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# Introduction

The discussions in this thread include URLLC UE and BS demodulation performance requirements for high reliability with higher BLER and low latency. The discussion about UE and BS demodulation requirements for high reliability with BLER 10^-5 and confidence level 99.999% and CQI reporting test will happen in another thread RAN4 [97e][321] NR\_L1enh\_URLLC\_Demod\_Part1.

Besides, there are some CRs which contain contents of both thread [321] and [323]. In this thread, the common issues (such as FRCs, applicability rules etc.) will be discussed. In thread [321], the test methodology for ultra-low BLER and CQI reporting test will be discussed. Please comment the following issues in this summary:

CR structures for UE and BS.

1. Discuss CRs for all common issues (such as FRCs, applicability rule etc.)
2. Discuss CRs for the PDSCH repetition, mapping type B and processing capability 2 and pre-emption.
3. Discuss CRs for the PUSCH repetition type A and low latency (i.e. type B) requirements.

**Topics in this summary:**

***URLLC UE:***

* Topic #1: UE demodulation performance requirements for high reliability
	+ Sub-topic 1-1: High reliability for FR1
	+ Sub-topic 1-2: High reliability for FR2
* Topic #2: UE demodulation performance requirements for low latency
	+ Sub-topic 2-1: PDSCH mapping Type B and processing capability 2 for FR1
	+ Sub-topic 2-2: PDSCH mapping Type B for FR2
	+ Sub-topic 2-3: UE demodulation requirements for pre-emption
* Topic #3: URLLC UE Rel-16 features and release independent.
	+ Sub-topic 3-1: Rel-16 URLLC UE features
	+ Sub-topic 3-2: Release independent

***URLLC BS:***

* Topic #4: BS demodulation requirements for high reliability.
	+ Sub-topic 4-1: BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR1
	+ Sub-topic 4-2: BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR2
* Topic #5: BS demodulation requirements for low latency.
	+ Sub-topic 4-1: PUSCH mapping Type B for FR1
	+ Sub-topic 4-2: PUSCH mapping Type B for FR2
* Topic #6: URLLC BS Rel-16 features

*Start of UE discussion*

# Topic #1: UE demodulation performance requirements for high reliability

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2014242**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014242.zip) | Apple | Proposal #1: Define requirements with PDSCH slot aggregation in FR1 with MCS 19Proposal #2: Define requirements in FR2 with PDSCH slot aggregation re-using most of the parameters from FR1 test, and the following:  Propagation condition: TDLA30-75 TDD Pattern: DDDSU with S=10D:2G:2U CBW and SCS: 100MHz/ 120KHzProposal #3: Define requirements with PDSCH slot aggregation in FR2 with MCS 16 |
| [**R4-2014243**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014243.zip) | Apple | Draft CR on requirements with slot aggregation in FR2 |
| [**R4-2014544**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014544.zip) | Intel Corporation | Proposal 1: Use MCS13 for FR1 High reliability PDSCH requirements.Proposal 2: Use the following assumptions for FR2 PDSCH high reliability requirements:* CBW/SCS: 100 MHz/120 kHz
* TDD pattern: DDDSU with S = 10D:2G:2U
* PDSCH configuration: Mapping Type A, Start symbol 1, Duration 13
* PDSCH scheduling: slot i, if mod(i, 5) = {1,2} for i from {1,…,159}.within 20 ms
* Aggregation factor 2
* Number of HARQ process: 2
* MCS 13 from Table 3
* Channel model: TDLA30-75
* Antenna configuration: 2x2, ULA low
 |
| [**R4-2015616**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015616.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Simulation results on UE PDSCH demodulation requirements with higher BLER and low latency |
| [**R4-2015617**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015617.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: We propose to use MCS19 for FR1 PDSCH high reliability test with higher BLER.Proposal 2: For FR2 high reliability with higher BLER test, we propose the duplex mode is TDD with pattern of “DDDSU”; bandwidth and SCS are 100 MHz/120 kHz; the antenna configuration is 2x2, ULA low; Channel model is TDLA30-75.Proposal 3: For FR2 high reliability with higher BLER test, we propose the PDSCH mapping type is Type A, starting symbol is 1 and symbol length is 13. PDSCH aggregation factor is 2.Proposal 4: For FR2 high reliability with higher BLER test, we propose the DMRS type is Type 1 and the number of additional DMRS is 1.Proposal 5: For FR2 high reliability with higher BLER test, we propose the number of HARQ processes is 8 and the maximum number of HARQ transmissions is 4. |
| [**R4-2015620**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015620.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR to TS 38.101-4 Addition of UE performance requirements for FR1 URLLC PDSCH repetitions over multiple slots |
| [**R4-2016005**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016005.zip) | Intel Corporation | CR on FRC for UE Higher BLER requirements |
| [**R4-2016103**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016103.zip) | Ericsson | Slot aggregation FR1Proposal 1: Configure MCS 19 for slot aggregation test.Slot aggregation FR2Observation 1: TDD pattern DDSU with aggregation factor 2 causes less overhead from a scheduling perspective given RAN4 agreed scheduling constraintsProposal 2: Define TDD pattern DDSU for FR2 slot aggregation test.Proposal 3: Exclude PDSCH scheduling in slots i, where mod(i, 160) = 0 and mod(i, 160) = 1.Proposal 4: Select an MCS which gives higher or equal to -4 dB for final 2 Rx requirement definition (average ideal SNR alignment result + IM)Proposal 5: Define FR2 PDSCH slot aggregation test with the configurations summarized in Table 1 below.Table 1 FR2 PDSCH slot aggregation test configurations

|  |
| --- |
| * *TDD pattern: DDSU*
* *AL = 2*
* *Propagation condition: TDLA30-75, TDLA30-300*
* *SCS & CBW*
	+ *120kHz & 100MHz*
* *MCS: {13, 16, 19} from table 3*
* *PDSCH configuration: Mapping type A, symbol length 13, starting symbol 1.*
* *DMRS configuration: Type 1, 1 additional DMRS, Single symbol*
* *Antenna configuration 2x2, ULA low*
* *Target BLER 1%*
* *Scheduling for PDSCH:*
	+ *No scheduling in D slot i, where mod(i,160) = 0 and mod(i, 160) = 1, and S slots*
* *PTRS on*
* *Overhead for TBS determination: 6*
 |

 |
| [**R4-2016104**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016104.zip) | Ericsson | Simulation results on UE URLLC demodulation performance requirements with higher BLER |
| [**R4-2016106**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016106.zip) | Ericsson | CR to TS 38.101-4: Performance requirements for URLLC High BLER feature tests |
| [**R4-2016462**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016462.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 1: Define high reliability high BLER tests with MCS 16 or 19 in Low SE MCS Table. |

## Open issues summary

During the last meeting, most of the test parameters for FR1 were agreed. In this section, the MCS for FR1 will be selected based on the simulation results (R4-2015628).

Parameters for FR2 will be discussed in sub-topic 1-2.

### Sub-topic 1-1: UE demodulation requirements for high reliability for FR1

*From the approved WF R4-2012648 in RAN4 #96 e-meeting, following were agreed:*

***Agreements of #96-e***

* *HARQ process number: 2 for FDD and 4 for TDD*
* *Higher or equal to -4 dB for final 4 Rx requirement definition (average ideal SNR alignment result + IM)*
* *BLER calculation method*
* *BLER = NpacketFail/NpacketTx, where NpacketFail is the number of packets with CRC fail after all transmissions (initial and retransmissions), NpacketTx is the total number of packets transmitted during the test.*

***Open issues of #96-e:***

* *MCS for FR1:*
	+ *Option 1: MCS13*
	+ *Option 2: MCS16*
	+ *Option 3: MCS19*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-1-1: MCS (table 3)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS13 (Intel)
	+ Option 2: MCS16 (QC)
	+ Option 3: MCS19 (Huawei, Apple, Ericsson, QC)
* Recommended WF
	+ Based on the simulation results (R4-2015628) and agreements of “Higher or equal to -4 dB for final 4 Rx requirement definition (average ideal SNR alignment result + IM)”. Moderator recommend MCS19 as the conclusion as MCS19 is the only option meets the agreements. (Apple)
	+ Option 3

**Issue 1-1-2: SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)**

* Proposals

FDD 2x2:

Option 1: [0.9] dB

Option 2:

FDD 2x4:

Option 1: [-2.9] dB

Option 2:

TDD 2x2:

Option 1: [1.2] dB

Option 2:

TDD 2x4:

Option 1: [-3.3] dB

Option 2:

* Recommended WF
	+ Qualcomm: please indicate impairment results for MCS19 in R4-2015628.
	+ Intel: Please double check your simulation results as it seems there is larger span between yours and others’ results. And please indicate impairments results for MCS19 in R4-2015628.
	+ Further alignment on the 2nd round.

Issues raised from CR R4-2015620:

The number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD has not been discussed. The number of HARQ processes for TDD has not been discussed. Please provide your opinions on these two parameters:

**Issue 1-1-3: The number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 (Huawei)
	+ Option 2: 3 for initial transmission and 2 for repetition (Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ As the PDSCH aggregation factor is n2, and the setting for this parameter in Rel-15 is 2. Here, we can double the number. (Apple)
	+ More discussion on 2nd round

**Issue 1-1-4: The number of HARQ processes for TDD (7D1S2U)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 (Huawei, Intel, Apple)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ As the PDSCH aggregation factor is n2, and no PDSCH scheduling in D slots i, where mod(i, 10) = 0, and S slots. Thus, 4 HARQ processes is enough for 7D1S2U. (Apple)
	+ Option 1

### Sub-topic 1-2: UE demodulation requirements for high reliability for FR2

*From the approved WF R4-2012648 in RAN4 #96 e-meeting, following were agreed:*

***Agreements of #96-e***

* *Companies are encouraged to provide view on detailed test parameters for FR2 in the next RAN4 meeting:*
	+ *Aggregation factor, MCS, Channel bandwidth, SCS, Channel model, TDD pattern, PDSCH Mapping type etc.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-2-1: PDSCH aggregation factor**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: n2 (Huawei, Apple, Intel, Ericsson)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-2: TDD pattern**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: DDDSU, S=10:2:2 (Huawei, Intel, Apple)
	+ Option 2: DDSU (Ericsson, QC, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 1-2-3: SCS/BW**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 120 kHz / 100 MHz (Huawei, Apple, Intel, Ericsson)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-4: Frequency domain resource allocation**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Full bandwidth (Huawei, Apple, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-5: Channel model**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: TDLA30-75 (Huawei, Apple, Intel, Ericsson, QC)
	+ Option 2: TDLA30-300 (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-6: Antenna configuration**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2x2, ULA low (Apple, Intel, Ericsson, Huawei)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-7: PDSCH mapping type**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Type A (Huawei, Apple, Intel, Ericsson)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-8: PDSCH starting symbol**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (Huawei, Intel, Ericsson, Apple)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-9: PDSCH symbol length**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 13 (Huawei, Intel, Ericsson, Apple)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-10: PDSCH scheduling**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Scheduling PDSCH on slot i, if mod(i, 5) = {1,2} for i from {1,…,159}.within 20 ms (Intel, Apple, Huawei)
	+ Option 2: No scheduling in D slot i, where mod(i,160) = 0 and mod(i, 160) = 1, and S slots (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ Depends on Issue1-2-2.

**Issue 1-2-11: DM-RS type**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Type 1 (Huawei, Apple, Ericsson, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-12: DM-RS duration**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Single-symbol DM-RS (Huawei, Apple, Ericsson, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-13: Additional DM-RS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (Huawei, Apple, Ericsson, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-14: PTRS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: on (Ericsson, Apple, Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-14a: PTRS frequency density**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-14b: PTRS time density**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-14c: PTRS resource element offset**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-15: Overhead for TBS determination**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 6 (Ericsson, Apple, Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-16: HARQ process**

* Proposals
	+ Option 2: 2 (Intel, Apple, Huawei, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-17: Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 (Huawei, Apple, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-18: Test metric**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1% BLER (Huawei, Apple, Ericsson, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 1-2-19: MCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS19 from Table 3 (Huawei, QC)
	+ Option 2: MCS16 from Table 3 (Apple)
	+ Option 3: MCS13 from Table 3 (Intel)
* Recommended WF
* Higher or equal to -4 dB for final 2 Rx requirement definition (average ideal SNR alignment result + IM) (Huawei, Intel)

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 1-1-1: Issue 1-1-2: Issue 1-1-3:  |
| Ericsson | Issue 1-1-2: There is a fairly large span between the results; we should check as it is >3dB in placesIssue 1-2-2: we prefer option 2 since as we’ve highlighted in our paper with more overhead for DDDSU which means the last **D** and **S** slots would not have any scheduled data on it.Issue 1-2-4:Ok with option 1Issue 1-2-5:Ok to go with option 1.Issue 1-2-10:This is related to issue 1-2-2 with TDD pattern. So in essence Option 1 is for DDDSU and option 2 is for DDSU. We cannot agree to the recommend WF if issue 1-2-2 is not resolved.Issue 1-2-14a/14b/14c:Option 1 is same as Rel-15 eMBB FR2 testing and OK with us.Issue 1-2-16:Ok with option 2Issue 1-2-17:Ok with option 1Issue 1-2-19:Agree with recommended WF. |
| Apple | Issue 1-1-1: We agree with the recommended WF.Issue 1-1-2: We cannot agree on SNR values/ requirements without good alignment in results. Span is as high as 4 dB in some cases. Issue 1-1-3, 1-1-4: We support the recommended WF. Issue 1-2-8/1-2-9: We are fine with PDSCH starting symbol 1 and 13 symbols in D slots.Issue 1-2-10: option 1Issue 1-2-14/1-2-15: Option1 Issue 1-2-16: Option 2 |
| Huawei | Issue 1-2-10: option 1 is fine.Issue 1-2-14/14a/14b/14c: Option 1.Issue 1-2-15: Option 1.Issue 1-2-16: By considering TDD pattern of DDDSU with slot aggregation of n2 and HARQ-ACK feedback at U. 2 HARQ process is enough. Option 2. |
| QC | **Issue 1-2-2: TDD pattern**We support option 2, since aggregation factor is 2 and with DDDSU, we will have longer test time with no grant on DSU part**Issue 1-2-5: Channel model**We support option 1 since it’s a high reliability test, lower Doppler is preferred.**Issue 1-2-19: MCS**We support option 3, although 1% BLER is considered, since this is FR2, 1% BLER is still considered as higher reliability, therefore, lower MCS is preferred.We would like to update our comments for issue 1-2-19: instead of option 3, we would like to support option 1 (MCS 19). For option 3, the SNR is too low and PDCCH may not be reliable, therefore we think such setting should be avoid, and support option 1 instead. |
| Intel | **Issue 1-1-1: MCS (table 3)**We need to double check our results. We will come back as soon as possible.**Issue 1-1-3: The number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD**We need to have more discussion on this issue. Based on our understanding, ACK/NACK feedback will be sent after second transmission (i.e. repetition). If we need to specify this number between initial transmission and slot with ACK/NACK and between repetition and slot with ACK/NACK then we will have 3 slots for initial transmission and 2 slots for repetition.**Issue 1-1-4: The number of HARQ processes for TDD (7D1S2U)**In the previous RAN4 meeting, the following agreement was captured in WF R4-2012648: “HARQ process number: 2 for FDD and 4 for TDD”. Same time, we realized, that 2 is not sufficient for FDD and 4 should be used like it proposed in R4-2015620. As for TDD, we support Option 1, because it is aligned with previous agreement.**Issue 1-2-2: TDD pattern**Option 2 is also fine for us.**Issue 1-2-4: Frequency domain resource allocation**Support recommended WF**Issue 1-2-10: PDSCH scheduling**It depends on decision on Issue 1-2-2. If Option 1 will be agreed for 1-2-2 then Option 1 can be used for 1-2-10. If Option 2 will be agreed for 1-2-2 then Option 2 can be used for 1-2-10.**Issue 1-2-11 - Issue 1-2-19**Support recommended WFs. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close-to-finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2015620**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015620.zip)(Huawei)CR to TS 38.101-4Addition of UE performance requirements for FR1 URLLC PDSCH repetitions over multiple slots. | [Huawei]: TBD will be updated when agreements are reached. This CR needs to be revised. |
| Company B |
| [**R4-2016005**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016005.zip)(Intel)CR on FRC for UE Higher BLER requirements | Ericsson: The SE table should be referred to as 64QAM-MCS-TableAlt to align to Huawei CRs and should be declared in a note below the table. |
| Apple: The max Throughput should account for PDSCH repetition. But the test metric is BLER and not TP, should we still specify it? |
| [Huawei]: FRC for ultra-low BLER test is missing. Regarding to the table numbering: the current version of TS 38.101-4 for A.3.2.1.1 is ending with Table A.3.2.1.1-8. Would we start from A.3.2.1.1-9? Or do we missing some agreements? The current version of TS 38.101-4 for A.3.2.2.2 is ending with Table A.3.2.2.2-12, should we start from A.3.2.2.2-13? |
| [**R4-2016106**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016106.zip)(Ericsson)CR to TS 38.101-4: Performance requirements for URLLC High BLER feature tests | Apple: The test parameters should also configure PDCCH DCI format 2-1 with corresponding PI as payload. In Test parameters table, Note 1 suggests that UE flushes buffer upon NACK, irrespective of slot that was pre-empted. It should be upon receiving PI on PDCCH with DCI format 2-1.  |
| Huawei: Suggest to change Section number of 7.2.2.2.2 to 7.2.2.2.3. FR2 PDSCH repetition requirement use 7.2.2.2.2 (Apple CR R4-2014243). |
| [**R4-2014243**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014243.zip)(Apple)Draft CR on requirements with slot aggregation in FR2 | Ericsson: TDD pattern not yet agreed. Incorrect cover sheet version. |
| Apple: [To Ericsson] Will fix coversheet version and update parameters based on agreements.**--Update 11/03 9PM PST—**Don’t understand Huawei’s comment. 7.2.2.2.2 is for PDSCH slot aggregation covered in our CR, following same order as FR1 requirements[Huawei]: Huawei’s comments is for Ericsson CR not for Apple CR, please do not remove or make any changes to other companies’ comments as this cause confusion. |
| [**R4-2015622**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015622.zip)(Huawei)CR to TS38.101-4 Applicability rules for URLLC UE demodulation requirements | Apple: Suggest to have different feature for CQI Table 3 in Table 5.1.1.3-1. Also, different feature for Processing capability 2 in Table 5.1.1.4-1[Huawei]: CQI applicability will be discussed under email thread of 322 (CR R4-2015621) and which should be Chapter 6 of TS 38.101-4. CR of R4-2015622 is about applicability for PDSCH performance requirements which should be allocated in Chapter 5 and 7 of TS 38.101-4.Processing capability 2 is an optional capability and Table 5.1.1.4-1 is the table for mandatory UE features. |
| Company B |

