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# Introduction

This document is to address the following email discussion:

* [POST125bis][021][AI/ML mobility ] Simulation assumptions and methodology (Oppo)

 Intended outcome: Agree to set of common and RRM prediction use case simulation assumptions and methodology

 Deadline: three weeks

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Delegate name | Email address |
| OPPO | Zhongda Du | duzhongda@oppo.com  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Xin Wang | wangx@docomolabs-beijing.com.cn |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Discussion

## General aspect

Before diving into discussion on detailed simulation assumption and methodology/metrics, it could be helpful to identify study goal(s) of this SID in general, which could be used to guide the discussion. For discussion purposes, the case where no AI/ML model is used is called the benchmark case, where measurement is performed based on the current procedure and no measurement is reduced in any domain.

From the online discussion, measurement overhead reduction is one of the most interested goals. It was agreed that it is applied for FR1\_to\_FR1 handover scenario including intra-frequency and inter-frequency measurement and prediction. It could be also applied for FR2\_to\_FR2 intra-frequency measurement and prediction. For such purpose, simulation assumptions could be set as such that measurement could be challenging. For example, when setting the 2nd central frequency for FR1\_to\_FR1 scenario, we’d better choose two frequencies with some distance so that in general measurement gap is needed to perform inter-frequency measurement.

Another study goal could be improvement of handover performance. For FR1\_to\_FR1 case it may be not so attractive considering the handover performance is actually good in the field. But for FR2\_to\_FR2 it does. It is mainly because usually the ISD of FR2 is relatively smaller compared to FR1 cell and it demands effective measurement in order to make quick and right handover decision. On the other hand, UE need to spend time to measure analogy beams which is not efficient compared to FR1 carriers. When setting up simulation assumption for such study goal, some of the parameters like high UE speed could be considered so that handover performance gain powered by AI/ML model can be reflected in some way. You can find more in contributions [16][17] about such study goal discussion.

**Conclusion 1: 1st study goal of evaluation is to reduce measurement overhead**

**Conclusion 2: 2nd study goal of evaluation is to enhance handover performance**

**Question 2.1-1: Do you agree that FR2\_to\_FR2 intra-frequency scenario could be evaluated also to reduce measurement overhead i.e.,1st study goal apart from FR1\_to\_FR1 scenario?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2.1-2: Do you agree that only FR2\_to\_FR2 intra-frequency scenario is evaluated to improve handover performance i.e., 2nd study goal?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In order to achieve 1st goal, it is natural that the input measurement results, regardless it is L1 beam level measurement or L3 cell level measurement, should be reduced compared to benchmark case. But we also need to keep in mind that even though measurement can be reduced to some extent, still handover performance should not be degraded too much. It is still FFS how much handover performance degradation can be tolerated.

In order to achieve 2nd gaol with maximum performance gain, it is also natural that there is no any reduction of measurement result as input. However, technically it is possible that some level of handover performance can be still achieved as long as measurement is reduced not so much. Then one question could be raised: should we also study those middle cases (with question mark) as illustrated in Figure 2.1-1:



Figure 2.1-1 handover performance vs measurement reduction [17]

Rapporteur’s view is that we should focus on the case where maximum handover performance can be achieved and hence no measurement should be reduced. The middle case could still happen in field by deployment, but there is not so much value for study and evaluation, after cases with the highest gain and the least gain are evaluated.

**Question 2.1-3: For the evaluation exercise for 2nd study goal, do you agree that RAN2 should initially focus on the case with the highest gain and hence input measurement results of AI/ML model is not reduced?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | Our opinion is that the existing measurement should be the baseline for both AI/ML and legacy HO. With initial results of baseline schemes, we can further explore the methods for the 1st study goal. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Methodology and metrics

### Metrics

To facilitate the discussion, rapporteur takes the liberty to categorise RRM measurement prediction as follows based on [agreements in RAN2#125bis](#_Annex2_agreements_in):

RRM sub case 1: To predict beam level results, then generate cell level results based on the predicted beam results

RRM sub case 2: To directly predict cell level results based on cell level results

RRM sub case 3: Directly predict cell level results based on beam level results

The RRM sub case 1 is bit different from other two sub cases i.e., the direct output of model is beam level results but not cell level result. For RRM case 1, the RSRP difference could be interpreted as L1 RSRP difference for RRM case 1. For RRM case 2 and case 3, RSRP difference can be only interpreted as L3 RSRP difference. It is rapporteur’s understanding here the term “cell level results” refer to L3 cell level measurement results but not L1 cell level measurement results. Without aligned metrics, it will be difficult to compare model performance among 3 RRM sub-cases. Rapporteur believe it is necessary to align metrics among 3 RRM sub cases. Considering the eventual output of the 3 sub cases are all L3 cell level measurement result, the RSRP difference should be interpreted as RSRP difference between predicted L3 cell level measurement result and actual L3 cell level measurement result. Actual measurement is performed in benchmark case.

**Question 2.2.1-1: Do you agree that the prediction accuracy metric for RRM measurement prediction is defined as “RSRP difference between predicted L3 cell level measurement result and actual L3 cell level measurement result” for all RRM sub cases? If you have different interpretation, please provide your version.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | We prefer to follow the definition from Rel. 18 AI/ML for BM in TR38.843 with revisions from beam to cell, which isThe difference between the L3 cell-level measurement results (measured on the predicted time slots) of the Top-1 predicted cell and the L3 cell-level measurement results of the actual Top-1 cell.The reason is to highlight the impacts of the prediction error if the HO target is selected based on the cell with the best-predicted measurement results.Rapporteur: I am bit confused by the wording “top-1”. Do you assume cluster approach here? If we do it based on either intra or inter-cell case, the cell of input and output is fixed, right?For Case 1, the RSRP difference can also be calculated at beam-level. Rapporteur: this issue is addressed in question 2.2.1-2 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

If the answer to the above question is yes, one more question is that for RRM sub case 1, whether L1 RSRP difference between predicted and actual measurement needs to be also reported? Rapporteur believes the difference between RRM use case 1 and the other two sub cases are simulation methodology issue because eventually RAN2 is pursuing the prediction accuracy of L3 cell level measurement. In light of this, it may be not necessary to mandate company to report such L1 RSRP difference.

**Question 2.2.1-2: For RRM sub case 1, which option do you prefer?**

**Option 1: No L1 RSRP difference is necessary**

**Option 2: L1 RSRP difference is reported optionally i.e., up to company**

**Option 3: L1 RSRP difference is reported as mandatory**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred option | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 3 or Option 2 | Option 3 is more preferred. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

There are mainly 3 ways to express RSRP difference [20][21][22][17]:

Option 1: CDF of RSRP difference

Option 2: Average RSRP difference

Option 3: RMSE of RSRP difference

Option 4: X dB margin of RSRP difference

Option 1 is basically a curve which record the RSRP difference of the whole prediction process. It is helpful to reflect the detail performance with clear picture but maybe difficult to capture in the TR.

