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# Introduction

In this contribution, we summarize observations and issues regarding link level evaluation results for the following email discussion in RAN1#103-e.

[103-e-NR-52-71-Evaluations] Email discussion/approval on aspects related to link level evaluations until 11/4; address any remaining aspects by 11/12 – Huaming (Vivo)

Note that the collection of all evaluation results including both link and system level submitted to [102-e-Post-NR-52-71GHz-01] is captured in R1-2007485.

Section 2 contains the summary of observations based on the link level evaluation results in the submitted contributions from agenda 8.2.1 and 8.2.3. Section 3 contains the summary of remaining issues related to evaluation assumptions based on the submitted contributions from agenda 8.2.1 and 8.2.3.

# Observations on link level evaluation results

In this section, we provide a summary of observations and proposals on link level evaluation results discussed in the submitted contributions.

As agreed in RAN1#101-e, the primary objective of the evaluation is to evaluate performance of PDSCH/PUSCH including study of phase noise impairment impact for various numerology (i.e. subcarrier spacing, CP length) and possibly for various carrier frequencies. The evaluation KPI(s) include BLER. The secondary objective of the evaluation is to evaluate performance of SSB/PRACH including study of phase noise impairment impact for various numerology (i.e. subcarrier spacing, CP length) and possibly for various carrier frequencies. Evaluation KPI(s) include miss-detection, and false alarm.

Table 1 Link level evaluation assumptions and parameters

| Assumptions | Value |
| --- | --- |
| Carrier Frequency [GHz] | 60 GHz    Optional: 70 GHz |
| Subcarrier Spacing [kHz] | PDSCH/PUSCH:  - {120, 240, 480, 960} kHz  -optional: 1920 kHz  Optional:  - if evaluated companies are asked to provide information on other channels/signals and subcarrier spacing |
| Bandwidth [MHz] | PDSCH/PUSCH:  - {400, 2000} MHz    Optional:  - Companies are asked to provide information if other bandwidths are evaluated  Note: Evaluation of listed channel bandwidth does not mean RAN1 has agreed to support such channel bandwidth and are only for evaluation purposes to obtain useful insights. |
| Number of RB | For 400 MHz:  - 256 (120 kHz),  - 128 (240 kHz),  - 64 (480 kHz),  - 32 (960 kHz),  - N/A (1920 kHz)  For 2000 MHz:  - N/A (120 kHz),  - N/A (240 kHz),  - 320 (480 kHz) (optional),  - 160 (960 kHz),  - 80 (1920 kHz),    For other channel bandwidths:  - Companies are asked to provide information. Companies are encouraged to utilize linearly scaled PRB sizes for a given bandwidth based on above.  Note: Other bandwidth and sub-carrier spacing combinations can be optionally used. |
| Waveform | For PDSCH:  CP-OFDM  For PUSCH:  CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM |
| CP Type | Normal CP  Extended CP  Note: ECP is not expected to be applicable in all SCS and channel conditions, and companies providing results for ECP are encouraged to provide evaluation results with motivation/justification of simulated ECP cases |
| Channel Model | TDL model as defined in of TR38.901 Section 7.7.2:  - TDL-A (5ns, 10ns, 20ns DS)  - optional DS for consideration: 40ns, 60ns DS  CDL model as defined in of TR38.901 Section 7.7.1:  - CDL-B (20ns, 50ns DS)  - CDL-D (20ns, 30ns DS) with K-factor = 10 dB  - optional DS for consideration: 100ns DS  Optional modification CDL-B/D model  (a) Indoor Office NLOS: CDL-B (20 ns DS), and Indoor Office LOS: CDL-D (20 ns DS)  - Use mean angular spread values from Table 7.5.6-Part2 (for ASD, ASA, and ZSA) and Table 7.5-10 (for ZSD)  - Use mean angles of CDL-B/D for desired mean angles as baseline (no angle translation)  - Note that the angular spread values in the table are quoted in log units  - Mean K-factor for CDL-D from Table 7.5.6-Part2 (9 dB)  (b) UMi – Street Canyon NLOS: CDL-B (50 ns DS), and UMi – Street Canyon LOS: CDL-D (30 ns)  - Use mean angular spread values from Table 7.5.6-Part1 (for ASD, ASA, and ZSA) and Table 7.5-8 (for ZSD).  - Use mean angles of CDL-B/D for desired mean angles as baseline (no angle translation)  - Note that the angular spread values in the table are quoted in log units  - Use mean K-factor for CDL-D from Table 7.5.6-Part1 (7 dB)  Note: Mean angular spread values are used as desired AS value to scale the ray angles as described in TR38.901 section 7.7.5.1. As baseline, the ray angles are not translated, meaning (TR38.901 section 7.7.5.1). If companies perform translation of the ray angles they are encouraged to report the details. The mean K-factor is used to scale the tap powers as described in TR38.901 section 7.7.6.  Note 2: for TDL/CDL model, the delay spread (DS) value mentioned is the delay spread scaling value (i.e. corresponding to normalized delay of 1.0).  Note 3: Other models (either TDL or CDL) with DS values not listed are optional.  Note 4: Companies are encouraged to provide evaluation results with motivation/justification of simulated DS values. |
| Antenna Configuration (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) | For TDL model:  - 2x2  - 1x2 (optional)  For CDL model:  Configuration 1:  - (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,8,16,2) BS with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)  - (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,4,4,2) UE with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)  Configuration 2:  - (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,4,8,2) BS with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)  - (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,2,2,2) UE with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH) |
| Mobility | 3 km/hr |
| PA Model | Optional:  - Companies to provide modelling (in lieu of pre-loaded Tx EVM) |
| gNB TRP PN Model | 3GPP TR38.803 example 2 BS PN profile  Optional:  - If other PN profile is used, companies to provide information on the modelling used  Note: companies to provide information about the LO distribution model assumed in the simulations. |
| UE PN Model | 3GPP TR38.803 example 2 UE PN profile  Optional:  - If other PN profile is used, companies to provide information on the modelling used  Note: companies to provide information about the LO distribution model assumed in the simulations. |
| Pre-loaded Tx EVM | Optional:  - 3% at Tx (In lieu of PA model),  - If other values are used companies are asked to provide information on the values selected for simulation. |
| Additive Rx EVM | Optional:  - 5% at Rx,  - If other values are used companies are asked to provide information on the values selected for simulation. |
| I-Q Imbalance | Optional:  - (-26dBc),  - (-31dBc),  - If other values are used companies are asked to provide information on the values selected for simulation. |
| Frequency Offset | Optional:  - 0.1 ppm (for PDSCH/PUSCH)  - 5, 10, 20 ppm (for initial access) |
| Channel Estimation | Realistic channel estimation |
| Transmission Rank | Rank 1  Note: companies are asked to provide information the precoding scheme (including granularity) used in the evaluations. |
| PDSCH SLIV | (S=2, L=12)  Optional:(S=0, L=14)  Note: Starting symbol, S, (indexed from 0) and length, L. |
| DMRS Configuration | 1 DMRS symbol (front loaded), or 2 DMRS symbols at (2,11) symbol index  Note: no data multiplexing is assumed in DMRS symbols |
| PTRS Configuration | For CP-OFDM:  (K = 4, L = 1) or (K = 2, L = 1)  Note: PTRS per K number of PRBs, and PTRS every L number of OFDM symbols  For DFT-s-OFDM:  (Ng = 2, Ns = 2, L = 1)  (Ng = 2, Ns = 4, L = 1)  (Ng = 4, Ns = 2, L = 1)  (Ng = 4, Ns = 4, L = 1)  (Ng = 8, Ns = 4, L = 1)  Note: Ng number of PT-RS groups, Ns number of samples per PT-RS group, and PTRS every L number of DFT-s-OFDM symbols  Note 2: companies are asked to provide the PT-RS configuration used for DFT-s-OFDM simulation among the listed above, where the selection of the PT-RS is chosen such that it provides similar overhead as the chosen PT-RS configuration for PUSCH CP-OFDM (if simulated). |
| CSI-RS / TRS | CSI-RS/TRS is assumed to be off (for RS overhead) |
| MCS/TBS | From MCS Table 1 (TS38.214):  - MCS 7 (QPSK),  - MCS 16 (16QAM),  - MCS 22 (64QAM),  From MCS Table 2 (TS38.214):  - MCS 27 (256QAM) (optional)  Assume NohPRB = 0 for MCS calcuations.  Note: If normal CP and extended CP are to be compared, companies are asked to provide information on the MCS values used that provide similar payload sizes for the comparison. Companies to provide actual code rate used in the evaluations. |

The above table was agreed in last RAN1 meeting as the LLS evaluation assumptions.

## 2.1. PDSCH/PUSCH performance

Multiple sources submitted evaluation results on PDSCH/PUSCH BLER performance based on the above LLS evaluation assumptions and some are evaluated with optional assumptions. The observations are summarized on the impact of SCS, delay spread and CP type, DFT-s-OFDM waveform, ICI and PTRS, DMRS in the following sub-sections.

Sixteen sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [23, MediaTek], [1, Futurewei], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) evaluated PDSCH/PUSCH BLER performance with different SCS.

### SCS impact for CP-OFDM

#### Individual observations

The following are individual observations directly extracted from these sources.

###### [[1], Futurewei]

It evaluated 120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz SCS with ICI filter to cancel the PN impact. The optimal number of taps for ICI filter is decided to be {1,3,5,7} FD filter taps for {960 kHz, 480kHz, 240 kHz, 120 kHz} SCS respectively, where 1-tap filter is equivalent to CPE compensation. The following observations are made.

Observation 3: With the ICI filter, all analyzed SCS provide similar performance for DS=10ns at the cost of additional signal processing required by the ICI filtering.

###### [[2], Lenovo]

It evaluated PDSCH with different SCS values including 120kHz, 240kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz and 1920MHz with different MCS values including MCS7 (QPSK), MCS16 (16QAM) and MCS22 (64QAM) in TDL-A channel. The following observations are made.

