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# Introduction

List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round

* 1st round: Agree on the updated workplan, discuss on the topics related to PDSCH and CQI testing, collect PDSCH simulation results summary;
* 2nd round: Keep discussing on issues pending from the 1st round;

# Topic #1: Updated Work Plan

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2106469 | Qualcomm | Proposal 1: Approve Work Item detailed in this contribution; |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1

*Proposed updated workplan*

* RAN4 #96-e (Aug 2020)
	+ Way forward on general framework;
* RAN4 #97-e (Oct 2020)
	+ Discussions on general framework;
* RAN4 #98-e (Feb 2021)
	+ Discussion on general framework;
	+ Baseline link simulation assumptions agreed for PDSCH;
* RAN4 #98-bis-e (Apr 2021)
	+ Remaining details on DL model and test setup agreed for PDSCH and CQI;
	+ Collection of ideal and impairment simulation results for PDSCH;
	+ Baseline link simulation assumptions agreed for CQI reporting;
* RAN4 #99-e (May 2021)
	+ Collection of ideal and impairment simulation results for PDSCH and CQI reporting;
	+ CRs agreed;

**Issue 1-1-1: Approve updated workplan as proposed**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (Qualcomm)
* Recommended WF
	+ Update working plan according to the proposal.

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

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*Companies are encouraged to comment in the dedicated comment section below each issue.*

### CRs/TPs comments collection

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

# Topic #2: General and PDSCH Performance Requirements

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104544 | Ericsson | **Issue 1-1: Requirement definition according to UE capability of supporting CSI-validation features**Observation: It is not reasonable to set different LBT failure probability and scheduling configuration for UE with and without CSI-validation capability. Observation: If UE without CSI-validation capability have to be tested, packing SSB and TRS together could be a solution.Observation: TRS won’t impact performance under typical NR-U scenario. Proposal: Define requirements only for UE with CSI-validation capability and no applicable test cases for UE without capability.Proposal: No TRS configuration for NR-U tests.Issue 1-2: Detailed test setup for scenario A and C.Observation: Same test setup is feasible for both Scenario A SCell and Scenario C PCell.Issue 1-3: Requirement definition method for Scenario A and C.Proposal: Reuse Rel-16 NR CA PDSCH requirements for Scenario A PCell. Define a single set of PDSCH requirements with {20, 40, 60, 80} MHz bandwidth for unlicensed cell in both Scenario A and C, and use applicability rule to reduce test effort for Scenario C. Observation: A single CQI report requirement will be enough to cover unlicensed carrier Scenario A and C.**Issue 2-1: Slot format**Observation: DL burst transmission slot could be up to 8.Observation: There is no enough resource for TRS or CSI-RS allocation when DL burst is 2 slots with less PDSCH symbols in the last slot.Proposal: Limit the minimum DL burst length to 1ms. The DL burst length could be described as: DL burst transmission slot length is {2, 4, 6, 7(8)}; the PDSCH symbols in the last slot is 14 for 2 slots DL burst transmission and {6, 9, 10, 12} for more than 2 slots DL burst transmission.Observation: NR-U RRM performance test configure dynamic TDD by DCI 1\_1 slot by slot.**Issue 3-1: LBT failure propability**Observation: Different LBT failure probability won’t impact on performance so much. Observation: Test time caused by 0.5 LBT failure probability won’t be an issue according to previous eLAA discussion. Proposal: Define LBT failure probability to 0.5. |
| R4-2106470 | Qualcomm | Proposal 1: Do not define additional requirements for UEs that do not support ‘csi-RS-ValidationWith-DCI’, and rely on Rel.15 tests (Option 1a in the WF);Proposal 2: During the test for Scenario A, verify only the PDSCH performance on the NR-U SCell, and do not define a requirement for the NR PCell.Proposal 3: Reuse PDSCH Demodulation requirement for Scenario A and C, and apply to the Unlicensed Cell only.Proposal 4: To configure the NR PCell for Scenario A, use the parameters in 38.101-4, Table 5.2-1, assuming CBW=20MHz and SCS=30kHz;Proposal 5: To reduce the overall test duration, use pLBT=0.25. Observation 1: The maximum burst duration requirement of 4ms in Japan regulation that was used as a design parameter for the test in the last meeting has been increased to 8ms, according to Article 49-20 in Radio Equipment Rule in Japanese Radio Law [8];Proposal 6: Increase Maximum COT to 4.5ms, leaving only the last slot idle (no DL/UL allocation) within the DL periodicity to satisfy dynamic channel access requirement;Proposal 7: If Maximum COT is extended to 4.5 ms, support Option 2 ({2,4,6,7} slots) in the WF [3] for the Downlink portion duration within the COT values;Proposal 8: Do not introduce a new TDD Pattern for NR-U, but use DCI-based Dynamic UL/DL detection (mandatory capability);Observation 2: According to Table 5.3-1 in [7], minimum PDSCH processing time for 30kHz numerology is 13 Symbols;Proposal 9: Reserve a slot for UL scheduling for HARQ Feedback, after 1 Guard Slot after the end of the last Slot with PDSCH allocation in the COT; |
| R4-2104545 | Ericsson |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Slot Pattern  |   | According to DL Transmission Model |
| LBT failure probability |   | 0.5 |
| Common serving cell parameters | Physical Cell ID |   | 0 |
| SSB position in burst |   | The first SSB |
| SSB Q factor |   | 8 |
| PDCCH configuration | TCI state |  | TCI state #0  |
| CSI-RS for tracking | Not configured  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DL Transmission Model | Maximum DL COT Duration  | ms | 4 |
| DL Transmission Model Period/Fixed Frame Period (Note 1) | ms | 5 |
| Probability of LBT Failure pLBT |  | ***0.5***  |
| **UL COT start time within each FFP** | **ms** | **Option 1: 4 for maximum DL burst length <=7 slots****Option 2: 4.5 for maximum DL burst length is 8 slots** |
| **UL COT duration**  | **ms** | **Option 1: 0.9 for maximum DL burst length <=7 slots****Option 2: 0.4 for maximum DL burst length is 8 slots** |
| **Idle Time after UL COT**  | **ms** | **0.1** |
| Number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information  |  | **8 if mod(i,10)=0****7 if mod(i,10)=1****6 if mod(i,10)=2****5 if mod(i,10)=3****4 if mod(i,10)=4****3 if mod(i,10)=5****2 if mod(i,10)=6** |
| Duration of the Downlink burst  | Slots | **Option 1: {2, 4, 6, 7}** **Option 2: {2, 4 ,6, 8}** |
| PDSCH Allocation in the last Slot of the Downlink burst | Symbols | **14 for 2 DL slots** **{6, 9, 12, 14} for more than 2 DL slots**  |
| Notes:1. The Fixed Frame Period denomination applies only for *ChannelAccessType-r16 = ‘semistatic’.* For *ChannelAccessType-r16 = ‘dynamic’* this parameter is identified only as DL Transmission Model Period.
 |

