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# Overall Description

In 3GPP TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #94, following agreements have been reached on the simulation evaluation of reference signals in the NR-RIM frameworks.

Agreements:

For simulation evaluation of reference signals in the NR-RIM frameworks

* Following Descriptions of the RS should be provided
  + *RS sequence*
  + *Length of RS sequence*
  + *Time/frequency pattern of RS*

*Time pattern (number of symbols)*

*Frequency pattern*

* Following analytical metrics of the RS should be provided
  + *The complexity of reference signal detection at gNB*
  + *Overhead*
  + *Impact on UEs*
  + *Others*
* Simulation
  + *Simulation parameters*

*SCS:* 30 kHz (mandatory) / 15 KHz (optional)

*Simulation bandwidth:* 20 MHz

*gNB MIMO configuration:* 1T1R (mandatory)/1T2R(optional)

*Frequency offset:* 0 Hz

*FFT size:* to be provided

*Length of detection window Lsymbol:* to be provided

*Channel model:*

Option1: AWGN with random complex phase

Option2: TDL-E (K-factor = [22] dB, DS = [30] ns, Doppler [0] Hz)

FFS: whether one of the two options or both options are mandatory.

*Delay of received RS:* When multiple RSs arrive in the detection window, the arrival time of the *i*-th RS respect to the start of the detection window, △*i* , is uniformly distributed within [-*Lsymbol*, *Lsymbol*], where *Lsymbol* is the length of UL symbol based on the numerology of RS.

*Power of received RS:*

Option1: Pi of multiple RSs have a power offset with respect to the reference power P0, where the power offset is randomly selected from [-0.5dB, 0.5dB].

Use option1 as starting point for evaluation, FFS other option(s), e.g., different power offset ranges.

* + *Simulation cases and related metrics*

*Case 1: Single RS + AWGN (mandatory)*

Metric: the minimum SNR where detection probability of [90%] and a false alarm requirement of [1%]

FFS: successful detection time, e.g., one-shot.

*Case 2: Multiple RS + AWGN (mandatory)*

Number of total RSs arrived within one detection window: FFS

Number of base sequences arrived within the detection window: FFS

Metric: FFS.

An email discussion has been assigned to finalize the additional simulation assumptions for RIM till 9/7.

# Discussions on the additional simulation assumptions for NR-RIM reference signal evaluation

## 2.1 Simulation parameters

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Simulation parameters** | |
| SCS | 30 kHz (mandatory) / 15 KHz (optional) |
| Simulation bandwidth | 20 MHz |
| gNB MIMO configuration | 1T1R (mandatory)/1T2R(optional) |
| Frequency offset | 0 Hz |
| FFT size | to be provided |
| Length of detection window Lsymbol | to be provided |
| Channel model | Option1: AWGN with random complex phase  Option2: TDL-E (K-factor = [22] dB, DS = [30] ns, Doppler [0] Hz)  FFS: whether one of the two options or both options are mandatory |
| Delay of received RS | When multiple RSs arrive in the detection window, the arrival time of the *i*-th RS respect to the start of the detection window, △*i* , is uniformly distributed within [-*Lsymbol*, *Lsymbol*], where *Lsymbol* is the length of UL symbol based on the numerology of RS. |
| Power of received RS | Option1: Pi of multiple RSs have a power offset with respect to the reference power P0, where the power offset is randomly selected from [-0.5dB, 0.5dB].  Use option1 as starting point for evaluation, FFS other option(s), e.g., different power offset ranges. |

1. Question 1: channel model
   1. For the two options of channel model, whether one of the two options or both options are mandatory? If only one should be considered as mandatory, which one should it be?
   2. For the TDL-E model, what is the recommended values for K-factor, DS, and Doppler, and what is the reason behind the selections?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Ericsson | 1 & 2, or only 2 | As stated during the RAN1#94 discussion, if only mandating a simplistic model (single static tap AWGN) we believe it could have a too large impact on the RS design and evaluation. Using a multi-path channel, one gets, to start with, fading that will cause the target SNR to be more realistic than in pure static conditions. Further, there will be frequency selective fading which could have impact on the RS chosen and also the detector design (not assuming identical channel coefficients across the whole RS). Then the question is if the TDL-E with the parameters above is good enough to represent a multi-path channel. To us, this is of secondary interest and the important point is that it is at least better than using only a static channel tap for our evaluations.  a) We are ok with both as mandatory, or only having TDL-E as mandatory  b) To our knowledge, there are limited field trials in the area, but some indications that the delay spread is low, and also that LOS is present. Using the parameters above are fine with us. Maybe one could increase the Doppler slightly to model effects of moving surrounding environment, e.g. 1 Hz as used in the work NB-IoT and eMTC, but this is not expected to have an impact on our performance evaluation. |
|  |  |  |