## 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:***UE demodulation requirements for high reliability for FR1:*** MCS (table 3): MCS19
* The number of HARQ processes for TDD (7D1S2U): 4

**UE demodulation requirements for high reliability for FR2*** PDSCH aggregation factor: n2
* SCS/BW: 120 kHz / 100 MHz
* Frequency domain resource allocation: Full bandwidth
* Channel model: TDLA30-75
* Antenna configuration: 2x2, ULA low
* PDSCH mapping type: Type A
* PDSCH starting symbol: 1
* PDSCH symbol length: 13
* DM-RS type: Type 1
* DM-RS duration: Single-symbol DM-RS
* Additional DM-RS: 1
* PTRS: on
* PTRS frequency density: 2
* PTRS time density:1
* PTRS resource element offset: 2
* Overhead for TBS determination: 6
* HARQ process:2
* Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission: 4
* Test metric: 1% BLER

*Candidate options:** *Recommendations for 2nd round*

**UE demodulation requirements for high reliability for FR1**SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)* Proposals

FDD 2x2: Option 1: [0.9] dBOption 2:FDD 2x4:Option 1: [-2.9] dBOption 2:TDD 2x2:Option 1: [1.2] dBOption 2:TDD 2x4:Option 1: [-3.3] dBOption 2:* Recommended WF
	+ Qualcomm: please indicate impairment results for MCS19 in R4-2015628.
	+ Intel: Please double check your simulation results as it seems there is larger span between yours and others’ results. And please indicate impairments results for MCS19 in R4-2015628.
	+ Further alignment on the 2nd round.

The number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 (Huawei)
	+ Option 2: 3 for initial transmission and 2 for repetition (Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ As the PDSCH aggregation factor is n2, and the setting for this parameter in Rel-15 is 2. Here, we can double the number. (Apple)
	+ More discussion on 2nd round

**UE demodulation requirements for high reliability for FR2**TDD pattern* Proposals
	+ Option 1: DDDSU, S=10:2:2 (Huawei, Intel, Apple)
	+ Option 2: DDSU (Ericsson, QC, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

PDSCH scheduling* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Scheduling PDSCH on slot i, if mod(i, 5) = {1,2} for i from {1,…,159}.within 20 ms (Intel, Apple, Huawei)
	+ Option 2: No scheduling in D slot i, where mod(i,160) = 0 and mod(i, 160) = 1, and S slots (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ Depends on TDD pattern

MCS* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS19 from Table 3 (Huawei, QC)
	+ Option 2: MCS16 from Table 3 (Apple)
	+ Option 3: MCS13 from Table 3 (Intel)
* Recommended WF
* Higher or equal to -4 dB for final 2 Rx requirement definition (average ideal SNR alignment result + IM) (Huawei, Intel)
 |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | WF on URLLC UE performance requirements with higher BLER | Intel |
| #2 | Simulation assumption for URLLC FR2 UE performance requirements with higher BLER | Intel |

### 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**  |
| [**R4-2015620**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015620.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2016005**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016005.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2016106**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016106.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2014243**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014243.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2015622**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015622.zip) | *to be revised* |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### Sub-topic 1-5-1: UE demodulation requirements for high reliability for FR1

**Issue 1-5-1: SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)**

* Proposals

FDD 2x2:

Option 1: [1.0] dB

Option 2:

FDD 2x4:

Option 1: [-2.9] dB

Option 2:

TDD 2x2:

Option 1: [1.1] dB

Option 2:

TDD 2x4:

Option 1: [-3.1] dB

Option 2:

* Recommended WF
	+ Intel: Please double check your simulation results as it seems there is larger span between yours and others’ results. And please indicate impairments results for MCS19 in R4-2015628.
	+ Further alignment is needed.

Issues raised from CR R4-2015620:

The number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD has not been discussed. The number of HARQ processes for TDD has not been discussed. Please provide your opinions on these two parameters:

**Issue 1-5-2: The number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 (Huawei)
	+ Option 2: 3 for initial transmission and 2 for repetition (Intel)
	+ Option 3: The number of slots between final repetition PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD: 2
	+ Option 4: The number of slots between initial transmission PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD: 3 (Apple)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

Moderator:

As Intel indicated: ACK/NACK feedback will be sent after second transmission (i.e. repetition). If we need to specify this number between initial transmission and slot with ACK/NACK and between repetition and slot with ACK/NACK then we will have 3 slots for initial transmission and 2 slots for repetition.



The moderator think the purpose of this parameter is to define the final repetition PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information. Meaningless for initial or middle repetition (if larger slot factor is defined e.g. n4). We can indicate the number of slots is for the final repetition.

### Sub-topic 1-5-2: UE demodulation requirements for high reliability for FR2

**Issue 1-5-3: TDD pattern**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: DDDSU, S=10:2:2 (Huawei, Intel, Apple)
	+ Option 2: DDSU (Ericsson, QC, Intel, Apple)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 2

**Issue 1-5-4: PDSCH scheduling**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Scheduling PDSCH on slot i, if mod(i, 5) = {1,2} for i from {1,…,159}.within 20 ms (Intel, Apple, Huawei)
	+ Option 2: No scheduling in D slot i, where mod(i,160) = 0 and mod(i, 160) = 1, and S slots (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 2

**Issue 1-5-5 MCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS19 from Table 3 (Huawei, QC)
	+ Option 2: MCS16 from Table 3 (Apple)
	+ Option 3: MCS13 from Table 3 (Intel)
* Recommended WF
* Higher or equal to -4 dB for final 2 Rx requirement definition (average ideal SNR alignment result + IM) (Huawei, Intel)

## Companies views’ collection for 2nd round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | **Issue 1-5-1: SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)**We are checking our result. Same time we would like to check the simulation assumptions from our companies which may affect the performance. For our results, DMRS and PDSCH are FDMed, 2 PRB bundling and MMSE-IRC receiver are considered.**Issue 1-5-2: The number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD**Recommended WF is fine for us. Probably we can clarify this assumption in the spec**Issue 1-5-3: TDD pattern**It is rather important to close this topic in this meeting to avoid extra workload on simulation results preparation for the next meeting. Taking into account DDDSU is used for many URLLC tests and DDSU is more efficient for considered scenarios from achievable data rate perspective. Probably, it would be fine for all companies to go with Option 2? |
| Ericsson | **Issue 1-5-3: TDD pattern**We prefer option 2 as it can speed up test time and it does not waste DL slots. There is a 50/50 split between the use of the two TDD patterns in the Rel-15 eMBB spec so there is no real precedent for either in the existing test cases. |
| Apple | **Issue 1-5-1: SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)**To Intel: We have the same simulation assumptions. **Issue 1-5-2: The number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information for FDD**Isn’t this parameter supposed to be from the first transmitted PDSCH, rather than last? So should be 3 in our understanding. If the PDCCH scheduling PDCCH is in slot n, K1 would be 3 (for K0 = 0) if we want HARQ-ACK transmitted in slot n+3. **Issue 1-5-3: TDD pattern**We are fine with going with option 2, if that’s majority view.**Issue 1-5-4: PDSCH scheduling**Option 1 if option 1 is agreed for issue 1-5-3, Option 2 otherwise. |

### WF/Simulation assumptions comments collection

All the comments for UE WF/Simulation assumptions will be addressed in this section:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WF number** | **Comments** |
| R4-2017509WF on URLLC UE performance requirements with higher BLER  |  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Simulation assumptions** | **Comments** |
| R4-2017510Simulation assumption for URLLC FR2 UE performance requirements with higher BLER | Apple: In the test parameters we have PRB bundling 2, but wideband precoding granularity?  |
|  |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2017511 (from R4-2015620)HuaweiCR to TS 38.101-4: Addition of UE performance requirements for FR1 URLLC PDSCH repetitions over multiple slots |  |
|  |
| R4-2017512 (from R4-2016005)IntelCR on FRC for UE Higher BLER requirements | [Huawei]: FRC for ultra-low BLER test is missing. Regarding to the table numbering: the current version of TS 38.101-4 for A.3.2.1.1 is ending with Table A.3.2.1.1-8. Would we start from A.3.2.1.1-9? Or do we missing some agreements? The current version of TS 38.101-4 for A.3.2.2.2 is ending with Table A.3.2.2.2-12, should we start from A.3.2.2.2-13?In Ericsson CR R4-2017497, the reference channel is updated as ‘R.PDSCH.1-1.4 FDD’. If a new table is created for ultra-low BLER test, the reference channel of CR R4-2017497 also should be updated. |
| [Intel]: In another e-mail thread ([97e][328] NR\_perf\_enh\_Demod) CR with FRC for CA scenarios (R4-2014550) was agreed in the first round. We use the table numbering taking into account this CR. |
| R4-2017513 (from R4-2016106)EricssonCR to TS 38.101-4: Performance requirements for URLLC High BLER feature tests | Apple: Should we add a note that PDCCH configuration is in addition to the one in common parameters?  |
|  |
| R4-2017514 (from R4-2014243)AppleCR on requirements with slot aggregation in FR2 |  |
|  |
| R4-2017515 (from R4-2015622)HuaweiCR to TS 38.101-4: Applicability rules for URLLC UE demodulation requirements | Intel: Based on our understanding, applicability notes are not required to inform that multiple capabilities are required for certain tests. We don’t have such notes for Rel-15 UEs. We think that current table provide clear mapping of applicability to certain test.Based on our understanding, support of MCS Table 3 and CQI Table 3 is only required for test with Ultra-low BLER because support of CQI Table 3 guaranty the support of 10^-5. And there was agreement in the one of the previous meeting. Same time, there was no such discussion/agreement for test with higher BLER and MCS Table 3.Please check the updated version of CR with our suggestion in the Inbox.[Huawei] CR has been updated with your comments. |
| Apple: Suggest using “alternative 64QAM MCS table for PDSCH” instead of “new 64QAM MCS table”. The table was defined in Rel-15.Similarly, “CQI table with target BLER of 10^-5” instead of “new CQI table”We also agree with changes from Intel to separate the features.[Huawei]: We understand your idea. But the naming in feature table should be aligned with TR 38.822 column 2. There is no “alternative 64QAM MCS table for PDSCH” in TR 38.822.And “CQI table with target BLER of 10^-5” belongs to the Components (Column 3). [Apple] In our understanding we should use TS 38.306 for getting the correct UE feature name and description. Description from 38.306:***cqi-TableAlt***Indicates whether UE supports the CQI table with target BLER of 10^-5.***dl-64QAM-MCS-TableAlt***Indicates whether the UE supports the alternative 64QAM MCS table for PDSCH. |

## Summary for 2nd round

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

### 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 1-5-1/1-5-2 |  |

### WF and CR status

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WF number** | **Status summary**  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Simulation assumptions** | **Status summary**  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of simulation results** | **Status summary**  |
| R4-2015628Summary of simulation results of NR UE demod with higher BLER | To be noted |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR number** | **Status summary**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Topic #2: UE demodulation performance requirements for low latency

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2014242**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014242.zip) | Apple | Proposal #4: Define requirements with PDSCH mapping Type-B in FR2 with MCS 4Proposal #5: Introduce requirements for pre-emption indication with 20% pre-empted slots and MCS of 13.Proposal #6: Define requirements for pre-emption indication at 70% of maximum throughput. |
| [**R4-2014544**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014544.zip) | Intel Corporation | Proposal 3: Use the following assumptions for FR2 PDSCH requirements with mapping Type B:* MCS 4
* Channel model: TDLA30-75

Proposal 4: Define Pre-emption indication requirements under one of the following conditions:* Option 1:
	+ Number of eMBB retransmissions: 4
	+ eMBB MCS 13
	+ Pre-emption probability 20%
	+ Test metric: 70% of max T-put or 1% of BLER
* Option 2:
	+ Number of eMBB retransmissions: 2
	+ eMBB MCS 13
	+ Pre-emption probability 10%
	+ Test metric: 10% or 1% of BLER
 |
| [**R4-2015129**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015129.zip) | MediaTek inc. | *Proposal*: Only configure 10% pre-emption probability for pre-emption tests. |
| [**R4-2015616**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015616.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Simulation results on UE PDSCH demodulation requirements with higher BLER and low latency |
| [**R4-2015617**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015617.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 6: Use MCS4 from Table 1 for FR2 PDSCH mapping Type B test case.Proposal 7: We propose to use MCS16 from Table 1 for pre-emption test case.Proposal 8: We propose to configure 20% pre-emption probability. |
| [**R4-2015620**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015620.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR to TS 38.101-4 Addition of UE performance requirements for FR1 URLLC PDSCH repetitions over multiple slots |
| [**R4-2016005**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016005.zip) | Intel Corporation | CR on FRC for UE Higher BLER requirements |
| [**R4-2016103**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016103.zip) | Ericsson | PDSCH mapping type B FR2Proposal 6: Define max number of HARQ transmissions to be 1 for FR2 PDSCH mapping type B test.Proposal 7: Define FR2 PDSCH mapping type B test with the configurations summarized in Table 2 below.Table 2 FR2 PDSCH mapping type B test configurations

|  |
| --- |
| *SCS/CBW: 120 kHz/100 MHz**TDD pattern: DDDSU with S = 10D:2G:2U**Scheduling: No PDSCH in slot 0 within 20 ms**MCS: {MCS4} from table 1.**Max number of HARQ transmissions: 1**Number of HARQ process: 8**Antenna configuration: 2x2, ULA low**Channel model:* *Option 1: TDLA30-75**PTRS on**Overhead for TBS determination: 6**Test metrics: 70% throughput**PDSCH Configuration: Start symbol 1, Symbol length 7**DMRS configuration: Type 1, 1 additional DMRS, Single symbol**PTRS configuration: Frequency density (KPT-RS) 2, Time density (LPT-RS) 1, resource element offset* |

PDSCH pre-emption FR1Proposal 8: Configure MCS13 for pre-emption tests.Proposal 9: Only configure 10% pre-emption probability for pre-emption tests |
| [**R4-2016104**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016104.zip) | Ericsson | Simulation results on UE URLLC demodulation performance requirements with higher BLER |
| [**R4-2016106**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016106.zip) | Ericsson | CR to TS 38.101-4: Performance requirements for URLLC High BLER feature tests |
| [**R4-2016462**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016462.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 2: Define DL pre-emption test for eMBB with 10% pre-emption probability, fixed scheduling and MCS 4. |
| [**R4-2016504**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016504.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | CR on FR1 PDSCH Mapping Type B and Processing Capability 2 Requirements |

## Open issues summary

This section includes three sub-topic:

* Sub-topic 2-1: PDSCH mapping Type B and processing capability 2 for FR1
* Sub-topic 2-2: PDSCH mapping Type B for FR2
* Sub-topic 2-3: UE demodulation requirements for pre-emption

### Sub-topic 2-1: PDSCH mapping Type B and processing capability 2 for FR1

The SNR values will be aligned based on the simulation results provided by companies.

**Issue 2-1-1: SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)**

* Proposals

FDD 2x2:

Option 1: [0.2] dB

Option 2:

FDD 2x4:

Option 1: [-2.8] dB

Option 2:

TDD 2x2:

Option 1: [0] dB

Option 2:

TDD 2x4:

Option 1: [-2.9] dB

Option 2:

* Recommended WF
	+ Intel, Huawei: Please double check your results as Intel provided the highest SNR values and Huawei provides the lowest SNR values. Results can be updated.
	+ Further alignment is needed.

### Sub-topic 2-2: PDSCH mapping Type B for FR2

*From the approved WF R4-2012648 in RAN4 #96 e-meeting, following were agreed:*

***Agreements from #96:***

* *Test applicability rule for FR2: No need to define the applicability rule.*
* *Test applicability rule for FR1 and FR2: No test applicability rule is needed.*
* *SCS/CBW: 120 kHz/100 MHz*
* *TDD pattern: DDDSU with S = 10D:2G:2U*
* *PDSCH Configuration*
	+ *Scheduling: No PDSCH in slot 0 within 20 ms*
	+ *MCS: [MCS4] from table 1. Confirming the MCS depends on the simulation results to ensure a proper SNR value.*
	+ *Start symbol: 1*
	+ *Symbol length: 2*
	+ *Max number of HARQ transmissions: 4​*
	+ *Number of HARQ process: 8*
* *Antenna configuration: 2x2, ULA low*
* *Channel model:*
	+ *Option 1: TDLA30-75*
	+ *Other options are not precluded*
* *Test metrics: 70% throughput*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-2-1: Symbol length (2os has been agreed)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 7 (~~Ericsson~~)
	+ Option 2: 2 (Apple, Huawei, QC, Intel, Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 2

**Issue 2-2-2: Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission (4 has been agreed)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (Ericsson, Huawei)
	+ Option 2: 4 (Apple, QC, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 2-2-2a: Number of HARQ process (8 has been agreed)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 (Huawei)
	+ Option 2: 8 (QC, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 2-2-3: DM-RS type**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Type 1 (Ericsson, Apple, Huawei, QC, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 2-2-4: DM-RS duration**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Single-symbol DM-RS (Ericsson, Apple, Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 2-2-5: Additional DM-RS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (~~Ericsson~~, Apple)
	+ Option 2: 0 (Huawei, Intel, Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 2. As symbol length is 2os.