 |
| R4-2104838 | Apple | Test SetupProposal #1: Use one generic LBT model for all test cases, irrespective of UE capability of supporting CSI-RS validation.Observation #1: Requirement SNR based on 70% max TP would be similar with or without LBT failure.Proposal #2: Use probability of LBT failure as 0 for UEs that don’t support CSI-RS validation.Downlink Transmission ModelProposal #3: Use TDD pattern 6DS3U for NR-U demod requirements.Observation #2: With duration of DL portion of COT of 7 slots, it is not possible to accommodate an ‘S’ and ‘U’ slot within 8 slots for Max COT.Proposal #4: For NR-U demodulation requirements use randomly selected downlink portion of COT from set {2,3,5,6} slots.Proposal #5: For NR-U demodulation requirements use randomly selected partial ending slot length from {6,9,12,14} symbols.LBT ParametersObservation #3: With PLBT of 0.25 and 0.5, SNR @ 70% of Max TP is comparable. Proposal #6: Define NR-U UE demod requirements with PLBT of 0.25. |
| R4-2106784 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Define one LBT transmission model and one requirements/test setup for UE supporting CSI-validation features with following additional conditions:* For UE not supporting CSI-validation, set probability of LBT failure to 0.
* Set TRS periodicity to 40 slots and offset to 20/21 slots for TRS resource 1 and 2 /3 and 4.i.e. Reuse the configuration of Rel-15 PDSCH test.