Option 2 and option 3 are both a value reflecting the whole process. Mathematically RMSE can reflect the range of the RSRP difference better. Option 4 is a percentage of the RSRP difference, which is lower than X db. In some case e.g., when a threshold is needed in [Question 2.2.2-2](#OLE_LINK2), a value or percentage is more useful than a curve. But it seems also a bit redundant if all of them are used.

**Question 2.2.1-3: Among listed 4 options, which one(s) do you prefer to be taken as metric of RRM measurement prediction use case? If you have more option to add, please provide your description.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred option(s) | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 2 and Option 1 | At least Option 2 can be mandatory. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

RAN2 agreed that “measurement reduction rate as one KPI”, however, there is no detailed definition. For intra-cell prediction the definition could be different between temporal domain and spatial domain prediction. For temporal domain RAN2 start with pure temporal domain for case A and case B. Here is rapporteur’s recommendation of the definition:

Measurement reduction rate in temporal domain (MRRT):

MRRT= skipped measurement time instances / total measurement time instances

Measurement reduction rate in spatial domain (MRRS):

MRRS = skipped beams to be measured/ total beams to be measured

**Question 2.2.1-4: Do you agree the recommended definition of MRRT and MRRS? If you have different opinions, please provide your recommendation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes, no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes (w/ comments) | Similarly, the KPI for frequency domain prediction can be defined as the ratio of the reduced measurement gap. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Methodology

The cell level results refer to L3 cell level measurement results, which is depicted as reference point C in the measurement model. But it is not clear what does “beam level results” mean in the agreements. It could be the raw L1 beam level measurement result without L1 filtering (depicted by reference point A) or L1 beam level measurement result after L1 filtering (depicted by reference point A1). Because L1 filtering is up to UE’s implementation, so it is not easy to explain the difference between reference A and A1. Note this issue is also related to question 2.3.1.5-1 i.e., whether fast fading should be modelled as part of the channel modelling. Without fast fading element, there is not much difference between reference point A and A1. With fast fading element, L1 raw data before L1 filtering can reflect the channel variation better.

**Question 2.2.2-0: For the “beam level results” in RRM case 1 and RRM case 3, which option do you prefer?**

Option1: It is raw L1 beam level measurement result without L1 filtering i.e., reference point A

Option2: it is L1 beam level measurement result after L1 filtering i.e., reference point A1

Option3: it is up to company to choose either reference point A or point A1 and report it when providing simulation result

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred option | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 3 | We think this is too detailed and should be up to the companies. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

RAN2 agreed at RAN2#125bis:

1. We will consider intra-frequency intra and inter-cell spatial domain measurement predictions, for beam and cell level measurements.
2. For temporal domain measurement prediction, we will consider the AI-PHY beam management Case A and Case B from the RAN1 AI/ML PHY TR and it applies to both beam level and cell level. As baseline we will focus on pure temporal prediction.

These two agreements imply RRM prediction could be categorised in following 3 dimensions:

**D1: intra-frequency or inter-frequency.**

As agreed during last meeting, there are 3 cases totally i.e., FR1\_to\_FR1 intra-frequency, FR1\_to\_FR1 inter-frequency and FR2\_to\_FR2 intra-frequency.

**D2: intra-cell or inter-cell or cluster approach.**

The intra-cell prediction basically means the input and output measurement result of the model comes from same cell. Obviously intra-cell can only be applied for intra-frequency case. Inter-cell prediction means the input and output of the model is different cell. It could be for either intra-frequency or inter-frequency case. It is not crystal clear what is cluster approach. Based on some offline discussion with proponents, it basically means the number of input cells could be more than one cell [18] for intra-frequency prediction.

**D3: Temporal or spatial domain**

For temporal domain, RAN2 agreed that we will mimic case A and case B of BM case 2 in [38.843] in pure time domain as baseline. As for spatial domain prediction, it basically means UE will measure partially configured beams instead full set beams to perform RRM measurement. For RRM sub case 1, it also means that beam level measurement result of partial beams (i.e., not measured ones) is predicted based on measurement of other beams (i.e., measured ones).

The 1st step we can do is to list all the potential combinations and check which of them are valid case to be discussed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Scenarios | FR1\_to\_FR1 or FR2\_to\_FR2 intra-frequency | FR1\_to\_FR1 inter-frequency |
| Intra-cell | Intra\_F\_C\_T: temporal domain, to be clarifiedIntra\_F\_C\_S: spatial domain (FR2\_to\_FR2 only), to be clarified | Invalid case |
| Inter-cell | Intra\_F\_Inter\_C: To be clarified | Inter\_F\_C: to be clarified |
| Cluster approach | Intra\_F\_Cluster: To be clarified | Invalid case |

Table 2.2.2-2 prediction combinations

**Question 2.2.2-1: Do you agree with listed combinations in Table 2.2.2-2? If you have more cases to be discussed, please provide your case with detail description.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | yes or no  | Comments or more case(s) |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | The cluster approach is still valid for the FR1\_to\_FR1 inter-frequency case because the model's input can be the measurements of a cluster of cells on Band #1, and the model's output can be the predicted value for another cluster of cells on Band #2. Of course, the two clusters include different cells, but it is still a cluster-based approach.Rapporteur: Because this is additional one, I assume you are at least fine with the combinations listed in the table, right? The cluster approach is addressed in question 2.2.2-13For all 4 cases about Inter-cell and cluster approaches, the sub-cases of T and S domains are also available. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Combination Intra\_F\_C\_T refers temporal domain for both FR1\_to\_FR1 or FR2\_to\_FR2 intra-frequency intra-cell prediction. RAN2 agreed to mimic case A and case B in TR [2] without mixing spatial domain as baseline. Here is the Figure for case A in [2]:



Figure 2.2.2-1

Case A basically mean measurement result in future of one cell e.g., cell A is predicted based on historical ones of the same cell A. It can be further illustrated with Figure 2.2.1-1:



Figure 2.2.2-2 Intra-cell temporal domain prediction – case A

The reason for UE to predict RRM measurement results in future is to report either the measurement results or other associated event e.g., measurement event to network in advance so that network can trigger handover in the right time. Rapporteur’s understanding is that such evaluation is targeting 2nd goal discussed before and hence no measurement reduction is necessary. Observation window refer to a duration UE perform the actual measurements. When UE perform measurement in predicted instance(s), that instance(s) becomes part of the observation window instead of prediction window as illustrated in Figure 2.2.2-2 i.e., observation window and prediction window will slide when more measurement(s) is performed by UE in temporal domain. The prediction window depends on inner elements like model performance and observation window length and also outer element like radio channel. Regardless of these elements, the predicted measurements within prediction window should meet some predefined prediction accuracy because otherwise it doesn’t make sense.

