**3GPP TSG RAN WG1 Meeting #106bis-e R1-21xxxxx**

**e-Meeting, October 11th – October 19th, 2021**

**Agenda Item: 8.9.1**

**Source: Moderator (Huawei)**

**Title: Feature lead summary #1 on 106bis-e-LTE-Rel17-NB-IoT-eMTC-01**

**Document for: Discussion and Decision**

# Introduction

The WID for Rel-17 enhancements for NB-IoT and LTE-MTC [1] includes an objective to support 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL in NB-IoT.

* *Specify 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL, including necessary changes to DL power allocation for NPDSCH and DL TBS. This is to be specified without a new NB-IoT UE category. For DL, increase in maximum TBS of e.g. 2x the Rel-16 maximum, and soft buffer size will be specified by modifying at least existing Category NB2. For UL, the maximum TBS is not increased. [NB-IoT] [RAN1, RAN4]*
  + *Extend the NB-IoT channel quality reporting based on the framework of Rel-14—16, to support 16-QAM in DL. [NB-IoT] [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4]*

This documents provides the proposals and summary of discussions of the corresponding email discussion according to the inputs [2-9].

[106bis-e-LTE-Rel17-NB-IoT-eMTC-01] Email discussion on support of 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL for NB-IoT – Yubo (Huawei)

# Round 2 Discussion

## Stable agreements

From the comments, it seems the following proposal can be

Proposal 1: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure

* CSI report is not supported/expected during PUR procedure.

**Proposal 1A: To support 16-QAM for NPDSCH and NPUSCH in PUR procedure,**

* 16-QAM can be enabled/disabled by UE specific RRC signaling for NPDSCH and NPUSCH separately
  + The corresponding configurations and signaling details are up to RAN2

**Proposal 2: The reserved state to indicate the use of 16QAM in DCI format N0 and DCI format N1 should be “1111”.**

**Proposal 3: confirm the following working assumption:**

**Working Assumption**

**For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM:**

* **For inband deployments, a power ratio is signaled in addition to the signalling for standalone and guard-band deployments which in this case applies to “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS”.** 
  + **the power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signalled**
  + **the signalling is UE specific**

**Note: “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS” have the same power.**

**Proposal 8: the agreement below is updated as**

Agreement

**For the UE configured with 16-QAM for NPDSCH, the deployment of the carrier is signaled by *operationModeInfo* in MIB or *inbandCarrierInfo* in SIB/UE specific signaling.**

## Further discussion

### Issue 4: uplink power control

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator (Huawei) | The following has been achieved in online discussion, please share your comments regarding the FFS part.  **Working Assumption**  **For the new term**  **introduced for power control of NPUSCH,**   * Reuse the LTE definition simplified for NB-IoT: for and for , where is given by higher layer parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*, and where K is the code block size. * FFS: whether the new term applies to QPSK when configured with 16QAM, if it does not, whether an additional term is introduced to avoid jump between QPSK and 16QAM |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think the QPSK enhancement is out of the WID scope. Therefore, it is not supported that the new term applies to QPSK and an additional new term can be introduced to compensate the performance gap between QPSK and 16QAM, e.g.,  this additional new term can be configured by RRC signalling. |
| Qualcomm | After the discussion online, maybe we can add an offset to compensate the maximum QPSK. We do not think we need to configure this value, it can be derived from the MCS table. |
| Nokia, NSB | For the FFS, our preference is to apply the term to QPSK also. |
| Ericsson v011 | To avoid a large “jump between QPSK and 16-QAM”, since some companies seems to have a concern in applying the option-1’s formula to QPSK, perhaps the offset can be applied on the estimated .  I will try to illustrate it below:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | large “jump between QPSK and 16-QAM” | Offset to compensate for the large “jump between QPSK and 16-QAM” | | Estimation of option-1 as per [R1-2109314]:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | MCS |  | | 0 – 13 | 0 | | 14 | 6.4 | | 15 | 7.1 | | 16 | 7.7 | | 17 | 8.6 | | 18 | 9.7 | | 19 | 10.7 | | 20 | 11.7 | | 21 | 12.8 | | Estimation of option-1 as per [R1-2109314], after applying the offset:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | MCS |  | | 0 – 13 | 0 | | 14 | 6.4 – offset = 0.5 | | 15 | 7.1 – offset = 1.2 | | 16 | 7.7 – offset = 1.8 | | 17 | 8.6 – offset = 2.7 | | 18 | 9.7 – offset = 3.8 | | 19 | 10.7 – offset = 4.8 | | 20 | 11.7 – offset = 5.8 | | 21 | 12.8 – offset = 6.9 |   The offset is obtained accounting for where the jump occurs, to obtain it can be calculated on the last ITBS of QPSK, which produces an offset ⁓ 5.9 dB, which alleviates the “jump between QPSK and 16-QAM”. | |
| Lenovo, MotoM | For the FFS part, we share the similar view as Nokia. If we introduce the new term as LTE, we should follow the same principal, use the term for all modulation type not only for 16QAM, otherwise we don’t think we need to introduce the new term at all (the UL power control enhancement is an optimization and is not noted in WID). |
| MTK | Regarding the FFS part, we share the same view as Nokia and Lenovo. Actually, if we introduce an offset as proposed above, the enhancement from compensation will dramatically decreases, this violets the intention of introducing power control. |
| Moderator (Huawei) | @ ZTE, such an explanation on WID seems to be very rigorous, with the support of 16-QAM, the QPSK is still in the system, it can still be used, and we need to consider the situations still including QPSK and 16QAM within the network.  From the comments, my understanding is that both applying to QPSK and introducing a new term are able to compensate the big jump. A further benefit, although not so essential, of applying to QPSK is that it follows the legacy LTE principal, which has been used for years and no need to introduce any new thing.  Therefore, to move forward, I would like to ask companies whether you can accept to re-use the LTE term to apply to QPSK? |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are fine with the proposal as Moderator.   * **The new term**  **introduced for power control of NPUSCH applies to QPSK and 16QAM when configured with 16QAM.** |
| Ericsson v016 | It is not the WID in this case, I think ZTE’s point is that the agreement on the “new term” was meant to be for 16-QAM.  **Agreement**  Introduce a new term in uplink power control of NPUSCH using 16-QAM. FFS on the details.  If ZTE and other companies still have a concern, the offset plays the same role (indeed calculated using ’s equation) but without touching QPSK. The most important thing is to avoid the “jump between QPSK and 16-QAM”. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If the power control is applied for QPSK, it reverts the agreement. So from our understanding, an additional new term can be considered to compensate the performance jump between QPSK and 16-QM. |
| Moderator (Huawei) | @Ericsson, @ZTE, I think the proponents of applying to QPSK is to have a new agreement in addition the one you mentioned.  Regarding that some companies don’t support to apply the to QPSK, and some companies support to follow LTE principal instead of introduction of a new thing. Would it be possible to have P0 configured for 16-QAM? Then eNB can configure a proper P0 for 16-QAM to compensate the gap introduced by , while there’s no new thing is introduced compared with legacy. It seems it can address all the above concerns. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with the moderator that applying the new power control term also to QPSK is a potential new agreement, not reverting previous agreement. |
| Ericsson v021 | To Moderator: To provide the proper/required compensation, P0 would have to provide what is intended to be provided by the offset. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | From our understanding, P0 would be used for both QPSK and 16-QAM and it can not used for compensating the performance gap between QPSK and 16-QAM. |
| MTK | We also agree with the moderator that applying the new power control term also to QPSK is a potential new agreement which will actually enhance QPSK performance when UE stays in scenarios with 16QAM enabled, it’s beneficial. |