Observation 1: For lower MCS (QPSK) and mid-range MCS (16QAM), there is minor performance difference between different SCS values up to 960kHz with 400MHz bandwidth.

Observation 2: For higher MCS (64QAM), there is considerable performance gain, with 960kHz performing the best, while 120kHz performing the worst with 400MHz bandwidth.

Observation 3: For higher MCS (64QAM), for 10% BLER target, the performance is almost same for 960kHz and 480kHz subcarrier spacing, but for 1% BLER target, the performance for 960kHz is significantly better than 480kHz

Observation 4: For lower MCS (QPSK) and mid-range MCS (16QAM), there is minor performance difference between 960kHz and 1920kHz with 2000MHz bandwidth.

Observation 5: For higher MCS (64QAM), there is some performance gain with 1920kHz in comparison to 960kHz

###### [[55], Lenovo]

It evaluated PDSCH with different SCS values including 120kHz, 240kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz and 1920MHz with different MCS values including MCS7 (QPSK), MCS16 (16QAM) and MCS22 (64QAM) in CDL channel. The following observations are made.

Observation 1: For lower delay spread, low-mid range MCS and normal cyclic prefix, there is no significant performance difference for target BLER between different subcarrier spacing values

Observation 2: For lower delay spread, higher MCS and normal cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performs the best and with significant performance difference for target BLER of 1%, that might be needed for URLLC

Observation 3: For higher delay spread and normal cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performs the worst and target BLER cannot be reached for high MCS

Observation 4: For higher delay spread and extended cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performance is significantly improved compared to normal cyclic prefix

Observation 5: For lower delay spread, low-mid range MCS and normal cyclic prefix, there is no significant performance difference in terms of spectral efficiency between different subcarrier spacing values

Observation 6: For lower delay spread, higher MCS and normal cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performs the best and reaches the peak spectral efficiency at much lower SNR

Observation 7: For higher delay spread and normal cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performs the worst

Observation 8: For higher delay spread and extended cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performance is significantly improved compared to normal cyclic prefix and it performs slightly better than 480kHz for high MCS

###### [[3], Huawei]

It evaluated 120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz SCS in 400MHz CDL channel with only CPE compensation for MCS 7/16/22 with CP-OFDM, and with both CPE and ICI compensation for MCS 22 of CP-OFDM. In [3], it is observed “all the examined SCSs of 120, 240, 480, and 960 kHz achieve a similar BLER for QPSK and 16-QAM modulations” and “64-QAM is more sensitive to the phase noise and larger SCSs (480 and 960 kHz) perform considerably better than smaller SCSs (120 and 240 kHz) when only CPE compensation is carried out.”. In addition, the following observation is made.

Observation 1: For CP-OFDM, using SCS of 120 kHz or 240 kHz can achieve a similar PDSCH BLER as using 480 kHz or 960 kHz for QPSK, 16QAM and 64QAM with suitable phase noise compensation method.

###### [[68], Huawei]

Observation 1: For QPSK and 16QAM, SCSs larger than 120 kHz do not achieve a significantly better BLER. For 64QAM, a larger SCS performs better than a smaller SCS without ICI compensation. Block-based PTRS enables ICI compensation for smaller SCSs and helps a smaller SCS to perform even better than a larger SCS.

Observation 2: If CDL-B DS=50ns channel model is considered, the BLER performance of a subcarrier spacing larger than 480 kHz decreases a lot due to the short CP length.

Observation 3: When both the impact of phase noise and CP length on BLER performance are considered, simulation results show that a smaller SCS (120 kHz or 240 kHz) with NCP is the best solution if block-based PTRS for ICI compensation is introduced.

###### [[5], vivo]

It evaluated 120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz SCS with TDL-A channel model with 5, 10, 20 and 40ns DS for both 400MHz and 2GHz bandwidth. The following observations are made.

Observation 1: For 400MHz carrier bandwidth, (120K, NCP) and (240K, NCP) work well for low order modulation schemes (e.g. QPSK and 16QAM) but not for high order modulation scheme (e.g. 64QAM).

Observation 3: For high order modulation scheme (e.g. 64QAM), both (480K, NCP/ECP) and (960K, NCP/ECP) work well for 400MHz carrier bandwidth but (480K, NCP/ECP) doesn’t work well for 2000MHz carrier bandwidth.

###### [[56], vivo]

Observation 2: High order modulation is more sensitive to phase noise impact. Higher SCS benefits more with phase noise compensation than lower SCS, especially for high order modulation such as 64QAM.

Observation 3: For CP-OFDM waveform, SCS 960 KHz is the most affected because of its shortest CP coverage when the DS is increased to 40 ns.

Observation 4: The greater the bandwidth, the greater the number of RBs, resulting in more ICI impact.

Observation 5: For CP-OFDM, the larger SCS is more sensitive to DS.

###### [[7], InterDigital]

*Observation 1: Larger subcarrier spacings such as 480 kHz and 960 kHz mitigate the RF impairments in higher frequency especially for higher modulation order.*

###### [[10], Nokia]

*Observation 4: For 960 kHz SCS, 64QAM provides robust performance already with a simple CPE compensation while 480 kHz SCS suffers from a major performance degradation due to phase noise.*

*Observation 6: OFDM with CPE compensation*

* *Only QPSK and 16-QAM can be supported with SCS<960 kHz.*
* *64-QAM requires SCS=960 kHz with reasonable performance.*
* *Delay spread 5 or 10ns does not have big impact on the result, except that 1920kHz SCS suffers some performance loss for 10ns, which may be due to the too small CP size.*

###### [[12], Intel]

Observation 8:

* *The support of a high-order modulation, e.g., 64QAM, for systems operating in 52.6—71 GHz frequency range under various propagation channel conditions requires a large SCS, e.g., 960 kHz.*
* *In some propagation channel conditions, especially with low selectivity, 64QAM modulation can be supported with SCS=1920 kHz and even with SCS=480 kHz.*
* *Smaller SCS values, including those ones currently supported in NR Rel-15 for FR2, result in BLER performance degradation for 64QAM under various propagation channel conditions but can be used with 16QAM modulation.*
* *The values of SCS larger than 1920 kHz result in the short CP length which is insufficient to cope with ISI under propagation channels with relatively high frequency selectivity.*

###### [[13, 60], ZTE]

Observation 4: Phase noise has limited impact on QPSK and 16QAM modulation, and with PTRS CPE compensation, different SCS (120 kHz, 240 kHz, 480 kHz, 960 kHz) shows similar performance.

Observation 5: Phase noise has significant impact on 64QAM modulation, and with PTRS CPE compensation, larger SCS shows better performance.

Observation 6: Various delay spread values don’t affect the relative performance among different SCS.

###### [[14], Ericsson]

[[14, 61], Ericsson] used the following three sets of phase noise models in their evaluation:

* PN model set 1
  + BS: Ex2 BS
  + UE: Ex2 UE
* PN model set 2
  + BS: Ex2 BS
  + UE: R4-2011494 (ref R4-2011494)
* PN model set 3
  + BS: R4-2010176 DM=0 dB (ref R4-2010176)
  + UE: R4-2010176 DM=5 dB (ref R4-2010176)

The following proposal and observations are made in [14].

Proposal 9 Capture the following in TR 38.808: Link evaluation based on phase model Ex 2, with characteristics not reflecting realistic devices or current state of the technology, can lead to pessimistic assessment of smaller sub-carrier spacings. It is important for 3GPP to adopt more suitable phase noise models in the discussion and system designs for NR operation in 52.7 – 71 GHz range.

The following are observations made.

* With phase noise model set 1 using Ex 2 models at both BS and UE, BLER performance with only CPE compensation depends strongly on the SCS. It can be observed in Figure 18 that links using larger SCS outperforms those with smaller SCS. That is, links using small SCS suffer more from ICI problems caused by the time-varying phase noise. For 400 MHz bandwidth with 120 or 240 kHz SCS as well as 1.6 GHz bandwidth with 480 kHz SCS, BLER floors can be observed.
* With phase noise model set 2, the Ex 2 UE model is replaced by the new UE phase noise model provided in R4-2011494 (ref [20]). For the BS, the same Ex 2 BS model is still applied. It can be clearly observed in Figure 19 that there is significantly less dependence of BLER performance on SCS. For all test cases, no error floor is observed for smaller subcarrier spacings. Instead, there is only around 1 dB performance difference between consecutive SCSs.
* With phase noise model set 3, the BS and UE phase noise is modeled by the model provided in R4-2010176 (ref [19]) with different design margins, respectively. Similar to the cases observed in phase noise model set 2, there is significantly less dependence of BLER performance on SCS in Figure 20 than that observed in phase noise model set 1. Between consecutive SCSs, BLER performance for the same bandwidth differs by only 1 to 2 dB.
* With larger delay spreads, systems with large SCS start to suffer from inter-symbol interference (ISI). For the example of 960 kHz SCS, link performance error floor starts to develop for the 64QAM in a channel with 40 ns average delay spreads for all phase noise model sets. In contrast, for 480 kHz SCS, the performance is quite insensitive to delay spread in the range 10 – 40 ns for phase noise model sets 2 and 3.

Proposal 11 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: Systems with smaller sub-carrier spacing equipped with simple ICI compensation is on par or better than systems with larger sub-carrier spacing equipped with only CPE compensation.

###### [[61], Ericsson]

Observation 1 Phase noise induced performance issues for the OFDM waveform in the 52.6 – 71 GHz frequency range can be effectively addressed with the Rel-15 PTRS structure and simple ICI compensation algorithms. Performance with SCS of 480 kHz with simple ICI compensation is on par or better than the performance with 960 kHz with CPE compensation only.

###### [[18], Samsung]

*Observation 1: Higher sub-carrier spacing (e.g. 960 kHz) can mitigate phase noise impact better, especially for high MSC.*

###### [[21], Apple]

*Observation 3: By using PN ICI compensation, we can reduce the maximum SCS selected when compared with CPE compensation only.*

*Observation 5: As the SCS increases, there is a trade-off between the CP required for the delay spread after beamforming (reducing the cyclic prefix and increasing the irreducible noise floor), the phase noise (reducing the PN inter-carrier interference) and the bandwidth of operation.*

*Observation 6: for higher order modulation, an increase in the SCS from 120 kHz is needed for PDSCH/PUSCH transmission.*

###### [[25], NTT DOCOMO]

Observation 1: Following observations are derived according to the link-level simulation results.