**Issue 2-2-6: PTRS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: on (Ericsson, Apple, Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2: off
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 2-2-7: PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (Ericsson, Apple, Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 2-2-8: PTRS time density (LPT-RS)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (Ericsson, Apple, Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 2-2-9: PTRS resource element offset**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (Ericsson, Apple, Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 2-2-10: Overhead for TBS determination**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 6 (Apple, Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2: 0 (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 2-2-11: MCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS4 from Table 1. (Huawei, Apple, Intel, Intel, Ericsson)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

### Sub-topic 2-3: UE demodulation requirements for pre-emption

*From the approved WF R4-2012648 in RAN4 #96 e-meeting, following were agreed:*

***Agreements from #96:***

* *The assumption of UE behaviours for buffer flushing and decoding*
	+ *If UE cannot decode the PDCSH correctly, UE feeds back NACK to gNB. Then UE flushes the buffer and waits for the next re-transmission for LLR combing to decode the PDSCH.*
* *URLLC interference modelling*
	+ *SNR: Same as for eMBB transmission*
	+ *Structure: Some random data*

*Open issues:*

***Open Issues:***

* *Pre-emption probability*
	+ *Option 1: 10% within 1 radio frame*
	+ *Option 2: 20% within 1 radio frame*
* *eMBB MCS*
	+ *Option 1: MCS13 in Table 1*
	+ *Option 2: MCS4 in Table 1*
* *Test metric*
	+ *Option 1: 70% of max T-put*
	+ *Other options are not precluded*
* *Companies are encouraged to prepare comparison analysis of UE with and without HARQ buffer flushing of pre-empted bits to decide on options above*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-3-1: Simulation results observation (based on R4-2015628):**

The gain between with and without buffer flushing is

MCS13 with 20% probability:

* About 0.5 dB (Ericsson, Huawei, MTK)
* More than 2.5 dB (Intel, Apple)

MCS13 with 10% probability:

* Less than 0.5 dB (Ericsson, Huawei, MTK, Intel)
* More than 1 dB (Apple)

MCS4 with 20% probability:

* Less than 0.1 dB (Ericsson, Huawei, MTK, Intel, Apple)

MCS4 with 10% probability:

* Less than 0.03 dB (Ericsson, Huawei, MTK, Intel, Apple)
* More than 1 dB (QC)
* Recommended WF
	+ QC: Please double check your simulation results as it seems there is larger span between yours and others’ results.
	+ Please update your results if necessary.

**Issue 2-3-2: Test metric:**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 70% maximum throughput with gain larger than 1dB. (Huawei, Apple, Ericsson)
	+ Option 2: 1% or 10% BLER for scenarios with 2 re-transmissions. (Intel)
	+ Option 3: 1% BLER or 70% maximum throughput for scenarios with 4 re-transmissions. (Intel)
	+ Option 4: 70% maximum throughput (MTK)
* Recommended WF
	+ The main intention for this case is to find the performance difference between with and without buffer flushing. So the test metric should be defined based on this intention. By considering the limited time left, the moderator does not recommend to change the test metric but to define the agreed test metric (70% maximum throughput) with gain larger than 1dB. Based on the current simulation results, there is a large span between companies and the gain between with and without buffer flushing is fairly small. To achieve gain larger than 1dB, one suggestion is to increase the MCS value. E.g. MCS16 or higher. Please update your simulation results if new results are available. (Huawei, Intel)

**Issue 2-3-2a: Maximum HARQ re-transmission (4 has been agreed):**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 with BLER test metric. (Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 2-3-3: MCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS16 from Table 1. (Huawei)
	+ Option 2: MCS13 from Table 1 (Apple, Ericsson, Intel)
	+ Option 3: MCS 4 from Table 1 (QC)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 2-3-4: Pre-emption probability**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 20%. (Huawei, Apple, Intel in case of 4 re-transmissions)
	+ Option 2: 10% (Ericsson, QC, Intel in case of 2 re-transmissions and BLER test metric, MTK)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

Agreements from the GTW session:

Select proper test parameters and test metric to discriminate UE behavior and ensure proper UE processing i.e. the performance gap > 1dB

* Companies are encouraged to bring simulation results for MCS 16, and MCS 17 for comparison purpose.
* We will further check the results from companies to make decisions.
* Continue to discuss the simulation assumption and align companies’ results.

QC: Changing MCS levels maybe not helpful for performance gap. We may need to consider other parameters.

We are open to try other options. We also need to align the simulation assumption details to align the results among companies.

Apple: MCS 16 have higher code rating, with improper processing the performance loss more obviously. We have some agreements on UE behaviour assumption.

E///: We need to clarify the gap means the average results from companies? In our simulation, we update the results we see >1 dB gap under MCS 16.

Intel: With high MCS with higher modulation order and coding rate, the performance gap will be increased. Also collect the results for average to align the results.

QC: Agree E///, we need to discuss what MCSs to be simulated. The quality of LLR under low MCS is worse than high MCS.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 2-1-1: Issue 2-1-2: Issue 2-1-3:  |
| Ericsson | Issue 2-1-1: The span is lower than for the high reliability results but still 3dB in one caseIssue 2-2-1: We are ok with 2os only. 7os was a typo in simulation assumption proposal.Issue 2-2-5: Please remove our option for 1 additional since it is only applicable for 7os which we don’t want to pursue.Issue 2-2-10:Since double checking this issue the transport block size already very small and the overhead for TBS determination will in the case if 6 is configured only mean that very few symbols will be considered for the TBS size determination. Therefore, we propose to configure N\_OH = 0. Issue 2-3-1: We plan to update our simulation results.Issue 2-3-2: Option 1 is OK as long as the gain is more than 1dB. We plan to update our results in the summary; for MCS13 we see more than 1dB gain with 10% pre-emption.Issue 2-3-3: We see more than 1dB for MCS13, let’s see how it looks with all company results. We should take an MCS with >1dB gain averaged across all companies. |
| Apple | Issue 2-1-1: Need to look into span in results especially for 4RX before defining requirements.Issue 2-2-1/ 2-2-2: Prefer to keep the agreed parametersIssue 2-2-3 – 2-2-10: Fine with proposals from Ericsson. Issue 2-3-1: Large span in results for this case as well. Our results are with the agreed UE behavior in 96e.Issue 2-3-2: Prefer to have requirement based on 70% max TP. The BLER requirement is not justified for eMBB UE.  |
| Huawei | Issue 2-2-1: Prefer 2os. As this is low latency test and can be define the same parameter with FR1.Issue 2-2-2: Prefer max number of HARQ re-transmission is 1. We discussed a lot about this issues when define FR1 requirement. As this is a low latency requirement, we prefer no HARQ.Issue 2-2-2a: 4. Define the same HARQ process number with FR1.Issue 2-2-3/4: Option 1.Issue 2-2-5：For 2os, no additional DM-RS needed. Option 2.Issue 2-2-6/7/8/9/10: Option 1. |
| QC | **Issue 2-2-1: Symbol length**We support option 2.**Issue 2-2-2: Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission, Issue 2-2-2a: Number of HARQ process**We prefer to keep previous meeting agreement**Issue 2-3-2: Test metric**Option 1 is good for us**Issue 2-3-1: Simulation results observation and Issue 2-3-3: MCS**Based on our simulation results, gain can still observed with low MCS, hence we support option 3 for issue 2-3-3**Issue 2-3-4: Pre-emption probability**We support option 2 |
| MediaTek | **Issue 2-3-2: Test metric:**OK with option 1 but suggest to remove “with gain larger than 1dB”. Based on our understanding, the gain is highly depending on UE implementation.**Issue 2-3-4: Pre-emption probability**We support option 2. It could be more realistic to schedule type B transmission rather than using the pre-emption feature if pre-emption probability is more than 10% during a radio frame. |
| Intel | **Issue 2-1-1: SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)**We will double check our results and come back as soon as possible.**Issue 2-2-1: Symbol length**Prefer to keep previous meeting agreement, i.e. Option 2.**Issue 2-2-2: Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission**Prefer to keep previous meeting agreement, i.e. Option 2, because this is just Type B requirements without fast PDSCH processing. All existing FR1 requirements with just Type B mapping are defined with 4 HARQ transmissions.**Issue 2-2-2a: Number of HARQ process**DDDSU pattern will be used for requirements definition. In case HARQ re-transmissions will be used in test, it is rather hard to scheduler retransmission right after the slot with ACK/NACK feedback. Therefore, we prefer to keep previous meeting agreement (i.e. 8 HARQ processes).**Issue 2-2-3 - Issue 2-2-11**Support recommended WFs.**Issue 2-3-2 - Issue 2-3-4**In the previous RAN4 meeting, there was concern to define requirements under 20% pre-emption probability. Therefore, for this meeting we prepared additional analysis to show under which conditions and which test metric correct pre-emption processing can be verified with 10% pre-emption probability. Same time, we are fine to focus on throughput test metric and scenario with 4 HARQ transmissions if consensus can be reached on proper test configuration for this metric. We are fine to further investigate the another MCS. |
| QC | Regarding our simulation results, we think this gain shouldn’t vary across MCS, as the flushing out procedure is the same across all MCS, hence the effect of whether to combine contaminated LLRs shouldn’t differ when we change MCS/modulation order. Can other companies explain why the difference is observed? From other simulation results, the effects are similar across MCSs, intuitively we think this makes more sense. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2016504**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016504.zip)(QC)CR on FR1 PDSCH Mapping Type B and Processing Capability 2 Requirements |  [Huawei] SNR value can be updated when it is available. This CR needs to be revised. |
| Company B |
|  |

## 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:***PDSCH mapping Type B for FR2:*** Symbol length: 2os
* DM-RS type: Type 1
* DM-RS duration: Single-symbol DM-RS
* Additional DM-RS: 0
* PTRS: on
* PTRS frequency density : 2
* PTRS time density: 1
* PTRS resource element offset: 2
* MCS: MCS4 from Table 1.

**UE demodulation requirements for pre-emption**Agreements from the GTW session:Select proper test parameters and test metric to discriminate UE behavior and ensure proper UE processing i.e. the performance gap > 1dB * Companies are encouraged to bring simulation results for MCS 16, and MCS 17 for comparison purpose.
* We will further check the results from companies to make decisions.
* Continue to discuss the simulation assumption and align companies’ results.

*Candidate options:** *Recommendations for 2nd round*

**PDSCH mapping Type B and processing capability 2 for FR1**SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)* Proposals

FDD 2x2: Option 1: [0.2] dBOption 2:FDD 2x4:Option 1: [-2.8] dBOption 2:TDD 2x2:Option 1: [0] dBOption 2:TDD 2x4:Option 1: [-2.9] dBOption 2:* Recommended WF
	+ Intel, Huawei: Please double check your results as Intel provided the highest SNR values and Huawei provides the lowest SNR values. Results can be updated.
	+ Further alignment is needed.

**PDSCH mapping Type B for FR2**Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission (4 has been agreed)* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (Ericsson, Huawei)
	+ Option 2: 4 (Apple, QC, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

Number of HARQ process (8 has been agreed)* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 (Huawei)
	+ Option 2: 8 (QC, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

Overhead for TBS determination* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 6 (Apple, Huawei, Intel)
	+ Option 2: 0 (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD
 |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
|  | No assignment |  |

### 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**  |
| [**R4-2016504**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016504.zip) | *to be revised* |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### Sub-topic 2-5-1: PDSCH mapping Type B and processing capability 2 for FR1

The SNR values will be aligned based on the simulation results provided by companies.

**Issue 2-5-1: SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)**

* Proposals

FDD 2x2:

Option 1: [0.4] dB

Option 2: [0.9] dB

FDD 2x4:

Option 1: [-2.5] dB

Option 2:[-2.0] dB

TDD 2x2:

Option 1: [0.2] dB

Option 2: [0.7] dB

TDD 2x4:

Option 1: [-2.7] dB

Option 2: [-2.2] dB

* Recommended WF
	+ 0.5dB is added for average impairment results.
	+ Is this ok for all companies to agree option 2?

### Sub-topic 2-5-2: PDSCH mapping Type B for FR2

**Issue 2-5-2: Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission (4 has been agreed)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (Ericsson, Huawei, Apple)
	+ Option 2: 4 (, QC, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ Although 4 has been agreed, considering this is a low latency test, no HARQ re-transmission is more reasonable.
	+ Option 1

**Issue 2-5-2a: Number of HARQ process (8 has been agreed)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 (Huawei, Apple)
	+ Option 2: 8 (QC, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 2-5-3: Overhead for TBS determination**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 6 (Apple, Intel)
	+ Option 2: 0 (Ericsson, Huawei, Apple)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 2. As symbol length is 2os, MCS4 (table 1) has been defined, considering the small TBS, overhead of 0 for TBS determination is recommended.

### Sub-topic 2-5-3: UE demodulation requirements for pre-emption

Agreements from the GTW session:

Select proper test parameters and test metric to discriminate UE behavior and ensure proper UE processing i.e. the performance gap > 1dB

* Companies are encouraged to bring simulation results for MCS 16, and MCS 17 for comparison purpose.
* We will further check the results from companies to make decisions.
* Continue to discuss the simulation assumption and align companies’ results.

*Based on the agreements from the GTW session, a higher MCS is encouraged to be simulated. On the 2nd round, companies can update simulation results if they are available. And more comments and discussion are encouraged.*

**Issue 2-5-4: Simulation results observation (based on R4-2015628):**

The gain between with and without buffer flushing is

MCS13 with 20% probability:

* About 0.5 dB (Ericsson, Huawei, MTK)
* More than 2.5 dB (Intel, Apple)

MCS13 with 10% probability:

* Less than 0.5 dB (Ericsson, Huawei, MTK, Intel)
* More than 1 dB (Apple)

MCS4 with 20% probability:

* Less than 0.1 dB (Ericsson, Huawei, MTK, Intel, Apple)

MCS4 with 10% probability:

* Less than 0.03 dB (Ericsson, Huawei, MTK, Intel, Apple)
* More than 1 dB (QC)
* Recommended WF
	+ QC: Please double check your simulation results as it seems there is larger span between yours and others’ results.
	+ Please update your results if necessary.

**Issue 2-5-5: MCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS16 from Table 1. (Huawei, Apple)
	+ Option 2: MCS13 from Table 1 (Apple, Ericsson, Intel)
	+ Option 3: MCS 4 from Table 1 (QC)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 2-5-6: Pre-emption probability**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 20%. (Huawei, Apple, Intel in case of 4 re-transmissions)
	+ Option 2: 10% (Ericsson, QC, Intel in case of 2 re-transmissions and BLER test metric, MTK, Apple)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

## Companies views’ collection for 2nd round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | **Issue 2-5-2: Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission (4 has been agreed)**Similar to first round discussion, we prefer Option 2. Same time, to move forward, we can compromise to use Option 1 in case it is acceptable for other companies.**Issue 2-5-3: Overhead for TBS determination**Support Option 2, because length of PDSCH is very small and PTRS does not affect much resources. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-5-2: Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission (4 has been agreed)**Note that the maximum number of transmission is 1 for FR1 and for both FR1 and FR2 for the BS. We got the impression that 4 was agreed by mistake last meeting because it is 1 in other cases. The reason 1 was agreed for FR1 and the BS is that the requirement is a low latency requirement. Could proponents of 4 indicate why 4 would be used in this case but not for FR1 or BS ?**Issue 2-5-4: Simulation results observation (based on R4-2015628):****Issue 2-5-5: MCS****Issue 2-5-6: Pre-emption probability**Checking our latest simulation results, we believe that if the metric is 90% throughput and MCS13/10% is used then the difference with/without flushing will be more than 1dB and may be OK. With some simulations, it is not even possible to reach the maximum without buffer flushing.So, we do not think that 20% pre-emption is needed to get to 1dB gap.We should check the gap based on the final average of all companies’ simulations. |
| Intel | To Ericsson for issue 2-5-6: Based on our understanding, 90 % of maximum throughput can not be reached even with HARQ flushing because 2 slots within 20 ms will be corrupted. For FDD, we have 19 allocated slots within 20 ms which corresponds to max throughput 12.411 Mbps. If 2 slots are corrupted for pre-emption test, then the maximum achievable throughput is 11.104 Mbps. 11.104/12.411 = 0.895. |
| Apple | **Issue 2-5-1: SNR values for 38.101-4 (based on R4-2015628)**The suggested values are the average of impairment results. We typically add 0.5 dB to account for span in results.**Issue 2-5-2: Maximum number of HARQ re-transmission (4 has been agreed)**Looks like 4 was agreed by mistake at some point for FR2. We agree to change it to 1 to be consistent with other testcases.**Issue 2-5-2a: Number of HARQ process (8 has been agreed)**Fine with option 1**Issue 2-5-3: Overhead for TBS determination**Option 2 is fine with us. **Issue 2-5-5: MCS**MCS 13 . MCS 16 is fine if it helps with having more gap with and without buffer flush.**Issue 2-5-6: Pre-emption probability**Fie with either 10 or 20%, something that achives sufficient gap in performance between with and with buffer flush.  |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2017516 (from R4-2016504)QCCR on FR1 PDSCH Mapping Type B and Processing Capability 2 Requirements | [Huawei]: SNR values and reference channel are updated. Please double check. |
|  |

## Summary for 2nd round

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

### 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 2-5-1/2-5-2/2-5-3 |  |

### CR status

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR number** | **Status summary**  |
|  |  |

# Topic #3: URLLC UE Rel-16 features

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2014544**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014544.zip) | Intel Corporation | Proposal 5: Do not define demodulation performance requirements to verify Rel-16 URLLC PDCCH enhancements. |
| [**R4-2015617**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015617.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 9: UE URLLC requirements for Rel-15 features are release independent from Rel-15.Proposal 10: Requirements for PDCCH enhancement should be specified for URLLC. |
| [**R4-2016103**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016103.zip) | Ericsson | Rel-16 URLLC UE featuresProposal 10: Define new PDCCH demodulation test for DCI format 1\_2 and discuss the payload size in RAN4.Proposal 11: Do not need to define new URLLC PDCCH demodulation test for covering multiple PDCCH monitoring occasions per slot. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 3-1: Rel-16 URLLC UE features

*From the approved WF R4-2012648 in RAN4 #96 e-meeting, following were agreed:*

***Agreements：***

* *Requirements for Multi-TRP URLLC transmission schemes are covered by Rel-16 e-MIMO WI, no discussion in URLLC thread.*

***Open Issues:***

* *Rel-16 features need to be discussed*
	+ *PDCCH enhancement*
	+ *Other features not precluded.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-1-1: Rel-16 features need to be discussed**

* Proposals
	+ PDCCH enhancement (Huawei)
	+ Other features not precluded.
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 3-1-2: Whether to define performance requirements for PDCCH enhancement.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (Huawei, Ericsson)
	+ Option 2: No (Intel, Apple, QC)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 3-1-2a: Whether to define PDCCH performance requirements for DCI format 1\_2**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (Ericsson, CTC)
	+ Option 2: No (Apple, QC)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

GTW session discussion:

* Huawei: just DCI size difference, no UE receiver processing difference, no need see from our side.
* MTK: Same view as Huawei
* Apple: Same view as Huawei
* Intel: Similar view as Huawei
* QC: Similar view as Huawei
* China Telecomm: DCI size will impact the code rate and impact the receiver performance.

