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# 1 Introduction

This document provides a summary from the contributions submitted for under agenda item 8.16 for introduction of DL 1024-QAM for NR FR1 for email thread [104-e-NR-1024QAM-01].

A draft LS and an RRC parameter excel sheet are in the <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Inbox/drafts/8.16/Draft_LS_xls>.

# 2. Discussion

Below is a short moderator summary based on the tdocs [3-12] submitted for RAN1#104-e.

1. **4-bit CQI table with 1024-QAM**
	* Alt 1: Reuse LTE CQI table with 1024-QAM entries [4][5][6][7][9][11][12]
		+ Note: for CQI index 14, the SE value (from LTE) is slightly updated from 8.3321 to 8.3301
		+ Has 2 CQI entries for 1024-QAM
	* Alt 2: CQI table with 3 CQI entries for 1024-QAM [3]
	* Common MCSes between Alt 1 and Alt 2 are highlighted below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alt 1 |  |  |  |  | Alt 2 |  |  |  |
| **CQI index** | **modulation** | **code rate x 1024** | **Efficiency** |  | **CQI index** | **modulation** | **code rate x 1024** | **Efficiency** |
| 0 | out of range |   |   |  | 0 | out of range |
| 1 | QPSK  | 78 | 0.1523 |  | 1 | QPSK  | 78 | 0.1523 |
| 2 | QPSK  | 193 | 0.377 |  | 3 | QPSK  | 449 | 0.877 |
| 3 | QPSK  | 449 | 0.877 |  | 5 | 16QAM  | 490 | 1.9141 |
| 4 | 16QAM  | 378 | 1.4766 |  | 7 | 64QAM  | 466 | 2.7305 |
| 5 | 16QAM  | 616 | 2.4063 |  | 8 | 64QAM  | 567 | 3.3223 |
| 6 | 64QAM  | 567 | 3.3223 |  | 9 | 64QAM  | 666 | 3.9023 |
| 7 | 64QAM  | 666 | 3.9023 |  | 10 | 64QAM  | 772 | 4.5234 |
| 8 | 64QAM  | 772 | 4.5234 |  | 11 | 64QAM  | 873 | 5.1152 |
| 9 | 64QAM  | 873 | 5.1152 |  | 12 | 256-QAM  | 711 | 5.5547 |
| 10 | 256QAM  | 711 | 5.5547 |  | 13 | 256-QAM  | 797 | 6.2266 |
| 11 | 256QAM | 797 | 6.2266 |  | 14 | 256-QAM  | 885 | 6.9141 |
| 12 | 256QAM  | 885 | 6.9141 |  | 15 | 256-QAM  | 948 | 7.4063 |
| 13 | 256QAM  | 948 | 7.4063 |  | 13 | 1024-QAM | 822 | 8.0273 |
| 14 | 1024QAM  | 853 | 8.3301 |  | 14 | 1024-QAM | 885 | 8.6425 |
| 15 | 1024QAM  | 948 | 9.2578 |  | 15 | 1024-QAM | 948 | 9.2578 |

1. **5-bit MCS table with 1024-QAM entries**
	* Adopt NR 256-QAM MCS table with following modification [3][4][5][6][7][9][10][11][12]
		+ Remove M entries (between 0 and 27) to accommodate M entries for 1024-QAM MCSes
		+ Add One implicit MCS entry for 1024-QAM [3][4][5][6][7][9][10][11][12]
		+ Add M-1 Explicit MCS entries for 1024-QAM (with modulation order/Target Code rate/Spectral efficiency)
			- Alt 1 : M=5, four explicit 1024-QAM entries [4][5][6][9][11][12]
			- Alt 2 : M=6, five explicit 1024-QAM entries [7]
			- Alt 3 : M=6, five explicit 1024-QAM entries [10]
			- Alt 4 : M=7, six explicit 1024-QAM entries [3]



* + Regarding M entries to be removed from NR 256-QAM MCS table, different alternatives were proposed:
		- M=5 ([4][5][6][9][11][12])
			* Alt 1: {5, 7, 9, 12, 14}
				+ [4][6][9]
			* Alt 2: {6, 8, 10, 12, 14}
				+ [5]
			* Alt 3: {2,4,6,8,10}
				+ [11][12]
			* Alt 4: {1,3,5,7,9}
				+ [11]
		- M=6 ([7])
			* {5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 27}
		- M=6 ([10])
			* {1, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14}
		- M= 7 ([3])
			* {2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14}
1. **RRC configuration and DCI formats**
	* Use of 1024-QAM MCS table with DCI format 1\_2
		+ Allow : [4][7][10][11][12], with separate RRC signalling to indicate the use of 1024-QAM MCS table for DCI format 1\_2 than DCI format 1\_1
		+ Do not allow : [5]
	* Send LS to RAN2 [12]
2. **Remaining aspects of 1024-QAM including spec impacts, etc**
	* TPs to incorporate 1024-QAM feature in specification, including
		+ TBS [5][12]
		+ PTRS reception procedure [6][9][12]
		+ MCS [12]
		+ DataRateCC [12]
	* Use actual overhead instead of xOverhead to determine the TBS for the SPS PDSCH [3]
	* Introduce new RRC signalling to indicate the use of 1024-QAM MCS table with SPS-Config [10]
	* Processing time relaxation [9]
	* UE capability reporting [5]
	* System-level simulation to identify the cell size(s) [3]
	* Reduce the efforts and specification impacts of DL 1024QAM as much as possible [8]
	* Identify the crossover SINR point between 256QAM and 1024QAM and the cell size to facilitate the clarification of using scenario. [8]