* On SCS with 400 MHz carrier bandwidth: Under the PN model and linear channel/PN estimation methods used in the evaluations, similar performance is achieved with 120 kHz and 240 kHz SCS, which is superior to remaining configurations.
* On ECP with 960 kHz SCS: BLER performance gain can be observed with ECP configuration. However, when taking ECP overhead into the consideration (14% additional overhead introduced by ECP compared with normal CP), ECP does not introduce significant throughput gain to compensate the throughput loss caused by the additional overhead.
* On PTRS & PN compensation: With 400 MHz carrier bandwidth, the BLER cannot reach 0.01 for higher MCS levels such as MCS 22, and it cannot reach 0.1 for higher MCS levels with 2 GHz carrier bandwidth. Advanced receiver and/or enhanced PTRS should be further studied to improve the link performance.

###### [[26], Qualcomm]

Observation 1: For the PDSCH performance of different numerologies in the high frequency regime, when PTRS-based phase noise correction (CPE-only) is enabled (Section 2.2.1),

* At low and medium MCSs (MCS 7 and MCS 16, respectively), no noticeable performance difference is identified among SCSs in most of the tested cases.
* At MCS 22 with 64QAM, due to the increased phase noise impact, 120kHz SCS shows up to ~1.5dB loss compared to other SCSs.
* At MCS 22 with CDL-B 50ns, 960kHz SCS shows a BLER floor at high CINR due to inter-symbol interference, but the floor is below 10%.
* The observed performance trends of different SCSs are consistent across all tested channel and antenna configurations.

###### [[64], OPPO]

Observation 1: for MCS7 and MCS16 the phase noise influence is not obvious with different SCS.

Observation 2: for MCS22, 120KHz and 240KHz cannot work properly with a simple CPE compensation but 480KHz applying ICI compensation can have comparable performance to 960KHz.

###### [[67], Charter]

Observation 1: SCS = 240 kHz is not robust against phase noise and other impairments at higher MCSs, even with ideal CPE removal.

Observation 2: SCS=960kHz is necessary to support NR PDSCH high data throughput in FR2 60GHz.

#### Summary of observations

##### Summary of observations with baseline PN model for discussion:

For CP-OFDM, with evaluation assumptions and parameters as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808, the following are observed when CPE-only compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure is used for normal CP when delay spread is not large. The performance is measured in terms of SINR in dB achieving BLER target of 10% or 1%.