### Issue 5: Channel quality reporting

The baseline for the discussion of several options can be exemplified as below:

***Option 1:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Options | Examples |
| * Option 1: More than three candidate values for 16-QAM are added in the legacy table.   + FFS: Which of the legacy entries are removed | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Reported value | NPDCCH repetition level | 16-QAM | | noMeasurement | No measurement reporting | No measurement reporting | | candidateRep-A | 1 | N/A | | candidateRep-B | 2 | N/A | | candidateRep-C | 4 | N/A | | candidateRep-D | 8 | N/A | | candidateRep-E | 16 | N/A | | candidateRep-F | 32 | N/A | | candidateRep-G | 64 | N/A | | candidateRep-H | 1 | QPSK, TBS=0 | | candidateRep-I | 1 | QPSK, TBS=3 | | candidateRep-J | 1 | QPSK, TBS=6 | | candidateRep-K | 1 | QPSK, TBS=9 | | candidateRep-L | 1 | QPSK, TBS=12 | | candidateRep-M | 1 | 16-QAM, TBS=15 | | candidateRep-N | 1 | 16-QAM, TBS=18 | | candidateRep-O | 1 | 16-QAM, TBS=21 |   Or   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | NPDCCH repetition level | NPDSCH | | Modulation | Code rate x 1024 | | noMeasurement | No measurement reporting | N/A | N/A | | candidateRep-A | 1 | N/A | N/A | | candidateRep-B | 2 | N/A | N/A | | candidateRep-C | 4 | N/A | N/A | | candidateRep-D | 8 | N/A | N/A | | candidateRep-E | 16 | N/A | N/A | | candidateRep-F | 32 | N/A | N/A | | candidateRep-G | 64 | N/A | N/A | | candidateRep-H | 128 | N/A | N/A | | candidate-M | N/A | 16QAM | [429] | | candidate-N | N/A | 16QAM | [499] | | candidate-O | N/A | 16QAM | [549] | | candidate-P | N/A | 16QAM | [617] | | candidate-Q | N/A | 16QAM | [667] | | candidate-R | N/A | 16QAM | [712] | | candidate-S | N/A | 16QAM | [781] | |

Please give your comments on how to address the concerns or provide further benefits:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | Comments |
| Moderator (Huawei) | The concerns to support option 1 include: limited number of MCS entries for 16-QAM for efficient CQI reporting, “dB” step size granularity, increased size of legacy table, no backward compatible, and more UE complexity on hypothetical decoding of both NPDCCH and NPDSCH.  The first example is able to address the concern from “limited number of MCS entries for 16-QAM for efficient CQI reporting, “dB” step size granularity”, by adding several QPSK entries to fill the gap from legacy table to 16-QAM entries. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | For option 1, although we are supportive of the solution in our contribution, we are not willing to accept the “combination table”  For option 2, we don’t think it is sufficient to report only 3 CQI while more than 7~8 MCS levels for 16QAM are supported in MCS table.  For option 3, it seems to be most clean one. However, it doesn’t cover the very low SNR case (QPSK with repetition)? may not align with WID scope?  Based on that, option 1 is our first preference, and then option 3. |
| Ericsson v016 | We still think that Option-2 is sufficient, however as an ultimate compromise we can accept Option-1 but subject to make it more backward compatible by interpreting Table 9.1.22.15-1 as per legacy or as per the updates for 16-QAM depending on Rmax.  • A UE configured with 16-QAM should be configured with a small Rmax let’s say <= 16.  • If the UE is configured with 16-QAM and Rmax <= 16, then any “Reported value” up to e.g., candidateRep-G will be interpreted as per Table 9.1.22.15-1 prior Rel-17, whereas any “Reported value” from candidateRep-H onwards will be interpreted as per 16-QAM.  The above will make Option-1 backward compatible. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We’d like to mention that we already have the agreement in 104bis-emeeting,   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  If 16-QAM is configured for NPDSCH, the channel quality report for 16-QAM is based on NPDSCH transport block that achieves an error probability not exceeding 10% BLER. |   It means when the 16-QAM feature is configured, the CQI report should be based on NPDSCH, instead of NPDCCH. Option1 and option2 are not aligned with the agreement. |
| Ericsson v018 | To ZTE: The agreement you cited correspond to CQI reporting definition, and the designs presented by different companies on Opt-1 and Opt-2 account for it. |
| Moderator (Huawei) | @Lenovo, by “combination table” do you mean the first example in the table? I think without the combination, the concern on the big gap between NPDCCH repetition 1 and 16-QAM entries cannot be addressed.  *For option 1, although we are supportive of the solution in our contribution, we are not willing to accept the “combination table”*  @ Ericsson, what do you mean by “backward compatible”? In my understanding all options will specify a new CQI table, only Rel-17 UEs and eNBs supporting this feature can recognize the CQI table. Can you give us an example of critical issues regarding “backward compatibility”? |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with option 1. We are also open to discussion on the suggestion by Ericsson to switch between legacy table and new table when UE is configured with 16-QAM. However, we share similar view as the moderator that there is no backward compatibility issue even if only one table is used for UE configured with 16-QAM. |
| Ericsson v021 | About the “Backward compatibility”:   * Opt-2 is backward-compatible since the three reserved states in Table 9.1.22.15-1 will be used for 16-QAM reports, and because we are not touching the legacy QPSK reports at all. * Opt-1 is not backward-compatible since it requires to use more than three states in Table 9.1.22.15-1, which requires overriding one or more legacy QPSK reports. If one would like to make use of one of the legacy QPSK reports that were overridden, then some special handling is needed. Here I mentioned that perhaps we can make this solution a bit backward compatible by interpreting Table 9.1.22.15-1 as per legacy or as per the updates for 16-QAM depending on Rmax (In my comment v016, I elaborated a bit more on it). * Opt-3 is not backward-compatible since it redefines all the reports for QPSK. That is, Opt-3 has brand-new reports for both QPSK and 16-QAM. If one would like to make use of the legacy QPSK reports, then some special handling (signaling) is needed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Legacy QPSK reports does not exist. There only exist the NPDCCH repetition report. If legacy QPSK report refers to the NPDCCH report, see the comment for option3. |
| Ericsson v023 | To ZTE:  Legacy QPSK reports exist and span from candidateRep-A to candidateRep-L, and in Opt-2 all of them will be available and selectable, 16-QAM reports have been embedded into the subsequent unused entries from candidateRep-M to candidateRep-O.  I saw your comment for option 3 and there is nothing new, you just confirmed that option 3 will require a “triggering signaling” that option 2 does not require. The difference between all options at this point are pretty clear, and there is no need go through the same things/comments all over again. |