Proposal 2: The test set-up should be the same for scenario A and scenario C except for where HARQ feedback is transmitted and further discuss the time error and frequency offset of unlicensed CC to licensed CCProposal 3: Use TDD pattern 7D1S2UObservation 1: DL duration has negligible affection on the performance.Observation 2: DL duration {2, 4, 6, 7} doesn’t violate the Japan regulation.Proposal 4 Use DL duration {2, 4, 6, 7}Proposal 5: Use {6, 9, 12, 14} for PDSCH allocation in the last slot in the Downlink portion of the COT in Symbols.Proposal 6: Set number of additional DMRS is 0 when PDSCH allocation in the last slot is less than 8 and 1 otherwise. Proposal 7: Set LBT failure probability to 0.5 for UE supporting CSI-validation features. |
| R4-2107091 | Discussion on PDSCH requirements for NR-U | Proposal 1: Do not define test cases for UE which does not support CSI-validation features.Proposal 2: COT duration is randomly chosen with equal probability from the set {2, 3, 5, 6} slots.Proposal 3: Symbol length for the last slot in the COT is randomly chosen with equal probability from the set {6, 9, 12, 14} symbols. Proposal 4: Define LBT failure probability as 0.25. Proposal 5: The RB number of CSI-RS for tracking should be 48. |

## Open issues summary

The issues listed in this section address topics for discussions related to issue both general and specific for PDSCH performance testing.

### Sub-topic 2-1: Requirement definition according to UE capability of supporting CSI-validation features

**Issue 2-1-1: How to define requirements based on UEs capabilities related to CSI-RS validation**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Define requirements for UE supporting *‘csi-RS-validationWith-DCI’* only and no applicable test is defined for UE that do not support this capability (Ericsson, MediaTek, Qualcomm);
	+ Option 2: Use pLBT=0 for UEs that do not support *‘csi-RS-validationWith-DCI’* (Apple, Huawei);
* Recommended WF:
	+ TBA;

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

**Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define a different LBT Model for UEs that do not support CSI-RS validation**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: No (Apple, Huawei);
* Recommended WF
	+ Define a single LBT model for NR-U Demod tests, regardless of UE capabilities.

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

* + 1. Sub-topic 2-2: Details of the Downlink Transmission Model

**Issue 2-2-1: Possible value of the random downlink duration within the COT;**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: {2,3,5,6} Slots (Apple, MediaTek);
	+ Option 2a: {2,4,6,7} Slots (Ericsson, Huawei);
	+ Option 2b: {2,4,6,7} Slots, extending the maximum COT to 4.5ms (Qualcomm);
	+ Option 3: {2,4,6,8} Slots (Ericsson);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 2-2-2: Maximum COT duration within the DL Periodicity**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4ms (Agreement in WF);
	+ Option 2: 4.5 ms, only last slot in the DL periodicity is idle (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 2-2-3: Whether to limit the minimum DL duration to 1ms;**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (Ericsson);
* Recommended WF:
	+ Minimum DL duration is already agreed to be at least 2 slots (=1 ms) due to the DRS window duration (1ms), and both options under consideration in the next issue do not include 1 slot, so agree on this proposal.

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

**Issue 2-2-4: Overall duration of the last slot in the COT:**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: {6,9,12,14} Symbols (Apple, Huawei, MediaTek);
	+ Option 2: {2-14} Symbols;
	+ Option 3: 14 Symbols if DL duration equals 2 Slots, {6,9,12,14} Symbols otherwise (Ericsson);
* Recommended WF
	+ Agree on {6,9,12,14} Symbols, Companies are encouraged to comment on the proposal from Ericsson regarding the last slot duration when DL duration equals 2 Slots;

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

**Issue 2-2-5: TDD Pattern to be used in DL demodulation Tests**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Fixed TDD Pattern
		- Option 1a: 6D-1S-3U (Apple);
		- Option 1b: 7D-1S-2U (Huawei);
	+ Option 2: Do not specify a fixed pattern, use DCI-based Dynamic UL/DL detection instead (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 2-2-6: UL scheduling with fixed TDD Pattern**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: UL allocation, within each FFP, start at {4, 4.5} ms and duration {0.9, 0.4} ms, for DL duration {<=7, 8} Slots respectively (Ericsson);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 2-2-7: UL scheduling when using DCI-based Dynamic UL/DL detection**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Reserve 1 slot for UL scheduling of the UE HARQ feedback, after 1 Guard Slot following the end of the last slot with PDSCH allocation in the COT (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

* + 1. Sub-topic 2-3: Details of the LBT Model

**Issue 2-3-1: LBT Probabilities (PLBT)to be used in the tests for Scenario A and C**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 0.5 (Ericsson, Huawei);
	+ Option 2: 0.25 (Apple, MediaTek, Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