* For low MCS (QPSK) and medium MCS (16QAM), there is minor performance difference between different SCS values up to 960 kHz.
* For high MCS (64QAM), the performance improves in general as the increase of SCS
* For high MCS (64QAM), 13 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 120 and 240 kHz SCS in 400 MHz bandwidth
  + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 120kHz and 240kHz SCS where 240 kHz SCS performs better.
    - Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.
    - One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated channel model.
    - 3 sources ([68, Huawei], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia]) reported both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target
    - 4 sources ([56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [21, Apple], [7, InterDigital]) reported 120 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target while 240 kHz SCS can
    - One source ([2, 55, Lenovo]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS at TDL-A 5 and 10ns. It also reported that both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.
    - One source ([12, Intel]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported that both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.
    - 2 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [18, Samsung]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS
    - One source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance for both SCS in CDL-D. It also reported better performance of 120 kHz SCS for other evaluated channel model.
* For high MCS (64QAM), 13 sources ([61, Ericsson], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 240 and 480 kHz SCS in 400 MHz bandwidth
  + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 240kHz and 480kHz SCS where 480 kHz SCS performs better.
    - Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.
    - One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported better performance for 480 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated channel model.
    - 3 sources ([64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [67, Charter]) reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target while 480 kHz SCS can
    - One source ([2, 55, Lenovo]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS at TDL-A 5 and 10ns. It also reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.
    - One source ([12, Intel]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.
    - 6 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [7, InterDigital]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS
    - One source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance for both SCS in CDL-D. It also reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS for other evaluated channel model.
* For high MCS (64QAM), 14 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 480 and 960 kHz SCS in 400 MHz bandwidth
  + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 480kHz and 960kHz SCS where 960 KHz SCS performs better.
    - Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.
    - 7 sources ([61, Ericsson], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) reported a greater than 1 dB gain of 960 kHz SCS
    - 3 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [18, Samsung]) reported a smaller than 1 dB performance gain of 960 kHz SCS
    - One source ([68, Huawei]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS for CDL-B 50ns and better performance of 960 kHz SCS for other evaluated cases. In all comparison, the difference is greater than 1 dB.
    - Two sources ([21, Apple], [12, Intel]) reported a better performance of 480 kHz SCS than 960 kHz SCS at 20ns DS in TDL-A where 960 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target and comparable performance for both SCS in all other evaluated cases
    - One source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance for both SCS in CDL-D. It also reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS in TDL-A 5ns and better performance of 960 kHz SCS in CDL-B 20ns.
  + for 1% BLER target, the performance for 960kHz SCS is better than 480kHz SCS.
    - Among sources reported SINR values when both SCS can meet 1% BLER target, the absolute value of the performance gap between 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS is larger than that for 10% BLER target.
* For high MCS (64QAM), 4 sources ([61, Ericsson], [56, vivo], [10, Nokia], [18, Samsung]) compared performance of 480 and 960 kHz SCS in 1600 or 2000 MHz bandwidth. 4 out of 4 sources reported performance gain around 4 ~ 5 dB of 960 kHz SCS for 10% BLER target. All 4 sources also reported that 480 kHz SCS cannot meet 1% BLER target.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | | Comments/Views | |
| Ericsson | | Comment #1: We think that the observations/conclusions should be split into two cases:   1. Existing (Rel-15) PTRS structure 2. New PTRS structure   and if the new PTRS structure has higher overhead, then it should be clarified whether or not the performance comparison is done assuming equal TBS size (i.e., equal data rate, but higher effective code rate corresponding to higher PTRS overhead) or based on equal MCS (i.e., equal code rate, but lower data rate corresponding to higher PTRS overhead)  Comment #2: Under the 3rd bullet, consistent with ([1], Futurewei)'s observations, it should be added: "1 source ([14, Ericsson]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS than that of 960 kHz for all values 5/10/20/40 ns for TDL-A."  Comment #3: Observations/conclusions on TDL-A with 40 ns should be captured since at least one source performed such evaluations, e.g., "For high MCS, performance with 960 kHz is significantly degraded compared to 480 kHz SCS due to ISI with either ICI compensation or CPE compensation. With CPE compensation only, there is a high error floor for 960 kHz SCS." | |
| Moderator | | Respond to Ericsson’s comment #1:  Observations on comparison of new vs. existing PTRS patterns are captured in section 2.1.4.  Respond to Ericsson’s comment #3:  Observations/conclusions on TDL-A with 40 ns is captured in section 2.1.2.2.  Respond to Ericsson’s comment #2:  Below I copied table 2 (kept MCS 22 only) from [61, Ericsson] as [14, Ericsson] does not report numerical results in table where ICI compensation is used with baseline PN model. Performance of 480 and 960 KHz were highlighted in yellow. I don’t see how I can reach the observation that “better performance of 480 kHz SCS than that of 960 kHz for all values 5/10/20/40 ns for TDL-A.”  Table 2: SNR in dB achieving PDSCH BLER of 10% or 1% with ICI compensation for PN model set 1.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Tdoc /  Source | MCS | Channel | | 120KHz /400MHz | 240KHz /400MHz | 480KHz /400MHz | 480 kHz/1.6 GHz | 960KHz / 1.6 GHz | 960KHz /2GHz | |  | 22 | TDL-A, 5ns | | 18.5/- | 17.0/19.6 | 16.3/18.7 | 16.1/18.0 | 15.6/17.4 | 15.5/17.3 | | TDL-A, 10ns | | 18.2/21.3 | 16.5.18.7 | 15.8/17.8 | 15.8/17.5 | 15.4/16.9 | 15.3/16.8 | | TDL-A, 20ns | | 17.8/20.6 | 16.2/18.1 | 15.5/17.2 | 15.6/17 | 15.5/16.9 | 15.5/16.9 | | TDL-A, 40 ns | | 17.5/20.6 | 16.0/17.6 | 15.7/17.2 | 15.7/17.1 | 19.3/- | 19.4/- | | CDL-B, 20ns | | 18.2/- | 16.5/19.1 | 15.7/18.2 | 15.7/17.6 | 14.8/16.5 | 14.9/16.5 | | CDL-B, 50ns | | 17.5 /20.8 | 15.8/17.6 | 15.0/16.7 | 15.2/16.6 | 14.8/16.1 | 14.9/16.4 | | CDL-D, 20ns | | 14.7/16.4 | 13.7/15.0 | 13.2/14.5 | 13.5/14.9 | 13.1/14.3 | 13.3/14.5 | | CDL-D, 30ns | | 14.7/16.4 | 13.7/15.0 | 13.2/14.5 | 13.5/14.9 | 13.0/14.3 | 13.3/14.5 | |  | | Additional report/notes:   1. PN model set 1: BS: Ex2 BS and UE: Ex2 UE 2. ICI compensation 3. Normal CP 4. antenna configuration for CDL model   Configuration 2:  - (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,4,8,2) BS with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)  - (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) = (1,1,2,2,2) UE with (0.5 dv, 0.5 dH)   1. PTRS: K=2, L=1 2. DMRS configuration: 2 DMRS symbols at (2,11) 3. No TRS, No CSI-RS 4. The effective CR for MCS22, MCS16, and MCS 7 are 0.685, 0.678, and 0.539, respectively. | | | | | | | | |
| LG Electronics | | If ICI compensation or new PT-RS related observations will be collected in section 2.1.4, at least the perspective that performance gap between 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation or new PT-RS is reduced needs to be captured there, as we commented in section 2.1.4. | |
| Nokia, NSB | | We agree with FL to make conclusions separately for the case when ICI compensation is performed and when not.  Further, we think that that above observation should reflect the fact that with 1600MHz PDSCH, 64QAM with 480kHz SCS saturates at 10% BLER  Based on the results, most of the companies show that 480kHz SCS requires ICI compensation for higher MCS (64-QAM), because with CPE compensation there is clear performance loss. But 960kHz SCS can be used with CPE compensation only as shown in the following result assuming 1600MHz PDSCH. | |
| InterDigital | | We also agree with FL and Nokia that conclusions should be made for the results with ICI compensation and the results without compensation. We are generally fine with the proposed observations, but would like to comment a type as shown in the below:   * For high MCS (64QAM), when only CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PT-RS structure is used, 14 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 480 and 960 KHz SCS   + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 480kHz and 960kHz SCS where 960 KHz performs better.     - Note: the following is reference when derive the observations.     - 8 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) reported a greater than 1 dB gain of 960 KHz, 4 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance (< 1 dB difference), 2 sources ([21, Apple], [12, Intel]) reported comparable performance for low delay spread (5 and 10 ns DS in TDL-A) while a better performance of 480 KHz than 960 KHz at medium delay spread (20ns DS in TDL-A). | |
| Ericsson 2 | | Additional comments:  Regarding the 2nd sub-bullet under the 3rd main bullet (ICI compensation):   * We have concerns on the following text:   *2 sources ([61, Ericsson], [23, MediaTek]) reported better performance of larger SCS (480 and/or 960 KHz) than smaller SCS (120 and/or 240 KHz) when ICI compensation is used.*   * We think it is important to make a comparison between 480 and 960 kHz and quantify what "better" means, just like for the 4th main bullet on CPE compensation. From Table 1 in [61], the following is observed:   + For TDL-A with 5/10 ns DS, the performance gap between 960 kHz and 480 kHz is 0.5 dB for 10% and 1% BLER   + For TDL-A with 20 ns DS, there is no performance gap   Responding to the Moderator's comments above:  On Comment #1: To clarify our comment – the last two sub-bullets under the 3rd main bullet make observations about new PTRS structure; however, it is not clear if the comparison for different PTRS overheads is done assuming a fixed data rate (TBS size) or a fixed effective code rate (MCS).  On Comment #3: Thank-you for the clarification.  On Comment #2: Apologies for not clarifying well enough. The comparison we had in mind was between Table 2 (ICI compensation) and Table 1 (CPE compensation) in [61]. Results from a similar comparison by ([26, Qualcomm]) are captured in the 3rd sub-bullet under the 3rd main bullet.  Responding to the following comments from Nokia:  *Further, we think that that above observation should reflect the fact that with 1600MHz PDSCH, 64QAM with 480kHz SCS saturates at 10% BLER*  *Based on the results, most of the companies show that 480kHz SCS requires ICI compensation for higher MCS (64-QAM), because with CPE compensation there is clear performance loss. But 960kHz SCS can be used with CPE compensation only as shown in the following result assuming 1600MHz PDSCH.*  This precisely indicates why the phase noise model is important. The results shown above are for the Ex-2 phase noise model where with CPE compensation only, there BLER can saturate for 480 kHz SCS and below for 1.6 GHz bandwidth. However, when using the 2 new phase noise models proposed in RAN4, one arrives at a completely different conclusion. The two plots below show results with CPE compensation only using the two new phase noise models proposed in RAN4 for both 400 and 1.6 GHz bandwidth. Clearly, there is no saturation for 480 kHz SCS and below.    Figure 19: BLER for TDL-A channel with 10 ns delay spread. CPE compensation is used assuming the PN model set 2 (Updated phase noise model in R4-2011494 from Huawei). The dotted/solid curves correspond to MCS 16/22, respectively.    Figure 20: BLER for TDL-A channel with 10 ns delay spread. CPE compensation is used assuming the PN model set 3 (Updated phase noise model in R4-2010176 from Ericsson). The dotted/solid curves correspond to MCS 16/22, respectively.  For reference, here are the results using the Ex-2 phase noise model: | |
| Qualcomm | | We are fine with suggested conclusion. | |
| Samsung | | Our evaluation for new PT-RS can be removed from this summary (saw it is already captured in 2.1.4), since it may not provide efficient information on the selection of SCS.   * “Another source ([18, Samsung]) evaluated 120 KHz and 240 KHz SCS performance with ICI compensation based on some new PTRS pattern and reported performance improvement.” | |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | | Agree with the proposed conclusion | |
| Moderator 2 | | As commented by multiple companies, moved all ICI compensation related observations into section 2.1.4.  Added observations on comparison of more SCS pair. | |
| Ericsson 3 | | A correction is needed on our reported results as follows:   * For high MCS (64QAM), 12 sources ([61, Ericsson], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 120 and 240 kHz SCS   + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 120kHz and 240kHz SCS where 240 kHz SCS performs better.     - Note: the following are reference when derive the observations.     - One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported ~~the same performance for both SCS~~ better performance of 240 kHz in CDL-D. It also reported both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated channel model. | |
| Moderator 3 | | Respond to Ericsson 3’s comment:  Wording changed as commented. A follow-up question though.  I was referring Table 1 of [61] (copied relevant part below) when I draw the observation. Is there another place in [61] I should refer to?   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | MCS | Channel | 120KHz /400MHz | 240KHz /400MHz | | 22 | TDL-A, 5ns | -/- | -/- | | TDL-A, 10ns | -/- | -/- | | TDL-A, 20ns | -/- | -/- | | TDL-A, 40 ns | -/- | -/- | | CDL-B, 20ns | -/- | -/- | | CDL-B, 50ns | -/- | -/- | | CDL-D, 20ns | 21.8/- | 17.4/- | | CDL-D, 30ns | 21.8/- | 17.4/- | | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | | Our understanding is that this set of observations is intended to cover CP-OFDM for PDSCH and PUSCH with CPE-only based on existing Rel-15 NR PTRS **with NCP** (comparison of NCP and ECP is covered in section 2.1.2).  For 120 kHz and 240 kHz SCS at high MCS (64QAM), the main sub-bullet could observe that a majority of sources showed that both SCS don’t reach the target 10% BLER with CPE-only.  The comparison of 240 and 480 at high MCS is not really needed since the first part already observed that a majority of sources showed that 240 kHz SCS doesn’t meet the 10% BLER with CPE-only, and the part comparing 480 and 960 shows that 480 meets the 10% BLER target.  For CP-OFDM, with evaluation assumptions and parameters as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808, the following are observed when CPE-only compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure is used and with NCP. The performance is measured in terms of SINR in dB achieving BLER target of 10% or 1%.   * For low MCS (QPSK) and medium MCS (16QAM), there is minor performance difference between different SCS values up to 960 kHz. * For high MCS (64QAM), the performance improves in general as the increase of SCS * For high MCS (64QAM), 12 sources ([61, Ericsson], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [7, InterDigital], [69, Huawei]) compared performance of 120 and 240 kHz SCS   + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 120kHz and 240kHz SCS where 240 kHz SCS performs better, and a majority of sources showed that both SCS don’t reach the target 10% BLER with CPE only in the simulated SNR region.     - Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.     - One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated channel model.     - 3 sources ([64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [69, Huawei]) reported both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target     - 4 sources ([56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [21, Apple], [7, InterDigital]) reported 120 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target while 240 kHz SCS can     - One source ([2, 55, Lenovo]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS at TDL-A 5 and 10ns. It also reported that both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.     - One source ([12, Intel]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported that both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.     - 2 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [18, Samsung]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS     - One source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance for both SCS in CDL-D. It also reported better performance of 120 kHz SCS for other evaluated channel model. * For high MCS (64QAM), 13 sources ([61, Ericsson], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 240 and 480 kHz SCS   + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 240kHz and 480kHz SCS where 480 kHz SCS performs better.     - Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.     - One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported better performance for 480 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated channel model.     - 3 sources ([64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [67, Charter]) reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target while 480 kHz SCS can     - One source ([2, 55, Lenovo]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS at TDL-A 5 and 10ns. It also reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.     - One source ([12, Intel]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.     - 6 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [7, InterDigital]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS     - One source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance for both SCS in CDL-D. It also reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS for other evaluated channel model. * For high MCS (64QAM with MCS22), 14 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 480 and 960 kHz SCS   + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 480kHz and 960kHz SCS where 960 KHz SCS performs better.     - Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.     - 7 sources ([61, Ericsson], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) reported a greater than 1 dB gain of 960 kHz SCS     - 3 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [18, Samsung]) reported a smaller than 1 dB performance gain of 960 kHz SCS     - One source ([68, Huawei]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS for CDL-B 50ns and better performance of 960 kHz SCS for other evaluated cases. In all comparison, the difference is greater than 1 dB.     - Two sources ([21, Apple], [12, Intel]) reported a better performance of 480 kHz SCS than 960 kHz SCS at 20ns DS in TDL-A where 960 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target and comparable performance for both SCS in all other evaluated cases     - One source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance for both SCS in CDL-D. It also reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS in TDL-A 5ns and better performance of 960 kHz SCS in CDL-B 20ns.   + for 1% BLER target, the performance for 960kHz SCS is better than 480kHz SCS.     - Among sources reported SINR values when both SCS can meet 1% BLER target, the absolute value of the performance gap between 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS is larger than that for 10% BLER target. | |
| Moderator 4 | | Respond to Huawei’s comment above:  Regarding your suggested changes “and a majority of sources showed that both SCS don’t reach the target 10% BLER with CPE only in the simulated SNR region.”, there’re 3 out 13 sources showing both SCS cannot meeting 10% BLER target, I’m not sure that’s majority.  Other changes are made (highlighted in red) to address Huawei’s comment. | |
| Nokia, NSB | | It seems our comment was not addressed. It is not clear based on which PDSCH BW the observations are taken; I assume 400MHz. We think large BW simulations such s 1600/2000MHz should be captured separately. | |
| Moderator 5 | | Respond to Nokia’s comment:  The observations are drawn mostly based on evaluations in 400 MHz. The comparison between two SCSs is always based on the same bandwidth. Since [61] reported 960 kHz SCS without 400 MHz, the comparison between 480 and 960 kHz SCS for source [61] is done based on the results of 1.6GHz bandwidth.  Recall in the last meeting, the baseline assumption for 2000 MHz BW:  - N/A (120 kHz),  - N/A (240 kHz),  - 320 (480 kHz) (optional),  - 160 (960 kHz),  - 80 (1920 kHz),  Most companies only evaluated and reported 960 kHz SCS performance in larger bandwidth (e.g., 1.6 or 2 GHz). So my question to Nokia: what observations you think worth capturing on 1600/2000 MHz BW performance? | |
| Moderator 6 | | The last bullet added on the observations for wider BW: 1600 or 2000 MHz | |
| Moderator 7 | | Please refer to Chairman’s notes for agreement. | |

##### Summary #2 of observations with baseline PN model for discussion:

For CP-OFDM, with evaluation assumptions and parameters as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808, the following are observed when CPE-only compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure is used for normal CP when delay spread is not large. The performance is measured in terms of SINR in dB achieving BLER target of 10% or 1%.