One example of description of methodology of Intra\_F\_C\_T\_Case A: Intra-cell temporal domain prediction is done by predicting measurement result(s) in prediction window based on measurement results in observation window of the same cell for both FR1\_to\_FR1 and FR2\_to\_FR2 intra-frequency scenario, where the prediction accuracy of the measurement result(s) in prediction window should be higher than one predefined threshold. The predefined threshold should be aligned among companies. The detail value is FFS.

**Question 2.2.2-2: How do you think of the example methodology** **of Intra\_F\_C\_T\_Case A? If have better formulation, please provide your recommendation.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | comment | other formulation |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For temporal domain prediction case B, here is the Figure in [2]:



Figure 2.2.2-3

In [2] ‘s description of case B: “based on a periodicity T of the required reference signals for measurements to achieve a certain beam prediction accuracy. An example is shown in Figure 6.3.1-3.

- For non-AI baseline (Option 2), every T=X ms reference signals for measurements are needed

- For AI, every T=Y ms, reference signals for measurements are needed”

Here non-AI baseline (option 2) is “sample and hold based on the previous measurements” in [2]. For RAN2’s evaluation, to make it simple no such baseline is needed i.e., in the benchmark case all measurement instances are measured by UE. So essentially case B means some of the time instances are skipped by UE, whose measurement results will be predicted based on measured instances as illustrated in Figure 2.2.2-4.



Figure 2.2.2-4 intra-cell temporal domain prediction – case B

In order to compare among companies, it seems necessary to align the measurement reduction rate so that prediction accuracy can be compared with each other. For the same reduction rate, the skipping pattern i.e., which instances are skipped and hence predicted in temporal domain could be left to company’s implementation because otherwise there are too much combinations. Rapporteur’s view is that the result is comparable as long as reduction rate is aligned and believe detail pattern doesn’t matter too much. Obvious case B is targeting goal 1.

Example methodology of Intra\_F\_C\_T\_Case B: Intra-cell temporal domain prediction is done by predicting sub set measurement instances in temporal domain of the same cell for both FR1\_to\_FR1 and FR2\_to\_FR2 intra-frequency scenario. The measurement reduction rate should be aligned among companies. The detail value is FFS.

**Question 2.2.2-3: How do you think of example methodology of Intra\_F\_C\_T\_Case B? If you have better formulation, please provide detail description.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | comment | other formulation |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For both Intra\_F\_C\_T\_Case A and Intra\_F\_C\_T Case B, rapporteur’s understanding is that they are both applicable for 3 RRM sub cases. One more common issue is whether sampling period should be aligned among company or not. Note usual RAN4 assume UE will oversample within one measurement period. The minimum measurement period for FR1 and FR2 intra-frequency measurement is different. It hints the sampling period between FR1 and FR2 could be also different, if necessary.

**Question 2.2.2-4: For both Intra\_F\_C\_T\_Case A and Intra\_F\_C\_T Case B, which RRM sub cases are applicable?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | applicable RRM sub cases | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | All 3 sub cases | For Intra\_F\_C\_T\_Case A. We would like to clarify the meaning of CB\_1\_1\_Case BRapporteur: sorry this is a typo. it should be intra-frequency intra-cell time domain case B i.e. Intra\_F\_C\_T Case B |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2.2.2-5: For both Intra\_F\_C\_T\_Case A and Intra\_F\_C\_T Case B, do you think it is necessary to align sampling period? If so, please recommend sample period for both FR1 and FR2 respectively.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | Align with the typical SSB burst periodicity, i.e., 20ms. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For Intra\_F\_C\_S spatial domain prediction, the way to do it is different among RRM sub cases. For RRM sub case 1, it basically means the L1 beam level measurement result of sub set of configured reference signal e.g. SSB is predicted based on L1 beam level measurement result of other RS. And then L3 cell level measurement is got by UE after post processing, namely consolidation and L3 filtering. This is illustrated in Figure 2.2.2-5



Figure 2.2.2-5 Intra\_F\_C\_S intra-cell spatial domain prediction for RRM sub case 1

For RRM sub case 3 there is no such consolidation and L3 filtering. The procedure can be illustrated in Figure 2.2.2-6:



Figure 2.2.2-6 Intra\_F\_C\_S intra-cell spatial domain prediction for RRM sub case 3

In order to compare between the RRM sub case 1 and 3 and also to compare among companies result, it is necessary to align measurement reduction rate e.g., how much percentage of measurement of the SSB beams is skipped. Then by comparing the same metrics i.e., RSRP difference, we can know which method is better. If this is agreeable, one further issue is that whether company also need align detail skipping pattern in spatial domain. Rapporteur’s view is that this could be simply left to company because there could be so much detail pattern which doesn’t make too much difference with each other.

For RRM sub case 2 i.e., L3 to L3, it is not clear how to do it in spatial considering the input measurement is already L3 cell level measurement result. So, it seems Intra\_F\_C\_S is not applicable for RRM sub case 2.

Example methodology of Intra\_F\_C\_S: Intra-cell spatial domain prediction is done by measuring sub set of configured SSB as input to the model to predict L3 cell level measurements for every instance of the same cell. It is only applicable for FR2 intra-frequency scenario and RRM sub case 1 and 3. The measurement reduction rate should be aligned among company without defining detail pattern. The detail rate value is FFS.

**Question 2.2.2-6: How do you think of example methodology of Intra\_F\_C\_S? If you have better formulation, please provide detail description.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | comment | other formulation |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For Intra\_F\_Inter\_C and Inter\_F\_C, one relevant agreement is “We will consider intra-frequency intra and inter-cell spatial domain measurement predictions, for beam and cell level measurements”. If spatial domain measurement prediction is also applicable for inter-cell case, it basically means UE predict measurement of another cell (let’s say cell B) by measuring only **partial SSB** of the one cell (let’s say cell A). The intention of inter-cell prediction is to save measurement overhead of another cell. If it could be done the measurement reduction rate is 50% technically which is already plausible. Further reduction in cell A could make the prediction performance much worse. During offline discussion with proponent rapporteur’s view is confirmed. So for both Intra\_F\_Inter\_C and Inter\_F\_C, the measurement of cell A should not be reduced in both temporal and spatial domain.



Figure 2.2.2-7 inter-cell prediction

**Question 2.2.2-7: For both Intra\_F\_Inter\_C and Inter\_F\_C, do you agree that the measurement on source cell (cell A in the example) should not be reduced in both temporal and spatial domain? If no, please clarify which domain(s) can be reduced and why.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | At least for the baseline case, we start from the non-reduced measurements. Measurement reduction on the source cell can be further studied. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For Inter\_F\_C i.e., inter-frequency and inter-cell prediction for FR1\_to\_FR1 case, one task is left as following:

**Agreements to start evaluations**

* FR1-to-FR1
	+ Focus on intra-frequncy in time domain prediction for the purpose of measurement reduction
	+ Study inter-frequency scenario in terms of which scenarios can be studied without requiring new channel model and also resolving any simulation assumptions (if possible).
* FR2-to-FR2
	+ Focus on intra-frequency
	+ Perform evaluation both in time and spatial domain

The relevant section of 38.901[19] is section 7.6.5. Rapporteur’s understanding is that existing channel modelling in [19] only cover co-located scenario i.e., the discussion on channel modelling need be open by RAN1 for non-co-located case. And during offline discussion with proponents, it is also confirmed that some operators and vendors are fine to start from co-located. One thing needs to clarify that co-located scenario doesn’t mean prediction can only be done in the site where serving cell is located. For neighbouring site UE can also predict neighbouring cell on non-serving frequency by measurement neighbouring cell in serving frequency.