# 1st round

### Proposal 1

* For supporting 1024-QAM in NR downlink, adopt the LTE 1024-QAM CQI table entries
	+ Note: for CQI index 14, the SE value (from LTE) is slightly updated

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CQI index** | **modulation** | **code rate x 1024** | **Efficiency** |
| 0 | out of range |
| 1 | QPSK | 78 | 0.1523 |
| 2 | QPSK | 193 | 0.3770 |
| 3 | QPSK | 449 | 0.8770 |
| 4 | 16QAM | 378 | 1.4766 |
| 5 | 16QAM | 616 | 2.4063 |
| 6 | 64QAM | 567 | 3.3223 |
| 7 | 64QAM | 666 | 3.9023 |
| 8 | 64QAM | 772 | 4.5234 |
| 9 | 64QAM | 873 | 5.1152 |
| 10 | 256QAM | 711 | 5.5547 |
| 11 | 256QAM | 797 | 6.2266 |
| 12 | 256QAM | 885 | 6.9141 |
| 13 | 256QAM | 948 | 7.4063 |
| 14 | 1024QAM | 853 | 8.3301~~21~~  |
| 15 | 1024QAM | 948 | 9.2578 |

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 1)** |
| vivo | Support | The reasons for update CQI index 14 are as below: * All SE can be deduced based on CR/1024\*Qm except CQI index 14.
* When we use CR and SE to calculate TBS respectively, two different TBS values would be acquired, which is unexpected. The tiny SE difference will amplify with the increase of allocated PRBs.
* The SE values have an impact on MCS table design, since the medium 1024QAM entries are interpolated based on the SE values of 1024QAM CQI table.
 |
| CATT | Support | We noticed that the same update is proposed for LTE 1024 CQI table in R1-2101281. It is reasonable to have the same update for NR. |
| Intel |  | No strong preference as both options are equivalent.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support | We are fine to adjust the SE to align the SE and coding rate. However, the proposed CQI table has non-uniform SNR spacing for medium to high SNR region, therefore, we prefer to add three entries for 1024QAM. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support | 1. Okay with the updated SE.
2. Based on our simulation results, the SNR of (256QAM, 948/1024) is the same with or lower than the (1024QAM, 758.5/1024). Hence, we think the entry of (256QAM, 948/1024) should be considered in the CQI table.
 |
| Nokia, NSB  | Support  | We would support either proposal, but Alt. 1 appears to be more in line with WID objectives.  |

### Proposal 2

* For supporting 1024-QAM in NR downlink, adopt a five-bit MCS table with 1024-QAM entries:
	+ Remove M explicit MCS entries (from MCS indices 0-27) from the NR 256QAM MCS table and add M new entries for 1024QAM
	+ M=5
	+ Add one implicit MCS entry corresponding to 1024-QAM
	+ Add M-1 explicit MCS entries corresponding to 1024-QAM as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| modulation | code rate x 1024 | Efficiency |
| 10 | 806 | 7.8711 |
| 10 | 853 | 8.3301 |
| 10 | 900.5 | 8.7939 |
| 10 | 948 | 9.2578 |

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 2)** |
| vivo | Support | Sightly prefer to replace the entry {806, 7.8711} to {805.5, 7.8662}, since the spectral efficiency of later entry is closer to the interpolated value of (8.3301+7.4063)/2=7.8682. However, for progress, we can accept the minute difference. |
| CATT | Support | Although we prefer {805.5, 853, 900, 948}/1024, the proposal is also fine with us. |
| Intel | Partially support | Prefer M = 6 (additional MCS to be replaced is MCS#23) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Partially support | We are fine with the first and third sub-bullet. For the second and fourth sub-bullets, the SNR spacing between the proposed 1024QAN entries are larger than the medium SNR region, which is an optimization for high SRN region. We prefer M=6 and add 5 explicit MCS entries for 1024QAM. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support | The explicit 4 1024QAM MCS entries should include:1. Two 1024 QAM CQI entries
2. Two MCS entries by averaging these two 1024 QAM CQI entries.
 |
| Nokia, NSB  | Support  | Our preference is M=6, since we agree with Huawei that SNR spacing is slightly larger for 1024QAM entries.  We don’t, however, believe this poses a significant technical issue for the MCS table design.  |
| Samsung | Partially support | As vivo pointed out, we slightly prefer to have the entry of {805.5, 7.8662} instead of {806, 7.8711} since this is more accurate value of interpolation.  |
| Ericsson | Support | Alt 1 fits well with the WA on CQI table. |
| QC | Support | Alt 1 to align with the CQI table |
| Moderator  |  | Six companies support, three partially support the proposal.* Slight preference indicated by three companies to update {806, 7.8711} to {805.5, 7.8662} although the difference is very minute
* Huawei : M=6 with five entries for 1024-QAM to reduce SNR spacing
* For the SE corresponding to 7.4063, Intel prefers to use 1024-QAM instead of 256-QAM.
 |

### Proposal 3

* For supporting 1024-QAM in NR downlink, remove following M (=5) MCS entries from the NR 256-QAM MCS table
	+ 5, 7, 9, 12, 14