***Option 2:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Options | Examples |
| * Option 2: Three candidate values for 16-QAM are added in the legacy table. | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Reported value | NPDCCH repetition level | 16-QAM CQI index with NPDSCH transport block error probability not exceeding 0.1 | | | | | noMeasurement | No measurement reporting | No measurement reporting | | | | | candidateRep-A | 1 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-B | 2 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-C | 4 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-D | 8 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-E | 16 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-F | 32 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-G | 64 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-H | 128 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-I | 256 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-J | 512 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-K | 1024 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-L | 2048 | N/A | | | | | candidateRep-M | 1 | Guard-band and Stand-alone | ITBS = 17 | In-band | ITBS = 13 | | candidateRep-N | 1 | ITBS = 20 | ITBS = 16 | | candidateRep-O | 1 | ITBS = 21 | ITBS = 17 | |

Please give your comments on how to address the concerns or provide further benefits:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | Comments |
| Moderator (Huawei) | The concerns to support option 2 include: large SNR gap between NPDCCH repetition 1 and 16QAM TBS, more UE complexity on hypothetical decoding of both NPDCCH and NPDSCH, and limited number of MCS entries for 16-QAM for efficient CQI reporting. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Comments above |
| Ericsson v016 | To the Moderator:  If you intend to quantify the SNR gap, I think you should compare “NPDSCH TBS index 14 with 16QAM” versus “NPDSCH TBS index 13 with QPSK”.  Based on simulations, if we compare the average SNR from the TBSs associated to I\_TBS index 14 for 16-QAM versus the average SNR from TBSs associated to I\_TBS index 13 for QPSK, the SNR gap or ΔSNR is 9.02-8.28= 0.74 dB. So, the SNR gap is not large.  To All:  As we explained earlier, the reports are just a recommendation on what seems to be suitable to use, hence it is sufficient to hint around which I\_TBS indices a scheduling is suitable since anyhow the ultimate scheduling is up to the eNodeB. Three entries will basically hint to the eNodeB whether the radio conditions are overall perceived as very good, good or not so good, so the eNodeB can take this into account plus other aspects to perform the scheduling. With this approach we just make use of the reserved states without incurring in any other complication as e.g., having to re-design reports for QPSK, no-backward compatibility, step-sizes. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | More precise CQI report provide more higher data rate by matching the channel change. That the number of CQI values is limited to 3 should be avoided by sacrificing the data rate. |
| Ericsson v018 | To ZTE: As I mentioned earlier the reports are just a recommendation and the scheduling is up to the eNodeB accounting also for other aspects/factors. |
| Moderator (Huawei) | @Ericsson, could you please elaborate more on the reason of comparison on “NPDSCH TBS index 14 with 16QAM” versus “NPDSCH TBS index 13 with QPSK”? There’s no QPSK entry in option 2. In option 2, the SNR gap between “candidateRep-A” and “candidateRep-M” is larger than 9 dB from simulation shown in [2]. How could the UE report the SNRs within this large gap?  And could you also elaborate more on your concerns about “having to re-design reports for QPSK, no-backward compatibility, step-sizes”? I don’t see the impact to reports or step-sizes. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not prefer Option 2 due to the reasons cited by the moderator above. |
| Ericsson v021 | To Moderator:  Option-2 has QPSK entries, which are the ones available in legacy.  You are calculating the SNR gap using NPDCCHQPSK vs NPDSCH16-QAM (i.e., you are comparing two different physical channels), however the SNR gap should be calculated using NPDSCHQPSK vs NPDSCH16-QAM, more precisely we compared the average SNR from the TBSs associated to I\_TBS index 14 for 16-QAM versus the average SNR from TBSs associated to I\_TBS index 13 for QPSK, the SNR gap or ΔSNR is 9.02-8.28= 0.74 dB.  Now you want me to elaborate on re-designing the reports for QPSK, if we are introducing/designing 16-QAM why do we have to re-design QPSK? If the QPSK reports are redesigned, there should be a way to be able to utilize the legacy reports (new signaling required). For the no-backward compatibility you have already asked that question, and you can find my response as Ericsson v021 in the previous text-box used collect comments. Finally, for step-size, that question can only be answered once we have the place-holder entries for the CQI table, but in general the finer granularity (e.g., the closer reports between each other and the more reports for 16-QAM) the smaller the step-size which at some point can be unfeasible to deal with from an accuracy perspective. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | @Ericsson the CQI report value is the main reference for gNB scheduling, otherwise, there is no need to report 4 bits CQI values in legacy LTE. |
| Ericsson v023 | To ZTE:  I do not know what was the point with your latest comment, no one is against having CQI reports (at least in connected-mode), what is under discussion is the option to be selected after the technical comparison that is being performed. |

***Option 3:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Options | Examples |
| * Option 3: A new CQI table is defined for 16-QAM based on the eMTC table (CQI Tables in 36.213) as a starting point | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **CQI index** | **modulation** | **TBS index** | | 0 | QPSK | 0 | | 1 | QPSK | 2 | | 2 | QPSK | 4 | | 3 | QPSK | 6 | | 4 | QPSK | 8 | | 5 | QPSK | 10 | | 6 | QPSK | 12 | | 8 | 16QAM | 14 | | 9 | 16QAM | 16 | | 10 | 16QAM | 18 | | 11 | 16QAM | 20 | | 12 | Reserved | Reserved | | 13 | Reserved | Reserved | | 14 | Reserved | Reserved | | 15 | Reserved | Reserved | |