Agreement: no requirements for DCI format 1\_2.

**Issue 3-1-2b: Whether to define PDCCH performance requirements for covering multiple PDCCH monitoring occasions per slot.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes
	+ Option 2: No (Ericsson, Apple)
* Recommended WF

Agreement: Not define PDCCH performance requirements for covering multiple PDCCH monitoring occasions per slot

### Sub-topic 3-2: Release independent

*From the approved WF R4-2012648 in RAN4 #96 e-meeting, following were agreed:*

***Agreements:***

* *No additional features and capability needed for URLLC Demod and CSI requirements introduced for Rel-15 feature under Rel-16 URLLC WI.*

***Open issues:***

* *FFS whether UE URLLC requirements for Rel-15 features are release independent from Rel-15.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-2-1: UE URLLC requirements for Rel-15 features release independent from Rel-15**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (Huawei, QC, CTC, Intel)
	+ Option 2: No
* Recommended WF

Agreement: UE URLLC requirements for Rel-15 features release independent from Rel-15

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 3-1-1: |
| Ericsson | Issue 3-1-1: Our understanding is that in earlier discussions, the generic need for testing PDCCH at lower BLER was not seen. We believe that testing of the new formats could be useful though. |
| Apple | Issue 3-1-1: We don’t see strong motivation to introduce requirements with PDCCH enhancements as demodulation performance is not impacted. We don’t support introducing requirements for either DCI format 1-2 or multiple PDCCH monitoring occasions.  |
| QC | **Issue 3-1-1: Rel-16 features need to be discussed**We don’t think there is enough time to discuss PDCCH enhancement, and since PDCCH already has higher reliability than PDSCH, setting requirement for PDCCH is less relevant than PDSCH.**Issue 3-2-1: UE URLLC requirements for Rel-15 features release independent from Rel-15**We support option 1. |
| China Telecom | **Issue 3-1-2a: Whether to define PDCCH performance requirements for DCI format 1\_2**We support option 1. Share the similar view as E///, PDCCH performance with DCI format 1\_2 and different payload size needs to be tested.**Issue 3-2-1: UE URLLC requirements for Rel-15 features release independent from Rel-15**We support option 1. |
| MediaTek  | **Issue 3-1-1: Rel-16 features need to be discussed**We share the same view with QC. |
| Intel | **Issue 3-1-2: Whether to define performance requirements for PDCCH enhancement.**Support Option 2. Based on our understanding, the only difference from Rel-15 PDCCH will be the payload size. Same time, due to demodulation processing is same, we think that it is not required to define additional test with another payload.**Issue 3-2-1: UE URLLC requirements for Rel-15 features release independent from Rel-15**Option 1 is fine for us |

## 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:***Whether to define PDCCH performance requirements for DCI format 1\_2**Agreement: no requirements for DCI format 1\_2. **Whether to define PDCCH performance requirements for covering multiple PDCCH monitoring occasions per slot.**Agreement: Not define PDCCH performance requirements for covering multiple PDCCH monitoring occasions per slot**UE URLLC requirements for Rel-15 features release independent from Rel-15**Agreement: UE URLLC requirements for Rel-15 features release independent from Rel-15*Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:*No open issues. |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
|  | No assignment |  |

*End of UE discussion*

*Start of BS discussion*

# Topic #4: BS demodulation requirements for high reliability

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2014545**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014545.zip) | Intel Corporation | Proposal 1: Use the following applicability rule for FR1 PUSCH high reliability requirements definition: The requirements for PUSCH with aggregation for 15kHz can be tested either by configuring n8 and the DDDSU TDD pattern or by configuring FDD with aggregation level n2Proposal 2: Use the following assumptions for FR2 BS High reliability requirements:* TDD UL/Dl pattern: DDDSU with S=10D:2G:2U
* Aggregation factor = n8
* Applicability rule: The same requirements are applicable to TDD with different UL-DL patterns and different aggregation factor configurations under assumption that two effective transmissions of the transport block are generated
* DMRS configuration: 1+1
* Channel model: TDLA30-300
 |
| [**R4-2014820**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014820.zip) | NTT DOCOMO, INC. | CR for TS 38.141-2: Introduction of performance requirements of PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH mapping type B for URLLC |
| [**R4-2014821**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014821.zip) | NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Proposal 1: For high reliability test, the requirements for PUSCH with aggregation for 15 kHz can be tested either by configuring n8 and the DDDSU TDD pattern or by configuring FDD with aggregation level n2 (Option 2).Proposal 2: The value of SNR for TDD 15kHz SCS with PUSCH aggregation level n8 can be applied for the value of SNR for FDD 15kHz SCS with PUSCH aggregation level n2.Proposal 3: Adopt DDDSU, S=10:2:2 as TDD pattern (Option 1).Proposal 4: Adopt n8 for DDDSU as aggregation factor for TDD with note (Option 3).Proposal 5: Adopt TDLA30-300 Low as channel model (Option 1). Proposal 6: Introduce DM-RS with 1+1 (Option 2). |
| [**R4-2015023**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015023.zip) | Ericsson | FRCs for URLLC |
| [**R4-2015095**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015095.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Discussion on high reliability - FR1Applicability rule for FDD and TDD1. The agreement to add the explicatory note to the aggregation level configuration, makes an applicability rule unnecessary.
2. RAN4 to not include and applicability rule for FDD and TDD, which would be redundant due to agreed note.

Whether to clarify the safety statement1. RAN4 to discuss the inclusion of a statistical testing disclaimer in the online session/GtW.

TDD pattern1. RAN4 to agree on DDDSU, S=10:2:2.

Aggregation factor for TDDThe agreement to add the explicatory note to the aggregation level configuration, already decides the question of the aggregation factor for TDD as option 3.1. RAN4 to confirm the choice of n8 for DDDSU with note that testing can be performed with a different TDD pattern, as long as the intention of the configuration is preserved.

Channel modelA 300Hz (UL) Doppler corresponds to 6kph (jogging speed) at 28GHz.1. RAN4 to not specify requirement for higher UE speed than 1.5kph, i.e., to choose TDLA30-75.

DM-RS1. RAN4 to choose option 2 (DM-RS 1+1) for highest reliability in the agreed 10 symbol TDRA.
 |
| [**R4-2015122**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015122.zip) | Samsung | Proposal 1: Define the PUSCH high reliability requirement for FR2 with the following configurations:* TDD pattern: DDDSU, S=10:2:2
* Aggregation for TDD: n8 for DDDSU TDD pattern with note
* Channel Model: TDLA30-300 Low
* Waveform: CP-OFDM
* DM-RS configuration: 1+1
* PT-RS configuration: without PT-RS

Proposal 2: The same requirements are applicable to FDD for PUSCH aggregation level n2 and TDD 15 KHz with DDDSU pattern for PUSCH aggregation level n8. The BS conformance test can be declared, either configuring DDDSU TDD with PUSCH aggregation level n8 or configuring FDD with PUSCH aggregation level n2. |
| [**R4-2015123**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015123.zip) | Samsung | Draft CR on PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH mapping type B radiated performance requirement for TS 38.104 |
| [**R4-2015124**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015124.zip) | Samsung | Draft CR on FRC for URLLC BS radiated performance requirement for TS 38.141-2 |
| [**R4-2015618**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015618.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Applicability rule of PUSCH repetition over multiple slots for FDD and TDD: The requirements for PUSCH with aggregation for 15kHz TDD can be tested by configuring aggregation factor is n8 for DDDSU or configuring aggregation factor is n2 for 30kHz FDD.Proposal 2: No need to specify any safety statements in specification.Proposal 3: We propose to configure DDDSU for FR2 PUSCH repetition over multiple slots performance requirements.Proposal 4: We propose to use TDLA30-300 Low as the configuration for FR2 PUSCH repetition over multiple slots performance requirements.Proposal 5: We propose to configure DM-RS 1+1 for symbol length of 10. Proposal 6: Define 60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz and 100 MHz as SCS and bandwidth for FR2 PUSCH repetition over multiple slots performance requirements.Proposal 7: Define applicability rule for different SCS and BW: Only 1 SCS and 1 BW need to be tested based on the base station declaration. |
| [**R4-2015619**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015619.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Simulation results on PUSCH demodulation reuqirements with higher BLER and low latency |
| [**R4-2015623**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015623.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR to TS38.104 Addition of BS performance requirements for URLLC FR1 PUSCH repetition Type A |
| [**R4-2015624**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015624.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR to TS38.141-1 Addition of BS conformance testing for URLLC demodulation requirements with higher BLER |
| [**R4-2015626**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015626.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR to TS38.141-2 Addition of BS conformance testing for FR2 URLLC PUSCH repetition Type A |
| [**R4-2015865**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015865.zip) | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Define the FR2 high reliability requirement using DDDSU and n8. Note that the same requirement is applicable for any TDD pattern where 2 UL slots are aggregated.Proposal 2: Apply DM-RS 1+1 for the FR2 high reliability requirement |
| [**R4-2015866**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015866.zip) | Ericsson | Simulation results for BS high BLER URLLC |

## Open issues summary

In this section, two sub-topic will be discussed:

* BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR1
* BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR2

For FR1 requirements, applicability rule for FDD and TDD will be defined. And the safety statement in specification is better to be discussed during the online meeting. The SNR values for the specs will be aligned based on the simulation results.

### Sub-topic 4-1: BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR1

*The agreements and remaining open issues of #96 e-meeting for PUSCH FR1 high reliability are listed below:*

***Agreements:***

* *PUSCH aggregation factor for TDD 15 kHz SCS with pattern DDDSU: Configure n2 for FDD and n8 for TDD with note.*
	+ *Note: The intention of this configuration is to have two effective transmissions of the transport block. To achieve this for the standard TDD pattern captured in this table, a value of n8 is necessary, while for FDD a value of n2 is necessary.*
	+ *RV sequence with 4 HARQ transmission：{0,3,0,3} with note*
		- *Note: The effective RV sequence is {0,2,3,1} with slot aggregation*

***Open issues:***

* *Applicability rule for FDD and TDD*
	+ *Option 1: The requirement with PUSCH aggregation level n8 for TDD with 15 KHz SCS can be applied with FDD or TDD 30 KHz SCS with PUSCH aggregation level n2.*
	+ *Option 2: The requirements for PUSCH with aggregation for 15kHz can be tested either by configuring n8 and the DDDSU TDD pattern or by configuring FDD with aggregation level n2.*
* *Whether to clarify the safety statement*
	+ *Option 1: No need to specify any safety statements in specification*
	+ *Option 2: Yes*
		- *Option 1a: Since the URLLC features of 5G NR will potentially be used in safety critical applications, the ultimately chosen statistical testing methodology for testing of these features must be verified by an independent body of experts/statisticians, before requirements and test can be used as basis for safety critical implementations. All statistical analysis and discussions provided in this meeting are to be taken as a best effort and is not to be taken as due diligence*
		- *Option 1b: If the URLLC features of 5G NR would be used in safety or mission critical applications, the ultimately chosen statistical testing methodology for testing of these features must be verified by an independent body of experts/statisticians. It is also important to bear in mind that the demodulation requirements do not take account of all aspects of system operation (for example RF, transmitter, internal interfaces, higher layer protocol software etc.).*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 4-1-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDD:**

* PUSCH aggregation factor for 15 kHz SCS:
	+ Option 1: The requirements for PUSCH with aggregation for 15kHz can be tested either by configuring n8 and the DDDSU TDD pattern or by configuring FDD with aggregation level n2. (Intel, DoCoMo, Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia)
	+ Option 2: Same requirements are applicable to FDD for PUSCH aggregation level n2 and TDD 15 KHz with DDDSU pattern for PUSCH aggregation level n8. The BS conformance test can be declared, either configuring DDDSU TDD with PUSCH aggregation level n8 or configuring FDD with PUSCH aggregation level n2. (Samsung)
	+ Option 4: No applicability rule. (Nokia, DoCoMo)
* Recommended WF
	+ To Samsung: Only one requirement will be defined.
	+ To all companies: As Note 3 shown in below has been agreed to be introduced, is this applicability rule still necessary?
		- Note 3: The intention of this configuration is to have two effective transmissions of the transport block. To achieve this for the standard TDD pattern captured in this table, a value of n8 is necessary, while for FDD a value of n2 is necessary.

Necessary (Intel)

 More discussion on the 2nd round

**Issue 4-1-2: Whether to clarify the safety statement in specification**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: No need to specify any safety statements in specification (Huawei)
	+ Option 2: Yes (Nokia)
		- Option 1a: Since the URLLC features of 5G NR will potentially be used in safety critical applications, the ultimately chosen statistical testing methodology for testing of these features must be verified by an independent body of experts/statisticians, before requirements and test can be used as basis for safety critical implementations. All statistical analysis and discussions provided in this meeting are to be taken as a best effort and is not to be taken as due diligence
		- Option 1b: (Ericsson)

If the URLLC features of 5G NR would be used in safety or mission critical applications, the ultimately chosen statistical testing methodology for testing of these features must be verified by an independent body of experts/statisticians. It is also important to bear in mind that the demodulation requirements do not take account of all aspects of system operation (for example RF, transmitter, internal interfaces, higher layer protocol software etc.).

* Recommended WF

Agreement: capture following note in WF, not include into specification. ( no other companies show views on this topic till now except Huawei, Samsung, Nokia and E///).

* If the URLLC features of 5G NR would be used in safety or mission critical applications, the ultimately chosen statistical testing methodology for testing of these features must be verified by an independent body of experts/statisticians. It is also important to bear in mind that the demodulation requirements do not take account of all aspects of system operation (for example RF, transmitter, internal interfaces, higher layer protocol software etc.).

**Issue 4-1-3: SNR values in specs (based on simulation results in R4-2015629)**

* Proposals

38.104: (Nokia)

15 kHz/5 MHz:

* Option 1: [-8.2] dB
* Option 2:

15 kHz/10 MHz:

* Option 1: [-9.3] dB
* Option 2:

30 kHz/10 MHz:

* Option 1: [-8.2] dB
* Option 2:

30 kHz/40 MHz:

* Option 1: [-10.2] dB
* Option 2:

38.141:

15 kHz/5 MHz:

* Option 1: [-7.6] dB
* Option 2:

15 kHz/10 MHz:

* Option 1: [-8.7] dB
* Option 2:

30 kHz/10 MHz:

* Option 1: [-7.6] dB
* Option 2:

30 kHz/40 MHz:

* Option 1: [-9.6] dB
* Option 2:
* Recommended WF

The span for 15 kHz is acceptable. For 30 kHz/10 MHz, the span for ideal SNR is 3.3 dB, the span for impairment SNR is 2.8 dB. Companies add the impairment with different values：1.5dB – 2.5dB. Please update your results if new results are available. However, if no more updates whether the current values are acceptable?

Agree on the SNR values above.

