large, I believe the reader's sampling frequency is sufficiently high for adequate performance.  To [Ericsson], considering the typical value used and proposed by many companies, FL suggest to keep 1.92Msps and other values are not precluded for evaluation.  To [CATT] remove the note in this item and added another proposal for this.    To [DoCOMO][OPPO]  Clarify these values are not intended for design and only for evaluation.  To [ZTE], I think we need only two SFO values, i.e., initial SFO and after clock calibration SFO. No need to have another maximum initial SFO. Otherwise, we will end up with 3 SFO values.  For SFO, it is unstable for device 2. Some one think it is 10^3-10^4, some proposes 10-10^2. FL added FFS. Let’s further discuss that during this email discussion.  Proposal:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **[0q]** | Sampling frequency | Sampling frequency is 1.92 Msps. Other values are not precluded and reported by companies.  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for at least device 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   FFS: CFO for device 2b.   * [200ppm, 0.1ppm/s]   ~~Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ | | **…** |  |  | |  |  |  | | Note:  These values are for evaluation purpose and any differences among device types (if any) are not intended for harmonized design approach. | | | |
| DOCOMO | [0q] | Comment #1:  For the timing drift, “Fe” can be the SFO corresponds to after clock calibration and it should be clarified, per our understanding. Therefore, we prefer to add the following note.  The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.  Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.  Comment #2:  For the first FFS, we prefer to add “at least” for device 2 as follows.  FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration at least for device 2.  Comment #3:  As commented by companies at the online session, the note can be simplified as follows.  Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. ~~A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |
| OPPO | [0q] | [0q]: we suggest agreeing one value for “CFO for device 2b” as this value is needed for evaluation of D2R of device 2b. In the last meeting 2 options were provided in FL summary, maybe we can use the intersection of the 2 options, i.e. (200ppm, 0.1ppm/s) , as baseline, and other values is up to companies to report. We also support to simplify the Note as proposed by DCM. |
| vivo | **[0q]** Sampling frequency | Regarding this item, there is sampling frequency of 1.92Msps, it seems parameter for R2D receiver? We would like to clarify the assumption for initial SFO is also applicable to D2R transmitter. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 0q | Comments are as below.   |  | | --- | | Sampling frequency is 1.92 Msps. |   [ZTE, Sanechips] okay with the sampling frequency.   |  | | --- | | Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm ~~for device 1, reported by company~~ * ~~[0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^4 ppm for device 2, reported by company~~ |   [ZTE, Sanechips]  We think different devices with different architectures and capabilities should be equipped with different SFO accuracy.  For device 1, we are okay with the SFO up to 10^5ppm.  However, for device 2a, the implementation with large frequency shift is being discussed. If the SFO is up to 10^5ppm, for a frequency shift gap of 50MHz, the frequency shift uncertainty is 10MHz (50MHz\*0.1\*2), which may exceed the frequency range of FDD UL spectrum. Therefore, to enable the possibility of large frequency shift of device 2a, a higher frequency accuracy than device 1 is needed. Therefore, we think at least 10^4ppm is needed.  For device 2b, the impact of frequency uncertainty is more serious considering the carrier frequency is 900MHz or 2GHz. In this case, we think the model used in LP WUS can be reused for device 2b.  Moreover, we think the SFO value is the max value, not fixed. Hence, the actual SFO can be a random value between 0 and 10^5ppm/10^4ppm/10^2ppm depending on device type.  Therefore, our suggestion is:  **Suggestion:**  Maximum Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1~~, reported by company~~ * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^4 ppm for device 2a~~, reported by company~~ * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^2 ppm for device 2b  |  | | --- | | The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T. |   [ZTE, Sanechips] We agree with DoCoMo that the timing drift should be modeled after clock synchronization,instead of using initial sampling offset. Moreover, it seems the model above assume that the clock offset is fixed over the the time duration T. However, if clock drift is considered, the time offset per chip may be varied.  The suggestion is as below:  **Suggestion:**  The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fr~~e~~ \* T. where Fr is clock offset after synchronization. FFS other models.   |  | | --- | | FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for device 2. |   [ZTE, Sanechips] We think device 1 can also implement clock synchronization. Similar as RF ID tag, the device can count the number of samples during preamble detection. And then using the counted sample numbers to derive the required samples for the follow-up transmission. Therefore, the following is suggested:  **Suggestion:**  FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for device 1 and 2.   |  | | --- | | Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design. |   [ZTE, Sanechips] This is for evaluation discussion, instead of detailed design. The following is suggested.  **Suggestion:**  Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. ~~A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |
| CATT | **[0q]** | For the initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe),  • [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm  we would like clarification on its meaning. Does it indicate that the maximum SFO can be selected within the range of [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm, or does it mean that the maximum SFO is 10^5 ppm, and a value between [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm can be randomly selected for each LLS?  For the “Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design”, considering that not only SFO, but some other values (e.g., the order of Butterworth/RC filter) in the table are also defined for evaluation purposes, but not design parameters, it might be simpler to add a new row, e.g., [3c], and stating that the values in the table are for evaluation purposes. |
| Ericsson | [0q] | Regarding **sampling frequency**, we don’t think there is strong technical reason why the sampling frequency should be 1.92 Msps. Our understanding is that if the maximum data rate is 7 kbps and RF-ED, the sampling rate can be much smaller than that. For example, the sampling frequency could be 56 kHz (2 times the Nyquist rate corresponding to a data rate of 7 kbps).  We think sampling frequency can be up to companies to report.  Regarding **initial SFO**, we support the suggestion from ZTE. Alternatively, we can do coverage evaluation with different sampling frequencies for all device types, e.g., 10^5 ppm (M), 10^3 ppm (O), and 10^2 ppm (O).  Note that oscillators with very large errors will increase synchronization time with the network, resulting in higher energy consumption at the device and increasing complexity for synchronization (time/frequency error correction). |
| Apple | [0q] | Support |
| Futurewei | [0q] | Sampling frequency is 1.92 Msps.  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm ~~for device 1, reported by company~~ * ~~[0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^4 ppm for device 2, reported by company~~   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.  FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for device 2.  FFS: CFO for device 2b.  Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.  Propose to use [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm as mandatory for device 1 and 2a. In addition, companies can report an optional value for device 2a for Fe. |
| LGE | [0q] | [0q]: In our view, since all types of device 2 may not support clock calibration, we prefer to remove first FFS. Additionally, we prefer to remove second FFS to minimize device specific evaluation. For initial SFO and timing drift, we are okay with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [1c] | We are supportive of the proposal. | As suggested by vivo, BW of the BB LPF depends on data rates, then it will be very flexible. As stated by vivo, a fixed BB LPF BW is suggested for different data rates.  Hence, FL still suggest to consider the proposal as it is. |
| vivo | [1c] BB LPF | We are OK to assume a certain BW value for BB LPF (e.g., [90] kHz), while we don’t think it is related to half of transmission bandwidth. Instead, BB LPF BW depends on data rates. Even for Tx bandwidth of 1.08MHz(O), 90kHz for BB LPF is enough for a low data rate e.g., 7kbps.  Besides, the BB LPF in circuit of the receiver cannot be flexibly adjusted to different data rate and/or transmission BW, a fixed BB LPF BW can be assumed for different data rates/Tx bandwidth. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1c | okay |