**Question 2.2.2-8: For Inter\_F\_C, do you agree RAN2 start evaluation from co-located scenario? If no, please clarify what scenario is necessary.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

If question 2.2.2-8 is confirmed, further question is what is the relationship between source cell (say cell A) and target cell (say cell B)? There are could be two cases:

* Case 1: cell A and cell B is in the same sector (assuming there are 3 sectors per gNB site)
* Case 2: cell A and cell B is neighbouring sector in the same gNB site

 

Figure 2.2.2-8.1 case 2 Figure 2.2.2-8.1 case 1

After offline discussion with company, rapporteur believe inter-frequency prediction itself is already difficult compared to other cases. The inter-sector prediction will make the situation even worse. In order to have reasonable prediction accuracy, RAN2 should focus on case 2.

**Question 2.2.2-9: Do you agree for Inter\_F\_C, RAN2 should focus on the case where cell A and cell B are in the same sector? If no, please clarify reason to support case 1 or other case.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes(need clarification) | It seems that the above descriptions of Case 1 and Case 2 are not aligned with the figures and the texts following the figures. We support that Cell A and Cell B are in the same sector. Rapporteur: thanks for spotting this😊 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For Inter\_F\_C it is not clear which RRM sub cases are applicable. RRM sub case 1 means beam level prediction is feasible between cell A and cell B one by one. RRM sub case 3 and case 2 cover the detail and imply L3 cell level measurement of cell B can be predicted based on either L1 beam level or L3 cell level measurements of cell A. They look more promising from rapporteur point of view.

**Question 2.2.2-10: Among RRM sub case 1,2,3, which one(s) is applicable for Inter\_F\_C?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: applicable RRM sub case(s) | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Alll 3 sub cases. | In our view, there are not enough results to support the down selection so far. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

When UE perform intra-frequency measurement, UE’s behaviour could be bit different between serving cell and neighbouring cell. But there is no difference between neighbouring cell regardless whether neighbouring cell is co-located with serving cell or not. But it is almost not feasible for UE to predict a non-co-located neighbouring cell by measuring serving cell since there is spatial consistency between them. So technically it may make sense to predict a co-located neighbouring cell by measuring serving cell.



Figure 2.2.2-9

**Question 2.2.2-11: Do you agree for Intra\_F\_Inter\_C, the main case is to predict co-located neighbouring cell by measuring serving cell? If no, please provide description of other case(s).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | Because the HO does not always occur among co-located neighbouring cells, we should consider more general cases. Besides, AI/ML should be stronger than legacy algorithms on complex tasks such as non-co-located cases. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Assuming the answer to question 2.2.2-10 is yes, the best case is that measurement of only two co-located neighbouring cells can be saved i.e., the gain is limited. Secondary when UE measure serving cell, the signal of other neighbouring cell including co-located ones will be most likely also received, in that case intra-frequency intra-cell can be conducted, which is technically more reliable. So, it seems not so attractive for RAN2 to evaluate Intra\_F\_Inter\_C.

**Question 2.2.2-12: Do you agree Intra\_F\_Inter\_C will not be evaluated at least in early stage?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

It is not crystal clear what does cluster approach mean. So, before RAN2 has common understanding it is very difficult to proceed with this approach. Rapporteur believe following issues should be first clarified:

Issue Intra\_F\_Cluster\_1: Among FR1\_to\_FR1 intra-frequency, FR1\_to\_FR1 inter-frequency and FR2\_to\_FR2 intra-frequency, which scenario is applicable?

Issue Intra\_F\_Cluster\_2: Is it applicable for co-located cells or also non-co-located cells?

Issue Intra\_F\_Cluster\_3: Assuming the number of input and output cells is IN\_N and OUT\_N respective, what is the relationship between IN\_N and OUT\_N e.g. should OUT\_N<= IN\_N, can OUT\_N>1, what is maximum number of IN\_N and OUT\_N etc.?

Issue Intra\_F\_Cluster\_4: Any adjustment on metrics is needed for cluster approach?

**Question 2.2.2-13: Company are kindly requested to answer Intra\_F\_Cluster\_1~4. If you have something more to clarify, please provide detail description.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer to issues | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Issue Intra\_F\_Cluster\_1: All 3 scenarios are applicable. For all scenarios, the input to the AI/ML model can be from multiple cells (incl. source and neighbouring). The output of the model can also be the prediction of multiple cells. The AI/ML models have advantages in learning the relations among cells compared with legacy methods. Therefore, the cluster-based approach may have more gains.Issue Intra\_F\_Cluster\_2: Both. Same comment as Question 2.2.2-11.Issue Intra\_F\_Cluster\_3: IN\_N and OUT\_N can be up to companies report.Issue Intra\_F\_Cluster\_4: The RSRP differences, which definition is based on our previous suggestion as,The difference between the L3 cell-level measurement results (measured on the predicted time slots) of the Top-1 predicted cell and the L3 cell-level measurement results of the actual Top-1 cell. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Simulation assumption

### FR1 and FR2

#### UE trajectory

In section 6.3.1 of TR 38.843, there are three options listed for trajectory modelling:

- Option 1: Linear trajectory model with random direction change.

- UE moving trajectory: UE will move straight along the selected direction to the end of an time interval, where the length of the time interval is provided by using an exponential distribution with average interval length, e.g., 5s, with granularity of 100 ms.

- UE moving direction change: At the end of the time interval, UE will change the moving direction with the angle difference A\_diff from the beginning of the time interval, provided by using a uniform distribution within [-45°, 45°].

- UE moves straight within the time interval with the fixed speed.

- Option 2: Linear trajectory model with random and smooth direction change.

- UE moving trajectory: UE will change the moving direction by multiple steps within an time internal, where the length of the time interval is provided by using an exponential distribution with average interval length, e.g., 5s, with granularity of 100 ms.

- UE moving direction change: At the end of the time interval, UE will change the moving direction with the angle difference A\_diff from the beginning of the time interval, provided by using a uniform distribution within [-45°, 45°].

- The time interval is further broken into N sub-intervals, e.g. 100ms per sub-interval, and at the end of each sub-interval, UE change the direction by the angle of A\_diff/N.

- UE moves straight within the time sub-interval with the fixed speed.

- Option 3: Random direction straight-line trajectories.

- Initial UE location, moving direction and speed: UE is randomly dropped in a cell, and an initial moving direction is randomly selected, with a fixed speed.