* For low MCS (QPSK) and medium MCS (16QAM), there is minor performance difference between different SCS values up to 960 kHz.
* For high MCS (64QAM), the performance improves in general as the increase of SCS
* For high MCS (64QAM), 14 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 120 and 240 kHz SCS in 400 MHz bandwidth
  + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 120kHz and 240kHz SCS where 240 kHz SCS performs better.
    - Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.
    - One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated channel model.
    - 4 sources ([68, Huawei], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [67, Charter]) reported both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target
    - 4 sources ([56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [21, Apple], [7, InterDigital]) reported 120 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target while 240 kHz SCS can
    - One source ([2, 55, Lenovo]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS at TDL-A 5 and 10ns. It also reported that both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.
    - One source ([12, Intel]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported that both SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.
    - 2 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [18, Samsung]) reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS
    - One source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance for both SCS in CDL-D. It also reported better performance of 120 kHz SCS for other evaluated channel model.
* For high MCS (64QAM), 13 sources ([61, Ericsson], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 240 and 480 kHz SCS in 400 MHz bandwidth
  + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 240kHz and 480kHz SCS where 480 kHz SCS performs better.
    - Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.
    - One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported better performance for 480 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated channel model.
    - 3 sources ([64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [67, Charter]) reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target while 480 kHz SCS can
    - One source ([2, 55, Lenovo]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS at TDL-A 5 and 10ns. It also reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.
    - One source ([12, Intel]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS in CDL-D. It also reported 240 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target for other evaluated cases.
    - 6 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [7, InterDigital]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS
    - One source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance for both SCS in CDL-D. It also reported better performance of 240 kHz SCS for other evaluated channel model.
* For high MCS (64QAM), 14 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [21, Apple], [18, Samsung], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) compared performance of 480 and 960 kHz SCS in 400 MHz bandwidth
  + for 10% BLER target, there is a performance gap between 480kHz and 960kHz SCS where 960 KHz SCS performs better.
    - Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.
    - 7 sources ([61, Ericsson], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [2, 55, Lenovo], [67, Charter], [7, InterDigital]) reported a greater than 1 dB gain of 960 kHz SCS
    - 3 sources ([26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [18, Samsung]) reported a smaller than 1 dB performance gain of 960 kHz SCS
    - One source ([68, Huawei]) reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS for CDL-B 50ns and better performance of 960 kHz SCS for other evaluated cases. In all comparison, the difference is greater than 1 dB.
    - Two sources ([21, Apple], [12, Intel]) reported a better performance of 480 kHz SCS than 960 kHz SCS at 20ns DS in TDL-A where 960 kHz SCS cannot meet 10% BLER target and comparable performance for both SCS in all other evaluated cases
    - One source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported comparable performance for both SCS in CDL-D. It also reported better performance of 480 kHz SCS in TDL-A 5ns and better performance of 960 kHz SCS in CDL-B 20ns.
  + for 1% BLER target, the performance for 960kHz SCS is better than 480kHz SCS.
    - Among sources reported SINR values when both SCS can meet 1% BLER target, the absolute value of the performance gap between 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS is larger than that for 10% BLER target.
* For high MCS (64QAM), 4 sources ([61, Ericsson], [56, vivo], [10, Nokia], [18, Samsung]) compared performance of 480 and 960 kHz SCS in 1600 or 2000 MHz bandwidth. 4 out of 4 sources reported performance gain around 4 ~ 5 dB of 960 kHz SCS for 10% BLER target. All 4 sources also reported that 480 kHz SCS cannot meet 1% BLER target.

Companies are encouraged to check the above changes corresponding to updated results in source [67].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | Fine with the update |
| LG Electronics | Fine with this update, but we prefer to defer bringing up this update on GTW session this week, considering Chairman’s guideline that the results provided till 11/6 11:59pm UTC can be included in the observations/conclusions. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Fine with the updated summary. |

##### Observations on evaluations with different PN model(s):

During the GTW session, there’s a comment to capture observations on different phase noise model evaluation. To the best knowledge of moderator, there’s one company submitted evaluation results with different PN models (in addition to baseline PN model) in [[14, 61], Ericsson].

There’s only one explicit proposal/observation (proposal 9 in [14] quoted below) made related to different PN model.

###### [[14], Ericsson]

Proposal 9 Capture the following in TR 38.808: Link evaluation based on phase model Ex 2, with characteristics not reflecting realistic devices or current state of the technology, can lead to pessimistic assessment of smaller sub-carrier spacings. It is important for 3GPP to adopt more suitable phase noise models in the discussion and system designs for NR operation in 52.7 – 71 GHz range.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Moderator | A question to the companies who propose to capture observations on different phase noise model evaluation, is the above proposal 9 in [14] the one to be captured as the observation on evaluations of different PN model? If not, please state which observation/proposal in which submitted contributions is the observation(s) you are referring to be captured? |
| Moderator 2 | On the email reflector, Ericsson clarified to capture some observations in section 3.3.1 of [14] (copied below) which are not in the list of observations in the conclusion section of [14].  The following are observations made in [14].   * With phase noise model set 1 using Ex 2 models at both BS and UE, BLER performance with only CPE compensation depends strongly on the SCS. It can be observed in Figure 18 that links using larger SCS outperforms those with smaller SCS. That is, links using small SCS suffer more from ICI problems caused by the time-varying phase noise. For 400 MHz bandwidth with 120 or 240 kHz SCS as well as 1.6 GHz bandwidth with 480 kHz SCS, BLER floors can be observed. * With phase noise model set 2, the Ex 2 UE model is replaced by the new UE phase noise model provided in R4-2011494 (ref [20]). For the BS, the same Ex 2 BS model is still applied. It can be clearly observed in Figure 19 that there is significantly less dependence of BLER performance on SCS. For all test cases, no error floor is observed for smaller subcarrier spacings. Instead, there is only around 1 dB performance difference between consecutive SCSs. * With phase noise model set 3, the BS and UE phase noise is modeled by the model provided in R4-2010176 (ref [19]) with different design margins, respectively. Similar to the cases observed in phase noise model set 2, there is significantly less dependence of BLER performance on SCS in Figure 20 than that observed in phase noise model set 1. Between consecutive SCSs, BLER performance for the same bandwidth differs by only 1 to 2 dB. * With larger delay spreads, systems with large SCS start to suffer from inter-symbol interference (ISI). For the example of 960 kHz SCS, link performance error floor starts to develop for the 64QAM in a channel with 40 ns average delay spreads for all phase noise model sets. In contrast, for 480 kHz SCS, the performance is quite insensitive to delay spread in the range 10 – 40 ns for phase noise model sets 2 and 3.   A summary observation is formulated. |

##### Summary of observations with optional PN model for discussion:

For CP-OFDM, two sources ([14, 61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei]) evaluated PDSCH BLER performance with optional PN models in addition to PN model in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808. Note that such optional PN models are not confirmed and/or recommended by RAN4 at the time of RAN1#103-e.