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 3)** |
| vivo | Not support | Follow NR MCS table design principle, CQI entries should be kept, so {5,7,9} should be kept as they were already included in the 1024-QAM CQI table. To make comparable with LTE, we prefer to remove entries {6, 8, 10, 12, 14} from the 256QAM table, while keeping the lowest MCS. |
| CATT | Support |  |
| Intel | Partially support | Prefer to add MCS#23 to be replaced with 1024QAM |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support | As the 1024QAM is used for UEs with good coverage, the entries to be removed should be with low spectral efficiencies. In addition, it would be preferred if the entries listed in CQI table are not removed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support | Same principle as LTE MCS table design. |
| Nokia, NSB  | Support  |   |
| Samsung | Support | We think that this is aligned design with LTE |
| Ericsson | Support | Although not our first preference, we are OK with this proposal. |
| QC | Not support | MCS entries with low SE should be removed. Support Alt 3: {2,4,6,8,10} |
| Moderator |  | Five companies support, while 1 partially support, and 3 not support. Following alternatives were proposed. Two companies mentioned that entries corresponding to CQI MCS should not be removed.* Alt 1: {5, 7, 9, 12, 14}
* Alt 2: {6, 8, 10, 12, 14}
* Alt 3: {2,4,6,8,10}
 |
| Moderator (2nd comment) |  | Based on the inputs so far related to P3, ZTE showed analysis that spacing at low SE for Alt 3 is a bit larger. Qualcomm prefers Alt 3 as it is better at mid-range spectral efficiencies, but is also OK with Alt 1 or 2. Between Alts 1 and 2, it seems the difference is really minor, also seen in the evaluations from Qualcomm. Vivo’s prefers to follow the NR MCS design principle i.e. Alt 2, and not omit entries corresponding to CQI table. Samsung, ZTE prefer Alt 1 as it provides equivalent performance as Alt 1 and is aligned with LTE MCS table design principle (as per comment from 1st round input). Given the discussion, suggest to agree to proposal 3 which contained Alt 1 (copied below for convenience).proposal 3: * For supporting 1024-QAM in NR downlink, remove following M (=5) MCS entries from the NR 256-QAM MCS table
	+ 5, 7, 9, 12, 14

Below are results from Qualcomm |

### Proposal 4

* Introduce separate RRC signaling to indicate use of 1024-QAM MCS table for DCI format 1\_2.
* Send LS to RAN2 on RRC signaling for 1024-QAM.

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 4)** |
| vivo | Not support | For DCI format 1\_2 for URLLC scheduling, the motivation to support 1024QAM is unclear. It can be observed from our simulation that the UPT performance is not obvious for 1024QAM and edge users will suffer performance degradation. It should be noted that the unit of above UPT should be Mbit/TTI in our original Tdoc R1-2100484. |
| CATT | Support |  |
| Intel | Support |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Not support | DCI format 1\_2 is designed for URLLC, we don’t see the need to support 1024QAM for URLLC. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support | DCI format 1\_2 was designed for URLCC but has allowed configuration with 256QAM MCS table. The motivation was to enable higher SE when channel conditions allow. Given that DCI overhead is preserved, we feel the most flexible option is to allow 1024QAM table for DCI format 1\_2. |
| Samsung | Support | From specification point of view, there is no restriction to use DCI format 1\_2. That is, DCI format 1\_2 is not limited only for URLLC. Note that DCI format 1\_2 could have larger DCI size than DCI format 1\_1. Considering full flexibility or XR operation, no need to limit 1024QAM only for DCI format 1\_1. S |
| Ericsson | Support |  |
| QC | Support | It gives more flexibility as current functionalities of DCI format 1\_2 are not limited to URLLC.  |
| Moderator |  | Seven companies support, while two companies do not support allowing 1024-QAM to be used with DCI format 1\_2. |
| vivo2 |  | On supporting 1024QAM MCS table for DCI format 1\_2, can we add a sub-bullet as below:* Introduce separate RRC signaling to indicate use of 1024-QAM MCS table for DCI format 1\_2.
	+ Support of 1024-QAM MCS table for DCI format 1\_2 is a separate UE capability.

On sending LS to RAN2 on RRC signaling for 1024-QAM, we think all new RRC parameters for 1024-QAM should be included, e.g. *cqi-Table-r17, mcs-Table-r17* for DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 1\_2, respectively*.* |

### Proposal 5

* Adopt TP in section 5 (R1-2100484) for TBS determination for subclause 5.1.3.2 of TS 38.214.

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 5)** |
| vivo | Support |  |
| CATT | Support |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | However, just as the last meeting, it would be better to be clarified that such TPs are only for reference for the editors when the editors’ CR is to be prepared. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | support |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |  |
| Samsung | Support |  |
| Ericsson | Support | Regarding Huawei comment, RAN1 chairman had already clarified this in last meeting. |
| QC | Support | TP 🡪 TP3 |
| Moderator |  | All companies are OK with the proposal. Regarding QC suggestion, note the TP is from vivo contribution. Regarding Huawei comment, intention of TPs was clarified by RAN1 chairman during last meeting.Proposal 5 with TP is show below the table. |

### Proposal 5 with TP

* Adopt below TP in section 5 (R1-2100484) for TBS determination for subclause 5.1.3.2 of TS 38.214.

##### TS38.214 V16.4.0

#####  5.1.3.2 Transport block size determination

In case the higher layer parameter *maxNrofCodeWordsScheduledByDCI* indicates that two codeword transmission is enabled, then one of the two transport blocks is disabled by DCI format 1\_1 if *IMCS* = 26 and if *rvid* = 1 for the corresponding transport block. If both transport blocks are enabled, transport block 1 and 2 are mapped to codeword 0 and 1 respectively. If only one transport block is enabled, then the enabled transport block is always mapped to the first codeword.