- The initial UE location should be randomly drop within the following blue area:



where d1 is the minimum distance that UE should be away from the BS.

- Each sector is a cell and that the cell association is geometry based.

- During the simulation, inter-cell handover or switching should be disabled.

Table 2.3.1-1

Note the UE trajectory in table 2.3.1-1 in RAN1’s simulation is only limited to serving cell. As RAN2 agreed that “Reuse current RAN1’s simulation assumptions as much as possible by extending data generation to neighbouring cells”, this agreement could be also applied for UE trajectory i.e., UE supposes to moves across cells. RAN2 also agreed that “UE trajectory model uses options 1-3 in TR 38.843 section 6.3.1 as the starting point. Down-selection to be discussed in email discussion”. From rapporteur point of view it would desirable that RAN2 can boil down to just one option to easy comparison among companies’ simulation result. Only few contributions show some preference e.g.,[9] propose option1,[10] propose “Prioritize UE trajectory model option 1 of TR 38.843 for low-speed UEs and straight-line trajectory for high-speed UEs”. Another approach could be that RAN2 agree on one option as default one. If company want to use UE trajectory different from default one, it should be provided together with simulation result.

**Question 2.3.1.1-1 How do you think of selection of UE trajectory among 3 options listed in table 2.3.1-1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred option(s) | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 3 | Option 3 is preferred to reduce the complexity of the simulation. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

2nd issue is what should UE do when UE reach boundary of the simulation environment. For example, the simulation environment consists of 2-tier model (7 sites, 3 sectors/cells per site). When a UE is dropped in some way within one of the cell, UE moves with one predefined UE trajectory. When UE reaches the boundary, how should UE do? TR[3] capture two approach in section 5.4.5.1 i.e., wrap-round model and bouncing circle. For the wrap-around model, when the UE hit the simulation border (the wrap-around contour), it will wrap around and enter the simulation area from a different point on the wrap-around contour. For the bouncing-circle model, when the UE hit the simulation border (the bouncing-circle), it will bounce back with a random angle. For the bouncing-circle approach, the simulation area within the bouncing-circle should include 1 tier of complete sites. Only the results from the inner tiers of the sites will be logged, including all the outer border area of the sites.[12] propose 3rd options where the UE trajectory is terminated when UE hits the simulation border. TR[2] also adopt option3. These 3 options are illustrated with a nice Figure in [12].

 

Option 1 Option 2 Option 3

Figure 2.3.1-1: 3 Options for boundary processing [12]

[11] also proposes option 1 and option 2. The main issue for option 1 and 2 is that UE will change UE trajectory suddenly and hence cause sudden change of measurement result of same cell. On the other hand, a UE trajectory with relative long time is also necessary to study mobility performance.

**Question 2.3.1.1-2 How do you think of selection boundary processing as illustrated in Figure 2.3.1-1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred option(s) | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 2 or Option 3 | To control the simulation complexity. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Traffic model

In the simulation assumption from contribution [4][5][6][7][8][11], no one select traffic model as simulation parameter. [13] also propose not to consider user plane related performance. Without simulating traffic model, a lot calculation power can be saved during simulation which help make progress in RAN2.

**Question 2.3.1.2-1 Do you agree that no traffic model is simulated in order to evaluate user plane related performance e.g., user throughput?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes, no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | No user throughput simulations at least for the early stage of this SI. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### UE distribution

There are basically two issues for UE distribution:

Issue1: the possibility for UE to be distributed indoor or outdoor area.

Issue2 how to drop UE into simulation environment.

For issue 1, contribution [6][7][8][12] propose only consider outdoor. If we need consider indoor case, the channel model would also consider indoor scenario or outdoor to indoor scenario. It will make the simulation itself complicated. For 1st study goal, it seems not necessary to have such complexity. For 2nd study goal, there is other parameters e.g. UE speed, or T310 etc. to set up challenging scenario. Maybe it is easy to simply focus on dropping UE outdoor only.

**Question 2.3.1.3-1 Do you agree that UE is dropped 100% outdoor? If no, please clarify your preference**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes, no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes (w/ comments) | The baseline case can be 100% outdoor. Suggest not to preclude other options. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Contribution [6] also propose 3 options to drop UE:

* Option 1: the UE is randomly dropped within the cell;
* Option 2: the UE is randomly dropped at the edge of cell;
* Option 3: the UE is randomly dropped at the edge of cell and sector;

 

 Option 2[6] option 3[6]

Option 1 is adopted in the TR 38.843. By dropping UE at cell and/or sector edge more UEs will experience handover procedure compared to option 1. For RRM measurement prediction use case, it doesn’t matter too much. But it may matter for other use cases related to handover procedure e.g. measurement event prediction etc.

**Question 2.3.1.3-2 How do you think of drop option(s)? If you have other option, please describe the details.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | preferred option(s) | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 2 or Option 3 | These two options make the simulations more efficient. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### UE speed

As for UE speed, the candidate value is 3,30,60,90,120 Km/h. For 1st study goal, it doesn’t make too much sense to evaluate high speed. While for 2nd study goal, comparison between different speed is helpful to understand the performance gain brough by model in different speed. Since UE speed is a critical parameter for simulation on mobility performance, it would be desirable that company have common understanding which UE speed(s) should be evaluated.

**Question 2.3.1.4-1 Which UE speeds among 3,30,60,90,120 Km/h are chosen for which handover scenario (FR1\_to\_FR1, FR2\_to\_FR2) and for what purpose (e.g., study goal1, study goal 2)? Note selected UE speeds could be sub set or full set of the listed ones.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | chosen set of UE speeds and corresponding handover scenario, purpose | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | 30, 60, 90, 120 kmph as common assumptions. | 3 kmph may be used only if the indoor UEs are considered. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Channel modelling

Contribution [14] raised few issues w.r.t. channel model additionally. [14] has propose 8 “For simplified simulation, fast-fading model is optional, whether to adopt it is up to each company.” The modelling of fast fading can be time-consuming and has limited impact on cell-level results that have been L1/L3 filtered. On the other hand, L1 beam level measurement is input parameter in RRM sub case 1 and 3. And so far, it is not clear whether it should be L1 filtered or not. In addition, for RLF/HOF evaluation, L1 raw data (before L1 filtering) with fast fading is expected to reflect the variation of wireless channel. The concern on work load is at the phase to generate dataset instead of running simulation phase. If fast fading is deemed necessary for RLF/HOF evaluation, then it could be also used for RRM measurement prediction since anyway it will be there. Another approach is that for RRM measurement prediction use case, fast fading may be optional . If it is necessary for RLF/HOF evaluation, it can be added on top of agreed simulation assumption.