1. Question 2: Power of received RS
   1. Should other options be considered for the power of received RS within the detection window, and what is the reason behind it?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | As stated in the RAN1#94 discussions, we do not agree with the reasoning behind [-0.5,0.5] dB (assuming free space propagation ignoring antenna gain), it will though result in getting some sort of worst case performance at least for the case of single RS detection. In case of multi-RS detection and if multiple RSs would have to be detected in the same detection window, a strong power imbalance between them would lead to a more challenging detection. The answer to this question has thus a relation to the multi-RS model and the number of RSs that the gNB should detect (see Q6). In case RAN1 agrees on a single RS detection per detection window, the assumption on [-0.5,0.5] dB seems sufficient (and would represent a worst-case detector scenario).  We would though prefer to keep things simple and apply 0 dB instead of the [-0.5,0.5 ] dB distribution. This is more easily motivated (worst case detector assumptions) and would result in the same performance. |
|  |  |

## 2.2 Simulation cases and related metrics

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Case 1: Single RS + AWGN (mandatory)* | |
| Metric | the minimum SNR where detection probability of [90%] and a false alarm requirement of [1%]  FFS: successful detection time, e.g., one-shot. |

1. Question 3: Metrics for Case 1: single RS+AWGN
   1. What is recommended values for detection probability, false alarm requirement and the number of detection times (one-shot or multiple-shot)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | This has a large dependency on how the detector is designed. For example, do we assume that a missed detection can be corrected in the next opportunity when the RS is sent. The implications of this to the system performance will depend on for example the time period between RSs. Also, for false detection, if the detector takes a decision of a specific RS only after X number of consecutive detections (e.g.) it will have a great impact on the overall false alarm (even if the ‘per detection’ false alarm can be relatively high). We are OK to start with the numbers within brackets to get some results on the table for discussion. What is important to start with is a common baseline and the possibility to compare results between companies. For this reason, we also proposed to use single-shot as baseline, even though actual implementations might use multi-shot detection. However, assuming uncorrelated error events between multiple shots, it should be possible to derive multi-shot performance from single-shot simulations |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Case 2: Multiple RS + AWGN (mandatory)* | |
| Number of total RSs arrived within one detection window | FFS |
| Number of base sequences arrived within the detection window | FFS |
| Metric | FFS |

1. Question 4: Metrics for Case 2: *Multiple RS + AWGN*
   1. What is the recommended value for the total RSs arrived within one detection window, and what is the reason behind the selection?
   2. What is the recommended value for the number of base sequences arrived within the detection window, and what is the reason behind the selection?
   3. What metric(s) should be considered for the multiple RS case?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | There is no doubt that there will be a lot of RSs received in case of duct, the question is how many of them are worth modelling. Having multiple paths using the same RS is important to model as well as having multiple RS sequences.  We proposed to split these two into separate multi-RS scenarios as shown in the figures below:    The leftmost figure would evaluate the impact of the auto-correlation in the design (as the single RS case but now with multiple temporally separated paths).  The rightmost figure would evaluate the impact on cross-correlation of the RS design.  The two cases are shown in the table below, assuming here constant power of 0 dB (see Q2).   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | RIM scheme | RS# | Power [dB] | Delay | RS | | RIM-1 | RS-1 | 0 | [-Lsymb,Lsymb] | RS-A | | RS-2 | 0 | [-Lsymb,Lsymb] | RS-A | | … | … | … | … | | RS-5 | 0 | [-Lsymb,Lsymb] | RS-A | | RIM-2 | RS-1 | 0 | [-Lsymb,Lsymb] | RS-A | | RS-2 | 0 | [-Lsymb,Lsymb] | RS-B | | … | … | … | … | | RS-5 | 0 | [-Lsymb,Lsymb] | RS-E |   Regarding metrics, the same as in the single RS case can be re-used also here. |
|  |  |

## 2.3 Others

1. Question 5: Are there any other consideration on the simulation assumption or methodology you would like to share or clarify?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | See question 6 & 7 |
|  |  |

1. Question 6: How many RSs should the gNB attempt to detect in each detection window?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | To simplify our work and avoid complex receivers (e.g. SIC architecture), which also will cause a larger performance spread between companies, we propose **one RS** detected per detection window. The cross-correlation aspects will still be modelled, especially if all RSs are received with relatively equal power (see response to Q2), since sequences with poor cross-correlation would increase the false-alarm rate. Hence, we don’t see a loss in modelling by this simplification, although a gNB in the field might detect multiple RSs in each instance. |
|  |  |

1. Question 7: How should the false detection rate of RS evaluated?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | By only AWGN input to the receiver, i.e. modelling thermal noise |

# Next Step

The email discussion should be wrapped up before Sept. 7th. Companies are encouraged to feedback their comments regarding the questions in Section 2 before Sept. 5th, and start simulations for RS reference signal evaluation as soon as possible.
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