For the PDSCH assigned by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_0, format 1\_1 or format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, TC-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or SI-RNTI, if Table 5.1.3.1-2 is used and $0 \leq I\_{MCS }\leq 27$*,* else if Table 5.1.3.1-4 is used and $0 \leq I\_{MCS }\leq 27$*,* or a table other than Table 5.1.3.1-2 and Table 5.1.3.1-4 is usedand $0 \leq I\_{MCS }\leq 28$*,* the UE shall, except if the transport block is disabled in DCI format 1\_1, first determine the TBS as specified below:

…

else if Table 5.1.3.1-2 is used and *,*

- the TBS is assumed to be as determined from the DCI transported in the latest PDCCH for the same transport block using $0 \leq I\_{MCS }\leq 27$. If there is no PDCCH for the same transport block using $0 \leq I\_{MCS }\leq 27$, and if the initial PDSCH for the same transport block is semi-persistently scheduled, the TBS shall be determined from the most recent semi-persistent scheduling assignment PDCCH.

else if Table 5.1.3.1-4 is used and *,*

- the TBS is assumed to be as determined from the DCI transported in the latest PDCCH for the same transport block using $0 \leq I\_{MCS }\leq 27$. If there is no PDCCH for the same transport block using $0 \leq I\_{MCS }\leq 27$, and if the initial PDSCH for the same transport block is semi-persistently scheduled, the TBS shall be determined from the most recent semi-persistent scheduling assignment PDCCH.

else

- the TBS is assumed to be as determined from the DCI transported in the latest PDCCH for the same transport block using $0 \leq I\_{MCS }\leq 28$. If there is no PDCCH for the same transport block using$ 0 \leq I\_{MCS }\leq 28$, and if the initial PDSCH for the same transport block is semi-persistently scheduled, the TBS shall be determined from the most recent semi-persistent scheduling assignment PDCCH.

**Unchanged parts are omitted**

### Proposal 6

* Adopt TP4 from Annex D (R1-2101564) for PT-RS determination for subclause 5.1.6.3 of TS 38.214.

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 6)** |
| vivo | Support |  |
| CATT | Support |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | However, just as the last meeting, it would be better to be clarified that such TPs are only for reference for the editors when the editors’ CR is to be prepared. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | support |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |  |
| Samsung | Support |  |
| Ericsson | Support |  |
| QC | Support | Note: TP should be updated with actual INDEX of FIRST-16QAM ENTRY of 1024-QAM Table based on agreement of proposal 3. |
| Moderator |  | TP seems agreeable. As Qualcomm mentioned, we should update with the actual MCS index value when the MCS table is finalizedProposal 6 with TP is shown below.  |

### Proposal 6 with TP

* Adopt TP4 from Annex D (R1-2101564) for PT-RS determination for subclause 5.1.6.3 of TS 38.214.

TP for 38.214 v16.4.0

5.1.6.3 PT-RS reception procedure

<omit unchanged text>

If a UE is configured with the higher layer parameter *phaseTrackingRS* in *DMRS-DownlinkConfig*,

- the higher layer parameters *timeDensity* and *frequencyDensity* in *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* indicate the threshold values *ptrs-MCSi*, *i*=1,2,3 and *NRB,i* , *i*=0,1, as shown in Table 5.1.6.3-1 and Table 5.1.6.3-2, respectively.

- if either or both of the additional higher layer parameters *timeDensity* and *frequencyDensity* are configured, and the RNTI equals MCS-C-RNTI, C-RNTI or CS-RNTI, the UE shall assume the PT-RS antenna port' presence and pattern is a function of the corresponding scheduled MCS of the corresponding codeword and scheduled bandwidth in corresponding bandwidth part as shown in Table 5.1.6.3-1 and Table 5.1.6.3-2,

- if the higher layer parameter *timeDensity* given by *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* is not configured, the UE shall assume *LPT-RS* = 1.

- if the higher layer parameter *frequencyDensity* given by *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* is not configured, the UE shall assume *KPT-RS* = 2.

- otherwise, if neither of the additional higher layer parameters *timeDensity* and *frequencyDensity* are configured and the RNTI equals MCS-C-RNTI, C-RNTI or CS-RNTI, the UE shall assume the PT-RS is present with *LPT-RS* = 1, *KPT-RS* = 2, and the UE shall assume PT-RS is not present when

- the scheduled MCS from Table 5.1.3.1-1 is smaller than 10, or

- the scheduled MCS from Table 5.1.3.1-2 is smaller than 5, or

- the scheduled MCS from Table 5.1.3.1-3 is smaller than 15, or

- the scheduled MCS from Table 5.1.3.1-4 is smaller than [INDEX of FIRST-16QAM ENTRY of 1024-QAM Table], or

- the number of scheduled RBs is smaller than 3, or

<omit unchanged text>

The higher layer parameter *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* provides the parameters *ptrs-MCSi*, *i*=1,2,3 and with values in range 0-29 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-1 or MCS Table 5.1.3.1-3 is used and 0-28 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-2 is used, and 0-27 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-4 is used, respectively. *ptrs-MCS4* is not explicitly configured by higher layers but assumed 29 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-1 or MCS Table 5.1.3.1-3 is used and 28 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-2 is used and 27 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-4 is used, respectively. The higher layer parameter *frequencyDensity* in *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* provides the parameters *NRBi**i*=0,1 with values in range 1-276.

<omit unchanged text>

When a UE is receiving PDSCH for retransmission, if the UE is scheduled with an MCS index greater than V, where V=28 for MCS Table 5.1.3.1-1 and Table 5.1.3.1-3, and V=27 for MCS Table 5.1.3.1-2, and V=26 for MCS Table 5.1.3.1-4 respectively, the MCS for the PT-RS time-density determination is obtained from the DCI received for the same transport block in the initial transmission, which is smaller than or equal to V.