Please give your comments on how to address the concerns or provide further benefits:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | Comments |
| Moderator (Huawei) | The concerns to support option 3 include: not backward compatible, out of scope of WID, and additional signaling.  As discussed on GTW session, the clarification from Mr chair is clear that the framework includes the measurement, triggering and reporting. All options here are proposing new tables, there are no essential difference between them. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Comments above |
| Ericsson v016 | Beyond the interpretation of the WID, Option-3 is no backward compatible, to make use of the legacy CQI reporting table, additionally signaling will be required. Moreover, Option-3 re-designs the QPSK reports. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | From our understanding, for NPDCCH report, it is the same with legacy. For the NPDSCH report, new table is used. The channel quality for NPDSCH and NPDCCH can be reported separately based on different triggering signaling. Therefore, NPDSCH report would not impact on the NPDCCH report and they are independent from each other.  @Ericsson, based on the above analysis, could you please clarify what’s the back compatible issue here? |
| Ericsson v018 | To ZTE: You have the answer in your own comment “*For the NPDSCH report, new table is used. The channel quality for NPDSCH and NPDCCH can be reported separately based on different triggering signaling*” |
| Moderator (Huawei) | @Ericsson, for me, if 16-QAM is configured, anyway at least the new table will be used, new signaling for the new table is needed. Could you elaborate more on the critical issue on this? |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Option 3 and are open to discussion on switching between legacy table and new table when UE is configured with 16-QAM. |
| Ericsson v021 | To Moderator:  The difference is that with Opt-2, to access the legacy reports it is as simple as selecting a different row within the same table, whereas for Opt-1 that overrides certain legacy entries a special handling is needed to make use of those entries that were overridden, not to mention that with Opt-3 there will be a brand-new MTC-based table which will require a special handling (signaling) to use the legacy NB-IoT table. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | @Ericsson for option3, the channel quality for NPDSCH and NPDCCH can be reported separately based on different triggering signaling. NPDCCH report still can be triggered by legacy way and NPDCCH repetition can be reported by legacy signalling. Special handling is not required for using the legacy NPDCCH table when the NPDCCH report is triggered. |
| Ericsson v023 | As I mentioned earlier, with your comment you are just confirming the extra “triggering signaling” that Opt-3 requires, which is something Opt-2 does not require. We need to progress on this topic, and as a compromise we can accept Option-1 subject to make it more backward compatible by interpreting Table 9.1.22.15-1 as per legacy or as per the updates for 16-QAM depending on Rmax (or as Nokia proposed in R1-2109314). |
| MTK | We support Opition3 and think it is most perfect solution among 3 options. Except the poofs provide by ZTE and moderator, considering the alternation between 16QAM and QPSK when 16QAM is enabled, the option3 can easily meet it but the other two options cannot. |

# Previous Discussion

## Applicability

### Issue 1: Applicability

The following are proposed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Proposal 5: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure.**   * **CSI report is not supported/expected during PUR procedure.** |
| [4] | **Proposal 8: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure. CSI report is not expected during PUR procedure.**  **Proposal 9: For supporting 16-QAM in PUR procedure,**   * **One IE is introduced in pur-PhysicalConfig to enable the use of 16-QAM in NPUSCH**   + **The field multiTone in npusch-MCS in PUR NPUSCH configuration is modified to include MCS 0-21.** * **One IE is introduced in pur-PhysicalConfig to enable the use of 16-QAM in NPDSCH**   + **Power ratios of NRS and NPDSCH are given in pur-PhysicalConfig** |
| [8] | Observation 11 The applicability of 16-QAM in DL for PUR is less transparent and the use-case less evident than 16-QAM in UL for PUR. Therefore, the pre-configuration of 16-QAM for PUR should decouple UL and DL.  Observation 12 Given that the potential agreements touching upon the applicability of 16-QAM in DL for PUR were lengthy discussed and they address observation 11, we are ok with agreeing on them.  Proposal 6 Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure   * CSI report is not supported/expected during PUR procedure   Proposal 7 To support 16-QAM for NPDSCH and NPUSCH in PUR procedure,   * 16-QAM can be enabled/disabled by UE specific RRC signaling in *PUR-Config-NB* for NPDSCH and NPUSCH separately.   + When 16-QAM is enabled for NPUSCH, the MCS indices, RU indices and UL power control parameter are indicated in *PUR-Config-NB*.     - Note1: It’s up to RAN2 whether a new parameter or the legacy parameter is used to indicate the RU indices.     - Note 2: There may be additional parameters if agreed.   + When 16-QAM is enabled for NPDSCH, the DL power allocation is indicated in *PUR-Config-NB*. |

On the support of 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure, all companies with inputs proposed to support it without enhancement of CSI reporting. Therefore, the following is proposed:

Proposal 1: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure

* CSI report is not supported/expected during PUR procedure.

The details of RRC parameters can be discussed in the dedicated email thread for RRC parameters.

Please input your comments for the above proposal:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | In the previous e-meeting we said that we could accept proposal 1 subject to have an agreement for enabling/disabling and having separately DL and UL 16QAM in the PUR configuration. Towards the end of the previous e-meeting the following proposals were drafted, which should be agreed together.    **Potential agreement: To support 16-QAM for NPDSCH and NPUSCH in PUR procedure,**  ·       **16-QAM can be enabled/disabled by UE specific RRC signaling in *PUR-Config-NB* for NPDSCH and NPUSCH separately**  ·           **When 16-QAM is enabled for NPUSCH, the MCS indices, RU indices and UL power control parameter are indicated in *PUR-Config-NB***  ·         **Note1: It’s up to RAN2 whether a new parameter or the legacy parameter is used to indicate the RU indices**  ·         **Note 2: There may be additional parameters if agreed.**  ·           **When 16-QAM is enabled for NPDSCH, the DL power allocation is indicated in *PUR-Config-NB***  **Potential agreement: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure**  ·       **CSI report is not supported/expected during PUR procedure** |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Although we have some concern on how does eNB determine the suitable MCS for PDSCH, especially 16QAM if there is no CSI reporting during PUR procedure, we are OK to the proposal if majority companies believe it can work. |
| MTK | We are ok to the proposal and think Ericsson’s is also ok. For Lenovo’s concern, actually Network could request UE to report CQI by MAC CE before releasing it. Of course, it leaves to network private implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with proposal 1 |
| Nokia, NSB | We support proposal 1. We are OK to also agree together with the configuration proposal as suggested by Ericsson. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the FL proposal 1. |
| Moderator (Huawei) | According to comments, the proposals are updated as below:  Proposal 1: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure   * CSI report is not supported/expected during PUR procedure.   **Proposal 1A: To support 16-QAM for NPDSCH and NPUSCH in PUR procedure,**   * 16-QAM can be enabled/disabled by UE specific RRC signaling in *PUR-Config-NB* for NPDSCH and NPUSCH separately   + When 16-QAM is enabled for NPUSCH, the MCS indices, RU indices and UL power control parameter are indicated in *PUR-Config-NB*     - Note1: It’s up to RAN2 whether a new parameter or the legacy parameter is used to indicate the RU indices     - Note 2: There may be additional parameters if agreed. * When 16-QAM is enabled for NPDSCH, the DL power allocation is indicated in *PUR-Config-NB* |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with proposal 1.  For proposal1A, it is overlapped with the discussion in 8.19.9. we do not have strong view here. Both leave it to RAN2 or follow the majority are fine with us. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with both proposals. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with both proposals. |
| Ericsson v011 | We are fine with both proposals. About ZTE comment, rather than a potential overlap of Proposal 1A with the UE feature list, the potential overlap seems to occur mainly with respect to proposals 1 and 2 of the RRC parameter list discussion.  To avoid any sort of misunderstanding, we would be fine with simplifying proposal 1A as follows:  **Proposal 1A: To support 16-QAM for NPDSCH and NPUSCH in PUR procedure,**   * 16-QAM can be enabled/disabled by UE specific RRC signaling for NPDSCH and NPUSCH separately   + The corresponding configurations and signaling details are up to RAN2 |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are fine with the proposal by E/// v011 |
| MTK | We are fine with the proposal by E/// v011 |
| Moderator (Huawei) | There’s no further comment for proposal 1, and it seems the modification of proposal 1A from Ericsson can be acceptable and also avoids the collisions of views with the email thread of RRC parameter. |