**Question 2.3.1.5-1 In which use case(s)/sub-use case(s), do you think that fast-fading model is necessary?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | At least for RRM measurement prediction, since the channel will be too deterministic without the fast-fading model. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[14] also propose following models in TR38.901[15] are not considered to simplify the channel modelling for RAN2:

- Oxygen absorption (7.6.1 of TR 38.901)

- Large bandwidth and large antenna array (7.6.2)

- Time-varying Doppler shift (7.6.6)

- UT rotation (7.6.7)

- Explicit ground reflection model (7.6.8)

- Blockage (7.6.4)

RAN2 already agreed not to consider UE(UT) rotation. In addition, bandwidth and antenna array are covered by system bandwidth and gNB/UE antenna configuration parameters and hence not discussed over here.

**Question 2.3.1.5-2 Do you agree to not consider Oxygen absorption (7.6.1), Time-varying Doppler shift (7.6.6), Explicit ground reflection model (7.6.8) and blockage (7.6.4)? If you have any further model to be skipped by RAN2, please provide it with detail comments.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | Firstly, the Time-varying Doppler shift is necessary since we are simulating UE mobility across a long distance, the Doppler shift changes with the UE position.Second, the blockage can be optionally adopted, which is a practical case for causing HO in real-life networks. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

One more issue raised by from [14] is spatial dependency during LOS and NLOS transition. [14] believe that FR2 band is easily broken, and means that mobility performance highly depends on the LOS-NLOS transition. And TR 38.901 defines modelling methodology of LOS-NLOS transition called LOSsoft, as a spatial consistency model. LOSsoft state is an intermediate state between transitions which depend on correlation distance and frequency band. And [14] propose “RAN2 shall consider spatial consistency of LOS-NLOS transition, according to TR 38.901”. Note it is also complicated to add this model into channel modelling. So, there is trade-off between complexity and performance gain. Since it is so far proposed only by one company, there could be 3 options:

Option 1: it is mandatory in the channel modelling ([14]’s proposal)

Option 2: it is optional in the channel modelling

Option 3: it is not considered in the channel modelling

**Question 2.3.1.5-3 Which option do you prefer in terms of LOSsoft?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: option1, option2, option3 | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 2 | It should be encouraged to model it. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### FR2

Contributions [4][5][6][7][8][11] list detail simulation assumptions. The cross check among those contributions shows that some of the parameters are not necessary for RAN2 simulation. Table 2.3.4-1 list the parameters which are chosen by all or majority of the previous contributions from table 6.3.1-1[2].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value |
| Frequency Range | FR2 @ 30 GHz; SCS: 120 kHz |
| Deployment | 200m ISD, 2-tier model with wrap-around (7 sites, 3 sectors/cells per site)Other deployment assumption is not precluded |
| Channel model | UMa with distance-dependent LoS probability function defined in Table 7.4.2-1 in TR 38.901. |
| System BW | 80MHz |
| UE Speed | For spatial domain beam prediction: 3km/hFor time domain beam prediction: 30km/h (baseline), 60km/h (optional) 90km/h (optional), 120km/h (optional)Other values are not precluded |
| UE distribution | 10 UEs per sector/cell for system performance related KPI (if supported) [e.g., throughput] for full buffer traffic (if supported) evaluation (model inference).X UEs per sector/cell for system performance related KPI for FTP traffic (if supported) evaluation (model inference).Other values are not precluded. Number of UEs per sector/cell during data collection (training/testing) is reported by companies if relevant.For spatial domain beam prediction (optional to compare different UE distributions assumptions):- Option 1: 80% indoor ,20% outdoor as in TR 38.901- Option 2: 100% outdoorFor time domain prediction: 100% outdoor |
| BS Antenna Configuration | Antenna setup and port layouts at gNB: (4, 8, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1), (dV, dH) = (0.5, 0.5) λOther assumptions are not precluded. Companies to explain TXRU weights mapping.Companies to explain beam selection.Number of BS beams: 32 or 64 downlink Tx beams (max number of available beams) at NW side. Other values, e.g., 256 not precluded. |
| BS Antenna radiation pattern | TR 38.802 Table A.2.1-6, Table A.2.1-7 |
| UE Antenna Configuration | Antenna setup and port layouts at UE: (1, 4, 2, 1, 2, 1, 1), 2 panels (left, right)Other assumptions are not precludedCompanies to explain TXRU weights mapping.Companies to explain beam and panel selection.Number of UE beams: 4 or 8 downlink Rx beams (max number of available beams) per UE panel at UE side. Other values, e.g., 16 not precluded. |
| UE Antenna radiation pattern | TR 38.802 Table A.2.1-8, Table A.2.1-10 |
| BS Tx Power | 40 dBm (baseline)Other values (e.g., 34 dBm) not precluded |
| Maximum UE Tx Power | 23 dBm |
| BS receiver Noise Figure | 7 dB |
| UE receiver Noise Figure | 10 dB |
| Inter site distance | 200 m |
| BS Antenna height | 25 m |
| UE Antenna height | 1.5 m |
| Spatial consistency | At least for BM-Case1, companies report the one of spatial consistency procedures: - Procedure A in TR38.901- Procedure B in TR38.901 |
| UE trajectory model | Please check section 2.3.1 |

Table 2.3.4-1

Since no one mention whether any parameter could be different between UE and network sided model, as starting point, parameters in the table 2.3.3-1 is assumed common for both UE sided model and network sided model unless otherwise described by rapporteur.

**Question 2.3.4-1 Do you agree to take simulation parameter in table 2.3.4-1 as starting point for both UE sided model and network sided model? If you have different opinion, please provide your detail comments.**

*Note detail value will be discussed in later questions i.e., here the focus is to remove or to add parameters and whether parameter is UE or network sided model specific.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

There are proposals from company about detail values. We will discuss them one by one. W.r.t. frequency range, RAN2 agreed that “For FR2, only FR2-1 is considered, e.g., band n257. 30GHz central frequency can be adopted to reuse RAN1’s work as much as possible. FFS any other band”. Only contribution [8] propose 28GHz for FR2-1. Rapporteur believe it is not necessary to add one more frequency just due to such minority view.

**Question 2.3.4-2 Do you agree for FR2-1, only 30GHz is adopted as central frequency?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For inter-site distance, majority company e.g.,[6][7][8] prefer 200m for FR2-1 apart from [4], which propose 500ms. FR2 is potential frequency range to be evaluated for 2nd study goal i.e., to improve handover performance. ISD with 500m can’t set up a challenging scenario for such study goal.

**Question 2.3.4-3 Do you agree that ISD for FR2 should be 200m? If you have different opinion, please provide detail value.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

As for channel modelling, RAN2 agreed “focus on Urban Macro (UMa) for FR1 and Umi for FR2”. By combining this agreement with value of “channel model” in table 2.3.4-1, the starting point for FR2 could be “UMi with distance-dependent LoS probability function defined in Table 7.4.2-1 in TR 38.901”.

**Question 2.3.4-4 Do you agree that the baseline channel model for FR2 is defined as “UMi with distance-dependent LoS probability function defined in Table 7.4.2-1 in TR 38.901”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Apart from uncertain parameters in table 2.3.4-1. There may be some other parameters to be discussed by companies.