<omit unchanged text>

Given the agreement on MCS table, [INDEX of FIRST-16QAM ENTRY of 1024-QAM Table] can be replaced with the actual value given by 3. This change is reflected in proposal 6v2 with TP.

### Proposal 6v2 with TP

* Adopt TP4 from Annex D (R1-2101564) for PT-RS determination for subclause 5.1.6.3 of TS 38.214.

TP for 38.214 v16.4.0

5.1.6.3 PT-RS reception procedure

<omit unchanged text>

If a UE is configured with the higher layer parameter *phaseTrackingRS* in *DMRS-DownlinkConfig*,

- the higher layer parameters *timeDensity* and *frequencyDensity* in *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* indicate the threshold values *ptrs-MCSi*, *i*=1,2,3 and *NRB,i* , *i*=0,1, as shown in Table 5.1.6.3-1 and Table 5.1.6.3-2, respectively.

- if either or both of the additional higher layer parameters *timeDensity* and *frequencyDensity* are configured, and the RNTI equals MCS-C-RNTI, C-RNTI or CS-RNTI, the UE shall assume the PT-RS antenna port' presence and pattern is a function of the corresponding scheduled MCS of the corresponding codeword and scheduled bandwidth in corresponding bandwidth part as shown in Table 5.1.6.3-1 and Table 5.1.6.3-2,

- if the higher layer parameter *timeDensity* given by *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* is not configured, the UE shall assume *LPT-RS* = 1.

- if the higher layer parameter *frequencyDensity* given by *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* is not configured, the UE shall assume *KPT-RS* = 2.

- otherwise, if neither of the additional higher layer parameters *timeDensity* and *frequencyDensity* are configured and the RNTI equals MCS-C-RNTI, C-RNTI or CS-RNTI, the UE shall assume the PT-RS is present with *LPT-RS* = 1, *KPT-RS* = 2, and the UE shall assume PT-RS is not present when

- the scheduled MCS from Table 5.1.3.1-1 is smaller than 10, or

- the scheduled MCS from Table 5.1.3.1-2 is smaller than 5, or

- the scheduled MCS from Table 5.1.3.1-3 is smaller than 15, or

- the scheduled MCS from Table 5.1.3.1-4 is smaller than 3, or

- the number of scheduled RBs is smaller than 3, or

<omit unchanged text>

The higher layer parameter *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* provides the parameters *ptrs-MCSi*, *i*=1,2,3 and with values in range 0-29 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-1 or MCS Table 5.1.3.1-3 is used and 0-28 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-2 is used, and 0-27 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-4 is used, respectively. *ptrs-MCS4* is not explicitly configured by higher layers but assumed 29 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-1 or MCS Table 5.1.3.1-3 is used and 28 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-2 is used and 27 when MCS Table 5.1.3.1-4 is used, respectively. The higher layer parameter *frequencyDensity* in *PTRS-DownlinkConfig* provides the parameters *NRBi**i*=0,1 with values in range 1-276.

<omit unchanged text>

When a UE is receiving PDSCH for retransmission, if the UE is scheduled with an MCS index greater than V, where V=28 for MCS Table 5.1.3.1-1 and Table 5.1.3.1-3, and V=27 for MCS Table 5.1.3.1-2, and V=26 for MCS Table 5.1.3.1-4 respectively, the MCS for the PT-RS time-density determination is obtained from the DCI received for the same transport block in the initial transmission, which is smaller than or equal to V.

<omit unchanged text>

### Proposal 7

* Adopt TP2 from Annex D (R1-2101564) for MCS determination for subclause 5.1.3.1 of TS 38.214.

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 7)** |
| vivo | Support |  |
| CATT | Support |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | However, just as the last meeting, it would be better to be clarified that such TPs are only for reference for the editors when the editors’ CR is to be prepared. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Partially support | A minor modification in blue is needed for TP2.

|  |
| --- |
| <begin TP2 for 38.214>5.1.3.1 Modulation order and target code rate determinationFor the PDSCH scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_0, format 1\_1 or format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, TC-RNTI, CS-RNTI, SI-RNTI, RA-RNTI, MSGB-RNTI, or P-RNTI, or for the PDSCH scheduled without corresponding PDCCH transmissions using the higher-layer-provided PDSCH configuration *SPS-Config*, if the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table-r17* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam1024', and the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-4 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel. elseif the higher layer parameter *mcs-TableDCI-1-2* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam256', and the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-2 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel. **Unchanged parts are omitted**<end TP2 for 38.214> |

 |
| Nokia, NSB | Support | We support with proposed revision from ZTE |
| Samsung | Support | Fine with ZTE’s version. |
| Ericsson  | Support | Support with revision from ZTE |
| QC | Support | ZTE revision seems fine. |
| Moderator |  | TP with ZTE revision seems agreeable.Proposal 7-updated with TP is shown below |

### Proposal 7-updated with TP

* Adopt below updated TP for MCS determination for subclause 5.1.3.1 of TS 38.214.