### Sub-topic 4-2: BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR2

*The agreements and remaining open issues of #96 e-meeting for PUSCH FR2 high reliability are listed below:*

***Agreements:***

* *Test applicability rule for FR2 for different SCS: Only 1 SCS need to be tested*
* *Test applicability rule for FR1 and FR2: If BS declare to support both FR1 and FR2, the tests shall be done both.*
* *Antenna configuration: 1x2, ULA low*
* *SCS/BW for FR2: 60 kHz/50MHz, 120 kHz/ 50MHz*
* *Mapping type: Type B*
* *MCS: MCS5 from table 3*
* *Start symbol: 0*
* *Symbol length: 10*
* *DM-RS Type: Type 1*
* *DM-RS duration: Single-symbol DM-RS*
* *Bandwidth allocation: Full bandwidth*
* *Maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions: 4*
* *Test metric: 1% BLER (Calculated after all re-transmissions)*

***Open issues:***

* *TDD pattern*
	+ *Option 1: DDDSU, S=10:2:2*
	+ *Option 2: DSUU, S=12:2*
* *Aggregation factor for TDD*
	+ *Option 1: n8 for DDDSU*
	+ *Option 2: n2 for DSUU*
	+ *Option 3: n8 for DDDSU with note*
		- *Note: The testing can be performed with a different TDD pattern*
* *Channel model*
	+ *Option 1: TDLA30-300 Low*
	+ *Option 2: TDLA30-75*
* *DM-RS*
	+ *Option 1: 1+0 and 1+1.*
	+ *Option 2: 1+1*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 4-2-1: Waveform**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: CP-OFDM (Samsung, Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia, Intel, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 4-2-2: TDD pattern**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: DDDSU, S=10:2:2 (Huawei, Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia, Samsung, Ericsson, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 4-2-3: Aggregation factor for TDD**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: n8 for DDDSU with note (Huawei, Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia, Samsung, Ericsson, DoCoMo)
		- Note: The intention of this configuration is to have two effective transmissions of the transport block. To achieve this for the standard TDD pattern captured in this table, a value of n8 is necessary.
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 4-2-4: Applicability rule for TDD with different UL-DL patterns**

Proposals

* + Option 1: The same requirements are applicable to TDD with different UL-DL patterns and different aggregation factor configurations under assumption that two effective transmissions of the transport block are generated (Intel, Samsung, Huawei, Nokia, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 4-2-5: Channel model**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: TDLA30-300 Low (Huawei, Intel, DoCoMo, Samsung, Nokia, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: TDLA30-75 (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 4-2-6: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Both of 60 kHz and 120 kHz for both of 50 MHz and 100 MHz with applicability rule (Huawei, DoCoMo)
* Option 2: 60 kHz for 50 MHz and 120 kHz for 100 MHz (Huawei, Intel, Ericsson)Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 4-2-7: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Only 1 SCS and 1 BW need to be tested based on the base station declaration.(Huawei, Nokia, Intel, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: Option 1 + if there is no requirement for the declared BS bandwidth then the next lower requirement bandwidth is used (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 4-2-8: DM-RS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1+1 (Huawei, Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia, Samsung, Ericsson, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 4-2-9: PTRS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: No PTRS (Samsung, Huawei, Ericsson, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: PTRS on (Nokia, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 4-2-9a: PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (Nokia, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 4-2-9b: PTRS time density (LPT-RS)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (Nokia, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 4-2-10: HARQ process number**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 (Samsung, Intel, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 4-2-11: RV sequence for 4 HARQ re-transmission**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: {0,3,0,3} with note
		- Note: The effective RV sequence is {0,2,3,1} with slot aggregation (Samsung, Huawei, Nokia, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson: | Issue 4-1-2: We are OK with option 1b. There are a few text problems with 1a (“in this meeting”…)Issue 4-2-1: Option 1Issue 4-2-6: Could we clarify does this mean both 50 and 100MHz for both SCS ?Issue 4-2-7: We propose to clarify further that if the declared bandwidth has no requirement, the next lowest requirement is used (e.g. if BS declares support for 200MHz, then the 100MHz requirement is used). |
| Samsung | Issue 4-1-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDD:Just one clarification for option 1, whether two requirements will be introduced for 15KHz, one is n2 for FDD, another is n8 for TDD, or only one requirement will be introduced, the requirement specified is based on either configured aggregation level n2 for FDD or n8 for TDD?If only define one requirement, we think option 2 should have the same meaning with option 1. Issue 4-1-2: Whether to clarify the safety statement in specificationIssue 4-1-3: SNR values in specs (based on simulation results in R4-2015629)The current simulation results for each companies still have large gap with 2.5dB, further align is needed. Issue 4-2-1: WaveformWe prefer Option 1. It was agreed to not introduce lower latency requirement for DFT-s-OFDM waveform in FR1. To reduce the test efforts, we prefer to only define the requirement with CP-OFDM waveformIssue 4-2-2: TDD patternOK with option 1Issue 4-2-3: Aggregation factor for TDDOK with option1Issue 4-2-4: Applicability rule for TDD with different UL-DL patternsOK with option 1Issue 4-2-5: Channel modelWe are prefer option 1. It was agreed to introduce the requirement with MCS5 for high reliability in FR2, similar with FR2 requirement in Rel-15, we prefer to apply the channel model with TDLA30-300HzIssue 4-2-6: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)We prefer to not define the additional SCS/BW requirement for FR2. We have defined the minimum CBW requirement for each SCS in FR2, we can apply the same test applicability rule defined in Rel-15 for eMBB.Meanwhile, the performance different will be minor based on the previous results for different CBW in each SCS. Thus, we prefer to not define additional requirement only 60KHz/120KHz for 50MHzIssue 4-2-7: Applicability rule for different SCS and BWWe prefer to not define the additional SCS/BW requirement for FR2Issue 4-2-8: DM-RSOk with option1Issue 4-2-9: PTRSWe prefer to not configure PTRS in FR2. In Rel-15 eMBB, with PTRS on and off are considered for requirement with 16 QAM and 64QAM, there is no PTRS configuration for QPSK requirement. The impact of phase noise on low modulation order is minor.Issue 4-2-10: HARQ process numberOk with option 1Issue 4-2-11: RV sequence for 4 HARQ re-transmission\Ok with option 1 |
| Huawei | Issue 4-2-1/4: Option 1.Issue 4-2-6/7: We propose to introduce 100 MHz with full bandwidth allocation. The reason is 100MHz is more commonly used in the network. It is better to have a requirement to test. Option 1 and option 2 are both ok for us. By defining the applicability rule, only 1 SCS and 1 BW will be tested based on the BS declaration.Issue 4-2-9/11: Option 1. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 4-1-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDD:The agreement to add the explicatory note on the intention of the aggregation level configuration, makes an applicability rule unnecessary. But we can also agree to option1, if option 4 does not find a majority.Issue 4-1-2: Whether to clarify the safety statement in specificationThe proposal of Nokia was “to discuss the inclusion of a statistical testing disclaimer in the online session/GtW”. Not a specific text proposal.We hope that this request will finally be granted.Issue 4-1-3: SNR values in specs (based on simulation results in R4-2015629)For the 15kHz cases the ideal span is 2 and 2.5dB respectively. We think those are acceptable without intervention.For the 30kHz cases the ideal span is 3.3 and 2.8dB respectively. The 2.8dB span is acceptable.The 3.3dB span seems to come from the results being in two camps: -12dB and -10dB.We are relatively confident in our results:But we understand that contributors might have chosen quite conservative internal algorithmic settings for their provided results, to honor the URLLC target. The large span might be an artifact of this, and we would, thus, be inclined to accept it in this case.In summary: option 1 for all.Issue 4-2-1: WaveformNo need to change from FR1. Option 1.Issue 4-2-2: TDD patternOnly option 1 seems to have support at this time.Issue 4-2-3: Aggregation factor for TDDOnly option 1 seems to have support at this time.Furthermore, the previous agreement to add the explicatory note to the aggregation level configuration, already decides the question of the aggregation factor for TDD as DDDSU.[Moderator]: The previous agreement is for FR1, this issue is about FR2 TDD pattern.Issue 4-2-4: Applicability rule for TDD with different UL-DL patternsContinue with the Rel-15 assumption of the same requirements being applicable.Many meetings ago we argued that this is no longer valid for 1e-5 BLER with fading channel, but it is still ok for 1e-2.Issue 4-2-5: Channel modelA 300Hz (UL) Doppler corresponds to 6kph (jogging speed) at 28GHz, this seems quite challenging for URLLC to us, but we will follow the majority decision. Issue 4-2-6: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)We propose to not keep increasing the simulation and requirement load. 50MHz for both was agreed in the last meeting and this agreement should be honored.Issue 4-2-7: Applicability rule for different SCS and BWThe Rel-15 applicability rule limits testing to the widest CBW for each supported SCS. As long as new applicability rules do not expand on this, we can accept them.Issue 4-2-8: DM-RSOnly option 1 seems to have support at this time, which is aligned with our proposal.Issue 4-2-9: PTRSWe prefer to match the Rel-15 FR2 PUSCH eMBB PT-RS configuration for FR2 low latency testing, i.e., K=2 and L=1, at least for TDRAs >=4 symbols.It would be strange for high reliability to be less phase noise resistant than eMBB.Issue 4-2-11: RV sequence for 4 HARQ re-transmissionOnly option 1 seems to have support at this time and is aligned with FR1 agreement. |
| Intel | **Issue 4-1-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDD:**Our view on question from recommended WF: We think that it is better to have this note, because it clarifies why different aggregation level configurations are used for different scenarios and it be clear for spec reader.**Issue 4-2-1: Waveform**Support recommended WF**Issue 4-2-6: SCS/BW**Previous agreement or Option 2 are fine for us.**Issue 4-2-7: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**Option 1 is fine for us**Issue 4-2-9: PTRS**We prefer to define FR2 requirements with PTRS, to ensure more reliable performance for FR2.**Issue 4-2-9a and Issue 4-2-9b**Option 1 is fine for us.**Issue 4-2-10: HARQ process number**Option 1 is fine for us.**Issue 4-2-11: RV sequence for 4 HARQ re-transmission**Option 1 is fine for us, because it is aligned with FR1 agreement. |
| Docomo | **Issue 4-1-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDD**We are fine with Option 4. There already have been agreed the explicatory note on the intention of the aggregation level configuration in the last meeting. It seems to be sufficient adding the note only.**Issue 4-2-1: Waveform**No need to change from FR1. Option 1**Issue 4-2-2: TDD pattern**Option 1.**Issue 4-2-3: Aggregation factor for TDD**Option 1.**Issue 4-2-4: Applicability rule for TDD with different UL-DL patterns**Option 1.**Issue 4-2-5: Channel model**We prefer option 1. TDLA30-300 Low is general channel model and is reasonable to adopt for FR2 high reliability, because TDLA30-300 Low is used for QPSK/16QAM in Rel-15 requirement for FR2.**Issue 4-2-6: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**We prefer Option 1 to avoid implementation limitation for FR2 with 100MHz CBW that is more commonly used in the network.**Issue 4-2-7: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**We are OK with Option 1, if this applicability rule do not expand the Rel-15 applicability rule limits testing to the widest CBW for each supported SCS.**Issue 4-2-8: DM-RS**We are Ok with Option 1.**Issue 4-2-9: PTRS**We prefer Option 1. There is no PTRS configuration for QPSK requirement in Rel-15 eMBB specification.**Issue 4-2-10: HARQ process number**We are OK with Option 1 that is aligned with FR1 agreement. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2014820**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014820.zip)NTT DOCOMO, INCDraft CR for TS 38.141-2: Introduction of performance requirements of PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH mapping type B for URLLC | Huawei: There are some conflict work, please see comments on CR R4-2016006 and CR R4-2015626. |
|  Intel: Please check our comment for R4-2016006 |
| Docomo: To Huawei, thanks for comment. How about merging the part of clause 8.2.7 in CR R4 2014820 with CR R4-2015626?To Intel, Thanks for comment. How about merging the part of clause 8.2.8 in CR R4 2014820 with CR R4-2016006? |
| [**R4-2015023**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015023.zip)EricssonFRCs for URLLC | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| [**R4-2015123**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015123.zip)SamsungDraft CR on PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH mapping type B radiated performance requirement for TS 38.104 | Ericsson: Several TBD on transform precoding, PT-RS etc. need to be fixed in the parameters table. |
| Samsung: To Ericsson, these parameters are not discussed in previous meeting, the CR will be updated based on the agreement in this meeting for these parameters |
| Nokia: The rows in current 104 spec versions have been un-merged. This draftCR re-introduces tables with merged rows. |
| [**R4-2015124**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015124.zip)SamsungDraft CR on FRC for URLLC BS radiated performance requirement for TS 38.141-2 | [Huawei]: FRC for FR2 PUSCH mapping Type B needs to be added when symbol length and MCS are available. |
| Company B |
| [**R4-2015623**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015623.zip)HuaweiCR to TS38.104 Addition of BS performance requirements for URLLC FR1 PUSCH repetition Type A | [Huawei]: SNR value can be updated when it is available. |
| Nokia: The rows in current 104 spec versions have been un-merged. This CR re-introduces tables with merged rows. |
| [**R4-2015624**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015624.zip)HuaweiCR to TS38.141-1 Addition of BS conformance testing for URLLC demodulation requirements with higher BLER |  [Huawei]: SNR value can be updated when it is available. |
| Company B |
| [**R4-2015625**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015625.zip)HuaweiCR to TS38.141-1 Test applicability for URLLC BS demodulation requirements | [Huawei]: Wrong cover sheet version. |
| Company B |
| [**R4-2015626**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015626.zip)HuaweiCR to TS38.141-2 Addition of BS conformance testing for FR2 URLLC PUSCH repetition Type A | Ericsson: Some TBDs in the parameter tables need fixing[Huawei to Ericsson]: We will revise this CR with TBD updated. |
| [Huawei]: We have a question here: as CRs for FR1 and FR2 are separately allocated to DoCoMo and Huawei. Should each company only submit their work? We can discuss more about how to deal with this problem. |

## 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:***Whether to clarify the safety statement in specification**Agreement: capture following note in WF, not include into specification. ( no other companies show views on this topic till now except Huawei, Samsung, Nokia and E///).* If the URLLC features of 5G NR would be used in safety or mission critical applications, the ultimately chosen statistical testing methodology for testing of these features must be verified by an independent body of experts/statisticians. It is also important to bear in mind that the demodulation requirements do not take account of all aspects of system operation (for example RF, transmitter, internal interfaces, higher layer protocol software etc.).

**BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR1**SNR values in specs (based on simulation results in R4-2015629):38.104: 15 kHz/5 MHz: * Option 1: [-8.2] dB

15 kHz/10 MHz: * Option 1:[-9.3] dB

30 kHz/10 MHz:* Option 1: [-8.2] dB

30 kHz/40 MHz:* Option 1: [-10.2] dB

38.141: 15 kHz/5 MHz: * Option 1: [-7.6] dB

15 kHz/10 MHz: * Option 1:[-8.7] dB

30 kHz/10 MHz: * Option 1: [-7.6] dB
* Option 2:

30 kHz/40 MHz: * Option 1: [-9.6] dB

**BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR2*** Waveform: CP-OFDM
* TDD pattern: DDDSU, S=10:2:2
* Aggregation factor for TDD: n8 for DDDSU with note
	+ Note: The intention of this configuration is to have two effective transmissions of the transport block. To achieve this for the standard TDD pattern captured in this table, a value of n8 is necessary.
* Applicability rule for TDD with different UL-DL patterns: The same requirements are applicable to TDD with different UL-DL patterns and different aggregation factor configurations under assumption that two effective transmissions of the transport block are generated.
* Channel model: TDLA30-300 Low
* DM-RS: 1+1
* HARQ process number: 4
* RV sequence for 4 HARQ re-transmission: {0,3,0,3} with note
	+ Note: The effective RV sequence is {0,2,3,1} with slot aggregation

*Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:***BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR1**Applicability rule for FDD and TDD:* PUSCH aggregation factor for 15 kHz SCS:
	+ Option 1: The requirements for PUSCH with aggregation for 15kHz can be tested either by configuring n8 and the DDDSU TDD pattern or by configuring FDD with aggregation level n2. (Intel, DoCoMo, Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia)
	+ Option 2: Same requirements are applicable to FDD for PUSCH aggregation level n2 and TDD 15 KHz with DDDSU pattern for PUSCH aggregation level n8. The BS conformance test can be declared, either configuring DDDSU TDD with PUSCH aggregation level n8 or configuring FDD with PUSCH aggregation level n2. (Samsung)
	+ Option 4: No applicability rule. (Nokia, DoCoMo)
* Recommended WF
	+ To Samsung: Only one requirement will be defined.
	+ To all companies: As Note 3 shown in below has been agreed to be introduced, is this applicability rule still necessary?
		- Note 3: The intention of this configuration is to have two effective transmissions of the transport block. To achieve this for the standard TDD pattern captured in this table, a value of n8 is necessary, while for FDD a value of n2 is necessary.