| Futurewei | [1c] | Ok with the proposed text. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2a1] | We are supportive of [2a1]-Alt1 since for D2R we understand DSB should be the choice which can be supported by all devices. We are also supportive of Alternative 1, since Alternative 2 is not a full list and will be derived from other design agenda items. | Most companies prefer DSB (Alt 1).  For Alternative 1 and 2, FL suggest Alternative 1 (as stated by company so the results can be compared easily among companies) and other values can be reported by companies   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **[2a1]** | Transmission bandwidth | * **~~[2a1]-Alt1:~~**    + DSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for two sidebands, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * **~~[2a1]-Alt2:~~**    + ~~SSB~~   + ~~X kHz (M) and Y kHz (O) is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.~~   + ~~The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz (M) and Y kHz (O).~~ * ~~The value of X and Y is as follows, to be down-select from alternative 1 and 2~~   + ~~Alternative 1:~~      - ~~X = {15 (M), 180 (O)}~~     - ~~Y =180~~   + ~~Alternative 2:~~     - ~~X and Y reported by companies,~~       * ~~the value may be related to, e.g.,~~          + ~~Reference data rate~~         + ~~Coding scheme~~         + ~~Repetition~~         + ~~With or without SFS~~         + ~~SSB or DSB~~   + X = {15 (M), 180 (O)}, other values are not precluded and reported by companies | |
| DOCOMO | [2a1] | Comment#1:  In our understanding, alternatives in the 3rd main bullet does not correspond to [2a1]-Alt1 and [2a1]-Alt2, i.e., regardless of [2a1]-Alt1 or [2a1]-Alt2, alternatives in the 3rd bullet can be selected.  Comment#2:  The applicable device type of each [2a1]-Alt1 and [2a1]-Alt2 can be further clarified.  Comment#3:  For Alt.2 in the 3rd main bullet, it is unclear for us how repetition would affect to the transmission bandwidth. |
| OPPO | [2a1] | [2a1]-Alt 1 should be mandatory, and [2a1]-Alt 2 optional.  … |
| Spreadtrum | [2a1] | We prefer Alt1 in [2a1].  We are OK with [0q], [2a2] and [2a3]. |
| vivo | [2a1] Transmission bandwidth | Prefer [2a1]-Alt1, consider two sidebands. Receiver of D2R signal should be able to employ both sidebands.  We prefer Alternative 2 for transmission BW X, i.e., up to company report. And the BW may relate to line coding scheme, data rate, etc. We are not sure whether company have aligned Tx BW value even if for the same signal generation. Since this value is not used in link budget calculation, the X value can be up to company report, and the details e.g., data rate, coding scheme, repetition are reported together in the link level simulation template. |
| Apple | [2a1] | Support and prefer Alt1 |
| Futurewei | [2a1] | * **[2a1]-Alt1:**    + DSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for two sidebands, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * **[2a1]-Alt2:**    + SSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~.   ***Proposal: select DSB over SSB for device 1/2a in back scattering***.  Devices will need additional hardware to support SSB and consume additional energy.   * The value of X ~~and Y~~ is as follows, to be down-select from alternative 1 and 2   + Alternative 1:     - X = {15 (M), 180 (O)}     - ~~Y =180~~   + Alternative 2:     - X ~~and Y~~ reported by companies,       * the value may be related to, e.g.,         + Reference data rate         + Coding scheme         + Repetition         + With or without SFS         + SSB or DSB   We select Alternative 1 so the results can be compared easily among companies. |
| LGE | [2a1] | [2a1]: In our view, Alt1 should be considered since all types of AmIoT devices may not have capability to isolate one side band. Since the device architecture is not guaranteed, Alt1 should be considered as a baseline for LLS and Alt2 can be optional. Additionally, determining the value of X, we prefer Alternative 1 as a baseline for simplicity. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2a2] | We are fine to add [2a2] | Add [2a2] |
| OPPO | [2a2] | We support to report chip rate (i.e. [2a2]). Given that, alternative 2 in [2a1] should be used, as the chip rate and transmission bandwidth are relevant to each other and should be derived from same sets of factors, i.e., reference data rate, DSB/SSB, repetition, |
| Futurewei | [2a2] | Ok with the proposed text |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2a3] | We are fine with the proposal and as we stated above, we think DSB should be the choice for D2R. | So far, we have no idea about how is the potential guard bands. FL added and further down-selection is not precluded.  Proposals  D2R receiver bandwidth is the bandwidth used at the reader side to filter out the D2R signals for calculating noise and interference (if any) power.   * Assume the receiver matches the transmitter's modulation, i.e., ~~to receiver uses SSB when transmitter uses SSB,~~ receiver uses DSB when transmitter uses DSB.   Companies to report the value, and further down-selection is not precluded. |
| vivo | [2a3] Receiver bandwidth | A limited received BW value(s) for evaluation purpose are needed to ensure same SINR definition across companies, since we have working assumption that ‘For the D2R LLS, the SINR/SNR is reported and it is defined as the ratio of signal power to noise and interference (if any) power in the receiver bandwidth.’  The Rx BW may include Tx BW + potential guard bands in our understanding. We are not sure whether companies would have the same Rx BW for the same D2R signal. If [2a3] receiver bandwidth is totally up to company report, it implies companies would have different SINR definition even for the same D2R transmission signal, if reported ‘receiver BW’ is not aligned across companies. |
| Apple | [2a3] | Fine |
| Futurewei | [2a3] | Ok with the proposed text |
| Futurewei | [3b] | ok |  |

In summary, the LLS table is revised as follows,

**[H][Proposal2-v2]**

The link level simulation table is updated as follows,

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Parameters** | | **Assumptions** | **Company result1** | **Company result 2** |
|  | **R2D/D2R common parameters** | | |  |  |
| **[0a]** | Carrier frequency | | Refer to link budget template |  |  |
| **[0b]** | SCS | | 15 kHz as baseline |  |  |
| **[0c]** | Block structure | | Blocks as agreed in 9.4.2.3, or other blocks reported by companies |  |  |
| **[0d]** | Channel model | | <Editor’s Note: will be updated according to the agreements made for channel model> |  |  |
| **[0e]** | Delay spread | | ~~[30, 150] ns~~   * An RMS delay spread of 30 ns and [150] ns is considered for TDL-A channel model. * An RMS delay spread of 30 ns is considered for TDL-D channel model. |  |  |
| **[0f]** | Device velocity | | 3 km/h |  |  |
| **[0g]** | Number of Tx/Rx chains for Ambient IoT device | | 1 |  |  |
| **[0h1]** | BS | Number of antenna elements | 2 or 4 |  |  |
| **[0h2]** | Number of TXRUs | 2 or 4 |  |  |
| **[0j1]** | Intermediate UE | Number of antenna elements | 1 or 2 |  |  |
| **[0j2]** | Number of TXRUs | 1 or 2 |  |  |
| **[0m]** | Reference data rate | | ~~[0.1, 1, 5] kbps~~  [0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M), [2] kbps (O), [7] kbps (O), [large value] (O)   * Note1: companies to report the exact data rate. * Note 2: the exact data rate is close the values listed above. * Note 3: The data rate is calculated by dividing the total message size by the total transmission time. * Note 4: the data rate may be related to coding scheme, repetition and etc. |  |  |
| **[0n]** | Message size | | {20 bits, 96 bits, 400 bits} are considered for message size.   * Note 1: companies to report the M value and chip length used for each message size * Note 2: CRC is not included for the message size |  |  |
| **[0p]** | BLER target | | 1%, 10% |  |  |
| **[0q]** | Sampling frequency | | Sampling frequency is 1.92 Msps. Other values are not precluded and reported by companies.  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for at least device 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   FFS: CFO for device 2b.   * [200ppm, 0.1ppm/s]   ~~Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |  |  |
| **[0r]** | Device 1/2a/2b | | Options are as follows,   * Device 1, RF-ED * Device 2a, RF-ED * Device 2b, RF-ED/IF-ED/ZIF   <Editor’s Note: will be updated according to agreements from 9.4.1.2> |  |  |
|  | **R2D specific parameters** | | |  |  |
| **[1a]** | Transmission bandwidth | | 180 kHz as baseline |  |  |
| **[1b]** | ~~FFS:~~ ED bandwidth | | The ED bandwidth is the bandwidth for calculating the noise/interference (if any) power:  For evaluations, the value(s) of ED bandwidth is 20 MHz for RF-ED, [180] kHz for IF/ZIF receiver.  Note: this does not imply that a A-IoT device supports sampling clock rate as large as RF ED bandwidth. |  |  |
| **[1c]** | ~~FFS:~~ BB LPF | | [X]-order Butterworth/RC filter with cutoff frequency at ~~[Y] kHz,~~ half of R2D transmission bandwidth.  Companies to report X = {3, 5}. |  |  |
| **[1d]** | Waveform | | OOK waveform generated by OFDM modulator |  |  |
| **[1e]** | Modulation | | OOK  Companies to report, e.g., OOK-1, OOK-4 with M chips per OFDM symbol |  |  |
| **[1f]** | Line code | | Companies to report, e.g., Manchester, PIE |  |  |
| **[1g]** | FEC | | No FEC as baseline |  |  |