## DCI

### Issue 2: DCI design

The following are proposed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Proposal 1: The reserved state to indicate the use of 16QAM in DCI format N0 and DCI format N1 should be “1111”.** |

There’s only one proposal for the DCI design, regarding the reserved state for indication of 16-QAM. To complete the remaining issue, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 2: The reserved state to indicate the use of 16QAM in DCI format N0 and DCI format N1 should be “1111”.**

Please input your comments regarding the above proposal:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | We are OK with proposal 2. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Support proposal 2 |
| MTK | Ok with proposal2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with this proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with proposal 2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK with proposal2. |
| Qualcomm | OK |

## Power allocation and power control

### Issue 3: downlink power allocation

The following are proposed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Proposal 3: Confirm the WA of the DL power allocation for in-band deployments.**  **Working Assumption**  **For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM:**   * **For inband deployments, a power ratio is signaled in addition to the signalling for standalone and guard-band deployments which in this case applies to “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS”.**    + **the power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signalled**   + **the signalling is UE specific**   **Note: “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS” have the same power.** |
| [3] | **Proposal 1: Confirm the following working assumption:**  **For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM:**   * **For inband deployments, a power ratio is signaled in addition to the signalling for standalone and guard-band deployments which in this case applies to “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS”.**    + **the power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signalled**   + **the signalling is UE specific**   **Note: “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS” have the same power.** |
| [4] | **Proposal 4: Confirm the working assumption on downlink power allocation for in-band deployment.** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 2: Confirm the working assumption for DL power allocation for inband case.*** |
| [6] | ***Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption for downlink power allocation for inband deployments.*** |
| [8] | Observation 9 If the WA for In-band deployments is confirmed:   * The power ratio to be signalled does not have a dependency on the PCI case. * The deployment modes will all use the same DL power allocation framework based on signalling power ratios. * The in-band case will not be different in terms of complexity, specification impact and nature than the recently confirmed Working Assumption for Stand-alone and Guard-band deployments.   Proposal 4 Confirm the following Working Assumption from RAN1# 106-e related the DL power allocation for in-band deployments. |

All companies with inputs proposed to confirm the working assumption, therefore, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 3: confirm the following working assumption:**

**Working Assumption**

**For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM:**

* **For inband deployments, a power ratio is signaled in addition to the signalling for standalone and guard-band deployments which in this case applies to “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS”.** 
  + **the power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signalled**
  + **the signalling is UE specific**

**Note: “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS” have the same power.**

Please input your comments regarding the above proposal:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | We are OK with proposal 3. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Support proposal 3 |
| MTK | Ok with proposal3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with this proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support proposal 3. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK with proposal3. |
| Qualcomm | OK with proposal 3. |

### Issue 4: uplink power control

The following are proposed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Proposal 4：Option 1 should be supported for uplink power control for 16QAM.** |
| [3] | **Proposal 2: Include a configuration flag in *PUR-Config* to enable 16-QAM (row 6 in RRC parameter list).**  **Proposal 3: For uplink power control, introduce the following specification changes:**   * **Add a correction term in the power control equation following the same definition as in LTE (Option 1).** * **Add a configuration parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*** * **Add the definition of BPRE as in LTE.** |
| [4] | **Proposal 5: A new uplink power control term is introduced in the uplink power control as follows**  **and enabled via RRC configuration.**  **Proposal 6: For the new uplink power control term, select one of the options below –**   * **Option 1: Reuse the LTE definition simplified for NB-IoT: for and for , where is given by higher layer parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*, and where K is the code block size.** * **Option 2: is given in table based on MCS index if enabled, 0 otherwise.**   **Proposal 7: Close-loop power control for 16-QAM is not supported in Rel-17.** |
| [5] | Similar as defined in LTE, is determined as:  for and for , where is given by higher layers parameter.   * where is the code block size and is the number of resource elements determined as where , , are defined in TS36.211, and is defined in section 16.5.1.1 in TS36.213.   ***Proposal 3: Introduce parameter ΔTF to uplink power control enhancement in NBIoT.*** |
| [6] | ***Observation 1: Option 5 for UL power allocation only provides a fixed power offset for 16-QAM.***  ***Observation 2: For UL power allocation, compared with option 2, option 1 provides a finer power offset for different TBS under the same MCS.***  ***Observation 3: For UL power allocation, option 1 may cause a larger performance gap between QPSK and 16-QAM due to the power offset.***  ***Proposal 2: Option 4 from Cat 1 can be considered for open loop UL power allocation.***  ***Proposal 3: Closed-loop power control should be adopted for 16-QAM***   * ***The most significant bit of ‘subcarrier indication’ filed can be utilized to enable the dynamic power control.*** * ***If dynamic power control is enabled, the “Repetition number” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized to indicate the TBS indices for 16-QAM and the MCS can be utilized to indicate the power offset.*** |
| [7] | **Proposal 2: Take option 1/option 2 as stating point and make final decision at this meeting.** |
| [8] | Observation 10 On the additional power control parameter for 16-QAM in UL, in summary:   * Category 1:   + Opt-1 re-uses the ΔTF expression and the definition of *BPRE*, and as a result it provides a single ΔTF regardless of the ITBS index being used. While re-using the ΔTF expression seems suitable, reusing the legacy definition of *BPRE* seems to be an unnecessary overcomplication. The exact resulting value of ΔTF in dB from Opt-1 has not been provided by the proponent.   + Opt-2 provides one ΔTF per ITBS index. That is, 8 different ΔTFs would be introduced as to cover the ITBS indices spanning from 14 to 21. It is unclear from the proponent the methodology that will be used to determine a ΔTF per ITBS index.   + Opt-4 aims at defining a set of values, from which ΔTF is selected and delivered to the UE through an RRC parameter, if this RRC parameter is absent then ΔTF = 0dB will be used. This option can be made to encompass other options, e.g., the resulting numeric values from Opt-1 and/or Opt-5 can be included in the set to be used by Opt-4.   + Opt-5 re-uses the ΔTF expression as in LTE and redefines *BPRE* as “*BPRE* = CodeRatemax\*Qm” in order to simplify it. As result Opt-3 provides a single ΔTF regardless of the ITBS index being used (The estimated value is ΔTF = 7.2545 dB). * Category 2:   + Opt-3 aims at introducing a “TPC command” which is to be dynamically signaled via DCI rather than semi-statically signaled as ΔTF. The purpose of the new term in the UE transmit power control equation is to compensate for the fact that 16-QAM will have more bits per RE than QPSK, rather than compensating for the channel variations as it is the purpose of a TPC command. The “TPC command” serves a different purpose than was is intended to be achieved through ΔTF.   Proposal 5 For the introduction of the new term “ΔTF” into the uplink power control of NPUSCH using 16-QAM, Category 1 is used along with Option 4 as follows:   * ΔTF is indicated through a 2-bit HL parameter referring to one of the following values in the set: {2dB, 4dB, [Opt-5Result\_dB], [Opt-1Result\_dB]} “and if this field is absent then dB0 will be used”. |