* When CPE-only compensation is used with an optional PN model at the UE or at BS and UE, it is observed by both sources that there is significantly less dependence of BLER performance on SCS compared to the PN model in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808. For all test cases, no error floor is observed for smaller SCS with TDL-A or CDL-B/CDL-D for 1% BLER target. There is around 1 to 2 dB performance difference between consecutive SCSs for 1% BLER target.
* However, multiple sources expressed concerns on the validity of such optional PN models given no confirmation and/or recommendation from RAN4. In consequence, there’s a concern on whether and how the observations based on such optional PN models can be used given no RAN4 input on these optional PN models.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | The above observations correspond to CPE compensation only for both the existing (Ex-2) and the new phase noise models proposed in RAN4. |
| Moderator | Wording update as commented by Ericsson above. |
| Nokia, NSB | Conclusion RAN1 #101:  RAN1 will continue the study on the objectives of the SI and not stop the study until RAN4 response for the “LS to RAN4 on Phase noise and other RF Impairment modelling”. If RAN4 can provide the information requested with sufficient time to consider the information provided, RAN1 will consider the input from RAN4 as part of the on-going study.  There was clear intention that we consider FR2 phase noise model for FR4 studies in RAN1, unless further input from RAN4 is received in time. Therefore, we should focus on concluding observations based on agreed phase noise model in RAN1, and deprioritize discussion on results simulated by a single company. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Nokia that we should focus on observations based on the agreed phase noise model unless we have the updated phase noise model from RAN4. |
| Ericsson 2 | Like with all parameters that are optional, companies are free to evaluate and report results with a description of what was evaluated.  The following is stated in TR 38.808:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | gNB TRP PN Model | 3GPP TR38.803 example 2 BS PN profile  Optional:  - If other PN profile is used, companies to provide information on the modelling used | | UE PN Model | 3GPP TR38.803 example 2 UE PN profile  Optional:  - If other PN profile is used, companies to provide information on the modelling used | |
| Qualcomm | We share the same view as Nokia and InterDigital. Any new phase noise models, which would be recommended by RAN4, can be considered during the WI phase. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with Nokia, a new phase noise model should be first justified/agreed by RAN4, since according to the results provided for the new phase noise model, different observations can be seen, and hence the decision on the selected SCS(s) would be quite different. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with Ericsson and support capturing observations shown from the other PN model. It could be clarified that this model was not provided by RAN4, but the observation is nonetheless valid and should not be discarded based on the fact that it comes from a single company. We propose some clarification to the moderator’s proposal below.  For CP-OFDM, two sources ([14, 61], Ericsson, [69, Huawei]) evaluated PDSCH BLER performance with optional PN model in addition to PN model in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808. The following are observed when CPE-only compensation is used.   * For PN model as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808, it is observed that BLER performance with only CPE compensation depends strongly on the SCS. Larger SCS outperforms smaller SCS since small SCS suffer more from ICI problems caused by the time-varying phase noise, although with larger delay spreads 960 kHz SCS has error floor for 64QAM in TDL-A with 40 ns DS. * When the optional PN model ([14, 61] Ericsson, [69] Huawei) is used at the UE or at BS and UE, there is significantly less dependence of BLER performance on SCS. For all test cases, no error floor higher than 10-2 is observed for smaller SCS with TDL-A or CDL-B/CDL-D. There is around 1 to 2 dB performance difference between consecutive SCSs for 1% BLER target.   + Note: the PN model in [14, 60, 69] was not provided by RAN4. * With larger delay spreads, 960 kHz SCS has error floor for 64QAM in TDL-A with 40 ns DS. |
| InterDigital | We don’t think that the observations with unofficial phase noise models are nonetheless valid. In our view, RAN1 was supportive to confirm whether the proposed phase noise models are valid or not and that’s why we sent the LS to RAN4 from the beginning of the SI. We should remember that we are not the experts of phase noise model and the observations should be based on the confirmed phase noise models by RAN4. |
| Moderator 2 | Companies have diverse views in terms of capturing observations based on optional modelling. |
| Moderator 3 | The original 1st bullet “For PN model as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808, it is observed that BLER performance with only CPE compensation depends strongly on the SCS. Larger SCS outperforms smaller SCS since small SCS suffer more from ICI problems caused by the time-varying phase noise.” And the original 3rd bullet “ With larger delay spreads, 960 kHz SCS has error floor for 64QAM in TDL-A with 40 ns DS.” aew removed as they are already captured in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 corresponding to observations based on the baseline PN model. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thank you for adding the source for Huawei. For better clarity, we suggest the following update:  For CP-OFDM, two sources ([14, 61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei]) evaluated PDSCH BLER performance with optional PN model in addition to PN model in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808.   * When CPE-only compensation is used with an optional PN model (which was not confirmed and/or recommended by RAN4 at the time of RAN1#103e) at the UE or at BS and UE, it is observed by both sources that there is significantly less dependence of BLER performance on SCS. For all test cases, no error floor is observed for smaller SCS with TDL-A or CDL-B/CDL-D for 1% BLER target. There is around 1 to 2 dB performance difference between consecutive SCSs for 1% BLER target. * However, multiple sources expressed concerns on the validity of such optional PN model given no confirmation and/or recommendation from RAN4. In consequence, there’s a concern on whether and how the observations based on such optional PN model can be used. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Moderator’s original proposal. |
| Moderator 4 | Wording updated as Huawei’s comment above. |
| Ericsson 3 | We are supportive of the updates, but some clarification is needed on what "less" is relative to since the first bullet was removed. We suggest the below update to fix that issue. Regarding the final bullet, we can accept it with updates for accuracy on the status regarding the RAN4 LS reply.  For CP-OFDM, two sources ([14, 61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei]) evaluated PDSCH BLER performance with optional PN model in addition to PN model in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808.   * When CPE-only compensation is used with an optional PN model (which was not confirmed and/or recommended by RAN4 at the time of RAN1#103e) at the UE or at BS and UE, it is observed by both sources that there is significantly less dependence of BLER performance on SCS compared to the PN model in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808. For all test cases, no error floor is observed for smaller SCS with TDL-A or CDL-B/CDL-D for 1% BLER target. There is around 1 to 2 dB performance difference between consecutive SCSs for 1% BLER target. * However, ~~multiple~~ some sources expressed concerns on the validity of such optional PN model given no confirmation and/or recommendation from RAN4 at the time of RAN1#103-e. In consequence, there’s a concern on whether and how the observations based on such optional PN models can be used until an LS reply from RAN4 is received. |
| Moderator 5 | Wording updated.  Regarding the proposed wording “until an LS reply from RAN4 is received”, I interpret the intention is not to send another LS to RAN4 on this topic. So a different wording is used. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the Moderator’s updated proposal. |
| Apple | For the last bullet, if RAN4 endorses one or more of these models in the future, will we revisit this text especially if it is part of an agreement ? Can an FFS be placed to address this issue ? |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with Moderator’s update |

### Large delay spread and CP impact

#### Delay spread distribution

There’re multiple sources discussed delay spread distribution and reported delay spread distribution based on system level evaluation.

The following are observations and/or statements directly extracted from these sources.

###### [[7], InterDigital]

It shows the CDF of RMS delay spread for Indoor Factory B, Indoor Office C and Outdoor C based on the system level simulations with the agreed evaluation assumptions. The following observation is made.

Observation 4: While each scenario experiences different amounts of RMS delay spread, regardless of scenarios, most of UEs experience smaller RMS delay spreads than normal CP of 960 kHz.

###### [[12], Intel]

It shows the effective channel delay spread statistics observed on system-level simulation results. Note that the delay spread calculation takes Tx and Rx beamforming into account, i.e. it is the actual delay spread the receiver observes, not a general characteristic of a channel model multipath.

Observation 1

* *There is negligible difference between 60GHz and 70GHz RMS delay spread statistics for antenna arrays of 64 elements and larger.*

Observation 2

* *RMS delay spread significantly depends on Tx and Rx beamwidth.*

Observation 3

* *RMS delay spread in LoS links is 1 – 2 orders of magnitude smaller than in NLoS links.*

Observation 4

* *85% of UEs experience RMS delay spread smaller than SCS 1.92MHz CP length (36.6 ns).*

###### [[14], Ericsson]

It is observed that the 90th percentile RMS delay spread (45.2 ns) is a significant fraction of the CP duration for 960 kHz SCS (73.2 ns) and made the following proposal.

Proposal 8 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808. Factory Scenario A (InF-DH) results in post-beamforming delay spreads that are a significant fraction of the CP duration for 960 kHz SCS.

###### [[25], NTT DOCOMO]

It reported the distribution of RMS delay spread (DS) of the channel for those UEs whose RSRP is larger than the specified threshold for outdoor-B scenario and made the following observation.

Observation 8:

* *The mean RMS DS of 60 GHz system in Outdoor-B scenario is about 23 ns and the 95%-tile DS value is about 80 ns.*
  + *More than half of UE experiences channels with DS larger than 20 ns, which should be referred to in the link performance evaluation with large DS configurations.*

###### [[56], vivo]

It is observed that the DS of almost 80% users are less than 30ns in a typical indoor scenario (indoor-A).

##### Moderator’s comment

Delay spread distribution was agreed to be a secondary metric for SLS. It is moderator’s understanding that observations based on SLS in general including delay spread distribution for different scenarios would be in the scope of another discussion.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Nokia, NSB | agree |
| InterDigital | Agree |
| Qualcomm | We agree the moderator’s comment. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |

#### Large delay spread and CP type

Multiple sources evaluated the impact of CP type on the BLER performance with TDL-A and/or CDL channel model with large delay spread.

The following are observations directly extracted from these sources.

###### [[1], Futurewei]

It evaluated 120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz SCS with ICI filter to cancel the PN impact. The optimal number of taps for ICI filter is decided to be {1,3,5,7} FD filter taps for {960 kHz, 480kHz, 240 kHz, 120 kHz} SCS respectively, where 1-tap filter is equivalent to CPE compensation. The following observations are made.

Observation 5: Lower SCS {120 kHz, 240 kHz} offer better performance at higher DS. The BLER for SCS 960kHz, MCS16, and Normal CP is not acceptable for 40ns DS.

Observation 6: For 20ns DS, MCS 22, NCP, the BLER for 960 kHz SCS is not acceptable, while {120kHz, 240kHz and 480 kHz} SCS offer similar and acceptable performance.

Observation 7: The extended CP improves BLER performances, for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for larger DS, MCS 22 [Figures 8-10 in [1]] with a reduction in spectrum efficiency of 14% (from 14 symbols to 12 symbols slots).

Observation 8: CDL channel models simulations show for larger DS and higher MCS SCS 120kHz, 240kHz and 480 kHz offer similar good performances.

###### [[2], Lenovo]

Observation 6: For 400MHz BW, when higher delay spread value such as 40ns is simulated for SCS values up to 960kHz, it can be observed that the BLER is significantly improved for 960kHz with extended CP and it performs best in terms of BLER, however, the effective throughput is compromised due to larger overhead of extended CP and therefore, 480kHz with normal CP performs best in terms of throughput.

Observation 7: For 2GHz BW, when higher delay spread value such as 20ns is simulated for SCS values of 960kHz and 1920kHz, it can be observed that the BLER is significantly improved for 1920kHz with extended CP and it performs best in terms of BLER, however, the effective throughput is compromised due to larger overhead of extended CP and therefore, 960kHz with normal CP performs best in terms of throughput.

###### [[55], Lenovo]

It evaluated PDSCH with different SCS values including 120kHz, 240kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz and 1920MHz with different MCS values including MCS7 (QPSK), MCS16 (16QAM) and MCS22 (64QAM) in CDL channel. The following observations are made.