| **[1h]** | ADC bit width | | 1-bit for device 1  4-bit for device 2 |  |  |
| **[1j]** | Detection/decoding method for Line code | | Companies to report |  |  |
|  | **D2R specific parameters** | | |  |  |
| **[2a1]** | Transmission bandwidth ~~(w.r.t. D2R data rate)~~ | | * **~~[2a1]-Alt1:~~**    + DSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for two sidebands, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * **~~[2a1]-Alt2:~~**    + ~~SSB~~   + ~~X kHz (M) and Y kHz (O) is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.~~   + ~~The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz (M) and Y kHz (O).~~ * ~~The value of X and Y is as follows, to be down-select from alternative 1 and 2~~   + ~~Alternative 1:~~      - ~~X = {15 (M), 180 (O)}~~     - ~~Y =180~~   + ~~Alternative 2:~~     - ~~X and Y reported by companies,~~       * ~~the value may be related to, e.g.,~~          + ~~Reference data rate~~         + ~~Coding scheme~~         + ~~Repetition~~         + ~~With or without SFS~~         + ~~SSB or DSB~~   + X = {15 (M), 180 (O)}, other values are not precluded and reported by companies |  |  |
| **[2a2]** | [OOK/BPSK/BFSK chip rate] | | Companies to report |  |  |
| **[2a3]** | Receiver bandwidth | | D2R receiver bandwidth is the bandwidth used at the reader side to filter out the D2R signals for calculating noise and interference (if any) power.   * Assume the receiver matches the transmitter's modulation, i.e., ~~to receiver uses SSB when transmitter uses SSB,~~ receiver uses DSB when transmitter uses DSB.   Companies to report the value, and further down-selection is not precluded. |  |  |
| **[2b]** | Waveform (CW) | | Companies to report waveform, e.g., unmodulated single tone, multi-tone(multiple unmodulated single tone) |  |  |
| **[2d]** | Modulation | | Companies to report modulation, e.g., OOK, BPSK, BFSK |  |  |
| **[2e]** | Line code | | Companies to report, e.g., Manchester encoding, FM0 encoding, Miller encoding, no line coding |  |  |
| **[2g]** | FEC | | Companies to report, e.g., CC, No FEC |  |  |
| **[2h]** | ADC bit width | | Companies to report, e.g., 11-bit |  |  |
| **[2j]** | D2R receiver | | ~~FFS: Reader receiver, e.g., coherent receiver / non-coherent receiver~~  Companies to report, e.g., coherent receiver / non-coherent receiver |  |  |
|  | **Other assumptions** | | |  |  |
| **[3a]** | Other assumptions | | To be reported by company |  |  |
| **[3b]** | Note: Companies to report required SINR/SNR/CINR/CNR according to BLER target. | | |  |  |
| Note**:**   * These values are for evaluation purpose and any differences among device types (if any) are not intended for harmonized design approach. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which item?** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | [0q] sampling frequency | Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for at least device 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   We have two questions.  Q1: in the model ΔT = ±Fe \* T, Fe is the SFO corresponds to after clock calibration(for example, when device receive R2D self-clocking signal, its clock is synchronized with R2D signal, and is Fe is the SFO after receiving R2D signal, and then when it transmit D2R, device’s clock is drifting by drifting rate Fe ). In this model, there is no “initial SFO”. So what is the usage of the listed initial SFO values? And what is the assumption for the value of Fe after clock calibration?  Q2: Are we assuming the Fe is always kept the same during the whole transmission duration for D2R?  From our point of view, 10^5 ppm SFO is a quite large value and that means the clock is not stable and may fluctuate severely, the experienced SFO during a D2R transmission may be varied especially when the D2R transmission is long(e.g. 400bits message size). We share similar view as ZTE that the Fe value for different chips within a D2R transmission may be different. |
| MTK | [0q]  [2a3] | **[0q]**  Regarding whether the initial SFO defined here is a fixed value or max value for initial SFO, we think a clarification is needed. The corresponding SID is copied below:  [Rel-19 A-IoT SID]   1. *The overall objective shall be to study a harmonized air interface design with minimized differences (where necessary) for Ambient IoT to enable the following devices:* 2. *~1 µW peak power consumption, has energy storage,* ***initial sampling frequency offset (SFO) up to 10X ppm****, neither DL nor UL amplification in the device. The device’s UL transmission is backscattered on a carrier wave provided externally.* 3. *≤ a few hundred µW peak power consumption1, has energy storage,* ***initial sampling frequency offset (SFO) up to 10X ppm****, DL and/or UL amplification in the device. The device’s UL transmission may be generated internally by the device, or be backscattered on a carrier wave provided externally.*   Considering “up to” is used in the SID, our view is the initial SFO defined here is more like a max value (similar view as ZTE in last round).  The suggested updates for [0q] are marked in blue as below:  [0q]  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe) up to:   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm   **[2a3]**  We are ok for prioritizing DSB (Alt 1) in [2a1] to make the result comparison among COMs easier. Then, regarding the sentence “Companies to report the value, and further down-selection is not precluded.” In [2a3], we want to clary which understanding below is correct:   * Understanding 1: SSB is precluded, and the “further down-selection” here refers to different “X” values in DSB * Understanding 2: SSB is not precluded, and the “further down-selection” here refers to DSB or SSB   In our view, the table here is for evaluation purpose, which means both DSB and SSB are not precluded for further study for the purpose of design (maybe in another agenda). In that sense, we suggest the following note for [2a3] (marked in blue) to make it clear.  [2a3]  D2R receiver bandwidth is the bandwidth used at the reader side to filter out the D2R signals for calculating noise and interference (if any) power.   * Assume the receiver matches the transmitter's modulation, i.e., ~~to receiver uses SSB when transmitter uses SSB,~~ receiver uses DSB when transmitter uses DSB.   Companies to report the value, and further down-selection is not precluded.  Note: The study of SSB is not precluded for the purpose of design |
| vivo | [0m] | Similar view with QC in first round that ‘0.1kbps’ and ‘1kbps’ is too low for evaluation, even lower than that for RFID with ~5kbps lowest data rate. Hence, we prefer 5kbps (M). |
| vivo | [2a1] | For X = 15, it seems transmission BW for data rate with 0.1kbps/1kbps in current version proposal? And we currently don’t understand the exact relationship between Tx BW and {data rate, line code scheme, etc}. It has not been discussed in other agendas.  So we don’t think we need to determine the Tx Bw X now, or put brackets for [15] kbps and [180] kbps is also fine to us. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0m] | We would like to clarify the Note 3, does the total transmission time including overhead to message size (e.g. CRC, preamble, midamble, postamble etc.)? If so we suggest the following update:   * Note 3: The data rate is calculated by dividing the ~~total~~ message size (without CRC) by the total R2D or D2R transmission time including applicable overheads such as CRC, pre/mid/post-ambles if present.   We understand companies can propose any value they want to study, but now this proposal has increased to have 5 values which is obvious not minimizing cases to our understanding. TR38.848 has 0.1kbps and 5kbps thus at least the smaller one should be evaluated for coverage. And considering 1kbps and 2kbps are not too much different, 7kbps also seems no much difference to 5kbps, is it possible to minimize those cases where values are close to each other? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0q] | We are not OK with the updated proposal on ‘Initial SFO’ assumptions. It should be same for all devices as per SID guidance. We prefer the previous version in 1st round that initial SFO of [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for all devices.  For SFO after clock calibration, FFS is OK but our understanding Device 1 is not able to do such clock calibration which means the FFS for clock calibration should be only for Device 2. For Device 1 with only 1uW peak power consumption, clock calibration is impractical, as the clock frequency cannot be adjusted. It means although device can find the R2D timing by edge detection, the clock inside Device 1 still has the same SFO as initial even after R2D timing acquisition. |
| OPPO | [0m] | In Note 3 and Note 4, it is better to clarify what is the ‘data rate’ exactly referring to, reference data rate or exact data rate. |