In last meeting, the following has been achieved:

Agreement

Down-select one option from Cat 1 as starting point

* Cat 1: Option 1, Option 2/Option 4, Option 5

FFS Cat 2: Option 3, for close-loop power control

* Option 1: Reuse the LTE definition simplified for NB-IoT: for and for , where is given by higher layer parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*, and where K is the code block size.
* Option 2: is given in table based on MCS index if enabled, 0 otherwise.
* Option 3: A TPC command is introduce to indicate the power offset for NPUSCH with 16-QAM.
* Option 4: is configured by high layer parameter.
* Option 5: ΔTF = for *Ks* = 1.25 or ΔTF = 0 for *Ks* = 0, where BPRE =. is the highest code rate in the TBS/MCS table used for the Modulation Scheme, and is the number of bits per M-ary symbol of the Modulation Scheme.

On the down-selection of open loop power control term, companies (Huawei, HiSilicon, Qualcomm, Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola, MTK) support option 1, companies (Nokia, NSB, MTK) support option 2, and companies (ZTE, Sanechips, Ericsson) support option 4.

Based on majority view, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 4: For the new term**  **introduced for power control of NPUSCH,**

* Reuse the LTE definition simplified for NB-IoT: for and for , where is given by higher layer parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*, and where K is the code block size.

For closed loop power control, there are not many companies showing their opinions. So the following is proposed to collect more views.

**Proposal 5: Further study on support of Cat 2: Option 3, for close-loop power control.**

Please input your comments regarding the above proposal, and give your view on closed loop power control.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | On Proposal 4: It is not possible to agree with it until knowing what the resulting numeric value(s) from such a proposal are? That is the only it can be compared to other proposals  On Proposal 5: We do not see the need in keeping for further study the closed-loop power control since it serves a different purpose than was is intended to be achieved through ΔTF. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | On proposal 4, we think it is verified in LTE. So, we support proposal 4 |
| MTK | We support porposal4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with proposal 4, and this is exactly the same as LTE. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with proposal 4. Following online GTW discussion, we are fine to apply this for QPSK as well.  For proposal 5, we do not see the need to study closed-loop power control. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For proposal 5, close-loop power control not only can provide the compensation for the 16-QAM Res, but also can adapt to the channel condition variations. Therefore, close-loop power control include the purpose for and has some other benefits.  More specifically, it can help compensate the performance gap brought by and provide more flexible power control for better transmission performance.  Additionally, for the LTE uplink power control, close-loop power control is included. Considering that design is based on legacy LTE rule, the close-loop power control also should be supported. |
| Moderator (Huawei) | The following has been achieved in online discussion, please share your comments regarding the FFS part.  **Working Assumption**  **For the new term**  **introduced for power control of NPUSCH,**   * Reuse the LTE definition simplified for NB-IoT: for and for , where is given by higher layer parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*, and where K is the code block size. * FFS: whether the new term applies to QPSK when configured with 16QAM, if it does not, whether an additional term is introduced to avoid jump between QPSK and 16QAM |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think the QPSK enhancement is out of the WID scope. Therefore, it is not supported that the new term applies to QPSK and an additional new term can be introduced to compensate the performance gap between QPSK and 16QAM, e.g.,  this additional new term can be configured by RRC signalling. |
| Qualcomm | After the discussion online, maybe we can add an offset to compensate the maximum QPSK. We do not think we need to configure this value, it can be derived from the MCS table. |
| Nokia, NSB | For the FFS, our preference is to apply the term to QPSK also. |
| Ericsson v011 | To avoid a large “jump between QPSK and 16-QAM”, since some companies seems to have a concern in applying the option-1’s formula to QPSK, perhaps the offset can be applied on the estimated .  I will try to illustrate it below:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | large “jump between QPSK and 16-QAM” | Offset to compensate for the large “jump between QPSK and 16-QAM” | | Estimation of option-1 as per [R1-2109314]:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | MCS |  | | 0 – 13 | 0 | | 14 | 6.4 | | 15 | 7.1 | | 16 | 7.7 | | 17 | 8.6 | | 18 | 9.7 | | 19 | 10.7 | | 20 | 11.7 | | 21 | 12.8 | | Estimation of option-1 as per [R1-2109314], after applying the offset:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | MCS |  | | 0 – 13 | 0 | | 14 | 6.4 – offset = 0.5 | | 15 | 7.1 – offset = 1.2 | | 16 | 7.7 – offset = 1.8 | | 17 | 8.6 – offset = 2.7 | | 18 | 9.7 – offset = 3.8 | | 19 | 10.7 – offset = 4.8 | | 20 | 11.7 – offset = 5.8 | | 21 | 12.8 – offset = 6.9 |   The offset is obtained accounting for where the jump occurs, to obtain it can be calculated on the last ITBS of QPSK, which produces an offset ⁓ 5.9 dB, which alleviates the “jump between QPSK and 16-QAM”. | |
| Lenovo, MotoM | For the FFS part, we share the similar view as Nokia. If we introduce the new term as LTE, we should follow the same principal, use the term for all modulation type not only for 16QAM, otherwise we don’t think we need to introduce the new term at all (the UL power control enhancement is an optimization and is not noted in WID). |
| MTK | Regarding the FFS part, we share the same view as Nokia and Lenovo. Actually, if we introduce an offset as proposed above, the enhancement from compensation will dramatically decreases, this violets the intention of introducing power control. |