Observation 3: For higher delay spread and normal cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performs the worst and target BLER cannot be reached for high MCS

Observation 4: For higher delay spread and extended cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performance is significantly improved compared to normal cyclic prefix

Observation 7: For higher delay spread and normal cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performs the worst

Observation 8: For higher delay spread and extended cyclic prefix, 960kHz subcarrier spacing performance is significantly improved compared to normal cyclic prefix and it performs slightly better than 480kHz for high MCS

###### [[3], Huawei]

Observation 3: In CDL-B with DS=50ns, the NCP length of SCS 960 kHz is not sufficient to cover the delay spread. If 480 kHz or 960 kHz were supported, ECP would be required in order to accommodate the delay spread, time alignment error, analog beam switching time, DL/UL switching time, and Multi-TRP delay; causing a larger overhead.

###### [[68], Huawei]

Observation 2: If CDL-B DS=50ns channel model is considered, the BLER performance of a subcarrier spacing larger than 480 kHz decreases a lot due to the short CP length.

###### [[5], vivo]

Observation 6: (120K, NCP) and (240K, NCP) have better coverage than other candidate numerologies.

Observation 7: ECP doesn’t offer better coverage than NCP for both 480K and 960K SCS in TDL-A channel with delay spread setting as 5, 10, 20 and 40 ns.

###### [[56], vivo]

Observation 1: Under the same DS, the performance of NCP is basically the same as ECP for CP-OFDM waveform.

###### [[12], Intel]

Observation 9:

* *There is marginal performance improvement from the use of ECP observed only for 64QAM and SCS=1920kHz.*
* *There is almost no difference between ECP and NCP for 16QAM when SCS=960kHz or SCS=1920kHz for the tested delay spread values.*

###### [[14], Ericsson]

Proposal 12 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: 960 kHz SCS ECP MCS 22 performs worse than 480 kHz SCS NCP MCS 22 even for allowing lower data rates carried by ECP. On an equal data rate basis, 480 kHz SCS NCP MCS 22 is more than 6 dB better than 960 kHz SCS ECP MCS 25.

###### [[25], NTT DOCOMO]

Observation 1: *Following observations are derived according to the link-level simulation results.*

* *On SCS with 400 MHz carrier bandwidth: Under the PN model and linear channel/PN estimation methods used in the evaluations, similar performance is achieved with 120 kHz and 240 kHz SCS, which is superior to remaining configurations.*
* *On ECP with 960 kHz SCS: BLER performance gain can be observed with ECP configuration. However, when taking ECP overhead into the consideration (14% additional overhead introduced by ECP compared with normal CP), ECP does not introduce significant throughput gain to compensate the throughput loss caused by the additional overhead.*
* *On PTRS & PN compensation: With 400 MHz carrier bandwidth, the BLER cannot reach 0.01 for higher MCS levels such as MCS 22, and it cannot reach 0.1 for higher MCS levels with 2 GHz carrier bandwidth. Advanced receiver and/or enhanced PTRS should be further studied to improve the link performance.*

###### [[26], Qualcomm]

It was observed that 960kHz SCS can sustain pre-beamforming RMS channel delay spread up to 100ns with some moderate performance loss at high MCSs.

##### Summary of observations for discussion:

For CP-OFDM, with evaluation assumptions and parameters as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808 (including optional delay spread value), the following are observed when CPE-only compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure is used with respect to CP type and large delay spread.

* When delay spread is not large (< 40 ns in TDL-A), there is minor performance difference between normal and extended CP for SCS values up to 960 kHz when compared on the basis of equal MCS (code rate). If comparing on the basis of equal TBS (equal throughput), the performance of ECP is degraded due to higher overhead of ECP.
* Among 11 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [2, 55, Lenovo], [1, Futurewei], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [7, InterDigital]) evaluated with large delay spread (i.e. 40 ns in TDL-A and/or 50ns in CDL) based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure for normal CP, 10 sources observed that for low MCS (QPSK) and medium MCS (16QAM), there is minor performance difference between different SCS values up to 960kHz for 10% BLER target
  + The other source ([1, Futurewei]) evaluated SCS 960 kHz with CPE compensation at MCS16 with normal CP in TDL-A channel with 40ns DS. It reported that the BLER for SCS 960 kHz, MCS16, and Normal CP is not acceptable (cannot meet 10% BLER target) for 40ns DS.
* 10 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [2, 55, Lenovo], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [7, InterDigital]) evaluated large delay spread (i.e. 40 ns in TDL-A and/or 50ns in CDL) with CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure with normal CP. Among 10 sources, 5 sources ([14, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [5, 56, vivo], [2, 55, Lenovo], [25, NTT DOCOMO]) also evaluated extended CP at least for 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure.
  + 9 out 10 sources observed that for high MCS (64QAM) with normal CP, larger SCS (480 and 960 kHz) performs better than smaller SCS (120 and 240 kHz) when only CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure is used. The other source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported better performance of smaller SCS.
  + 5 out 5 sources observed the performance of 960 kHz SCS with extended CP is significantly improved compared to with normal CP for large delay spread case when compared on the basis of equal MCS (code rate).
  + 4 sources ([14, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [5, vivo], [2, 55, Lenovo]) compared throughput of normal CP and extended CP at least for 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure. They all reported worse throughput of extended CP.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree that “when delay spread is not large (< 40 ns in TDL-A), there is minor performance difference between normal and extended CP for SCS values up to 960 KHz”. Based on that it can be concluded that when SCS is selected correctly for the target scenario, NCP is sufficient for up to 960kHz. |
| InterDigital | Agree with Nokia that 960 kHz with NCP is sufficient if SCS is correctly selected. |
| Qualcomm | We think NCP is enough for a higher SCS up to 960kHz, particularly in the scenarios that 960kHz is beneficial over 120kHz, e.g., indoor, unlicensed, wide band, and high peak rate applications. The scenarios that see large delay spreads are usually large coverage, licensed, small bandwidth, and low-to-medium peak rate applications, and can be covered by 120kHz SCS. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree that NCP is sufficient for SCS up to 960kHz. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We are fine with only NCP considering a proper selection of SCS and MCS based on the target scenario. |
| Moderator | Moved ICI compensation related observations into section 2.1.4. |
| LG Electronics | “1-tap ICI filter” in sub-bullet of the second main bullet can be changed to “CPE compensation” to avoid potential confusion, even though it’s obvious. |
| Ericsson 3 | Recommend the following change to properly capture the comparison of ECP and NCP:  For CP-OFDM, with evaluation assumptions and parameters as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808 (including optional delay spread value), the following are observed with respect to CP type and large delay spread.   * When delay spread is not large (< 40 ns in TDL-A), there is minor performance difference between normal and extended CP for SCS values up to 960 kHz when compared on the basis of equal MCS (code rate). [When/if] comparing on the basis of equal TBS (equal throughput), the performance of ECP is degraded due to higher overhead of ECP. * Among 11 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [2, 55, Lenovo], [1, Futurewei], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [7, InterDigital]) evaluated with large delay spread (i.e. 40 ns in TDL-A and/or 50ns in CDL), 10 sources observed that for low MCS (QPSK) and medium MCS (16QAM), there is minor performance difference between different SCS values up to 960kHz for 10% BLER target   + The other source ([1, Futurewei]) evaluated SCS 960 kHz with 1-tap ICI filter at MCS16 with normal CP in TDL-A channel with 40ns DS. It reported that the BLER for SCS 960 kHz, MCS16, and Normal CP is not acceptable (cannot meet 10% BLER target) for 40ns DS. * 10 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [2, 55, Lenovo], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [7, InterDigital]) evaluated large delay spread (i.e. 40 ns in TDL-A and/or 50ns in CDL) with CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PT-RS structure with normal CP. Among 10 sources, 4 sources ([14, Ericsson], [56, vivo], [2, 55, Lenovo], [25, NTT DOCOMO]) also evaluated extended CP at least for 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PT-RS structure.   + 9 out 10 sources observed that for high MCS (64QAM) with normal CP, larger SCS (480 and 960 kHz) performs better than smaller SCS (120 and 240 kHz) when only CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure is used. The other source ([25, NTT DOCOMO]) reported better performance of smaller SCS.   + 4 out 4 sources observed the performance of 960 kHz SCS with extended CP is significantly improved compared to with normal CP for large delay spread case when compared on the basis of equal MCS (code rate). However, [when/if] compared on the basis of equal TBS (equal throughput), the performance of ECP is degraded due to higher overhead of ECP. ~~the effective throughput is compromised due to larger overhead of extended CP.~~ |
| Moderator 2 | Wording updated as commented in Ericsson 3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our suggested revisions are provided below based on results provided by Huawei in R1-2007604 and R1-2008779 and additional results provided in R1-2009459.  For CP-OFDM, with evaluation assumptions and parameters as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808 (including optional delay spread value), the following are observed with respect to CP type and large delay spread.   * When delay spread is not large (< 40 ns in TDL-A), there is minor performance difference between normal and extended CP for SCS values up to 960 kHz when compared on the basis of equal MCS (code rate). If comparing on the basis of equal TBS (equal throughput), the performance of ECP is degraded due to higher overhead of ECP. * Among 11 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [2, 55, Lenovo], [1, Futurewei], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [7, InterDigital]) evaluated with large delay spread (i.e. 40 ns in TDL-A and/or 50ns in CDL) based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure for normal CP, 10 sources observed that for low MCS (QPSK) and medium MCS (16QAM), there is minor performance difference between different SCS values up to 960kHz for 10% BLER target   + The other source ([1, Futurewei]) evaluated SCS 960 kHz with CPE compensation at MCS16 with normal CP in TDL-A channel with 40ns DS. It reported that the BLER for SCS 960 kHz, MCS16, and Normal CP is not acceptable (cannot meet 10% BLER target) for 40ns DS.   + One source ([68 69, Huawei]) observed that at MCS22 the performance of 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation is degraded compared to lower SCS with ICI compensation at 1% and 10% BLER, where ICI compensation for 960k provides no benefit. * 10 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [2, 55, Lenovo], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel], [7, InterDigital]) evaluated large delay spread (i.e. 40 ns in TDL-A and/or 50ns in CDL) with CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure with normal CP. Among 10 sources, 5 sources ([14, Ericsson], [5, 56, vivo], [2, 55, Lenovo], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [69, Huawei]) also evaluated extended CP at least for 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure.   + 8 out 10 sources observed that for high MCS (64QAM) with normal CP, larger SCS (480 and 960 kHz) performs better than smaller SCS (120 and 240 kHz) when only CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure is used. Two other sources ([25, NTT DOCOMO], [69, Huawei]) reported better performance of smaller SCS at 1% and 10% BLER.   + 4 out 4 sources observed the performance of 960 kHz SCS with extended CP is significantly improved compared to with normal CP for large delay spread case when compared on the basis of equal MCS (code rate).   + 1 source ([69, Huawei]) observed that ECP is necessary for high MCS (MCS26) to reach BLER of 1% with 960 kHz SCS, and ICI compensation is needed at least with 3 taps filter.   + 4 sources ([14, Ericsson], [5, vivo], [2, 55, Lenovo], [69, Huawei]) compared throughput of normal CP and extended CP at least for 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation and/or ICI compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure. They all reported worse throughput of extended CP. |
| Moderator 3 | Respond to Huawei’s comment above:  As mentioned before, all ICI compensation related observations are to be captured in section 2.1.4. A disclaimer is added in the first sentence to avoid confusion.  Suggested changes of “One source ([68 69, Huawei]) observed that at MCS22 the performance of 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation is degraded compared to lower SCS with ICI compensation at 1% and 10% BLER, where ICI compensation for 960k provides no benefit.” is not captured here as it relates to ICI/CPE comparison.  Similarly, the suggested changes of “1 source ([69, Huawei]) observed that ECP is necessary for high MCS (MCS26) to reach BLER of 1% with 960 kHz SCS, and ICI compensation is needed at least with 3 taps filter. ” is not captured here as it relates to ICI/CPE comparison.  Source number updated w.r.t. ECP evaluation.  A question to Huawei, could you please point to me which Figure/Table(s) in [68] where it showed better performance of smaller SCS with CPE-only compensation than larger SCS as you suggested changes for the 1st sub-bullet of the 3rd bullet? The comparison here is clearly stated in the 3rd bullet “with CPE compensation based on the existing Rel-15 NR PTRS structure with normal CP.” |
| Nokia, NSB | It seems that all companies were fine with this observation that when SCS is selected correctly for the target scenario, NCP is sufficient for up to 960kHz. e.g., indoor, unlicensed, wide band, and high peak rate applications. Recommend that we add the conclusion that NCP is sufficient for up to 960 kHz when SCS is selected for the target scenario (e.g., indoor, unlicensed, wide band, and high peak rate applications) |
| LG Electronics | We are against the conclusion drawn from Nokia. When it comes to recommendation or conclusion of NCP or ECP for 960 kHz SCS, we need to put performance depending on MCS/delay spread, beam switching time, timing alignment error, and so on, together, parts of which are not taken into account for evaluation assumptions. Therefore, any conclusion should be made under AI 8.2.1 rather than under AI 8.2.3. |
| InterDigital | We support the conclusion from Nokia. |
| Moderator 4 | Please refer to Chairman’s notes for agreement. |