| OPPO | [0q] | We believe the SFO range for device 1 is reasonable, the exact initial SFO can be randomly selected within the range.  For device 2a/b, we propose to evaluate 10^4ppm as mandatory, and the other 2 values as optional.  To evaluate active transmission of device 2b, we support to confirm (200ppm, 0.1ppm/s) as mandatory CFO for device 2b, which is aligned with the assumption in LP-WUS, other value(s) can be up to companies to report.  In general, we suggest following modifications:  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * Randomly selected between ~~[~~0.1 ~ 1~~]~~ \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * For ~~FFS~~ device 2:   + ~~[~~10^4~~]~~ ppm (M)   + ~~[~~10^3~~]~~ ppm (O)   + ~~[~~10^2~~]~~ ppm (O)   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for at least device 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   ~~FFS:~~ CFO for device 2b.   * ~~[~~200ppm, 0.1ppm/s~~]~~, other values are not precluded and reported by companies. |
| OPPO | [2a2] | The brackets can be removed:  ~~[~~OOK/BPSK/BFSK chip rate~~]~~ |
| Futurewei | [0m] | Suggest removing 2kbps option as there is not much difference between 1k and 2k bps and it increases evaluating cases.  [0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M), ~~[2] kbps (O),~~ [7] kbps (O), [large value] (O)   * Note1: companies to report the exact data rate. * Note 2: the exact data rate is close the values listed above. * Note 3: The data rate is calculated by dividing the total message size by the total transmission time.   Note 4: the data rate may be related to coding scheme, repetition and etc. |
| Futurewei | [0q] | We have similar understand as OPPO the SFO value used in LLS can be randomly selected within the range (0.1~1)\*10^5 ppm.  Propose for device 2a the initial SFO should be in a range (such as (0.1~1)\*10^4 ppm) so LLS can randomly choose a value in the range. |
| QC | 0e | [150] ns is too large for indoor. The longest delay we see is 59ns for indoor environment. |
| QC | 0m | 0.1kbps, 1kbps, 2kbps it too much low. It takes 4sec to send 400bits at 0.1kbps. Real A-IoT system should not support such low data rate.  7kbps is more realistic than other numbers. Note that minimum D2R data rate of RFID is 40kbps (FM0), 20kbps (MMS M=2), 10kbps (MMS M=4), and 5kbps (MMS M=8).  Our suggestion is to remove smaller values: 0.1kbps, 1kbps, 2kbps.    ~~[0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M), [2] kbps (O~~), [7] kbps (M~~O~~), [large value] (O)   * Note1: companies to report the exact data rate. * Note 2: the exact data rate is close the values listed above. * Note 3: The data rate is calculated by dividing the total message size by the total transmission time.   Note 4: the data rate may be related to coding scheme, repetition and etc. |
| QC | 0q | **We don’t need sampling frequency specified. This is not necessary.** Companies can report their assumed value. Since OOK data rate is quite low, the sampling rate could be also low. The sampling frequency and clock rate does not necessarily need to be the same.  **Clock could be calibrated after initial sync (i.e., preamble detection).** This could be either done in the form of clock adjustment or equivalently internal counter adjustment.  All devices can utilize clock sync signal, and clock information from Manchester coding. Post clock sync accuracy should be “<10^4” for device for sampling clock  Sampling frequency is ~~1.92 Msps. Other values are not precluded and~~ reported by companies.  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * ~~FFS:~~ Accuracy after clock calibration for ~~at least~~ device 1 and 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   FFS: CFO for device 2b.   * [100ppm, 200ppm, 0.1ppm/s]   ~~Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **[0m]** | 1)  A typo for Note 2:  -Note 2: the exact data rate is close to the values listed above.  2)  We assume that the message size in [0n] does not include preamble and CRC and only include original information bits, e.g., 96bits. So, the total message size in [0m] is confusing, for example, whether CRC is included? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **[0q]** | With following reasons,   * We do not need to define a new metric, i.e., accuracy and should try to avoid to use this term. Moreover, all the device has the capability for clock calibration, otherwise, it is meaningless to design a preamble for sync. * As we commented in last round and Xiaomi mentioned, the SFO drifting may be a random value especially when the oscillator corresponds to a high SFO, e.g., 10^5. Moreover, it is not so realistic that the SFO is accumulated in one direction due to e.g., environmental Stability. There are several options for initial thinking,   + The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modeled     - Option 1: ΔT = ±Fe \* T     - Option 2: a random value, e.g., ΔT = ±(Fe +Δ1), wherein Δ1 is a random value and ΔT is not larger than the maximum SFO value, e.g., 10^5.   Also, we need some time to check how it works in real deployment and implementation.  The following change could be a reference from our side   |  | | --- | | ‘Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):’ can be changed to ‘Initial Sampling Frequency Offset: Fe, up to’ to make it more readable.  The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T. Other models are not precluded and up to company report   * FFS: SFO ~~Accuracy~~ after clock calibration if applicable ~~for at least device 2.~~   Note: SFO ~~corresponds to~~ after clock calibration can be applied to Fe. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **Last row** | We feel the sentence‘Any differences among device types (if any) are not intended for harmonized design approach’ would cause confusion, since these different assumptions are necessary for evaluation, and how to achieve harmonized design is reflected in other agendas, e.g., 9421~9423. Here, we just focus on the evaluation part and harmonized design still is pursued according to the SID. Hope the following change could clarify:   |  | | --- | | Note:  -These values are only for evaluation purpose ~~and any differences among device types (if any) are not intended for harmonized design approach~~. | |
| Spreadtrum | **[0q]** | We prefer the current proposal. |
| Ericsson | [0q] | We share similar views as Qualcomm for [0q]. |
| DOCOMO | [0m] | We agree with QC and vivo that peak rate of 0.1 or 1 kbps are quite low especially for large message size case such as 400 bits. Therefore, at least one large value, e.g., [7] kbps, should be mandatory and 0.1 or 1 kbps can be removed or can be optional. We would like to note that the target peak rate in TR, i.e., 0.1-5kbps, is user experienced peak rate, and hence the PHY layer peak rate can be much larger to support such user experienced peak rate.  For note 3, as commented by HW and ZTE, we prefer to clarify the interpretation of total message size, e.g., whether it includes CRC. |
| DOCOMO | [0q] | We support the update descriptions.  For initial SFO, we are fine with the current formulation.  For the timing drift and accuracy after clock calibration, we are also fine with the updated version by ZTE. |
| DOCOMO | [2a1]  [2a3] | Both DSB and SSB should be studied.  As commented by QC, Futurewei in the previous round, DSB could be the baseline for device 1/2a while SSB could be the baseline for device 2b. Thus, our proposal is;   * [2a1]-Alt1 is mandatory for device 1/2a * [2a1]-Alt2 is mandatory for device 2b and optional for device 1/2a |
| Samsung | [0q], [1c], [2a1] | **[0q]**  Regarding “FFS: accuracy after clock calibration for device 2”, we prefer including device 1 as well.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for all device types.   Additionally, we would like to know whether the initial SFO value for device 2 will be down selected to a single value or if multiple options will be provided.  Regarding CFO, we prefer not to add any values to this proposal at this time. A CFO of 200 ppm is the value considered for LP-WuS. For A-IoT, a higher value might be considered. Therefore, further study on this value may be necessary.  **[1c]**  We would like to note that this BB LPF is intended for coverage evaluation purposes.  **[2a1]**  For two alternatives of X, we think it should be determined based on reference data rate, coding schemes or etc of D2R transmission. Therefore, we prefer Alternative 2. |
| Apple | [0m] | If companies want to reduce the set of data rate values, we suggest 2kbps and 7Kbps. |
| Apple | [0q] | We are also fine with suggested updated from Qualcomm |
| Lenovo | [0m] | Agree with Qualcomm and Docomo that the data rate is very small and we can keep the minimum as 7kbps and add other higher values. |
| Lenovo | [0q] | We don’t understand why the Sampling frequency of 1.92 Msps is chosen, while SFO can be differently assumed for different device types due to differences in the architecture. |

### Round 3

Based on the comments from round 2, a summary is provided as follows,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which item?** | **Comments** | **FL comments** |
| QC | 0e | [150] ns is too large for indoor. The longest delay we see is 59ns for indoor environment. | During the meeting, companies also raised some comments regarding 150ns. And in Qualcomm’s contribution, it is proposed that  **Proposal 16: Use 30ns for Mandatory and 150ns for optional.**  Maybe we can take this as a compromised way,  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **[0e]** | Delay spread | ~~[30, 150] ns~~   * An RMS delay spread of 30 ns (M) and [150] ns (O) is considered for TDL-A channel model. * An RMS delay spread of 30 ns is considered for TDL-D channel model. | |