**Question 2.3.4-5 Do you have any other parameters to be discussed? If so, please provide detail description and reason behind.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Any other parameters? | comments |
|  |  |  |

### FR1

At last RAN2 meeting, it was agreed that both FR1 and FR2 should be evaluated. As for simulation assumption there is no parameters was agreed as starting point for FR1 apart from propagation scenario (Uma i.e., Urban macro cell) and one central frequency (4GHz). It could be difficult to draft the simulation parameters from sketch. Rapporteur noticed that table 6.2.1-1 [2] is simulation assumptions for evaluation of CSI feedback, where the propagation scenario is Uma and the central frequency could be 4GHz. Some company also provide detail simulation assumptions for FR1. We can have a baseline table based on table 6.2.1-1 and company’s contribution.

**Question 2.3.3-1 Do you agree table 6.2.1-1 is taken as starting point for FR1 simulation assumptions?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes(w/ comments) | It is fine to use it as a template, but many revisions are necessary, and some items in the table are not necessary for our studies.We also suggest adding a parameter beam number to the table, which candidate value can be 4. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Then we start to discuss important assumptions. For FR1, RAN2 agreed that “For FR1, band n77/n78 is considered with 4GHz as the central frequency. FFS any other band”. The FFS is mainly for another frequency for inter-frequency scenario. 2GHz is proposed by [6] and RAN1 usually also use 2GHz as FR1 frequency which is also reflected in table 6.2.1-1[2]. As for SCS, [5][8] propose to use 30KHz while [6] propose 15KHz. In real deployment 2GHz is more likely configured with 15KHz while 4GHz is more likely configured with 30KHz.

**Question 2.3.3-2 Do you agree to take {4GHz,30KHz} as frequency for intra-frequency scenario and {2GHz, 15KHz} as another frequency for inter-frequency scenario?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | For the inter-frequency scenario, we suggest considering two options. One could be 2GHz, as suggested, which is far from Band 1 (4GHz). Another could be a frequency not so far from the Band 1, such as 3.5GHz. With these two options, we can check the width of the frequency gap so that AI/ML can make a good prediction. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The deployment of FR1 could be same as FR2 i.e.,“2-tier model (7 sites, 3 sectors/cells per site)”. Thus could help to reduce simulation work load.

**Question 2.3.3-3 Do you agree that FR1 take the same deployment as FR2 i.e. to set up 2-tier model (7 sites, 3 sectors/cells per site)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The ISD in current table 6.2.1-1[2] is 200m. Based on contributions from company, it is likely that ISD of FR2 is 200m. Considering FR1 is usually for coverage purpose and the evaluation of FR1 is targeting 1st study goal, the ISD for FR1 could be more relaxed compared to FR2. In addition, contribution [5][6] propose ISD of FR1 is 500m.

**Question 2.3.3-3 Do you agree that ISD of FR1 is 500m? If no, please provide suggested value**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | 200m is more typical and widely used. |
|  |  |  |

As for the channel modelling, RAN2 agreed that “focus on Urban Macro (UMa) for FR1 and Umi for FR2”. So the recommended channel modelling is “UMi with distance-dependent LoS probability function defined in Table 7.4.2-1 in TR 38.901”

**Question 2.3.3-4 Do you agree that channel modelling of FR1 is “UMa with distance-dependent LoS probability function defined in Table 7.4.2-1 in TR 38.901”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

There are both 10 and 20MHz in current table 6.2.1-1[2]. 20MHz is proposed by [5][6]. Rapporteur think one bandwidth should be sufficient for evaluation.

**Question 2.3.3-5 Do you agree that system bandwidth for FR1 is 20MHz? If no, please provide your suggested bandwidth**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For parameters which is missed from table 6.2.1-1[2], a value is recommended by rapporteur based on contributions at last RAN2 meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | comment |
| Frequency Range | FR1 only, 2GHz as baseline, optional for 4GHz (if R16 as baseline)FR1 only, 2GHz with duplexing gap of 200MHz between DL and UL, optional for 4GHz (if R17 as baseline) | Up to Question 2.3.3-2 |
| Deployment | Dense Urban (Macro only) is a baseline.Other scenarios (e.g., UMi@4GHz 2GHz, Urban Macro) are not precluded. | Up to Question 2.3.3-3 |
| Channel model | According to TR 38.901 | Up to Question 2.3.3-4 |
| System BW | 10 MHz for 15kHz as a baseline, and configurations which emulate larger BW, e.g., same sub-band size as 40/100 MHz with 30kHz, may be optionally considered. Above 15kHz is replaced with 30kHz SCS for 4GHz (if R16 as baseline)20 MHz for 15kHz as a baseline (optional for 10 MHz with 15KHz), and configurations which emulate larger BW, e.g., same sub-band size as 40/100 MHz with 30kHz, may be optionally considered. Above 15kHz is replaced with 30kHz SCS for 4GHz (if R17 as baseline) | Up to Question 2.3.3-5 |
| UE Speed |  | Up to question 2.3.1.4 |
| UE distribution | CSI compression: 80% indoor (3 km/h), 20% outdoor (30 km/h)CSI prediction: 100% outdoor (10, 20, 30, 60, 120 km/h) including outdoor-to-indoor car penetration loss per TR 38.901 if the simulation assumes UEs inside vehicles. No explicit trajectory modeling considered for evaluations.please check question2.3.1.3-1 | Up to question 2.3.1.3 |
| BS Antenna Configuration | Companies need to report which option(s) are used between- 32 ports: (8,8,2,1,1,2,8), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.8)λ- 16 ports: (8,4,2,1,1,2,4), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.8)λOther configurations are not precluded. | No change |
| BS Antenna radiation pattern | 3-sector antenna radiation pattern, 8 dBi | Proposed by [5] |
| UE Antenna Configuration | 4RX: (1,2,2,1,1,1,2), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ for (rank 1-4)2RX: (1,1,2,1,1,1,1), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ for (rank 1,2)Other configuration is not precluded. |  |
| UE Antenna radiation pattern | Omni-direction | Proposed by [5][8] |
| BS Tx Power | 41 dBm for 10MHz, 44dBm for 20MHz, 47dBm for 40MHz | Up to Question 2.3.3-5 |
| Maximum UE Tx Power | 23dbm | Proposed by [4][5] |
| BS receiver Noise Figure | 5db | Proposed by [5][6] |
| UE receiver Noise Figure | 9dB |  |
| Inter site distance | 200m | Up to Question 2.3.3-3 |
| BS Antenna height | 25m |  |
| UE Antenna height | Follow TR36.873, which is 1.5m | Proposed by [5] |
| Spatial consistency | At least for BM-Case1, companies report the one of spatial consistency procedures: - Procedure A in TR38.901- Procedure B in TR38.901 | Same as FR2, which recommended by rapporteur |
| UE trajectory model |  | Up to Question 2.3.1.1 |

Table 2.3.3-1

**Question 2.3.3-6 Do you agree the recommended value for parameters with yellow colour in table 2.3.3-1 for FR1? If you have different opinion, please provide your comment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### FR1 inter-frequency specific

About inter-frequency correlation,[14] propose to consider section 7.6.5 of TR[15]. Contribution [8] propose few detail proposals. Rapporteur’s understand is that those proposals are aligned with basic principle in section 7.6.5[15].