TP for 38.214 v16.4.0

5.1.3.1 Modulation order and target code rate determination

For the PDSCH scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_0, format 1\_1 or format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, TC-RNTI, CS-RNTI, SI-RNTI, RA-RNTI, MSGB-RNTI, or P-RNTI, or for the PDSCH scheduled without corresponding PDCCH transmissions using the higher-layer-provided PDSCH configuration *SPS-Config*,

if the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table-r17* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam1024', and the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-4 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

elseif the higher layer parameter *mcs-TableDCI-1-2* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam256', and the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-2 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

<omit unchanged text>

elseif the UE is configured with MCS-C-RNTI, and the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with CRC scrambled by MCS-C-RNTI

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-3 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

elseif the UE is not configured with the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table* given by *SPS-Config*, and the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table-r17* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam1024',

- if the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled by CS-RNTI or

- if the PDSCH with SPS activated by DCI format 1\_1 is scheduled without corresponding PDCCH transmission using *SPS-Config*,

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-4 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

elseif the UE is not configured with the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table* given by *SPS-config*, and the higher layer parameter *mcs-TableDCI-1-2* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam256',

- if the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by CS-RNTI or

- if the PDSCH with SPS activated by DCI format 1\_2 is scheduled without corresponding PDCCH transmission using *SPS-Config*,

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-2 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

<omit unchanged text>

### Proposal 8

* Adopt TP1 from Annex D (R1-2101564) for per-cell data rate constraint for subclause 5.1.3 of TS 38.214.

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 8)** |
| vivo | Support |  |
| CATT | Support |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | However, just as the last meeting, it would be better to be clarified that such TPs are only for reference for the editors when the editors’ CR is to be prepared. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |  |
| Samsung | Support |  |
| Ericsson | Support |  |
| QC | Support |  |
| Moderator |  | TP seems agreeable.Proposal 8 with TP is shown below |

### Proposal 8 with TP

* Adopt TP1 from Annex D (R1-2101564) for per-cell data rate constraint for subclause 5.1.3 of TS 38.214.

TP for 38.214 v16.4.0

5.1.3 Modulation order, target code rate, redundancy version and transport block size determination

<omit unchanged text>

For a *j-*th serving cell, if higher layer parameter *processingType2Enabled* of *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig* is configured for the serving cell and set to '*enable',* or if at least one *IMCS >* *W* for a PDSCH, where *W* = 28 for MCS tables 5.1.3.1-1 and 5.1.3.1-3, and *W* = 27 for MCS table 5.1.3.1-2, and *W* = 26 for MCS table 5.1.3.1-4, the UE is not required to handle PDSCH transmissions, if the following condition is not satisfied:

<omit unchanged text>

# 2nd round proposals

There was progress on CQI and MCS tables, as well as enabling support of 1024-QAM with DCI format 2. Based on this, following TPs are proposed – note the previous proposal #7 is now updated to v2 below (reflecting also DCI format 1\_2).

### Proposal 7-v2 with TP

* Adopt below updated TP for MCS determination using 1024-QAM MCS table for both DCI formats 1\_1 and 1\_2 for subclause 5.1.3.1 of TS 38.214.

TP for 38.214 v16.4.0

##### 5.1.3.1 Modulation order and target code rate determination

For the PDSCH scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_0, format 1\_1 or format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, TC-RNTI, CS-RNTI, SI-RNTI, RA-RNTI, MSGB-RNTI, or P-RNTI, or for the PDSCH scheduled without corresponding PDCCH transmissions using the higher-layer-provided PDSCH configuration *SPS-Config*,

if the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table-r17* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam1024', and the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-4 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

elseif if the higher layer parameter *mcs-TableDCI-1-2-r17* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam1024', and the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-4 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

elseif the higher layer parameter *mcs-TableDCI-1-2* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam256', and the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-2 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

<omit unchanged text>

elseif the UE is configured with MCS-C-RNTI, and the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with CRC scrambled by MCS-C-RNTI

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-3 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

elseif the UE is not configured with the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table* given by *SPS-Config*, and the higher layer parameter *mcs-TableDCI-1-2-r17* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam1024',

- if the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled by CS-RNTI or

- if the PDSCH with SPS activated by DCI format 1\_1 is scheduled without corresponding PDCCH transmission using *SPS-Config*,

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-4 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

elseif the UE is not configured with the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table* given by *SPS-Config*, and the higher layer parameter *mcs-TableDCI-1-2-r17* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam1024',

- if the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by CS-RNTI or

- if the PDSCH with SPS activated by DCI format 1\_2 is scheduled without corresponding PDCCH transmission using *SPS-Config*,

- the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-4 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel.

elseif the UE is not configured with the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table* given by *SPS-config*, and the higher layer parameter *mcs-TableDCI-1-2* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam256',

<omit unchanged text>

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 7v2 with TP)** |
| Samsung | Partially support (needs one correction) | elseif the UE is not configured with the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table* given by *SPS-Config*, and the higher layer parameter *mcs-Table-r17* *~~mcs-TableDCI-1-2-r17~~* given by *PDSCH-Config* is set to 'qam1024', - if the PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled by CS-RNTI or- if the PDSCH with SPS activated by DCI format 1\_1 is scheduled without corresponding PDCCH transmission using *SPS-Config*, - the UE shall use *IMCS* and Table 5.1.3.1-4 to determine the modulation order (*Qm*) and Target code rate (*R*) used in the physical downlink shared channel. |
| QC | Support | Support revised version by Samsung.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support | Support with revision proposed by Samsung |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support with revision | Agree with Samsung’s revision. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Proposal 9 with TP

* Adopt below TP for incorporating CQI table containing 1024-QAM MCS entries in subclause 5.2.2.1 of TS 38.214.