| Apple | [0m] | If companies want to reduce the set of data rate values, we suggest 2kbps and 7Kbps. | To ZTE, DOCOMO,  In proposal [H][Proposal2-v2] item [0n], it is clarified that ‘Note 2: CRC is not included for the message size’  To all,  For the data rate, some companies want to only keep 7kbps as minimum data rate, and some companies think 0.1kbps – 5kbps should be considered according to the TR. Hence, FL remains all these values as mandatory.  To Huawei, OPPO, ZTE,  As suggested by OPPO, adding exact data rate in note 3 and note 4. And clarify the determination of exact data rate.  To Apple  In order to reduce the set of data rate values, remove 2kbps, hope it is acceptable.  To ZTE and Huawei  Modified ‘~~total~~ message size’ in note3 as suggested.  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **[0m]** | Reference data rate | ~~[0.1, 1, 5] kbps~~  [0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M), ~~[2] kbps (O),~~ [7] kbps (~~O~~ M), [large value] (O)   * Note1: companies to report the exact data rate. * Note 2: the exact data rate is close to the values listed above. * Note 3: The exact data rate is calculated by dividing the ~~total~~ message size (excluding CRC) by the total transmission time including applicable overheads (e.g., CRC, pre/mid/post-ambles if present). * Note 4: the exact data rate may be related to coding scheme, repetition and etc. | |
| vivo | [0m] | Similar view with QC in first round that ‘0.1kbps’ and ‘1kbps’ is too low for evaluation, even lower than that for RFID with ~5kbps lowest data rate. Hence, we prefer 5kbps (M). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0m] | We would like to clarify the Note 3, does the total transmission time including overhead to message size (e.g. CRC, preamble, midamble, postamble etc.)? If so we suggest the following update:   * Note 3: The data rate is calculated by dividing the ~~total~~ message size (without CRC) by the total R2D or D2R transmission time including applicable overheads such as CRC, pre/mid/post-ambles if present.   We understand companies can propose any value they want to study, but now this proposal has increased to have 5 values which is obvious not minimizing cases to our understanding. TR38.848 has 0.1kbps and 5kbps thus at least the smaller one should be evaluated for coverage. And considering 1kbps and 2kbps are not too much different, 7kbps also seems no much difference to 5kbps, is it possible to minimize those cases where values are close to each other? |
| OPPO | [0m] | In Note 3 and Note 4, it is better to clarify what is the ‘data rate’ exactly referring to, reference data rate or exact data rate. |
| Futurewei | [0m] | Suggest removing 2kbps option as there is not much difference between 1k and 2k bps and it increases evaluating cases.  [0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M), ~~[2] kbps (O),~~ [7] kbps (O), [large value] (O)   * Note1: companies to report the exact data rate. * Note 2: the exact data rate is close the values listed above. * Note 3: The data rate is calculated by dividing the total message size by the total transmission time.   Note 4: the data rate may be related to coding scheme, repetition and etc. |
| QC | 0m | 0.1kbps, 1kbps, 2kbps it too much low. It takes 4sec to send 400bits at 0.1kbps. Real A-IoT system should not support such low data rate.  7kbps is more realistic than other numbers. Note that minimum D2R data rate of RFID is 40kbps (FM0), 20kbps (MMS M=2), 10kbps (MMS M=4), and 5kbps (MMS M=8).  Our suggestion is to remove smaller values: 0.1kbps, 1kbps, 2kbps.    ~~[0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M), [2] kbps (O~~), [7] kbps (M~~O~~), [large value] (O)   * Note1: companies to report the exact data rate. * Note 2: the exact data rate is close the values listed above. * Note 3: The data rate is calculated by dividing the total message size by the total transmission time. * Note 4: the data rate may be related to coding scheme, repetition and etc. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **[0m]** | 1)  A typo for Note 2:  -Note 2: the exact data rate is close to the values listed above.  2)  We assume that the message size in [0n] does not include preamble and CRC and only include original information bits, e.g., 96bits. So, the total message size in [0m] is confusing, for example, whether CRC is included? |
| DOCOMO | [0m] | We agree with QC and vivo that peak rate of 0.1 or 1 kbps are quite low especially for large message size case such as 400 bits. Therefore, at least one large value, e.g., [7] kbps, should be mandatory and 0.1 or 1 kbps can be removed or can be optional. We would like to note that the target peak rate in TR, i.e., 0.1-5kbps, is user experienced peak rate, and hence the PHY layer peak rate can be much larger to support such user experienced peak rate.  For note 3, as commented by HW and ZTE, we prefer to clarify the interpretation of total message size, e.g., whether it includes CRC. |
| Lenovo | [0m] | Agree with Qualcomm and Docomo that the data rate is very small and we can keep the minimum as 7kbps and add other higher values. |
| Xiaomi | [0q] sampling frequency | Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for at least device 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   We have two questions.  Q1: in the model ΔT = ±Fe \* T, Fe is the SFO corresponds to after clock calibration(for example, when device receive R2D self-clocking signal, its clock is synchronized with R2D signal, and is Fe is the SFO after receiving R2D signal, and then when it transmit D2R, device’s clock is drifting by drifting rate Fe ). In this model, there is no “initial SFO”. So what is the usage of the listed initial SFO values? And what is the assumption for the value of Fe after clock calibration?  Q2: Are we assuming the Fe is always kept the same during the whole transmission duration for D2R?  From our point of view, 10^5 ppm SFO is a quite large value and that means the clock is not stable and may fluctuate severely, the experienced SFO during a D2R transmission may be varied especially when the D2R transmission is long(e.g. 400bits message size). We share similar view as ZTE that the Fe value for different chips within a D2R transmission may be different. | To ZTE and Xiaomi,  If SFO fluctuates severely during a D2R/R2D transmission, then I think any post-sync clock calibration may not be possible. Different companies may have different opinions on this point.  I originally assume companies’ understanding is that the SFO is not fluctuating severely during a transmission (the sampling clock operates continuously without interruption). Based on this assumption, we have formulated the proposals. However, if there are differing interpretations among companies, let's explore alternative discussion approaches.  For the initial SFO,  There are two different views, alt 1 is to keep one assumption for all device types, alt 2 is to use different values for different device types. FL keep both alternatives for further discussion.  For alt 1, as suggested by OPPO and Futurewei, FL proposed randomly select from [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1. For device 2, FL included all the proposed values for further discussion.  To Qualcomm, Ericsson,  Considering 1.92Msps is widely proposed in the contributions and similar value is used in RFID system, FL suggest to keep it. For other values, it is open to report.  To Qualcomm, Huawei, Samsung  For whether device (1uW) can perform clock calibration or not, it seems quite controversial. So, FL suggest to keep as it is. Any update can be subject to future discussion.  To Samsung, Qualcomm, OPPO,  It seems different companies has different understanding of the CFO value, keeping them in [] should be OK for further discussion. WE can solve that next meeting.  Also for SFO device 2 (alt 1), keep them in [] and up to companies to report this time. We can further discuss in the future if any consensus.  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  Sampling frequency is 1.92 Msps. Other values are not precluded and reported by companies.  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe): (down-select between alt1 and alt2)   * Alt 1: * Randomly select from ~~[~~0.1 ~ 1~~]~~ \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^5] ppm   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm * Alt 2: * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for at least device 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   FFS: CFO for device 2b.   * [100/200ppm, 0.1ppm/s]   ~~Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |
| MTK | [0q] | **[0q]**  Regarding whether the initial SFO defined here is a fixed value or max value for initial SFO, we think a clarification is needed. The corresponding SID is copied below:  [Rel-19 A-IoT SID]   1. *The overall objective shall be to study a harmonized air interface design with minimized differences (where necessary) for Ambient IoT to enable the following devices:* 2. *~1 µW peak power consumption, has energy storage,* ***initial sampling frequency offset (SFO) up to 10X ppm****, neither DL nor UL amplification in the device. The device’s UL transmission is backscattered on a carrier wave provided externally.* 3. *≤ a few hundred µW peak power consumption1, has energy storage,* ***initial sampling frequency offset (SFO) up to 10X ppm****, DL and/or UL amplification in the device. The device’s UL transmission may be generated internally by the device, or be backscattered on a carrier wave provided externally.*   Considering “up to” is used in the SID, our view is the initial SFO defined here is more like a max value (similar view as ZTE in last round).  The suggested updates for [0q] are marked in blue as below:  [0q]  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe) up to:   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0q] | We are not OK with the updated proposal on ‘Initial SFO’ assumptions. It should be same for all devices as per SID guidance. We prefer the previous version in 1st round that initial SFO of [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for all devices.  For SFO after clock calibration, FFS is OK but our understanding Device 1 is not able to do such clock calibration which means the FFS for clock calibration should be only for Device 2. For Device 1 with only 1uW peak power consumption, clock calibration is impractical, as the clock frequency cannot be adjusted. It means although device can find the R2D timing by edge detection, the clock inside Device 1 still has the same SFO as initial even after R2D timing acquisition. |
| OPPO | [0q] | We believe the SFO range for device 1 is reasonable, the exact initial SFO can be randomly selected within the range.  For device 2a/b, we propose to evaluate 10^4ppm as mandatory, and the other 2 values as optional.  To evaluate active transmission of device 2b, we support to confirm (200ppm, 0.1ppm/s) as mandatory CFO for device 2b, which is aligned with the assumption in LP-WUS, other value(s) can be up to companies to report.  In general, we suggest following modifications:  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * Randomly selected between ~~[~~0.1 ~ 1~~]~~ \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * For ~~FFS~~ device 2:   + ~~[~~10^4~~]~~ ppm (M)   + ~~[~~10^3~~]~~ ppm (O)   + ~~[~~10^2~~]~~ ppm (O)   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for at least device 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   ~~FFS:~~ CFO for device 2b.   * ~~[~~200ppm, 0.1ppm/s~~]~~, other values are not precluded and reported by companies. |
| Futurewei | [0q] | We have similar understand as OPPO the SFO value used in LLS can be randomly selected within the range (0.1~1)\*10^5 ppm.  Propose for device 2a the initial SFO should be in a range (such as (0.1~1)\*10^4 ppm) so LLS can randomly choose a value in the range. |
| QC | 0q | **We don’t need sampling frequency specified. This is not necessary.** Companies can report their assumed value. Since OOK data rate is quite low, the sampling rate could be also low. The sampling frequency and clock rate does not necessarily need to be the same.  **Clock could be calibrated after initial sync (i.e., preamble detection).** This could be either done in the form of clock adjustment or equivalently internal counter adjustment.  All devices can utilize clock sync signal, and clock information from Manchester coding. Post clock sync accuracy should be “<10^4” for device for sampling clock  Sampling frequency is ~~1.92 Msps. Other values are not precluded and~~ reported by companies.  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):   * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * ~~FFS:~~ Accuracy after clock calibration for ~~at least~~ device 1 and 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   FFS: CFO for device 2b.   * [100ppm, 200ppm, 0.1ppm/s]   ~~Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **[0q]** | With following reasons,   * We do not need to define a new metric, i.e., accuracy and should try to avoid to use this term. Moreover, all the device has the capability for clock calibration, otherwise, it is meaningless to design a preamble for sync. * As we commented in last round and Xiaomi mentioned, the SFO drifting may be a random value especially when the oscillator corresponds to a high SFO, e.g., 10^5. Moreover, it is not so realistic that the SFO is accumulated in one direction due to e.g., environmental Stability. There are several options for initial thinking,   + The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modeled     - Option 1: ΔT = ±Fe \* T     - Option 2: a random value, e.g., ΔT = ±(Fe +Δ1), wherein Δ1 is a random value and ΔT is not larger than the maximum SFO value, e.g., 10^5.   Also, we need some time to check how it works in real deployment and implementation.  The following change could be a reference from our side   |  | | --- | | ‘Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe):’ can be changed to ‘Initial Sampling Frequency Offset: Fe, up to’ to make it more readable.  The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T. Other models are not precluded and up to company report   * FFS: SFO ~~Accuracy~~ after clock calibration if applicable ~~for at least device 2.~~   Note: SFO ~~corresponds to~~ after clock calibration can be applied to Fe. | |
| Spreadtrum | **[0q]** | We prefer the current proposal. |
| Ericsson | [0q] | We share similar views as Qualcomm for [0q]. |
| DOCOMO | [0q] | We support the update descriptions.  For initial SFO, we are fine with the current formulation.  For the timing drift and accuracy after clock calibration, we are also fine with the updated version by ZTE. |
| Apple | [0q] | We are also fine with suggested updated from Qualcomm |
| Lenovo | [0q] | We don’t understand why the Sampling frequency of 1.92 Msps is chosen, while SFO can be differently assumed for different device types due to differences in the architecture. |
| Samsung | [0q], | **[0q]**  Regarding “FFS: accuracy after clock calibration for device 2”, we prefer including device 1 as well.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for all device types.   Additionally, we would like to know whether the initial SFO value for device 2 will be down selected to a single value or if multiple options will be provided.  Regarding CFO, we prefer not to add any values to this proposal at this time. A CFO of 200 ppm is the value considered for LP-WuS. For A-IoT, a higher value might be considered. Therefore, further study on this value may be necessary. |
| Samsung | [1c] | **[1c]**  We would like to note that this BB LPF is intended for coverage evaluation purposes. | In RAN1#116bis, it is already agreed that the LLS table is for coverage evaluation purpose.  Agreement  The following table of coverage evaluation assumptions in link level simulation is considered as start point.   * Other values/options are not precluded and subject to future discussion.   *<other part omitted>* |
| vivo | [2a1] | For X = 15, it seems transmission BW for data rate with 0.1kbps/1kbps in current version proposal? And we currently don’t understand the exact relationship between Tx BW and {data rate, line code scheme, etc}. It has not been discussed in other agendas.  So we don’t think we need to determine the Tx Bw X now, or put brackets for [15] kbps and [180] kbps is also fine to us. | To DOCOMO,  I think the proposal is reasonable. However, I do not see much interests from companies to simulate SSB for device 1/2a. I keep both [2a1]-Alt1 and [2a1]-Alt2.  To vivo, Samsung,  I think in some sense it is true the Transmission bandwidth is determined by data rate, coding schemes. However, some minimum/typical values can still be existed. Similar as 15kHz/180kHz in NB-IoT/NR design. FL suggest to put the values in [] and can be further updated if needed. Any comments are welcome.  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**   * **[2a1]-Alt1:**    + DSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for two sidebands, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * **[2a1]-Alt2:**    + SSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * ~~The value of X and Y is as follows, to be down-select from alternative 1 and 2~~   + ~~Alternative 1:~~      - ~~X = {15 (M), 180 (O)}~~     - ~~Y =180~~   + ~~Alternative 2:~~     - ~~X and Y reported by companies,~~       * ~~the value may be related to, e.g.,~~          + ~~Reference data rate~~         + ~~Coding scheme~~         + ~~Repetition~~         + ~~With or without SFS~~         + ~~SSB or DSB~~   + X = {[15 (M)], [180 (O)]}, other values are not precluded and reported by companies |
| Samsung | [2a1] | **[2a1]**  For two alternatives of X, we think it should be determined based on reference data rate, coding schemes or etc of D2R transmission. Therefore, we prefer Alternative 2. |
| DOCOMO | [2a1]  [2a3] | Both DSB and SSB should be studied.  As commented by QC, Futurewei in the previous round, DSB could be the baseline for device 1/2a while SSB could be the baseline for device 2b. Thus, our proposal is;   * [2a1]-Alt1 is mandatory for device 1/2a * [2a1]-Alt2 is mandatory for device 2b and optional for device 1/2a |
| OPPO | [2a2] | The brackets can be removed:  ~~[~~OOK/BPSK/BFSK chip rate~~]~~ | In 9.4.2.1, OOK chip is widely used in the R2D discussion. However, FL failed to find OOK/BPSK/BFSK chip is the term widely used in D2R discussion. Maybe we can still keep [] and wait for any better wording. |