**Question 2.3.3.1-1: Do you agree section 7.6.5 [15] is taken as baseline for inter-frequency correlation model?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### RRC parameters

To train model for RRM prediction use case, genie L3 cell level measurement result should be generated as label. In addition, for RRM sub case 1, the predicted L1 beam level measurement need be postprocessed so that a predicted L3 cell level measurement can be produced. That’s why RRC parameters related to consolidation and L3 filtering should be aligned among company. Contribution [7] also propose to align measurement gap configuration for inter-frequency scenario.

**Question 2.3.4-1: Do you agree to setup following RRC parameters as simulation assumption? If you have other parameters to recommend, please provide detail description.**

* RRC parameters for measurement consolidation
* RRC parameters for L3 filtering
* Measurement gap configuration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Position: yes or no | comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes(w/ comments) | The aligned parameters can be used for the baseline schemes. For the study on the overhead reduction, these parameters may be adjusted. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Applicability of simulation assumption

So far, the simulation assumptions discussion is based on the RRM measurement prediction use case. However RAN2 is planning discuss other use cases in future meeting including RAN2#126. If we can identify the common simulation assumption for all use cases as much as possible then it would save time to re-open the discussion again. And in future meeting RAN2 can focus on delta part i.e. something to add on or some parameter to be updated.

**Question 2.3.5-1: Which simulation assumptions discussed in section 2.3.1~2.3.3 are common for all use cases? If you identify that an assumption is use case specific, please explain the details.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Common simulation assumptions | Use case specific assumptions |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

# Reference

1. RP-234055 Study on Artificial Intelligence (AI)/Machine Learning (ML) for mobility in NR
2. TR 38.843 Study on Artificial Intelligence (AI)/Machine Learning (ML) for NR air interface
3. TR 36.839 Mobility enhancements in heterogeneous networks
4. R2-2403245 Simulation based evaluation of the AIML added mobility Ericsson
5. R2-2402673 Simulation assumption and evaluation methodology NEC
6. R2-2402751 Discussion on simulation assumption and evaulation methodology for AI mobility ZTE
7. R2-2403487 Discussion on simulation assumptions of AI for mobility Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
8. R2-2403498 Discussion on the simulation assumption and evaluation methodology of AI/ML for mobility NTT DOCOMO, INC.
9. R2-2403112 Discussion on simulation assumptions Huawei, HiSilicon discussion
10. R2-2403557 Simulation assumption and evaluation methodology Interdigital Inc.
11. R2-2402406 Simulation Assumption for AI/ML Mobility Intel Corporation
12. R2-2402562 Discussion on Simulation assumption and evaluation methodology vivo
13. R2-2402413 Simulation assumption and evaluation methodology Qualcomm
14. R2-2402445 Simulation Environments for AI/ML-assisted Mobility Samsung
15. 38.901 Study on channel model for frequencies from 0.5 to 100 GHz
16. R2-2402287 Discussion on Evaluation Methodology for AI Mobility MediaTek Inc.
17. R2-2402168 Discussion on RRM measurement prediction OPPO
18. R2-2402589 Discussion on RRM measurement prediction Samsung
19. 38.901 Study on channel model for frequencies from 0.5 to 100 GHz
20. R2-2402748 Discussion on RRM measurement prediction ZTE Corporation
21. R2-2402552 Initial consideration on RRM measurement prediction CMCC
22. R2-2402403 Areas of interest for RRM measurement prediction Intel Corporation

# Annex1 Measurement model



# Annex2 Agreements in RAN2#125bis

**Agreements**

1. For cell level measurement prediction model, at least consider the following cases:

Case 1: To predict beam level results, then generate cell level results based on the predicted beam results;

Case 2: To directly predict cell level results based on cell level results.

Case 3: To directly predict cell level results based on beam level results

1. We will consider intra-frequency intra and inter-cell spatial domain measurement predictions, for beam and cell level measurements.
2. For temporal domain measurement prediction, we will consider the AI-PHY beam management Case A and Case B from the RAN1 AI/ML PHY TR and it applies to both beam level and cell level. As baseline we will focus on pure temporal prediction.
3. The following items can be considered as a baseline for the prediction accuracy of the cell-level measurement prediction：

Spatial-domain prediction： RSRP difference to the actual measurement

Temporal prediction:RSRP difference to the actual measurement

measurement reduction rate as one KPI

1. As a first step we will focus on measurement prediction accuracy. FFS whether and what system level performance evaluation is needed

**Agreements to start evaluations**

* FR1-to-FR1
	+ Focus on intra-frequncy in time domain prediction for the purpose of measurement reduction
	+ Study inter-frequency scenario in terms of which scenarios can be studied without requiring new channel model and also resolving any simulation assumptions (if possible).
* FR2-to-FR2
	+ Focus on intra-frequency
	+ Perform evaluation both in time and spatial domain

Agreements

1 AI mobility SI uses synthesized datasets based on 3GPP agreed channel model and deployment for evaluation. Field data is optional

2 Reuse current RAN1’s simulation assumptions as much as possible by extending data generation to neighbouring cells.

3 Once a set of simulation parameters and assumptions per each sub-use case (e.g., propagation scenario, deployment topology, channel modelling, UE trajectories, etc.) are settled, it should be used for baseline case (i.e. without AI/ML model), training (e.g. data set generation), validation, and inference etc.

4 Clarify and document the use of random seeds in between the training and test dataset, simulation drops/runs at least for channel modelling and UE trajectory.

5 Alignment of simulation assumptions is necessary, but explicit result calibration (e.g., as in TR 36.839) is not expected. Companies can independently report their gains achieved by AI/ML with detailed evaluation descriptions for cross-checking purposes.

6 For FR1, band n77/n78 is considered with 4GHz as the central frequency. FFS any other band

7 For FR2, only FR2-1 is considered, e.g., band n257. 30GHz central frequency can be adopted to reuse RAN1’s work as much as possible. FFS any other band

8 focus on Urban Macro (UMa) for FR1 and Umi for FR2

9 RAN2 takes hexagonal regular topology as the starting point.

10 Take baseline simulation assumptions from Table 6.3.1-1 in TR 38.843 for FR2 as the starting point for channel modelling, e.g., BS/UE antenna configuration, BS Tx power, and BS/UE antenna height. UE rotation is excluded in the initial phase of evaluation.

11 UE trajectory model uses options 1-3 in TR 38.843 section 6.3.1 as the starting point. Down-selection to be discussed in email discussion

12 AI/ML model generalization could be addressed after sufficient performance gains for different use cases are found.