### Sub-topic 2-4: Details of NR-U PDSCH Performance Tests

**Issue 2-4-1: Define a single set of PDSCH Requirements for the unlicensed cell for both Scenario A and C.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (Ericsson, Qualcomm);
	+ Option 1a: Yes (only HARQ feedback transmission differs), and further discuss time and frequency offset errors of unlicensed to licensed CC (Huawei);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 2-4-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirements for the licensed cell performances in Scenario A**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: In Scenario A, verify only PDSCH performances on the unlicensed cell (no requirement on the NR PCell) (Qualcomm);
	+ Option 2: Reuse Rel-16 NR CA PDSCH requirements for Scenario A PCell (Agreement in the WF, Ericsson);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 2-4-3: How to configure NR PCell in Scenario A PDSCH Demodulation test setup**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Use the parameters in 38.101-4, Table 5.2-1, with CBW = 20MHz and SCS = 30kHz (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 2-4-4: Bandwidth to be used for the PDSCH Requirements for Scenario C**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 20 MHz (Agreement in the WF);
	+ Option 2: {20,40,60,80} MHz with applicability rule (Ericsson);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

* + 1. Sub-topic 2-5: Configuration details for PDSCH Tests

**Issue 2-5-1: Whether to reduce the number of additional DMRS in PDSCH**

* Proposal
	+ Set the number of additional DMRS to 0 when the PDSCH allocation in the last slot is less than 8 symbols, otherwise set it to 1 (Huawei);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 2-5-2: Whether to configure CSI-RS for tracking**

* Proposal
	+ Option 1: No (Ericsson);
	+ Option 2: Yes, with the same configuration as in Rel.15 PDSCH tests. (20ms=40 slots periodicity and offset 10ms=20/21 slots for Res.1-2/3-4) (Huawei);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 2-5-3: CSI-RS for tracking configuration: RB size**

* Proposal
	+ 48 RBs (MediaTek);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

*Moderator comment: Can MediaTek please elaborate on this proposal? Does it apply to 20 MHz only or to all CBWs?*

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

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*Companies are encouraged to comment in the dedicated comment section below each issue.*

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

# Topic #3: CQI Reporting Requirements

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104547 | Ericsson | Issue 1: Do we need to check how UE measure CSI-RS?Observation: It is not practical to check UE CSI measurement behaviour under CQI report demodulation setup.Proposal: Only consider the option that two different runs with different SNR values.Issue 2: CQI report methodProposal: Use periodic CQI report configuration |
| R4-2104841 | Apple | Proposal #1: For NR-U introduce CQI reporting requirements with aperiodic CSI reporting.Proposal #2: Introduce tests with 2 SNR levels to verify CQI reporting.Proposal #3: PDSCH BLER measurement for CQI reporting need not be subject to LBT failure. |
| R4-2106472 | Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 1: For NR-U CQI Reporting test, reuse the DL Transmission Model already defined and agreed for NR-U PDSCH Demodulation tests;Observation 1: With proper scheduling, aperiodic CSI Reporting can fit within the constraints of the DL Model as defined for PDSCH tests in [3];Proposal 2: Use Aperiodic CSI Reporting in the NR-U CQI reporting test;Proposal 3: For the test setup details of CQI performance test, support Option 1 in the WF, designing the test using two sets of burst transmissions, each with distinct transmission power level boost and keeping the interference level constant during the test;Proposal 4: Use [0dB, +6dB], random with equal probability, as Transmission Power boost level for each DL Period;Proposal 5: Collect PDSCH and CQI reporting results separately per each transmission power level boost;Proposal 6: Determine PDSCH transport format for each transmission power level boost independently, according to the transmission power level boost applied to the resources measured by the UE to produce the CQI reports received;Proposal 7: Requirement for CQI reporting should include CQI reporting statistics and PDSCH BLER statistics, with each set of statistics collected separately per each transmission power level boost, and a minimum difference in median CQI between set collected per each transmission power level boost as described in this contribution;Proposal 8: To define CQI Reporting tests for NR-U, use AWGN channel only;Proposal 9: To define CQI Reporting tests for NR-U, agree on one SNR pair, with the condition that satisfying the requirement on one SNR is sufficient to pass the test;Proposal 10: For the next meeting, companies should be encouraged to presents results for alignment including: SNR pair to be used in the simulation, minimum delta across CQIs for different transmission power level boost; |
| R4-2106785 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Use periodic CSI reporting and set periodicity of CSI-RS transmission and CSI reporting to FFP and set the offset of CSI-RS transmission less than minimal transmission duration (i.e. 2 slots) to collect CQI from every burst transmission.Proposal 2: For information, use following test set-up:* CSI-RS periodicity/offset: 10/1 slots
* CSI-RS reporting periodicity/offset: 10/8 slots
* TDD pattern: 7D1S2U

Proposal 3: Use option 1 as CQI Performance Test Design: -> with power boost Proposal 4: Use CQI distribute criterion and BLER criterion. |
| R4-2107090 | MediaTek inc. | Proposal 1: Define CQI requirements only for UEs supporting optional capabilities related to CSI-RS validation.Proposal 2: For the type of CSI reporting, we support periodic CSI with CSI-RS validation.Proposal 3: During the CQI test, there are two sets of burst transmissions, each with distinct transmission power level and keeping the interference level constant. |

## Open issues summary

The issues listed in this section address topics for discussions related to issues specific to CQI Reporting performance testing.