Necessary (Intel) More discussion on 2nd round**BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR2**SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Both of 60 kHz and 120 kHz for both of 50 MHz and 100 MHz with applicability rule (Huawei, DoCoMo)
* Option 2: 60 kHz for 50 MHz and 120 kHz for 100 MHz (Huawei, Intel, Ericsson)Recommended WF
	+ TBD

Applicability rule for different SCS and BW* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Only 1 SCS and 1 BW need to be tested based on the base station declaration.(Huawei, Nokia, Intel, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: Option 1 + if there is no requirement for the declared BS bandwidth then the next lower requirement bandwidth is used (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

PTRS* Proposals
	+ Option 1: No PTRS (Samsung, Huawei, Ericsson, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: PTRS on (Nokia, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (Nokia, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

PTRS time density (LPT-RS)* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 (Nokia, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD
 |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | WF on URLLC BS performance requirement with higher BLER | Huawei |
| #2 | Simulation assumption for URLLC FR2 BS performance requirement with higher BLER | Huawei |

### 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**  |
| [**R4-2014820**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014820.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2015023**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015023.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2015123**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015123.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2015124**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015124.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2015623**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015623.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2015624**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015624.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2015625**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015625.zip) | *to be revised* |
| [**R4-2015626**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015626.zip) | *to be revised* |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### Sub-topic 4-5-1: BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR1

**Issue 4-5-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDD:**

* PUSCH aggregation factor for 15 kHz SCS:
	+ Option 1: The requirements for PUSCH with aggregation for 15kHz can be tested either by configuring n8 and the DDDSU TDD pattern or by configuring FDD with aggregation level n2. (Intel, DoCoMo, Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia, Samsung)
	+ Option 2: Same requirements are applicable to FDD for PUSCH aggregation level n2 and TDD 15 KHz with DDDSU pattern for PUSCH aggregation level n8. The BS conformance test can be declared, either configuring DDDSU TDD with PUSCH aggregation level n8 or configuring FDD with PUSCH aggregation level n2. (Samsung)
	+ Option 4: No applicability rule. (Nokia, DoCoMo)
* Recommended WF
	+ To all companies: As Note 3 shown in below has been agreed to be introduced, is this applicability rule still necessary?
		- Note 3: The intention of this configuration is to have two effective transmissions of the transport block. To achieve this for the standard TDD pattern captured in this table, a value of n8 is necessary, while for FDD a value of n2 is necessary.

Necessary (Intel)

Option 1

### Sub-topic 4-5-2: BS demodulation requirements of high reliability for FR2

**Issue 4-5-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Both of 60 kHz and 120 kHz for both of 50 MHz and 100 MHz with applicability rule (Huawei, DoCoMo, Nokia, Samsung, Ericsson, Intel)
	+ Option 2: 60 kHz for 50 MHz and 120 kHz for 100 MHz with applicability rule (Huawei, Intel, Ericsson)
	+ Option 3: Only define 60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz (Nokia, Samsung)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1 and option 2 are all with applicability rule. Our intention is to cover 50MHz and 100 MHz.
	+ Option 1

**Issue 4-5-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Only 1 SCS and 1 BW need to be tested based on the base station declaration.(Huawei, Nokia, Intel, DoCoMo, Samsung)
	+ Option 2: Option 1 + if there is no requirement for the declared BS bandwidth then the next lower requirement bandwidth is used (Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia, Samsung, DoCoMo, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 2 Same with Rel-15 PUSCH applicability rules.

**Issue 4-5-4: PTRS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: No PTRS (Samsung, Huawei, Ericsson, DoCoMo, Nokia)
	+ Option 2: PTRS on (Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

## Companies views’ collection for 2nd round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 4-5-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDDWe can accept both option 1 and 4, with a preference for 4 (no applicability rule).Following note 3 it seems redundant to capture the same information in the applicability rules.We would like to avoid option 2, since it requires the explicit declaration of the aggregation level configuration used for testing.Option 2 already introduces redundancy with the applicability rule, and would the add another stage of redundancy in the manufacturer declarations; apart from the additional work required to agree on a new manufacturer declaration table entry…Issue 4-5-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)We propose to not keep increasing the simulation and requirement load. 50MHz for both was agreed in the last meeting and this agreement should be honored.We can compromise to adding new requirement in the case an applicability rule is defined, to test only the widest declared to be supported CBW, i.e., option 1 could be fine depending on the applicability rule.Issue 4-5-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BWBoth options are fine for us. Option 2 is slightly preferred, since it replicates the Rel-15 PUSCH applicability rules.Issue 4-5-4: PTRSGiven the results we present in topic #5, we would recommend changing to option 1 (no PT-RS).Unfortunately, our higher reliability simulations won’t finish during this meeting, so we extrapolate from the low latency ones in topic #5.Issue 4-5-4a: PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)No PT-RS.Issue 4-5-4b: PTRS time density (LPT-RS)No PT-RS. |
| Samsung | Issue 4-5-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDDWe can compromise with option 1 for moving forwardIssue 4-5-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)Firstly, we have agreement in the last meeting to define requirement with 60KHz/120KHz for 50MHz, we should follow the agreement. Based on the test applicability defined in Rel-15, we think it can still guarantee the BS can tested, even BS declare that only support largest CBW with 100MHz or 200MHz, for testing, the number of PRB within 50MHz can be located in the center of 100MHz CBW.With additional test, we prefer to not introduce them from both simulation effort and test cases effort.We can accept both option 1 with test applicability rule and option 3Issue 4-5-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BWBoth option 1 and option 2 are fine with us. Option 2 is the test applicability rule defined in Rel-15. If we go with option 2, we just need to define the requirement with minimum CBW for each SCS. Issue 4-5-4: PTRSIssue 4-5-4a: PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)Issue 4-5-4b: PTRS time density (LPT-RS)No PTRS configuration |
| Docomo | **Issue 4-5-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDD**We prefer Option 4 but also OK with Option 1, if Option 1 is majority.**Issue 4-5-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**We prefer Option 1. Because 100MHz CBW is more typical in network so it is beneficial to verify. In addition, by adopting the applicability rule (Issue 4-5-3), the number of testing remains the same. If Option 2 means adding to 120 kHz for 100 MHz in addition to 60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz, we can compromise to Option 2. However, if it is not or additional simulation load is not acceptable, then we are OK with Option 3, because the requirements for 50 MHz CBW have been agreed in the previous meeting and it should be a priority.**Issue 4-5-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**We prefer Option 1. It is obvious, since the applicability rule for URLLC is essentially a reference to the applicability rule for Rel-15. However, we do not have strong opinion for this topic, so we are also OK with Option 2. In addition, if Option 3 in Issue 4-5-2 is agreed, then this applicability rule has already been approved.**Issue 4-5-4: PTRS**We prefer Option 1. There is no PTRS configuration for QPSK requirement in Rel-15 eMBB specification.**Issue 4-5-4a: PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)**No PT-RS**Issue 4-5-4b: PTRS time density (LPT-RS)**No PT-RS |
| Intel | **Issue 4-5-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**Option 1 is fine for us.**Issue 4-5-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**Both options are fine for us. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 4-5-1: Applicability rule for FDD and TDD**We are OK with option 1.**Issue 4-5-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**We do not have a strong view, but see some benefit in defining a requirement for 100MHz since it is a more common use-case. We would also be OK for option 1 if we define 100Mz bandwidth.**Issue 4-5-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**Our understanding is that option 2 is needed, otherwise some BS will not have any test. For example, if the BS bandwidth is declared as 200MHz, then it would not be possible to test. |

### WF/Simulation assumptions comments collection

All the comments for BS WF and simulation assumptions will be addressed in this section:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WF** | **Comments** |
| R4-2017525WF on URLLC BS performance requirement with higher BLER |  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Simulation assumptions** | **Comments** |
| R4-2017526Simulation assumption for URLLC FR2 BS performance requirement with higher BLER |  |
|  |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2017517 (from R4-2014820)DoCoMoCR for TS 38.141-2: Introduction of performance requirements of PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH mapping type B for URLLC | Docomo: Requirements of PUSCH repetition type A for FR1 in this CR are merged with CR R4-2017522. Requirements of PUSCH mapping type B with non-slot transmission for FR1 in this CR are merged with CR R4-2017523. So all contents of this CR are captured in CR R4-2017522 and CR R4-2017523. |
|  |
| R4-2017518 (from R4-2015023)EricssonFRCs for URLLC | [Huawei]: payload size for G-FR1-A3A-4 should be ‘2976’, Code block size including CRC (bits) should be “2992” |
| [Intel]: Agree with HW comment. Based on our understanding TBS from Table 5.1.3.2-1 of 38.214 will be used for this case. This table does not contain TBS of size 2960. |
| R4-2017519 (from R4-2015123)SamsungDraft CR on PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH mapping type B radiated performance requirement for TS 38.104 |  |
|  |
| R4-2017520 (from R4-2015124)SamsungDraft CR on FRC for URLLC BS radiated performance requirement for TS 38.141-2 |  |
|  |
| R4-2017527 (from R4-2015623)HuaweiCR to TS 38.104: Addition of BS performance requirements for URLLC PUSCH repetition Type A |  |
| *Ericsson:* *Cover sheet:Incorrect Tdoc number, no revision number, “Source to TSG” should be “R4”. Incorrect cover sheet version.**SNR values need to be added.**[Huawei]: all corrected.* |
| R4-2017528 (from R4-2015624)Huawei CR to TS 38.141-1: Addition of BS conformance testing for URLLC demodulation requirements with higher BLER |  |
|  |
| R4-2017521 (revised from R4-2015625)HuaweiCR to TS 38.141-1: Applicability of URLLC BS demodulation requirements |  |
|  |
| R4-2017522 (from R4-2015626)HuaweiCR to TS 38.141-2: Addition of BS conformance testing for FR2 URLLC PUSCH repetition Type A | *Docomo:* The tables are arranged differently between FR1 and FR2. Table 8.2.7.5.2-1 to Table 8.2.7.5.2-4 (for FR2) are arranged based on CBW. On the other hand, Table 8.2.7.5.1-1 to Table 8.2.7.5.1-8 (for FR1) are arranged based on SCS. The tables for performance requirements for PUSCH with transform precoding disabled (clause 8.2.1 TS 38.141-2) are arranged based on SCS. Should we align arrangement together?[Huawei]: Re-arranged.  |
| *Ericsson:**Cover sheet: Incorrect TDOC number, revision number missing, “Source to TSG” should be R4**Missing SNR values**[Huawei]: Please check* [draft R4-2017522 CR to TS38.141-2 Addition of BS conformance testing for FR2 URLLC PUSCH repetition Type A\_v2.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B97e%5D%5B323%5D%20NR_URLLC_Demod_Part2/Revised%20CRs/BS/draft%20R4-2017522%20CR%20to%20TS38.141-2%20Addition%20of%20BS%20conformance%20testing%20for%20FR2%20URLLC%20PUSCH%20repetition%20Type%20A_v2.docx)*SNR for FR1 has been added.*  |

## Summary for 2nd round

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

### 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 4-5-1/4-5-2 |  |

### WF and CR status

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WF number** | **Status summary**  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Simulation assumption** | **Status summary**  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of simulation results** | **Status summary**  |
| R4-2015629Summary of simulation results of NR BS demod with higher BLER | To be noted |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
|  |  |

# Topic #5: BS demodulation requirements for low latency

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2014545**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014545.zip) | Intel Corporation | Proposal 3: Use the following assumptions for FR2 PUSCH mapping Type B requirements:* PUSCH configuration: Mapping Type B, Start symbol 0, Duration 2 or 4.
* MCS 10 from Table 3
* DMRS 1+0
 |
| [**R4-2014820**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014820.zip) | NTT DOCOMO, INC. | CR for TS 38.141-2: Introduction of performance requirements of PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH mapping type B for URLLC |
| [**R4-2014821**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014821.zip) | NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Proposal 7: Adopt MCS 10 from table 3 (Option 1).Proposal 8: Adopt 2 as symbol length (Option 1) and DM-RS with 1+0 (Option 2). |
| [**R4-2015023**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015023.zip) | Ericsson | FRCs for URLLC |
| [**R4-2015095**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015095.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Discussion on low latency - FR2MCS1. RAN4 to chose MCS10 from table 3.

DM-RS1. RAN4 to choose addPos=0, if TDRA=2 or 4 OS is chosen, and addPos=1, if TDRA= 7 OS is chosen.

Symbol length (TDRA)1. RAN4 to choose the same TDRA as for FR1, i.e., 2 symbols.

PT-RS1. RAN4 to match the Rel-15 FR2 PUSCH eMBB PT-RS configuration for FR2 low latency testing, i.e., K=2 and L=1, at least for TDRAs >=4 symbols.
 |
| [**R4-2015097**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015097.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR for 38.104: Low latency BS demodulation requirements |
| [**R4-2015122**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015122.zip) | Samsung | Observation 1: The combination sets for (2 OS, MCS10, 1 DMRS), (4 OS, MCS5, 1 DMRS) and (7 OS, MCS 2 and 1 DMRS) are not feasible for date packet size with 32 bytes as least for 120 KHz SCS and 50 MHz CBW.Observation 2: The combination sets for (4 OS, MCS 6, 1 DMRS) has less padding bits compared with other potential feasible combination sets.Observation 3: Compared with 2 OS, 4 OS or 7 OS can achieve better gain from the coding rate perspective.Observation 4: 4 or 7 OS is assumption for baseline performance evaluation for most of URLLC use cases.Observation 5: Mini-slot repetition with 4OS is the typical scenario in RAN1 discussion to supporting dynamic switch between mini-slot repetition and multi-segmentsObservation 6: Minor performance difference existed for DMRS configuration with 1 and 1+1 for eMBB in FR2Observation 7: From the target SNR value with 70% TP perspective, there is no significant difference with configured 2, 4 and 7 OS for PUSCH mini-slot transmission.Proposal 3: The following combination for MCS, number of DMRS and symbol length are preferred for low latency requirement for FR2 either with (4 OS, MCS6, and 1 DMRS) or (7 OS, MCS 4 and 2 DMRS).Proposal 4: No PT-RS configuration for FR2 low latency requirement Proposal 5: No low latency requirement for FR2 with DFT-s-OFDM waveform. |
| [**R4-2015123**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015123.zip) | Samsung | Draft CR on PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH mapping type B radiated performance requirement for TS 38.104 |
| [**R4-2015124**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015124.zip) | Samsung | Draft CR on FRC for URLLC BS radiated performance requirement for TS 38.141-2 |
| [**R4-2015618**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015618.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 8: Define 60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz and 100 MHz as SCS and bandwidth for FR2 PUSCH mapping Type B performance requirements.Proposal 9: Define applicability rule for different SCS and BW: Only 1 SCS and 1 BW need to be tested based on the base station declaration.Proposal 10: We propose symbol length of 7 for FR2 PUSCH mapping Type B.Proposal 11: We propose DM-RS is 1+1 for FR2 PUSCH mapping Type B.Proposal 12: We propose to configure MCS5 from table 3 for FR2 PUSCH mapping Type B. |
| [**R4-2015619**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015619.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Simulation results on PUSCH demodulation reuqirements with higher BLER and low latency |
| [**R4-2015865**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015865.zip) | Ericsson | Proposal 3: Adopt the following wording for the 15kHz aggregation requirement for FR1: The requirements for PUSCH with aggregation for 15kHz can be tested either by configuring n8 and the DDDSU TDD pattern or by configuring FDD with aggregation level n2.Proposal 4: For the FR2 low latency requirement, assume (2 symbols, MC10) or (4 symbols, MCS5)Proposal 5: For 2 or 4 symbols, assume single DM-RS for FR2 low latency requirement |
| [**R4-2015866**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015866.zip) | Ericsson | Simulation results for BS high BLER URLLC |
| [**R4-2016006**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016006.zip) | Intel Corporation | CR on FR2 requirements for PUSCH mapping Type B with low number of symbols |

## Open issues summary

In this section, two sub-topic will be discussed:

* PUSCH mapping Type B for FR1
* PUSCH mapping Type B for FR2

For FR1 requirements, the SNR values in specs will be aligned. For FR2 requirements, open issues will be discussed further.

### Sub-topic 5-1: PUSCH mapping Type B for FR1

**Issue 5-1-1: SNR values in specs (based on simulation results in R4-2015629)**

* Proposals

38.104: (Samsung, Ericsson)

15 kHz/5 MHz: [0.6] dB

15 kHz/10 MHz: [0.2] dB

30 kHz/10 MHz: [0.4] dB

30 kHz/40 MHz: [-0.1] dB

38.141: (Samsung, Ericsson)

15 kHz/5 MHz: [1.2] dB

15 kHz/10 MHz: [0.8] dB

30 kHz/10 MHz: [1.0] dB

30 kHz/40 MHz: [0.5] dB

* Recommended WF
	+ Agree on the SNR values above.

### Sub-topic 5-2: PUSCH mapping Type B for FR2

*The agreements and remaining open issues of #96 e-meeting for PUSCH FR2 mapping Type B are listed below:*

***Agreements from #96e-meeting:***

* *Test applicability rule for FR1 and FR2 if both are supported by BS: Tests shall be done for both, and only 1 SCS will be tested for each frequency band with test applicability rule.*
* *SCS/CBW for FR2: 60kHz/50 MHz, 120 kHz/ 50 MHz*
* *TDD pattern: DDDSU, S=10:2:2*
* *Aggregation factor for TDD: n1*
* *Channel model：TDLA30-300*
* *Antenna configuration：1x2, ULA low*
* *Bandwidth allocation：Full bandwidth*
* *Maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions: 1*
* *DM-RS Type: Type 1*
* *DM-RS duration: Single-symbol DM-RS*
* *Start symbol: 0*
* *Test metric: 70% TP*
* *Section numbers and title for TS38.104: (TS 38.141-1/2 will follow the agreements.)*
* *8.2.6 Requirements for PUSCH 0.001% BLER*
* *8.2.7 Requirements for PUSCH repetition Type A*
* *8.2.8 Requirements for PUSCH mapping Type B with non-slot transmission*
* *FRC numbers in Annex A for TS38.104: (TS38.141-1 and TS38.141-2 will follow the agreements.)*
* *A.3A Fixed Reference Channels for performance requirements (QPSK, R=99/1024)*
* *A.3B Fixed Reference Channels for performance requirements (QPSK, R=308/1024)*

***Open issues from #96e-meeting::***

* *MCS*
	+ *Option 1: MCS10 from table 3*
	+ *Option 2: MCS 5 or MCS 2 from table 3*
* *DM-RS*
	+ *Option 1: 1+0 and 1+1.*
	+ *Option 2: 1+0*
	+ *Option 3: 1+1 if symbol length larger than 4*
* *Symbol length*
	+ *Option 1: 2*
	+ *Option 2: 4*
	+ *Option 3: 7*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 5-2-1: Waveform**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: CP-OFDM only (Samsung, Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia, Intel, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1

**Issue 5-2-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Both of 60 kHz and 120 kHz for both of 50 MHz and 100 MHz with applicability rule (Huawei, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: 60 kHz for 50 MHz and 120 kHz for 100 MHz. (Huawei, Intel, Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 5-2-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Only 1 SCS and 1 BW need to be tested based on the base station declaration. (Huawei, Nokia, Intel, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: Option 1 + if declared bandwidth has no requirement, the next lower requirement bandwidth is used (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 5-2-4: Symbol length**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia, Ericsson, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: 4 (Intel, Samsung, Ericsson)
	+ Option 3: 7 (Huawei, Samsung)
* Recommended WF0
	+ TBD

**Issue 5-2-5: DM-RS (depends on symbol length)**

* Proposals
	+ 1+1 for symbol length of 7
	+ 1+0 for symbol length of 2 or 4
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 5-2-6: PTRS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: With PTRS configuration for symbol length is 4 or 7 (Nokia)
	+ Option 2: No PTRS configuration (Samsung, Ericsson, Huawei, Intel, DoCoMo)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 5-2-7: PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 for symbol length is 4 or 7 (Nokia, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 5-2-8: PTRS time density (LPT-RS)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 for symbol length is 4 or 7 (Nokia, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 5-2-9: Maximum HARQ re-transmission**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4
	+ Option 2: 1 (Samsung, Huawei, DoCoMo)
* Recommended WF
	+ Has been agreed on last meeting: 1.