| MTK | [2a3] | **[2a3]**  We are ok for prioritizing DSB (Alt 1) in [2a1] to make the result comparison among COMs easier. Then, regarding the sentence “Companies to report the value, and further down-selection is not precluded.” In [2a3], we want to clary which understanding below is correct:   * Understanding 1: SSB is precluded, and the “further down-selection” here refers to different “X” values in DSB * Understanding 2: SSB is not precluded, and the “further down-selection” here refers to DSB or SSB   In our view, the table here is for evaluation purpose, which means both DSB and SSB are not precluded for further study for the purpose of design (maybe in another agenda). In that sense, we suggest the following note for [2a3] (marked in blue) to make it clear.  [2a3]  D2R receiver bandwidth is the bandwidth used at the reader side to filter out the D2R signals for calculating noise and interference (if any) power.   * Assume the receiver matches the transmitter's modulation, i.e., ~~to receiver uses SSB when transmitter uses SSB,~~ receiver uses DSB when transmitter uses DSB.   Companies to report the value, and further down-selection is not precluded.  Note: The study of SSB is not precluded for the purpose of design | Considering company proposed to keep SSB as well, and it is proposed to keep SSB as well in [2a1], FL proposed to keep SSB in [2a3] as well.  Also FL clarified that any further down-selection of the values and DSB/SSB in the future is not precluded.  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  D2R receiver bandwidth is the bandwidth used at the reader side to filter out the D2R signals for calculating noise and interference (if any) power.   * Assume the receiver matches the transmitter's modulation, i.e., to receiver uses SSB when transmitter uses SSB, receiver uses DSB when transmitter uses DSB.   Companies to report the value, and further down-selection of the values and DSB/SSB is not precluded. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **Last row** | We feel the sentence‘Any differences among device types (if any) are not intended for harmonized design approach’ would cause confusion, since these different assumptions are necessary for evaluation, and how to achieve harmonized design is reflected in other agendas, e.g., 9421~9423. Here, we just focus on the evaluation part and harmonized design still is pursued according to the SID. Hope the following change could clarify:   |  | | --- | | Note:  -These values are only for evaluation purpose ~~and any differences among device types (if any) are not intended for harmonized design approach~~. | | As ZTE mentioned, we just focus on the evaluation and harmonized design still is pursued according to the SID. Modified the note as follows.    Also, FL added note2.  **The updated proposal is as follows (v3),**  Note 1:  -~~These values are only for evaluation purpose and any differences among device types (if any) are not intended for harmonized design approach.~~Any differences among device types (if any) are for evaluation purpose only.  Note 2: (M) denotes the value is mandatory to be evaluated. (O) denotes the value can be optionally evaluated. |

**[H][Proposal2-v3]**

The link level simulation table is updated as follows,

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Parameters** | | **Assumptions** | **Company result1** | **Company result 2** |
|  | **R2D/D2R common parameters** | | |  |  |
| **[0a]** | Carrier frequency | | Refer to link budget template |  |  |
| **[0b]** | SCS | | 15 kHz as baseline |  |  |
| **[0c]** | Block structure | | Blocks as agreed in 9.4.2.3, or other blocks reported by companies |  |  |
| **[0d]** | Channel model | | <Editor’s Note: will be updated according to the agreements made for channel model> |  |  |
| **[0e]** | Delay spread | | ~~[30, 150] ns~~   * An RMS delay spread of 30 ns (M) and [150] ns (O) is considered for TDL-A channel model. * An RMS delay spread of 30 ns is considered for TDL-D channel model. |  |  |
| **[0f]** | Device velocity | | 3 km/h |  |  |
| **[0g]** | Number of Tx/Rx chains for Ambient IoT device | | 1 |  |  |
| **[0h1]** | BS | Number of antenna elements | 2 or 4 |  |  |
| **[0h2]** | Number of TXRUs | 2 or 4 |  |  |
| **[0j1]** | Intermediate UE | Number of antenna elements | 1 or 2 |  |  |
| **[0j2]** | Number of TXRUs | 1 or 2 |  |  |
| **[0m]** | Reference data rate | | ~~[0.1, 1, 5] kbps~~  [0.1] kbps (M), [1] kbps (M), ~~[2] kbps (O),~~ [7] kbps (~~O~~ M), [large value] (O)   * Note1: companies to report the exact data rate. * Note 2: the exact data rate is close to the values listed above. * Note 3: The exact data rate is calculated by dividing the ~~total~~ message size (excluding CRC) by the total transmission time including applicable overheads (e.g., CRC, pre/mid/post-ambles if present). * Note 4: the exact data rate may be related to coding scheme, repetition and etc. |  |  |
| **[0n]** | Message size | | {20 bits, 96 bits, 400 bits} are considered for message size.   * Note 1: companies to report the M value and chip length used for each message size * Note 2: CRC is not included for the message size |  |  |
| **[0p]** | BLER target | | 1%, 10% |  |  |
| **[0q]** | Sampling frequency | | Sampling frequency is 1.92 Msps. Other values are not precluded and reported by companies.  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe): (down-select between alt1 and alt2)   * Alt 1: * Randomly select from ~~[~~0.1 ~ 1~~]~~ \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2:   + [10^5] ppm   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm * Alt 2: * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   * FFS: Accuracy after clock calibration for at least device 2. * Note: SFO corresponds to after clock calibration can be applied to Fe.   FFS: CFO for device 2b.   * [100/200ppm, 0.1ppm/s]   ~~Note: the values are for coverage evaluation purpose. A harmonized design approach for all devices should be considered when utilizing these values in the design.~~ |  |  |
| **[0r]** | Device 1/2a/2b | | Options are as follows,   * Device 1, RF-ED * Device 2a, RF-ED * Device 2b, RF-ED/IF-ED/ZIF   <Editor’s Note: will be updated according to agreements from 9.4.1.2> |  |  |
|  | **R2D specific parameters** | | |  |  |
| **[1a]** | Transmission bandwidth | | 180 kHz as baseline |  |  |
| **[1b]** | ~~FFS:~~ ED bandwidth | | The ED bandwidth is the bandwidth for calculating the noise/interference (if any) power:  For evaluations, the value(s) of ED bandwidth is 20 MHz for RF-ED, [180] kHz for IF/ZIF receiver.  Note: this does not imply that a A-IoT device supports sampling clock rate as large as RF ED bandwidth. |  |  |
| **[1c]** | ~~FFS:~~ BB LPF | | [X]-order Butterworth/RC filter with cutoff frequency at ~~[Y] kHz,~~ half of R2D transmission bandwidth.  Companies to report X = {3, 5}. |  |  |
| **[1d]** | Waveform | | OOK waveform generated by OFDM modulator |  |  |
| **[1e]** | Modulation | | OOK  Companies to report, e.g., OOK-1, OOK-4 with M chips per OFDM symbol |  |  |
| **[1f]** | Line code | | Companies to report, e.g., Manchester, PIE |  |  |
| **[1g]** | FEC | | No FEC as baseline |  |  |
| **[1h]** | ADC bit width | | 1-bit for device 1  4-bit for device 2 |  |  |
| **[1j]** | Detection/decoding method for Line code | | Companies to report |  |  |
|  | **D2R specific parameters** | | |  |  |
| **[2a1]** | Transmission bandwidth ~~(w.r.t. D2R data rate)~~ | | * **[2a1]-Alt1:**    + DSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for two sidebands, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * **[2a1]-Alt2:**    + SSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * ~~The value of X and Y is as follows, to be down-select from alternative 1 and 2~~   + ~~Alternative 1:~~      - ~~X = {15 (M), 180 (O)}~~     - ~~Y =180~~   + ~~Alternative 2:~~     - ~~X and Y reported by companies,~~       * ~~the value may be related to, e.g.,~~          + ~~Reference data rate~~         + ~~Coding scheme~~         + ~~Repetition~~         + ~~With or without SFS~~         + ~~SSB or DSB~~   + X = {[15 (M)], [180 (O)]}, other values are not precluded and reported by companies |  |  |
| **[2a2]** | [OOK/BPSK/BFSK chip rate] | | Companies to report |  |  |
| **[2a3]** | Receiver bandwidth | | D2R receiver bandwidth is the bandwidth used at the reader side to filter out the D2R signals for calculating noise and interference (if any) power.   * Assume the receiver matches the transmitter's modulation, i.e., to receiver uses SSB when transmitter uses SSB, receiver uses DSB when transmitter uses DSB.   Companies to report the value, and further down-selection of the values and DSB/SSB is not precluded. |  |  |
| **[2b]** | Waveform (CW) | | Companies to report waveform, e.g., unmodulated single tone, multi-tone(multiple unmodulated single tone) |  |  |
| **[2d]** | Modulation | | Companies to report modulation, e.g., OOK, BPSK, BFSK |  |  |
| **[2e]** | Line code | | Companies to report, e.g., Manchester encoding, FM0 encoding, Miller encoding, no line coding |  |  |
| **[2g]** | FEC | | Companies to report, e.g., CC, No FEC |  |  |
| **[2h]** | ADC bit width | | Companies to report, e.g., 11-bit |  |  |
| **[2j]** | D2R receiver | | ~~FFS: Reader receiver, e.g., coherent receiver / non-coherent receiver~~  Companies to report, e.g., coherent receiver / non-coherent receiver |  |  |
|  | **Other assumptions** | | |  |  |
| **[3a]** | Other assumptions | | To be reported by company |  |  |
| **[3b]** | Note: Companies to report required SINR/SNR/CINR/CNR according to BLER target. | | |  |  |