TP for 38.214 v16.4.0

#### 5.2.2.1 Channel quality indicator (CQI)

<omit unchanged text>

Table 5.2.2.1-4: 4-bit CQI Table 3

< Table 5.2.2.1-4 omitted for brevity>

Table 5.2.2.1-5: 4-bit CQI Table 4

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CQI index** | **modulation** | **code rate x 1024** | **efficiency** |
| 0 | Out of range |
| 1 | QPSK | 78 | 0.1523 |
| 2 | QPSK | 193 | 0.377 |
| 3 | QPSK | 449 | 0.877 |
| 4 | 16QAM | 378 | 1.4766 |
| 5 | 16QAM | 616 | 2.4063 |
| 6 | 64QAM | 567 | 3.3223 |
| 7 | 64QAM | 666 | 3.9023 |
| 8 | 64QAM | 772 | 4.5234 |
| 9 | 64QAM | 873 | 5.1152 |
| 10 | 256QAM | 711 | 5.5547 |
| 11 | 256QAM | 797 | 6.2266 |
| 12 | 256QAM | 885 | 6.9141 |
| 13 | 256QAM | 948 | 7.4063 |
| 14 | 1024QAM | 853 | 8.3301 |
| 15 | 1024QAM | 948 | 9.2578 |

##### 5.2.2.1.1 (void)

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 9 with TP)** |
| Samsung | Support |  |
| QC | Support |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Proposal 10 with TP

* Adopt below TP for incorporating MCS table containing 1024-QAM MCS entries in subclause 5.1.3.1 of TS 38.214.

TP for 38.214 v16.4.0

#### 5.1.3.1 Modulation order and target code rate determination

<omit unchanged text>

Table 5.1.3.1-3: MCS index table 3 for PDSCH

< Table 5.1.3.1-3 omitted for brevity>

Table 5.1.3.1-4: MCS index table 4 for PDSCH

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MCS Index*IMCS*  | Modulation Order *Qm* | Target code Rate *R* x [1024] | Spectralefficiency |
| **0** | 2 | 120 | 0.2344 |
| **1** | 2 | 193 | 0.3770 |
| **2** | 2 | 449 | 0.8770 |
| **3** | 4 | 378 | 1.4766 |
| **4** | 4 | 490 | 1.9141 |
| **5** | 4 | 616 | 2.4063 |
| **6** | 6 | 466 | 2.7305 |
| **7** | 6 | 517 | 3.0293 |
| **8** | 6 | 567 | 3.3223 |
| **9** | 6 | 616 | 3.6094 |
| **10** | 6 | 666 | 3.9023 |
| **11** | 6 | 719 | 4.2129 |
| **12** | 6 | 772 | 4.5234 |
| **13** | 6 | 822 | 4.8164 |
| **14** | 6 | 873 | 5.1152 |
| **15** | 8 | 682.5 | 5.3320 |
| **16** | 8 | 711 | 5.5547 |
| **17** | 8 | 754 | 5.8906 |
| **18** | 8 | 797 | 6.2266 |
| **19** | 8 | 841 | 6.5703 |
| **20** | 8 | 885 | 6.9141 |
| **21** | 8 | 916.5 | 7.1602 |
| **22** | 8 | 948 | 7.4063 |
| **23** | 10 | 805.5 | 7.8662 |
| **24** | 10 | 853 | 8.3301 |
| **25** | 10 | 900.5 | 8.7939 |
| **26** | 10 | 948 | 9.2578 |
| **27** | 2 | reserved |
| **28** | 4 | reserved |
| **29** | 6 | reserved |
| **30** | 8 | reserved |
| **31** | 10 | reserved |

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **support/not support** | **Comments (Proposal 10 with TP)** |
| Samsung | Support |  |
| QC | Support |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusions

TBD
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# 5 Annex A (Agreements from RAN1#103-e)

Agreements:

* Introduce new RRC signaling to indicate use of 1024-QAM CQI table.
* For supporting 1024-QAM in NR downlink, adopt the LTE 1024-QAM constellation.
* 1024-QAM MCS table can be used only with DCI format with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI or CS-RNTI.

Agreements:

* Introduce new RRC signaling to indicate use of 1024-QAM MCS table for at least DCI format 1\_1
	+ FFS : support of 1024-QAM MCS table for DCI format 1\_2
		- Note: If 1024-QAM MCS table for DCI format 1\_2 is supported, separate RRC signaling is used for each of the two DCI formats 1\_1 and 1\_2, respectively
	+ FFS : whether the RRC signaling is only introduced in PDSCH-Config or it can also be separately configured in SPS-Config

Agreements:

* RRC signaling (mcs-Table-r17) to indicate use of 1024-QAM MCS table for DCI format 1\_1 is present only in PDSCH-config
* When UE is configured with mcs-Table-r17 set to ‘qam1024’ in PDSCH-Config,
	+ UE uses 1024-QAM MCS table for PDSCH scheduled with a DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI,
	+ UE uses 1024-QAM MCS table for PDSCH scheduled with the DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled by CS-RNTI if the UE is not configured with mcs-Table in SPS-Config
* Note: If 1024-QAM MCS table for DCI format 1\_2 is supported, similar approach is used for 1024-QAM MCS table usage with DCI format 1\_2

Agreements:

* Adopt following TP for in 38.212, subclause 5.4.2.1 for TBS\_LBRM determination.