**Issue 5-2-9a: Number of HARQ process**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 5-2-10: MCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS5 from Table 3 (Huawei, , Ericsson for 4os)
	+ Option 2: MCS10 from Table 3 (Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia, Ericsson for 2os)
	+ Option 3: MCS6 for 4os or MCS4 for 7os (Samsung)
	+ Option 4: MCS5 for 4os or MCS10 for 2os (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue   |
| Ericsson | Issue 5-1-2: Option 1Issue 5-2-2: This is both SCS for both BW ?Issue 5-2-6: There is no need for a PTRS at the considered MCSsRegarding the channel model: The agreed assumptions for last time, repeated here show the model as TDLA30-300. However, the results spreadsheet shows TLDC300-100. I presume the spreadsheet needs updating; has everyone used the TDLA channel ?Issue 5-2-3: We propose to clarify further that if the declared bandwidth has no requirement, the next lowest requirement is used (e.g. if BS declares support for 200MHz, then the 100MHz requirement is used). |
| Samsung | Issue 5-1-1: SNR values in specs (based on simulation results in R4-2015629)We are ok the SNR value with keeping [] in this meeting and remove the [] in the next meeting if no more results updated or no technical issue identified. Issue 5-2-1: WaveformOption 1Similar with FR1 requirement, we prefer to only define the low latency requirement for CP-OFDM waveformIssue 5-2-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)We prefer to not define the additional SCS/BW requirement. We have defined the minimum CBW requirement for each SCS in FR2, we can apply the same test applicability rule defined in Rel-15 for eMBB.Meanwhile, the performance different will be minor based on the previous results for different CBW in each SCS. Thus, we prefer to not define additional requirement only 60KHz/120KHz for 50MHzIssue 5-2-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BWRelated with Issue 5-2-2, we do not think it is necessary to define additional SCS/BW requirement.Issue 5-2-4: Symbol lengthWe prefer either option 2 or option 3In terms of requirement, we think RAN4 should focus on the typical scenario with possible network scheduling.Base on the requirement of low latency, the targeting is to satisfy the latency (i.e., 1ms air interface latency), where the applicable data packet size 32 bytes and 200 bytes.As agreed in the last meeting, the minimum CBW for each SCS in FR2 with full bandwidth was agreed to introduce low latency requirement. The following is the feasibility checking for each combination set.Table 1. Padding bits for each combination set of (OS, MCS and DMRS) for 50MHz with 60 KHz SCS, and 50MHz with 120 KHz SCS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Combination set** | **Number of RB** | **TBS** | **Coding Rate** | **Padding bits compared with 32bytes (256 bits)** |
| (2 OS, MCS10, 1 DMRS) | 66 (60KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 480 | 0.3 | 224 |
| 32 (120KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 224 | 0.3 | N.A |
| (2 OS, MCS11, 1 DMRS) | 66 (60KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 608 | 0.37 | 352 |
| 32 (120KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 288 | 0.37 | 32 |
| (4 OS, MCS5, 1 DMRS) | 66 (60KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 456 | 0.097 | 200 |
| 32 (120KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 224 | 0.097 | N.A |
| (4 OS, MCS6, 1 DMRS) | 66 (60KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 552 | 0.12 | 296 |
| 32 (120KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 272 | 0.12 | 16 |
| (4 OS, MCS7, 1 DMRS) | 66 (60KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 736 | 0.15 | 480 |
| 32 (120KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 352 | 0.15 | 96 |
| (7 OS, MCS2, 1 DMRS) | 66 (60KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 480 | 0.05 | 224 |
| 32 (120KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 224 | 0.05 | N.A |
| (7 OS, MCS3, 1 DMRS) | 66 (60KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 608 | 0.0625 | 352 |
| 32 (120KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 288 | 0.0625 | 32 |
| (7 OS, MCS3, 2 DMRS) | 66 (60KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 504 | 0.0625 | 248 |
| 32 (120KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 240 | 0.0625 | N.A |
| (7 OS, MCS4, 2 DMRS) | 66 (60KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 608 | 0.0762 | 352 |
| 32 (120KHz SCS/ 50 CBW) | 288 | 0.0762 | 32 |

Based on the feasibility checking, the combination sets for (2OS, MCS10, 1 DMRS), (4OS, MCS5) are not feasible for data packet size with 32 bytes at least for 120khZ SCS and 50 MH CBWThe combination sets for (4OS, MCS6, 1 DMRS) has less padding bits compared with other potential feasible combination sets.Compared with 2OS, 4OS or 7OS can achieve better gain from the coding rate perspective.Meanwhile, as indicated in the specification 38.824, most of URLLC use cases (i.e. Rel-15 enabled use case, factory automation, transport industry and electrical power distribution), 4 or 7 OS is assumption for baseline performance evaluation.Again, from the test coverage perspective, 2 OS has already covered in the FR1 for low latency. From the receiver processing perspective, there is no different foreseen with 2OS in FR2.Thus, we think 4 OS or 7 OS is more feasible for lower latency requirement from padding bits, coding rate, use cases, and test coverage perspective.Issue 5-2-5: DM-RS (depends on symbol length)We are ok with 1 DMRS for 4 OS and 2 DMRS for 7OS.In current Rel-15 BS demodulation requirement for eMBB, RAN4 has already defined with 10 symbols requirement with type B in FR2. In terms for performance, we do not think there is too much different between 7OS and 10OS. Meanwhile, both 1 DMRS and 1+1 DMRS are configured for requirement for mapping type B in FR2. As indicated, the requirement between 1 DMRS and 2 DMRS configuration is minor.Issue 5-2-6: PTRSWe prefer to not configure PTRS in FR2. In Rel-15 eMBB, with PTRS on and off are considered for requirement with 16 QAM and 64QAM, there is no PTRS configuration for QPSK requirement. The impact of phase noise on low modulation order is minor.Meanwhile, with PTRS configuration, the number of available REs for data transmission is reduced, which will result in the increasing effective coding rate for targeting information bits.Issue 5-2-7: PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)As for issue 5-2-6, we prefer to not define PTRS in FR2Issue 5-2-8: PTRS time density (LPT-RS)As for issue 5-2-6, we prefer to not define PTRS in FR2 Issue 5-2-9: HARQ process numberWe prefer to define FR2 requirement without HARQ transmission, similar with requirement defined in FR1.Issue 5-2-10: MCSWith analyzed in issue 5-2-4, and 5-2-5, we think the current MCS 5 or 10 is not feasible, we prefer MCS6 for 4OS or MCS4 for 7OS. |
| Huawei | Issue 5-2-1: Option 1Issue 5-2-2: We propose to introduce 100 MHz with full bandwidth allocation. The reason is 100MHz is more commonly used in the network. It is better to have a requirement to test. Option 1 and option 2 are both ok for us. By defining the applicability rule, only 1 SCS and 1 BW will be tested based on the BS declarationIssue 5-2-3: Option 1.Issue 5-2-6: Option 2. No PT-RS. The recommend MCS is small. The performance improvement with PT-RS is limited. Issue 5-2-9: No HARQ. keep same with FR1. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 5-1-1: SNR values in specs (based on simulation results in R4-2015629)Wait for possible updates in week 1 (but most likely fine).Issue 5-2-1: WaveformMatch FR1, i.e., option 1.Issue 5-2-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)We propose to not keep increasing the simulation and requirement load. 50MHz for both was agreed in the last meeting and this agreement should be honored.Issue 5-2-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BWThe Rel-15 applicability rule limits testing to the widest CBW for each supported SCS. As long as new applicability rules do not expand on this, we can accept them.Issue 5-2-4: Symbol lengthWe don’t see a reason to change the TDRA w.r.t. the FR1 use case. The same arguments apply.I.e., go for 2 symbols.Issue 5-2-5: DM-RS (depends on symbol length)Choose addPos=0, if TDRA=2 or 4 OS is chosen, and addPos=1, if TDRA= 7 OS is chosen.Issue 5-2-6: PTRSWe prefer to match the Rel-15 FR2 PUSCH eMBB PT-RS configuration for FR2 low latency testing, i.e., K=2 and L=1, at least for TDRAs >=4 symbols.It would be strange for high reliability to be less phase noise resistant than eMBB.Issue 5-2-9: HARQ process numberFor our understanding, “HARQ process number” here supposed to be defining the “Maximum number of HARQ transmissions”?We are a proponent of having multiple HARQ transmissions (ideally 4) in high reliability testing. Though this could also be implemented in a single singe HARQ process.Issue 5-2-10: MCSAgree with MCS5 for 4 OS and MCS10 for 2 OS. |
| Intel | **Issue 5-2-1: Waveform**Support Option 1**Issue 5-2-2: SCS/BW**Previous agreement or Option 2 are fine for us.**Issue 5-2-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**Support Option 1**Issue 5-2-6: PTRS**Support Option 1 to achieve better performance in FR2 conditions.**Issue 5-2-7 and Issue 5-2-8**Support Option 1**Issue 5-2-10: MCS**We proposed to use MCS 10 to align with FR1 assumptions. Same time, we are open to further discuss another MCS values if there is any technical concern to use MCS 10. |
| Docomo | **Issue 5-2-1: Waveform**We are OK with Option 1.**Issue 5-2-2: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**We prefer Option 1 to avoid implementation limitation for FR2 with 100MHz CBW that is more commonly used in the network.**Issue 5-2-3: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**We are OK with Option 1, if this applicability rule do not expand the Rel-15 applicability rule limits testing to the widest CBW for each supported SCS.**Issue 5-2-4: Symbol length**We prefer Option 1 aligned with FR1 agreement.**Issue 5-2-5: DM-RS (depends on symbol length)**If symbol length of 2 or 4 is chosen, we prefer Option 2. If symbol length of 7 is chosen, we prefer Option 1.**Issue 5-2-6: PTRS**There is no need for a PTRS at the considered MCSs (Option 2).**Issue 5-2-9: HARQ process number**We prefer Option 2 similar with FR1 agreement.**Issue 5-2-10: MCS**We prefer Option 2. In the previous meeting, discussions have concluded that MCS 10 from table 3 is appropriate for the amount of data assumed in the URLLC for FR1. If it is feasible to use MCS 10 from table 3 in FR2 for low latency, we can reuse the same MCS as agreed in FR1. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2015097**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015097.zip)NokiaCR for 38.104: Low latency BS demodulation requirements | Ericsson: For the requirements tables, additional DM-RS position should be pos0 not pos1.Nokia: Thank you for spotting this copy paste error. We will fix using a revision.@Moderator: Please request a revision for this CR. Thanks. |
|  Huawei: For 8.2.8 Section title: suggest to keep the same with exited structure: “Performance requirements……”Nokia: Unfortunately, 38.104 and 38.141 follow different naming conventions for the headings. Currently 141 uses “Performance requirements…”, while 104 uses “Requirements …”.Would it be ok to continue this “tradition”, or did I overlook something?Huawei: Please continue the tradition. You are right. Sorry for the confusion. |
|  |
| [**R4-2016006**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016006.zip)IntelCR on FR2 requirements for PUSCH mapping Type B with low number of symbols |  Huawei: the proposed change affects on the cover sheet should be Radio Access Network.We have a question here: as CRs for FR1 and FR2 are separately allocated to DoCoMo and Intel. Should each company only submit their work? As DoCoMo’ CR (R4-2014820) has not been approved. From our understanding, R4-2016006 should only based on the current version of 38.141-2, which does not include the PUSCH mapping type B with low number of symbols for FR1 requirement. We can discuss more about how to deal with this problem. |
| Intel: During the drafting of this CRs, we’ve realized that some of the tables contain parameters for FR1 and FR2 and we assume that it will be hard for MCC to merge two tables. Therefore, we’ve prepared our CR which includes FR1 and FR2 parts for tables which contains joint information. As the next step, we see two options to resolve this issue:Option 1: Keep all sections (except the last section with Test Requirement) in one CR. FR1 Test Requirement Section will covered by DCM CR. FR2 Test Requirement Section will be covered by our CR.Option 2: Merge two CRs in CR one.Both options are fine for us. Probably Option 2 will be better from MCC and review point of view. |
| Docomo: FR2 requirements for PUSCH mapping Type B with low number of symbols should be introduced in clause 8.2.8, because requirements for PUSCH 0.001% BLER is introduced in clause 8.2.6. |

## 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:***PUSCH mapping Type B for FR1:*** SNR values in specs (based on simulation results in R4-2015629)

38.104: 15 kHz/5 MHz: [0.6] dB15 kHz/10 MHz: [0.2] dB30 kHz/10 MHz: [0.4] dB30 kHz/40 MHz: [-0.1] dB38.141: 15 kHz/5 MHz: [1.2] dB15 kHz/10 MHz: [0.8] dB30 kHz/10 MHz: [1.0] dB30 kHz/40 MHz: [0.5] dB**PUSCH mapping Type B for FR2*** Issue 5-2-1: Waveform: CP-OFDM only
* Maximum HARQ re-transmission: 1

*Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:***PUSCH mapping Type B for FR2**SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Both of 60 kHz and 120 kHz for both of 50 MHz and 100 MHz with applicability rule (Huawei, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: 60 kHz for 50 MHz and 120 kHz for 100 MHz. (Huawei, Intel, Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

Applicability rule for different SCS and BW* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Only 1 SCS and 1 BW need to be tested based on the base station declaration. (Huawei, Nokia, Intel, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: Option 1 + if declared bandwidth has no requirement, the next lower requirement bandwidth is used (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

Symbol length* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia, Ericsson, DoCoMo)
	+ Option 2: 4 (Intel, Samsung, Ericsson)
	+ Option 3: 7 (Huawei, Samsung)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

DM-RS (depends on symbol length)* Proposals
	+ 1+1 for symbol length of 7
	+ 1+0 for symbol length of 2 or 4
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

PTRS* Proposals
	+ Option 1: With PTRS configuration for symbol length is 4 or 7 (Nokia)
	+ Option 2: No PTRS configuration (Samsung, Ericsson, Huawei, Intel, DoCoMo)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 for symbol length is 4 or 7 (Nokia, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

PTRS time density (LPT-RS)* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 1 for symbol length is 4 or 7 (Nokia, Intel)
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

Number of HARQ process* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4
	+ Option 2:
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

MCS* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS5 from Table 3 (Huawei, , Ericsson for 4os)
	+ Option 2: MCS10 from Table 3 (Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia, Ericsson for 2os)
	+ Option 3: MCS6 for 4os or MCS4 for 7os (Samsung)
	+ Option 4: MCS5 for 4os or MCS10 for 2os (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD
 |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
|  | No assignment |  |

### 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**  |
| [**R4-2016006**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016006.zip) | *to be revised* |
| R4-2015097 | *to be revised* |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### Sub-topic 5-5-1: PUSCH mapping Type B for FR2

**Issue 5-5-1: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Both of 60 kHz and 120 kHz for both of 50 MHz and 100 MHz with applicability rule (Huawei, DoCoMo, Nokia, Samsung, Intel)
	+ Option 2: 60 kHz for 50 MHz and 120 kHz for 100 MHz with applicability rule. (Huawei, Intel, Ericsson)
	+ Option 3: Only define 60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz (Nokia, Samsung)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 1 and option 2 are all with applicability rule. Our intention is to cover 50MHz and 100 MHz.
	+ Option 1

**Issue 5-5-2: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Only 1 SCS and 1 BW need to be tested based on the base station declaration. (Huawei, Nokia, Intel, DoCoMo, Samsung)
	+ Option 2: Option 1 + if declared bandwidth has no requirement, the next lower requirement bandwidth is used (Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia, Samsung, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 2. Same with Rel-15 applicability rule.

**Issue 5-5-3: Symbol length**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia, Ericsson, DoCoMo, Huawei)
	+ Option 2: 4 (Intel, Samsung, Ericsson)
	+ Option 3: 7 (Huawei, Samsung)
* Recommended WF
	+ Will be discussed during GTW session. Depends on Chairman’s arrangement.