## Channel quality reporting

### Issue 5: Channel quality reporting

The following are proposed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Observation 1: The SNR gap between the legacy entry with largest SNR (NPDCCH repetition 1) and the 16-QAM TBS with smallest SNR (TBS index 14 with 16QAM) is significant (>>3dB).**  **Proposal 2: Option 3 should be supported for CQI table for downlink 16-QAM CQI reporting, i.e., a new CQI table is defined for 16-QAM based on the eMTC table (CQI Tables in 36.213) as a starting point.** |
| [4] | **Proposal 1: For 16-QAM CQI table, our preferences are**   * **First preference – Option 3: A new CQI table is defined for 16-QAM based on the eMTC table (CQI Tables in 36.213) as a starting point** * **Second preference – Option 1: More than three candidate values for 16-QAM are added in the legacy table by replacing candidates with high repetition values (e.g. candidateRep-J to candidateRep-L).** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 1: Remove some of the legacy CQI reporting values and add more than 3 CQI reporting values for support 16QAM in DL or report the subset of CQI reporting values determined by channel condition.*** |
| [6] | ***Observation 4: For option 1 and 2 of CQI table,***   * ***The limited number of CQI states with 16QAM cannot adequately match the variety of channel conditions.*** * ***There is large SNR gap between the adjacent two CQI indices with NPDCCH repetition 1 and 16QAM TBS.***   ***Observation 5: For CQI table, option 1 and option 2 are not aligned with the agreement, i.e. the channel quality report for 16-QAM is based on NPDSCH transport block that achieves an error probability not exceeding 10% BLER.***  ***Observation 6:*** ***The channel quality for NPDSCH and NPDCCH can be reported separately based on different tables.***  ***Observation 7: The existing MAC CE can be reused to report 4-bit CQI for NPDSCH if the UE receives a NPDSCH CQI command and 4-bit number of repetitions for NPDCCH if the UE receives a NPDCCH CQI command.***  ***Proposal 4: A new 4-bit CQI table should be defined for downlink 16QAM.*** |
| [7] | **Proposal 1: Support Option3 and take Table1 as starting point to make final decision at this meeting.**  **Table 1: 4-bit CQI Table for 16QAM**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **CQI index** | **modulation** | **code rate x 1024** | **efficiency** | | 0 | out of range | | | | 1 | QPSK | 40 | 0.0781 | | 2 | QPSK | 78 | 0.1523 | | 3 | QPSK | 120 | 0.2344 | | 4 | QPSK | 193 | 0.3770 | | 5 | QPSK | 308 | 0.6016 | | 6 | QPSK | 449 | 0.8770 | | 7 | QPSK | 602 | 1.1758 | | 8 | 16QAM | 480 | 1.8788 | | 9 | 16QAM | 524 | 2.0472 | | 10 | 16QAM | 610 | 2.3844 | | 11 | 16QAM | 718 | 2.8052 | | 12 | 16QAM | 836 | 3.2684 | | 13 | Reserved | Reserved | Reserved | | 14 | Reserved | Reserved | Reserved | | 15 | Reserved | Reserved | Reserved | |
| [8] | Observation 3 In relation with the CQI mapping table, the WID states: “Extend the NB-IoT channel quality reporting based on the framework of Rel-14—16, to support 16-QAM in DL”  Observation 4 Based on the WID, the selected option should be incorporated into the legacy CQI mapping Table in TS 36.133 clause 9.1.22.15 as to re-use the NB-IoT’s framework and provide backward compatibility.  Observation 5 The legacy CQI mapping table in TS 36.133 clause 9.1.22.15 currently uses 13 out of 16 entries, hence the three unused fields could be utilized to incorporate the channel quality reporting for 16-QAM in DL.  Observation 6 For the TBS/MCS table for DL, the step-size between ITBS indices is in most cases smaller than 1dB, which is a level of granularity that is not feasible from a measurement accuracy perspective even in the static condition because of the limited number of NRS symbols. Today the channel quality reporting is specified for each repetition level 1, 2, 4, 8, …, which means that in legacy the step size is 3dB.  Observation 7 In Rel-17, the full range of ITBS indices (14 to 21 and 11 to 17 depending on the deployment mode) can be covered using only three candidate reports (i.e., candidateRep-M, candidateRep-N, or candidateRep-O) as to have a feasible level of granularity with step-sizes larger than 1dB.  Observation 8 Encompassing the full-range of I\_TBS indices using three reports is suitable, since the report is just a recommendation on what seems to be suitable to use. Hence, it is sufficient to hint around which I\_TBS indices a scheduling is suitable since anyhow the ultimate scheduling is up to the eNodeB  Proposal 3 The three unused entries in the legacy CQI mapping Table in clause 9.1.22.15 of TS 36.133 (i.e., Table 9.1.22.15-1) are used for the CQI reporting of 16-QAM in DL.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Reported value | NPDCCH repetition level | 16-QAM CQI index with NPDSCH transport block error probability not exceeding 0.1 | | candidateRep-M | 1 | 0 | | candidateRep-N | 1 | 1 | | candidateRep-O | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **CQI Index** | **ITBS index** | | |  | Guard-band and Stand-alone deployments | In-band deployments | | 0 | [17] | [13] | | 1 | [20] | [16] | | 2 | [21] | [17] | |

On the CQI table for downlink 16-QAM, 4 companies (Nokia, NSB (2nd preference), Lenovo, Moto) prefer option 1, 1 company (Ericsson) prefers option 2, and 7 companies (Huawei, HiSilicon, Nokia, NSB (1st preference), ZTE, Sanechips, MTK) prefer option 3.

Agreement

For CQI table for downlink 16-QAM, down-select between following options in RAN1#106-e:

* Option 1: More than three candidate values for 16-QAM are added in the legacy table.
  + FFS: Which of the legacy entries are removed
* Option 2: Three candidate values for 16-QAM are added in the legacy table.
* Option 3: A new CQI table is defined for 16-QAM based on the eMTC table (CQI Tables in 36.213) as a starting point

The concerns to support option 1 include: limited number of MCS entries for 16-QAM for efficient CQI reporting, “dB” step size granularity, increased size of legacy table, no backward compatible, and more UE complexity on hypothetical decoding of both NPDCCH and NPDSCH.

The concerns to support option 2 include: large SNR gap between NPDCCH repetition 1 and 16QAM TBS, more UE complexity on hypothetical decoding of both NPDCCH and NPDSCH, and limited number of MCS entries for 16-QAM for efficient CQI reporting.

The concerns to support option 3 include: not backward compatible, out of scope of WID, and additional signaling.