![5.4.2.1  Bit selection The bit sequence after encoding   from Clause 5.3.2 is written into a circular buffer of length   for the  -th coded block, where   is defined in Clause 5.3.2. For the  -th code block, let   if   and   otherwise, where  ,  ,   is determined according to Clause 6.1.4.2 in [6, TS 38.214] for UL-SCH and Clause 5.1.3.2 in [6, TS 38.214] for DL-SCH/PCH, assuming the following: - maximum number of layers for one TB for UL-SCH is given by X, where - if the higher layer parameter maxMIMO-Layers of PUSCH-ServingCellConfig of the serving cell is configured, X is given by that parameter  - elseif the higher layer parameter maxRank of pusch-Config of the serving cell is configured, X is given by the maximum value of maxRank across all BWPs of the serving cell - otherwise, X is given by the maximum number of layers for PUSCH supported by the UE for the serving cell - maximum number of layers for one TB for DL-SCH/PCH is given by the minimum of X and 4, where - if the higher layer parameter maxMIMO-Layers of PDSCH-ServingCellConfig of the serving cell is configured, X is given by that parameter - otherwise, X is given by the maximum number of layers for PDSCH supported by the UE for the serving cell - if the higher layer parameter mcs-Table-r17 given by a pdsch-Config for at least one DL BWP of the serving cell is set to 'qam1024', maximum modulation order   is assumed for DL-SCH, elseif the higher layer parameter mcs-Table given by a pdsch-Config for at least one DL BWP of the serving cell is set to 'qam256', maximum modulation order   is assumed for DL-SCH; otherwise else a maximum modulation order   is assumed for DL-SCH;  Unchanged parts are omitted ]()

Agreements:

* Adopt following text proposal for TS 38.201, subclause 4.2.2.

|  |
| --- |
| -------------------------------------------------------- Omitted -----------4.2.2          Physical channels and modulation-------------------------------------------------------- Omitted ---------------The modulation schemes supported are -    in the downlink, QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM, ~~and~~ 256QAM and 1024 QAM-    in the uplink, QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM and 256QAM for OFDM with a CP and π/2-BPSK, QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM and 256QAM for DFT-s-OFDM with a CP-------------------------------------------------------- Omitted ------ |

Agreements:

* Adopt following TP for 38.211 to reflect the agreed 1024-QAM constellation.



Agreements:

* Adopt following TP to 38.211, subclause 7.3.1.2, to reflect 1024-QAM support for PDSCH

Section 7.3.1.2

Table 7.3.1.2-1: Supported modulation schemes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Modulation scheme | Modulation order  |
| QPSK | 2 |
| 16QAM | 4 |
| 64QAM | 6 |
| 256QAM | 8 |
| 1024QAM | 10 |

Agreements:

* Adopt following TP for 38.214, subclause 5.2.2.1, reflecting the 1024-QAM CQI table usage based on corresponding RRC parameter as follows.
	+ Note : RAN1 to further align with the RAN2 signaling design

5.2.2.1   Channel quality indicator (CQI)

-------------------------------------------------------- Omitted ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The CQI indices and their interpretations are given in Table 5.2.2.1-2 or Table 5.2.2.1-4 for reporting CQI based on QPSK, 16QAM and 64QAM. The CQI indices and their interpretations are given in Table 5.2.2.1-3 for reporting CQI based on QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM and 256QAM. The CQI indices and their interpretations are given in Table 5.2.2.1-5 for reporting CQI based on QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM, 256QAM and 1024 QAM.

Based on an unrestricted observation interval in time unless specified otherwise in this Clause, and an unrestricted observation interval in frequency, the UE shall derive for each CQI value reported in uplink slot *n* the highest CQI index which satisfies the following condition:

-    A single PDSCH transport block with a combination of modulation scheme, target code rate and transport block size corresponding to the CQI index, and occupying a group of downlink physical resource blocks termed the CSI reference resource, could be received with a transport block error probability not exceeding:

-    0.1, if the higher layer parameter *cqi-Table* in *CSI-ReportConfig* configures ‘table1’ (corresponding to Table 5.2.2.1-2), or ‘table2’ (corresponding to Table 5.2.2.1-3), or if the higher layer parameter *cqi-Table-r17* in *CSI-ReportConfig* configures ‘table4’ (corresponding to Table 5.2.2.1-5)

-    0.00001, if the higher layer parameter *cqi-Table* in *CSI-ReportConfig* configures ‘table3’ (corresponding to Table 5.2.2.1-4).

-------------------------------------------------------- Omitted -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Agreements:

* Companies are encouraged to use below link-level simulation assumptions for assessing at least transition point between 256-QAM and 1024-QAM.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| Carrier frequency, SCS, System BW | 3.5GHz, 30kHz, 100 MHz  |
| Channel model | AWGN, CDL-B or CDL-C in TR 38.901 with up to 30ns delay spread  |
| UE speed | 3km/h, 0km/h |
| Number of UE antennas  | 1T4R, ~~2T4R or 4T4R~~ |
| Number of gNB antennas | 32T32R or 64T64R or 2T or 8T |
| Tx EVM | 0, 2% |
| Rx EVM | 0, 3% |
| MCS | 256 QAM, 1024 QAM Coding Rate\*: 0.70, 0.75, 0.80, 0.85, 0.90~~, 0.925~~Other coding rates are not precluded and, if simulated, to be reported by each company |
| DMRS type | DM-RS type 1 |
| Number of DMRS symbols | 1 |
| Number of scheduled RBs | 273 |
| PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 |
| Rank | Rank1, Rank 2,  |
| Channel estimation | Realistic channel estimation |
| Metric | Crossover SNR at transition points between 256-QAM and 1024-QAM |
| Note\*: Coding rates are used for 1024QAM, while coding rates for 256QAM are selected from TS38.214 MCS table 2 |