| Note 1:  -~~These values are only for evaluation purpose and any differences among device types (if any) are not intended for harmonized design approach.~~Any differences among device types (if any) are for evaluation purpose only.  Note 2: (M) denotes the value is mandatory to be evaluated. (O) denotes the value can be optionally evaluated. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which item?** | **Comments** |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Note2 in last row** | Regarding Mandatory, it may potentially have two explainings:   1. For all (M), means if you want to provide evaluation results, all cases/scenarios related to (M) value shall be provided. 2. For all (M) cases/scenarios, it is not mandatory companies to provide all evaluation results.    1. For example, one company can provide only some (M) cases/scenarios.    2. For one case/scenario with (M) and (O) values, if one company want to provide evaluation results with (O) value, evaluation results with (M) should be provided as well.   I would to ask FL, regarding the above two interpretation, which one is correct? Or other meanings? Thanks a lot. |
| FL |  | To Spreadtrum,  My understanding is (2).   * For items with multiple mandatory value(s), companies still have the freedom to report one or multiple of the mandatory value(s). * For items with multiple mandatory value(s) and multiple optional value(s), companies report only optional value(s) are not encouraged. |
| OPPO | **[0m]** | As the item is almost stable, the brackets around the mandatory values should be removed.  ~~[~~0.1~~]~~ kbps (M), ~~[~~1~~]~~ kbps (M), ~~[2] kbps (O),~~ ~~[~~7~~]~~ kbps (~~O~~ M), [large value] (O) |
| OPPO | **[0q]** | The “FFS” before “CFO for device 2b” is misleading, it reads like whether CFO is considered for device 2b or not is FFS. We propose to remove the FFS given all the candidate values are in brackets now.  ~~FFS:~~ CFO for device 2b.   * [100/200ppm, 0.1ppm/s]   One more general comment, as we are supposed to provide preliminary evaluation results next RAN1 meeting, but it seems unclear how to select SFO and CFO value. Can we add one note “NOTE: SFO and CFO are up to company to report before down selection and/or confirmation” as a guidance for following evaluation work. |
| OPPO | **[2a1]** | Regarding SSB, in our understanding it cannot be supported for device 1, and the feasibility for device 2a in backscattering has not been studied yet. Hence, we propose to add following sub-bullet for clarification.   * **[2a1]-Alt2:**    + SSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~.   + For device 2b only, FFS for device 2a. |
| Xiaomi | [0q] | For the timing drift ΔT modelling, thanks for FL’s reply, and we’d like to emphasise our views. 10^5 ppm SFO is a quite large value and that means the clock is not stable. The device clock is fluctuated in practical through each transmission duration of D2R. To fix the SFO value may be easy for evaluation work, but it is not a feasible assumption in reality. We would like to suggest to use real-time and variable SFO values for evaluation.  One way to model the SFO fluctuation is to have different SFO in time domain. And the model is proposed as the following:   * + The timing drift ΔT over a time T is modeled     - ΔT = ± (Fe+Δf) \* T, Δf is the fluctuation of SFO within each chip, whose value can be reported by companies( e.g. Δf<= 0.05 \*Fe ), and can be different for different chips, and Fe+Δf is no larger than the maximum value of SFO   And One of our questions in Round 2 still unsolved, and we copied as follows,  Q1: In the model ΔT = ±Fe \* T, Fe is the SFO corresponds to after clock calibration (for example, when device receive R2D self-clocking signal, its clock is synchronized with R2D signal, and is Fe is the SFO after receiving R2D signal, and then when it transmit D2R, device’s clock is drifting by drifting rate Fe). In this model, there is no “initial SFO”. So what is the usage of the listed initial SFO values? And what is the assumption for the value of Fe after clock calibration? Or do we assume Fe = initial SFO value? |
| vivo | [0q] | Regarding initial SFO for device 2 in Alt-1, we suggest also have a range for initial SFO device 2.   * Alt 1: * Randomly select from ~~[~~0.1 ~ 1~~]~~ \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * FFS device 2, up to:   + [10^5] ppm   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0e] | We are supportive of the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0m] | For selection one from 7kbps and 5kbps, maybe 5kpbs is more preferable due TR38.848 guidance.  Regarding FL’s response to Spreadtrum on meaning of multiple M values. Having multiple M is not ideal, due to increase of expected effort. For the case in [0m] with a mixture of multiple M and O, the FL’s explanation is equivalent to:  - Companies are expected to evaluate at least the Mandatory values.  This seems reasonable. We are not so aligned with the first bullet of the FL’s response, however. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [0q] | Our 1st preference is Alt 2 for all devices as we commented in previous round.  If go with Alt 1 with the understanding for evaluation purpose only, we have the following comments:  1. For device 1, it can be done in two ways:  Option 1: random select from 0.1 – 1 \* 10^5 ppm as FL proposed  Option 2: select one value from the range.  Based on our understanding for coverage evaluation it seems reasonable to select large value from the range i.e. 10^5 ppm. So our 1st preference is Option 2 with 10^ppm but we are open to Option 1 from the FL’s suggestion.  2. For device 2, we are fine to FFS candidate values while we understand the FFS for device 2 should finally achieve similar way used in LLS as for Device 1. That to say, if Device 1 go with Option 1 random select from a range for Device 1, then Device 2 should also do random select from a range for Device 2. And same if go with Option 2. Additionally, we think the last value of [10^2] ppm seems too small for a few hundred uW devices.  We don’t think Device 1 is able to do clock calibration as we comment before, but we can leave with FL’s proposal with adding at least for now.  For FFS CFO of Device 2b, 200ppm is the maximum value referring to lp-WUR and A-IoT device should be lower capability than lp-WUR. We would suggest to add one value larger than 200ppm to reflect that possibilities, some companies proposed 1000ppm in their papers which can be a start point in our view.  FFS: CFO for device 2b.   * [100/200/1000ppm, 0.1ppm/s]   Regarding the model of ΔT = ±Fe \* T, we are supportive of FL’s proposal. We don’t see problems and the note added by FL is to address the case if device can do clock calibration in our understanding. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [2a1] | Generally we can live with this proposal. It seems there is no controversial that all devices are able to support [2a1]-Alt1 DSB for D2R while [2a1]-Alt2 SSB not. How about further update as [2a1]-Alt1 DSB (M) and [2a1]-Alt2 SSB (O)? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [Note 1] | Since Device 1/2 are just terminologies we used for the study, no any device types were defined. An editorial update suggestion to Note 1: devices ~~types~~ |
| ZTE, Sanechips | [0q] | (1)Regarding the Alt1 and Alt2 for SFO candidate values, the current Alt1 comprises Alt2. Therefore, it is unclear about how to down select.  So the following update is suggested, i.e., remove FFS and [10^5]ppm for device 2.  Suggested update:  Initial SFO (Sampling Frequency Offset) (Fe): (down-select between alt1 and alt2)   * Alt 1: * Randomly select from ~~[~~0.1 ~ 1~~]~~ \* 10^5 ppm for device 1, * ~~FFS~~ device 2:   + ~~[10^5] ppm~~   + [10^4] ppm   + [10^3] ppm   + [10^2] ppm * Alt 2: * [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm   (2)Clarification question: For device 1 in Alt1, the SFO range is [0.1 ~ 1] \* 10^5 ppm. For device 2, only one upper bound is provided. Does it mean the SFO range for device 2 in Alt1 is randomly selected from 0 to 10^4/10^3/10^2 ppm?   1. For the following bullet, we would like to echo with xiaomi. So adding “at least” is suggested:   The timing drift ΔT over a time T is at least modelled as ΔT = ±Fe \* T.   1. For clock calibration, we share similar views with QC that device 1 can also implement it at least by sampling counter. 2. For device 2b, we agree with OPPO that CFO model needs to be used, instead of FFS. |
| CMCC | [0q] | We are supportive of the current version of [0q] and can live with both alternatives.  But we are NOT OK to assume SFO is variable across different chips, which we don’t agree with Xiaomi, variable SFO is in fact NOT realistic. We would like to know whether any reference/literature/research can prove the fluctuate SFO? From our understanding, initial SFO is more related to PVT condition, which for Ambient IoT devices, are not frequently fluctuated. In a practical implementation, the SFO should be quite constant. |
| CMCC | [2a1] | There is a typo in Alt. 2, it should be “SSB is X kHz”:   * **[2a1]-Alt1:**    + DSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for two sidebands, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for DSB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. * **[2a1]-Alt2:**    + SSB   + X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~ is considered for D2R transmission bandwidth.   + The value is for one sideband, i.e., the total transmission bandwidth for S~~D~~SB is X kHz ~~(M) and Y kHz (O)~~. |