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1. Introduction

During RAN#104 the study item on Spatial Channel Model was agreed, whereby the SI started during RAN4#112, within this contribution we present some views on the work plan of the Study Item as well as details of what Nokia believes should be included in TR 38.753.

Furthermore, during RAN#107 the study item was extended, such that the revised completion plenary was RAN#109, indicated in the new SID [1].

During RAN4#113 the work split for the TR was agreed, in this document, TR content for the conclusions chapter is included.

1. Text Proposal

***<Start of Change 1>***

8 Summary

8.1 General

* This Technical Report has studied candidate spatial channel models for NR demodulation performance requirements in FR1, considering both SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO scenarios, and evaluating CDL-based and Multi cluster TDL-based modelling approaches. The study has:Investigated methodology to generate repeatable spatial channel effects with manageable test complexity
* Compared performance outcomes across candidate models against agreed test cases
* Collected alignment results from multiple contributors to determine the span and average for key performance metrics.

The following subsections capture the preliminary consensus points and highlight areas requiring further discussion.

8.3 Comparison of SCM Candidates

Regarding legacy TDL the following observations can be drawn:

* Spatial properties of legacy channel models do not match the measured typical deployment MIMO characteristics
* The PDSCH post-EQ SINR profiles, when using TDL channel models do not match measurements. SDM processing does not impact performance, when using TDL channel models.
* TDL channel models are very simple and extensively used in RAN4 demodulation and CSI testing.
* Legacy TDL correlation models and related correlation derivation models introduce strong spatial selectivity so that higher transmission ranks are either infeasible or require unreasonably high SNR or low MCS.

Regarding [rCDL-C1] the following observations can be drawn:

* .
* For CDL models, both spatial and temporal properties are drawn from a common ray-based framework that resembles physical environments.
* CDL (link level) models are based on the same paradigm that is extensively used for system-level simulations by RAN1 and regularly used for link-level simulations by RAN1 to develop MIMO related features.
* Each tabulated CDL model corresponds to a single possible physical environment example with static long-term spatial properties, with the realization chosen by RAN1 to match the median of the system level environment distribution.
* In this study item, RAN4 contributors spent considerable effort to clarify and align the understanding of the details of CDL models.
* As also pointed out in TS 38.901, the angular values of the agreed CDL mode is fixed, which is not suitable for PMI test for the reason that the PMI statistic is biased and a fixed precoder performs better than channel adaptive precoders performed by PMI selection algorithm, leading to that UE PMI selection may not be verified correctly. Taking 8T8R,8 layers as an example, UE constantly reporting PMI (i1,1,i1,2,i2)=(4,0,0), which can be pre-acquired without precoder selection may also past the PMI test. The related improvement should be investigated to ensure the CDL model to be very generic that can be suitable for different performance requirements testing to verify the proper UE / BS performance.
* The agreed CDL channel is generalized according to certain frequency (3.5GHz), which is not be aligned with the real deployment and not suitable for demodulation test for other frequencies, especially for FDD with low frequency.

Regarding [xTDL-C1] the following observations can be drawn:

* Multi-cluster TDL models, which are builds on top of the well-known and well-aligned legacy TDL models, are very simple and extensively used in RAN4 demodulation and CSI testing, and should therefore be easy to take into use by RAN4.
* Multi-cluster TDL models are more flexible compared to CDL channel, since the power ratio of clusters is configurable so that power level of each cluster can be adjusted to desired level to meet more specific test purposes.
* The multi-cluster TDL model breaks the spatial limitations of the underlying spatially correlated legacy TDL model so that higher ranks can be supported.
* The multi-cluster TDL model does not alter the Doppler spread or the frequency selectivity of the underlying legacy TDL model.
* The multi-cluster TDL model can be configured by a handful of beam-steering parameters to match various desired test cases and features.

***<End of Change 1>***
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