### Sub-topic 3-1: NR-U CQI Reporting test

**Issue 3-1-1: Requirement definition according to UE capability of supporting CSI-validation features**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Define CQI requirements only for UEs supporting optional capabilities related to CSI-RS validation (MediaTek);
	+ Option 2: The decisions on the CQI Requirements definition for UEs not supporting optional capabilities will follow the agreements reached on the same issue related to PDSCH Requirements (Agreement in WF);
* Recommended WF
	+ Discuss PDSCH and CQI requirements definition together in Topic #2 as per previous agreements;

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

**Issue 3-1-2: CQI Test Setup Details**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: TE to transmit randomly in each DL periodicity with one of two different power level boost, with constant interference level during the test (Huawei, Qualcomm, MediaTek);
	+ Option 2: Two different runs with different SNR values (Ericsson, Apple);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 3-1-3: CQI Test Metrics Details**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: CQI distribution criterion and BLER criterion (Huawei);
	+ Option 2: Include CQI distribution statistics, PDSCH BLER, minimum difference in median CQI between sets collected per each transmission power level boost (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 3-1-4: Power boost for CQI Test Setup with two transmission power level boosts**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Use randomly per each DL period [0, +6]dB with equal probability (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 3-1-5: Scheduling details for CQI Test Setup with two transmission power level boosts**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Determine PDSCH transport format for each transmission power level boost independently, depending on the boost applied to the resources measured by the UE to produce the CQI reports received (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 3-1-6: Test metric collection for CQI Test Setup with two transmission power level boosts**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Collect PDSCH and CQI reporting results separately per each transmission power level boost (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

### Sub-topic 3-2: Configuration details for CQI Reporting test

**Issue 3-2-1: LBT setup in CQI test**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Reuse the DL model as agreed for PDSCH (Qualcomm);
	+ Option 2: Do not consider LBT failure in PDSCH BLER measurement for CQI Reporting tests (Apple);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 3-2-2: Type of CQI Reporting**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Aperiodic (Apple, Qualcomm)
	+ Option 2: Periodic (Ericsson, MediaTek, Huawei);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 3-2-3: Scheduling of CSI-RS transmission and reporting for CQI Tests**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1 (Huawei):
		- CSI-RS periodicity/offset: 10/1 slots
		- CSI-RS reporting periodicity/offset: 10/8 slots
		- TDD pattern: 7D1S2U
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 3-2-4: Channel Model for CQI Tests**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Use AWGN channel only (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 3-2-5: SNR for CQI Test**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Agree on one SNR pair, with the condition that satisfying the requirement on one SNR is sufficient to pass successfully the test (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

**Issue 3-2-6: Simulation results**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Encourage companies to present alignment results including at least: SNR pair for the simulation, minimum delta across CQI for different transmission power level boost (Qualcomm);
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

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

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*Companies are encouraged to comment in the dedicated comment section below each issue.*

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

# Topic #4: Simulation Results

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104546 | Ericsson | Simulations Results for Alignment |
| R4-2104839 | Apple | Simulation Results for Alignment |
| R4-2106471 | Qualcomm Incorporated | Simulation Results for Alignment |
| R4-2106507 | Intel Corporation | Simulation Results for Alignment |
| R4-2106783 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Simulation Results for Alignment |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 2-1: Simulation results for alignment

**Issue 3-2-1: Simulation results summary**

* Recommended WF

Companies are encouraged to summarize their results in the summary document which will be shared via mail during the meeting (please see below in Section 5, **‘Existing TDocs’**).

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

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*Companies are encouraged to comment in the dedicated comment section below each issue.*

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on … | YYY |  |
| LS on … | ZZZ | To: RAN\_X; Cc: RAN\_Y |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation**  | **Comments** |
| R4-2104840 | Summary of simulation results for NR-U UE Demod | Apple |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
	1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
	2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

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

Notes:

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