**Issue 5-5-4: DM-RS (depends on symbol length)**

* Proposals
	+ 1+1 for symbol length of 7
	+ 1+0 for symbol length of 2 or 4
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

**Issue 5-5-5: PTRS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 2: No PTRS configuration (Samsung, Ericsson, Huawei, Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia)
* Recommended WF
	+ Option 2

**Issue 5-5-7: MCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MCS5 from Table 3 (Huawei, , Ericsson for 4os)
	+ Option 2: MCS10 from Table 3 (Intel, DoCoMo, Nokia, Ericsson for 2os)
	+ Option 3: MCS6 for 4os or MCS4 for 7os (Samsung)
	+ Option 4: MCS5 for 4os or MCS10 for 2os (Nokia)
* Recommended WF

Depends on symbol length. Will be discussed during GTW session. Depends on Chairman’s arrangement.

## Companies views’ collection for 2nd round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 5-5-1: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)We propose to not keep increasing the simulation and requirement load. 50MHz for both was agreed in the last meeting and this agreement should be honored.We can compromise to adding new requirement in the case an applicability rule is defined, to test only the widest declared to be supported CBW, i.e., option 1 could be fine depending on the applicability rule.Issue 5-5-2: Applicability rule for different SCS and BWBoth options are fine for us. Option 2 is slightly preferred, since it replicates the Rel-15 PUSCH applicability rules.Issue 5-5-3: Symbol lengthWe don’t see a reason to change the TDRA w.r.t. the FR1 use case. The same arguments apply. I.e., go for 2 symbols.Samsung has presented an extensive analysis of the payload sizes for the different OS/MCS/DM-RS configurations.Unlike Samsung themselves, we take away from their table that our preferred TDRA of 2 OS is extremely usable and close to a hypothetical 32Byte payload target, even for the smallest CBWs currently under discussion.2OS is still the lowest latency configuration among all the TDRA, assuming the demodulation algorithm and hardware are up to the task.Issue 5-5-4: DM-RS (depends on symbol length)The proposal by the moderator is acceptable.Issue 5-5-5: PTRSWe just finished a quick exploratory simulation campaign in the common low latency setting:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SCS/CBW** | **MCS** | **TDRA** |
| **Ptrs On; PN On** | **Ptrs Off; PN On** |
| 60 kHz/50 MHz | 10 | 2 | -1.26 | -1.77 |
| 4 | -1.31 | -1.77 |
| 7 (2DMRS) | -1.41 | -1.92 |
| 5 | 2 | -5.42 | -6.24 |
| 4 | -5.58 | -6.52 |
| 7 (2DMRS) | -5.55 | -6.46 |

It is noted that the TB size is kept constant between PT-RS on and off.It is observed that PT-RS on degrades the performance between 0.5 and 1.0dB, even in the scenario with modelled phase noise (PN On).Hence, we would like to change our previous proposal and go for PT-RS off (option 2).Issue 5-5-5a: PTRS frequency density (KPT-RS)PT-RS off.Issue 5-5-5b: PTRS time density (LPT-RS)PT-RS off.Issue 5-5-6: Number of HARQ processWe are still not clear in our understanding, “HARQ process number” here supposed to be defining the “Maximum number of HARQ transmissions”? (After checking other companies’ responses above from the first round, we still could not find an answer.)We are a proponent of having multiple HARQ transmissions (ideally 4) in high reliability testing. Though this could also be implemented in a single singe HARQ process.So nearly all options are acceptable for the HAR process number (following our interpretation of the term above).Issue 5-5-7: MCSAgree with MCS5 for 4 OS and MCS10 for 2 OS.See also our comments on issue 5-5-3. |
| Samsung | Issue 5-5-1: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)Firstly, we have agreement in the last meeting to define requirement with 60KHz/120KHz for 50MHz, we should follow the agreement. Based on the test applicability defined in Rel-15, we think it can still guarantee the BS can tested, even BS declare that only support largest CBW with 100MHz or 200MHz, for testing, the number of PRB within 50MHz can be located in the center of 100MHz CBW.With additional test, we prefer to not introduce them from both simulation effort and test cases effort.We can accept both option 1 with test applicability rule and option 3Issue 5-5-2: Applicability rule for different SCS and BWBoth option 1 and option 2 are fine with us. Option 2 is the test applicability rule defined in Rel-15. If we go with option 2, we just need to define the requirement with minimum CBW for each SCS. To reduce the test effort, we are fine to define the test applicability rule, only 1 SCS and 1 BW need to be tested.If my understanding is correctly, only 1 test case among 4 cases should be tested?Issue 5-5-3: Symbol lengthBased on our technical analysis, either 4OS or 7OS are feasible for us. We are not fine with option 1The algorithm with 2 OS has been verified in FR1, we do not see any different in FR2. 4 OS or 7 OS can be guarantee the proper channel estimation algorithm implementation, like a pressure test. Meanwhile, the test coverage can be guaranteed for mini-slot transmission.to cover 2, 4, 7 symbols.Issue 5-5-4: DM-RS (depends on symbol length)Either 1 DMRS for 4 OS or 2 DMRS for 7OS are fineIssue 5-5-5b: PTRS time density (LPT-RS)No PTRS configuration.Issue 5-5-6: Number of HARQ processFor clarification, our intention is related with the maximum number of HARQ transmission as 4, which is same with the assumption in FR1. Issue 5-5-7: MCSWe still prefer option 3 based on our analysis. |
| Docomo | **Issue 5-5-1: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**We prefer Option 1. Because 100MHz CBW is more typical in network so it is beneficial to verify. In addition, by adopting the applicability rule (Issue 5-5-2), the number of testing remains the same. If Option 2 means adding to 120 kHz for 100 MHz in addition to 60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz, we can compromise to Option 2. However, if it is not or additional simulation load is not acceptable, then we are OK with Option 3, because the requirements for 50 MHz CBW have been agreed in the previous meeting and it should be a priority.**Issue 5-5-2: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**We prefer Option 1. It is obvious, since the applicability rule for URLLC is essentially a reference to the applicability rule for Rel-15. However, we do not have strong opinion for this topic, so we are also OK with Option 2. In addition, if Option 3 in Issue 5-5-1 is agreed, then this applicability rule has already been approved.**Issue 5-5-3: Symbol length**We prefer Option 1 aligned with FR1 agreement, if it is feasible.**Issue 5-5-4: DM-RS (depends on symbol length)**The proposal by the moderator is acceptable.**Issue 5-5-5: PTRS**There is no need for a PTRS at the considered MCSs (Option 2).**Issue 5-5-7: MCS**We prefer Option 2. |
| Intel | **Issue 5-5-1: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**Option 1 is fine for us.**Issue 5-5-2: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**Both options are fine for us. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 5-5-1: SCS/BW (60 kHz/120 kHz for 50 MHz has been agreed)**We do not have a strong view, but see some benefit in defining a requirement for 100MHz since it is a more common use-case. We would also be OK for option 1 if we define 100Mz bandwidth.**Issue 5-5-2: Applicability rule for different SCS and BW**Our understanding is that option 2 is needed, otherwise some BS will not have any test. For example, if the BS bandwidth is declared as 200MHz, then it would not be possible to test. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
| R4-2017523 (from R4-2016006)IntelCR on FR2 requirements for PUSCH mapping Type B with low number of symbols | [Huawei]: The SNR values for FR1 test cases have been agreed after the 1st round. Values can be updated in the CR. |
| Ericsson: Section 8.2.8.1 incorrectly states that HARQ retransmissions are assumed. |
| R4-2017524 (from R4-2015097)NokiaCR for 38.104: Low latency BS demodulation requirements | Nokia: Requirement introduction for BS type1-O is missing (section 11.2).Nokia: Done (V3).Remove highlights and changes on changes.Nokia: Done (V3). |
|  |

## Summary for 2nd round

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

### 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 5-5-1 |  |
|  |  |

### CR status

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR number** | **Status summary**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Topic #6: URLLC BS Rel-16 features

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2014545**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014545.zip) | Intel Corporation | Proposal 4: Define Rel-16 URLLC BS demodulation requirements to verify PUSCH repetition Type B.Proposal 5: Do not define Rel-16 URLLC BS demodulation requirements to verify enhanced inter UE Tx prioritization/multiplexing and enhanced UL configured grant transmission. |
| [**R4-2015095**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015095.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Discussion on Rel-16 URLLC BS featuresPUSCH repetition type BThe current TU request excel (bundled with RP-191584) has run out of allocated time in the last meeting. No update to this WID was agreed in the last plenary as far as we are aware: The submitted SR (RP-201661) did not contain the TU allocation excel, just a suggestion to extend to RAN#92, and it was ultimately noted.1. RAN4 to not treat PUSCH repetition type B demodulation performance requirements in this WI.

Inter-UE multiplexingNo impact on BS demodulation performance is expected from dynamic power boosting or UL cancellation indication.1. RAN4 to not treat inter-UE multiplexing, as no demodulation impact is expected.
 |
| [**R4-2015122**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015122.zip) | Samsung | Proposal 6: No BS demodulation requirement need to be specified for Rel-16 URLLC feature: PUSCH repetition type BProposal 7: No BS demodulation requirement need to be specified for Rel-16 URLLC feature: inter-UE multiplexing feature. |
| [**R4-2015618**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015618.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 13: PUSCH repetition type B performance requirements should be specified.Proposal 14: Parameters for PUSCH repetition Type B:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value |
| Frequency range | FR1 |
| Transform precoding | Disabled |
| Antenna configuration | 1x2, ULA Low |
| PUSCH configuration | Mapping type |  Type B |
| Starting symbol (S)  | 0 |
| Length (L) | 7 |
| PUSCH aggregation factor | n2 |
| PUSCH DMRS configuration | DMRS Type | Type 1 |
| DMRS duration | Single-symbol DM-RS |
| Number of additional DMRS | 1 |
| Propagation condition | TDLB100-400 |
| MCS Table | Table 3, [MCS 5] |
| SCS and BW | 15 kHz / 10 MHz30 kHz / 40 MHz |
| Frequency domain resource | Full Bandwidth |
| TDD pattern  |  15 kHz SCS: 3D1S1U, S=10:2:230 kHz SCS: 7D1S2U, S=6:4:4 |
| Maximum number of HARQ transmissions | 4 |
| Testing metric | Target BLER: 10-2(Calculate the target BLER after all transmission) |

Proposal 15: No need to define the performance requirements for inter-UE multiplexing. |
| [**R4-2015626**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015626.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR to TS38.141-2 Addition of BS conformance testing for FR2 URLLC PUSCH repetition Type A |
| [**R4-2015865**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015865.zip) | Ericsson | Proposal 6: Do not create further BS requirements for Rel-16 features as the demodulation aspects are captured with existing requirements. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 6-1: Rel-16 URLLC BS features

In this section, URLLC Rel-16 features for BS will be discussed.

*The open issues of #96 e-meeting for Rel-16 URLLC BS features are listed below:*

***Open issues:***

* *Features need to be discussed*
	+ *PUSCH repetition type B*
	+ *Inter-UE multiplexing*
	+ *Other features not precluded.*
* *Whether to define performance requirements for PUSCH repetition type B*
	+ *Option 1: Yes*
	+ *Option 2: No*
* *Whether to define performance requirements for Inter-UE multiplexing*
	+ *Option 1: Yes*
	+ *Option 2: No*

**Issue 6-1-1: Features need to be discussed**

* Proposals
	+ PUSCH repetition type B
	+ Inter-UE multiplexing
	+ Other features not precluded.

**Issue 6-1-2: Whether to define performance requirements for PUSCH repetition type B**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (Huawei, Intel, CTC)
	+ Option 2: No (Nokia, Samsung, Ericsson, Nokia)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

Discussion on the GTW session:

Nokia: what’s the timeline for this WI performance part?

Huawei: Current timeline is Dec, but we should focus on the technical discussion on this feature.

E///: We expect same performance compared to existing test cases, what’s the delta?

Nokia: We can further discuss this feature, but we are worry about the completion date and progress.

Intel: Mapping pattern is different and processing from receiver side is different compared to existing test cases even the performance can be similar.

Samsung: Compared to Type B, what’s the difference from baseband processing aspect?

China Telecomm: From receiver side, the processing is same. Meanwhile from operator side, we would like to check the operating scenario since the deployment scenarios are different.

This feature is Rel-16 feature introduced by Rel-16 URLLC feature and we see much Rel-16 WI performance need to be extended, we think time line not issue.

Huawei: The mapping can cause slot boundary, we didn’t cover such scenario for slot-cross.

Samsung: Fine to comprise for cover this new scenario but would like to further discuss the details of parameters.

We should prioritize the existing Rel-15 open issues.

Nokia: There are 3 cases each of them required new implementation which required further study.

* Postpone the decision in next RAN4 meeting, and till Dec 2020 focused on Rel-15 test cases open issues.

**Issue 6-1-3: Whether to define performance requirements for Inter-UE multiplexing**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes
	+ Option 2: No (Huawei, Intel, Nokia, Ericsson, Samsung, Nokia, CTC)
* Recommended WF

Agreement: Do not define the performance requirement for inter-UE multiplexing as no demodulation impact is expected.

### Sub-topic 6-2: PUSCH repetition Type B (only if this is agreed to be defined)

**Issue 6-2-1: Parameters for PUSCH repetition Type B**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: (Huawei)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| Frequency range | FR1 |
| Transform precoding | Disabled |
| Antenna configuration | 1x2, ULA Low |
| PUSCH configuration | Mapping type |  Type B |
| Starting symbol (S)  | 0 |
| Length (L) | 7 |
| PUSCH aggregation factor | n2 |
| PUSCH DMRS configuration | DMRS Type | Type 1 |
| DMRS duration | Single-symbol DM-RS |
| Number of additional DMRS | 1 |
| Propagation condition | TDLB100-400 |
| MCS Table | Table 3, [MCS 5] |
| SCS and BW | 15 kHz / 10 MHz30 kHz / 40 MHz |
| Frequency domain resource | Full Bandwidth |
| TDD pattern  |  15 kHz SCS: 3D1S1U, S=10:2:230 kHz SCS: 7D1S2U, S=6:4:4 |
| Maximum number of HARQ transmissions | 4 |
| Testing metric | Target BLER: 10-2(Calculate the target BLER after all transmission) |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue  |
| Samsung | Issue 6-1-1: Features need to be discussedWe are ok to discuss the Rel-16 URLLC functionalities with PUSCH repetition type B and Inter-UE multiplexing Issue 6-1-2: Whether to define performance requirements for PUSCH repetition type BWe prefer to option 2. Compared with PUSCH repetition type A, only different is the mini-slot repetition can cross the slot boundary, where the number of repetition can be supported with {n1, n2, n4, n7, n12 and n16}. From the BS receiver processing perspective, we don't think the combination of multiple repetition transmission blocks with PUSCH repetition A and repetition will be different. The performance is very minor, only the transmission delay can be reduced for repetition type B.Issue 6-1-3: Whether to define performance requirements for Inter-UE multiplexingWe are ok with option 1. This feature is related with scheduling and power control, no impact on the receiver foreseenIssue 6-2-1: Parameters for PUSCH repetition Type BThe issue depends on the issue 6-1-2. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 6-1-1: Features need to be discussedThe current TU request excel (bundled with RP-191584) has run out of allocated time in the last meeting. No update to this WID was agreed in the last plenary as far as we are aware: The submitted SR (RP-201661) did not contain the TU allocation excel, just a suggestion to extend to RAN#92, and it was ultimately noted.It is our understanding that there is neither time nor need to add Rel-16 URLLC features.Issue 6-1-2: Whether to define performance requirements for PUSCH repetition type BAs shown above, there are not resources left to treat rep type B in this WI.As a general comment outside the scope of this WI: It is not recommended to continue overloading and extending the WIs, in order to circumvent the restrictions and downscoping currently imposed on 3GGP work. A new WI can take over the introduction of this feature in RAN4, once the 3GPP resources and efficiency permit it.Issue 6-1-3: Whether to define performance requirements for Inter-UE multiplexingDo not treat inter-UE multiplexing, as no demodulation impact is expected (apart from the time issues). |
| China Telecom | **Issue 6-1-2: Whether to define performance requirements for PUSCH repetition type B**Option 1. Non-slot based PUSCH transmission with repetition type B has performance impact, and has not been verified in the existing tests.**Issue 6-1-3: Whether to define performance requirements for Inter-UE multiplexing**Option 2. |
| Intel | **Issue 6-1-2: Whether to define performance requirements for PUSCH repetition type B**Due to new PUSCH mapping behaviour is defined for PUSCH repetition type B in comparison to PUSCH repetition type A, we think that it will be rather benefitial to verify this functionality for BS supported it. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## 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:***Whether to define performance requirements for PUSCH repetition type B*** Postpone the decision in next RAN4 meeting, and till Dec 2020 focused on Rel-15 test cases open issues.

**Whether to define performance requirements for Inter-UE multiplexing**Agreement: Do not define the performance requirement for inter-UE multiplexing as no demodulation impact is expected.*Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
|  | No Assignment  |  |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### Sub-topic 6-5-1: Rel-16 URLLC BS features

Agreements from the GTW on the 1st round:

Postpone the decision in next RAN4 meeting, and till Dec 2020 focused on Rel-15 test cases open issues.

*In this section, interested companies can continue to provide their comments.*

**Issue 6-5-1: Whether to define performance requirements for PUSCH repetition type B**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (Huawei, Intel, CTC)
	+ Option 2: No (Nokia, Samsung, Ericsson, Nokia)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBD

## Companies views’ collection for 2nd round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Follow GtW agreement. |
| Ericsson | Follow GTW. |

## Summary for 2nd round

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

### 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 6-5-1 |  |