Based on the number of supporting companies, the following is proposed to move forward:

**Proposal 6: For CQI table for downlink 16-QAM, down-select between following options:**

* **Option 1: More than three candidate values for 16-QAM are added in the legacy table.**
  + **FFS: Which of the legacy entries are removed**
* **Option 3: A new CQI table is defined for 16-QAM based on the eMTC table (CQI Tables in 36.213) as a starting point**

Please input your comments regarding the above proposal:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | We have a concern in removing Option 2 since it is the only proposal that doesn’t have an impact on the legacy Table 9.1.22.15-1 due that it simply makes use of the available reserved states.  If to move forward a down-selection is to intended to be made, then the down-selection should be made between Option 1 and Option 2 since they both use the NB-IoT framework (Still the issue with Option 1 is having to remove legacy QPSK entries, and the step-size). |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are OK to the proposal.  For our first preference, we should follow the NB-IoT framework as option-1, the detail reporting entries (subset of the reporting entries) are determined by higher layer parameter or channel condition with limited 4 bits.  If majority companies believe option 3 is aligned with the WID, we are OK, this is our second preference. |
| MTK | Ok with the proposal6, and we prefer option3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We observe a large SNR gap between the legacy entry and the 16-QAM, thus more entries are preferred, so we are fine with this proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. And option3 is preferred. From our understanding, hope the following analysis can facilitate the discussion.  About the legacy framework, we think ‘the framework of Rel-14—16’ means the mechanism of CQI reporting triggered by high layer and report by MAC CE should be reused, instead of reusing the same table. If the new CQI table is out of the framework, can we say new signalling to trigger the report is also out of the framework?  Additionally, for the back-compatible issue, it also does not exist. For NPDCCH report, it is the same with legacy. For the NPDSCH report, new table is used. The channel quality for NPDSCH and NPDCCH can be reported separately based on different triggering signaling. Therefore, NPDSCH report would not impact on the NPDCCH report and they are independent from each other.  Last, we’d like to mention that we already have the agreement in 104bis-emeeting,   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  If 16-QAM is configured for NPDSCH, the channel quality report for 16-QAM is based on NPDSCH transport block that achieves an error probability not exceeding 10% BLER. |   It means when the 16-QAM feature is configured, the CQI report should be based on NPDSCH, instead of NPDCCH. |
| Qualcomm | Our preference is to keep Option 1 with a small number of new entries. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Consider only 1 meeting left, we hope we should elaborate the detail solution to select instead of the general design guideline. |

### Issue 6: Measurement reference resource

The following are proposed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [4] | **Proposal 2: Define CSI reference resource to be used for 16-QAM CQI measurement.**  **Proposal 3: The CSI reference resource is given by a set of the last *R*CSI subframes used for NPDCCH monitoring by the BL/CE UE in the corresponding narrowband before *n*-*nCQI\_ref*.** |
| [6] | ***Proposal 5: There is no need to specify measurement reference resource for CQI report for NB-IoT 16QAM.*** |
| [8] | Observation 1 It is needed to define the reference resource to estimate the CQI.  Observation 2 The reason why RAN1 did not specify the measurement resource in previous releases is because RAN4 specified it in TS 36.133 (e.g., see TS 36.133 clause 6.6.2.6). Since RAN4 has no plan to discuss the core part on 16 QAM CQI report, RAN1 needs to define the reference resource in TS 36.213.  Proposal 2 In Rel-17 for 16-QAM in DL, NRS symbols are used as reference resource for CQI measurement. |

Based on the inputs, companies still have different views on the introduction of measurement reference resources, therefore, the following is proposed to collect more views and discussions:

**Proposal 7: Further study on the specification of measurement reference resource.**

Please input your comments regarding whether to specify the measurement reference resource.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | The reference resource is as fundamental as the CQI mapping table. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We hope we can follow legacy behavior although the reference resource is important, we don’t know what has changed compared with legacy release. |
| MTK | We are ok to the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have not defined the reference resource for the channel quality report in legacy, it depends on UE implementation. So we can follow the legacy even for channel quality reporting here. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with the proposal. Our preference is to define the measurement reference resource as that is typically part of the definition of CQI. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In the frequency domain, the UE can only measure CQI based on one PRB where UE monitors NPDCCH and the associated NPDSCH. In the time domain, whether to use a single subframe or multiple subframes to measure CQI can be based on UE implementation. We do not see the need to define measurement reference resource. |
| Qualcomm | This was discussed also in the past when CQI was first introduced, and the conclusion was no reference resource was to be defined. It is unclear what changed.  Just to be clear, the “reference resource” is not the same as the set of subframes over which you perform the measurement (you can measure over a larger number of subframes to filter out noise). |
| Moderator (Huawei) | It seems companies still have very diverse views, and the situation doesn’t change compared with the last meeting. As there’s no comment raising any critical issue without the definition, I would like to close the corresponding discussion. |

## Others

**Issue 6: Others**

The following are proposed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [8] | Proposal 1 To clarify that the “*inbandCarrierInfor*” is not only signalled in SIB, the “/UE specific signaling” is appended to related agreement from RAN1# 106-e as follows:  “For the UE configured with 16-QAM for NPDSCH, the deployment of the carrier is signaled by *operationModeInfo* in MIB or *inbandCarrierInfo* in SIB/UE specific signaling” |
| [9] | Observation 1 The WID left open the applicability of 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL for both FDD and TDD, hence it needs to be investigated whether the agreements we have reached to support 16-QAM hold for TDD and what would be the impact in other Working Groups.  Observation 2 A preliminary assessment on RAN1 aspects touching upon TBS/MCS tables, DCI designs, DL power allocation, UL power control term, channel quality reporting, etc, seem to indicate that there won’t be any incompatibility issue with TDD.  Observation 3 Nonetheless, it seems that from a RAN4 perspective there might be a need to add another Test Model (in the BS conformance specs) and NPDSCH demodulation requirements for supporting 16-QAM in TDD.  Observation 4 Operators, UE vendors, Network vendors and other interested parties should discuss the relevance of supporting 16-QAM for TDD NB-IoT, especially if supporting it results in an extra impact in any of the Working Groups involved.  Proposal 1 Discuss whether the agreements we have reached to support 16-QAM in UL and DL hold for TDD and what are the impacts in other Working Groups.  Proposal 2 Decide whether 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL is applicable for both FDD and TDD. |

As discussed in last meeting, regarding the proposal that the *inbandCarrierInfo* can also be signaled by UE specific signaling, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 8: the agreement below is updated as**

Agreement

**For the UE configured with 16-QAM for NPDSCH, the deployment of the carrier is signaled by *operationModeInfo* in MIB or *inbandCarrierInfo* in SIB/UE specific signaling.**

Please input your comments to the above proposal, and also your views on the support of 16-QAM for FDD and TDD:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | On Proposal 8: We are OK with proposal 8, otherwise the agreement is incomplete.  On the support of FDD and TDD: In our view it is important that operators, UE vendors, Network vendors and other interested parties discuss the relevance of supporting 16-QAM for TDD NB-IoT, especially if supporting it results in an extra impact in any of the Working Groups involved. It seems that from a RAN4 perspective there might be a need to add another Test Model (in the BS conformance specs) and NPDSCH demodulation requirements for supporting 16-QAM in TDD. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | OK |
| MTK | Ok with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with proposal 8. And we think 16QAM can also be applicable for TDD. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with proposal 8. The 16-QAM feature is applicable for TDD and we don’t see any RAN1 issue. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK with proposal 8 |
| Moderator (Huawei) | Proposal 8 is stable.  For support of TDD, it can be discussed at UE feature email thread. |
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