### DFT-s-OFDM PUSCH

Multiple sources evaluated the BLER performance of DFT-s-OFDM PUSCH with TDL-A and/or CDL channel model. The following are observations directly extracted from these sources.

###### [[3], Huawei]

Observation 2: For DFT-s-OFDM, when the PTRS pattern defined in R15 for DFT-s-OFDM is used, SCS of 240 kHz can achieve similar PUSCH BLER as 480 kHz or 960 kHz for QPSK, 16QAM and 64QAM. Sample density of 8 PTRS groups and 4 PTRS samples per group is not suitable for 120 kHz SCS with 400 MHz scheduled bandwidth for 64QAM.

###### [[68], Huawei]

Observation 4: Simulation results for DFT-s-OFDM show that, SCSs larger than 240 kHz do not achieve a better BLER performance than 120 and 240 kHz SCSs for QPSK and 16QAM. BLER performance of 120 kHz for 64QAM reaches a floor above 10-2 due to a lower overhead of PTRS and the longest interpolation range.

###### [[10], Nokia]

Observation 9: DFT-s-OFDM is more robust under phase noise than CP-OFDM, and can enable use of smaller SCS with significantly smaller PTRS overhead. Even 120kHz can be supported for 64-QAM.

###### [[14, 61], Ericsson]

Observation 2 Phase noise induced performance issues for the DFT-s-OFDM waveform in the 52.6 – 71 GHz frequency range can be addressed with the Rel-15 uplink PTRS structure and currently supported SCS values, e.g., 120 kHz.

###### [[26], Qualcomm]

Observation 2: For the PUSCH (DFT-s-OFDM) performance of different numerologies in the high frequency regime, when PTRS-based phase noise correction is enabled (Section 2.2.2 in [26]),

* At low and medium MCSs (MCS 7 and MCS 16, respectively), no noticeable performance difference is identified among SCSs in most of the tested cases.
* At MCS 22 with 64QAM, due to the increased phase noise impact, 120kHz SCS shows up to ~2.0dB loss compared to other SCSs.
* At MCS 22, the performance is slightly degraded as the bandwidth increases due to the residual inter-time-domain-sample interference after the frequency-domain equalization.
* At MCS 22 with CDL-B 50ns, 960kHz SCS shows a BLER floor at high CINR due to inter-symbol interference, but the floor is below 10%.
* The observed performance trends of different SCSs are consistent across all tested channel and antenna configurations.

###### [[56], vivo]

Observation 6: For 400MHz bandwidth, compared with CP-OFDM waveform, the PN compensation of DFT-S-OFDM waveform can eliminate the influence of PN more effectively, especially for the small SCS (120KHz and 240KHz).

Observation 7: For DFT-S-OFDM waveform, under the same PTRS overhead, the more PTRS number, the better the BLER performance.

Observation 8: For DFT-S-OFDM waveform, with the increase of DS (≤20ns), the performance of higher SCS will slightly deteriorate. When the DS increase to 40ns, the SCS 960 has significant performance loss.

Observation 9: For DFT-S-OFDM waveform, larger bandwidth (more RB numbers) is more sensitive to PN impact.

##### Summary of observations for discussion:

7 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia], [21, Apple]) evaluated DFT-S-OFDM PUSCH BLER performance with different SCS.

* Compared to CP-OFDM, DFT-s-OFDM is more robust under phase noise when CPE-only compensation is enabled.
  + For low and medium MCSs (QPSK and 16QAM), there’s minor performance difference among evaluated SCSs up to 960 kHz.
  + With normal CP, for high MCS (64QAM), the performance improves as the increase of SCS, 120 kHz SCS shows up to ~2.0dB loss compared to other larger SCS.
    - Note: the following are references when derive the observations.
    - One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported a performance gap of 1.4~1.8 dB between 120 and 960 kHz SCS
    - One source ([68, Huawei]) reported a performance gap of 1.3~2.5 dB between 120 and 960 kHz SCS
    - One source ([26, Qualcomm]) reported a performance gap of 1.2~1.7 dB between 120 and 960 kHz SCS
    - One source ([56, vivo]) reported a performance gap of ~1.4 dB between 120 and 960 kHz SCS
    - One source ([10, Nokia]) did not report numerical SINR results in table but provided figures showing approximately similar performance difference (~ 2 dB) between 120 and 960 kHz SCS.
    - One source ([21, Apple]) reported a performance gap of more than 7 dB performance gap between 120 kHz SCS and other SCS (240, 480 and 960 kHz) at TDL-A 5 ns DS. It also reported 120 kHz SCS cannot meet the BLER target of 10% at TDL-A 10ns DS and 960 kHz SCS cannot meet the BLER target of 10% at TDL-A 20ns DS.
    - Another source ([64, OPPO]) reported 120 and 240 kHz SCS cannot meet the BLER target of 10% for all evaluated DS values.
  + For high MCS (64QAM) at large delay spread (TDL-A 40ns or CDL-B 50ns DS), there’s error floor for 960 KHz SCS at least for BLER target 1%.
    - Note: the following are reference when derive the observations.
    - One source ([26, Qualcomm]) reported an error floor for 960 kHz SCS for BLER target 1%.
    - One source ([56, vivo]) reported an error floor for 960 kHz SCS for BLER target 10%
    - One source ([64, OPPO]) reported no error floor of 960 kHz SCS for the BLER target of 10% and 1% for CDL-B 50ns but an error floor for 960 kHz SCS at TDL-A 20ns for BLER target 1%

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Nokia, NSB | Maybe it could be clarified:  Compared to CP-OFDM with CPE compensation only, DFT-s-OFDM is more robust under phase noise when PTRS-based phase noise compensation is enabled |
| Moderator | Wording update as commented by Nokia in above. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposed conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanchips | Agree with the proposed conclusion. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with the proposed conclusion |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the proposed conclusion |
| Moderator 2 | Please refer to Chairman’s notes for agreement. |

### ICI and PTRS impact

Multiple sources evaluated the BLER performance with respect different phase noise compensation methods (e.g. PTRS based CPE, ICI) and different PTRS configurations.

The following are observations directly extracted from these sources regarding ICI, PTRS-based CPE impact.

###### [[1], Futurewei]

It evaluated 120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz SCS with ICI filter to cancel the PN impact. The optimal number of taps for ICI filter is decided to be {1,3,5,7} FD filter taps for {960 kHz, 480kHz, 240 kHz, 120 kHz} SCS respectively, where 1-tap filter is equivalent to CPE compensation. The following observations are made.

Observation 3: With the ICI filter, all analyzed SCS provide similar performance for DS=10ns at the cost of additional signal processing required by the ICI filtering.

Observation 4: The filtering operation for ICI cancelation consists of convolution in the frequency domain between the filter and data subcarriers for each symbol.

###### [[2], Lenovo]

It evaluated no phase noise compensation and PT-RS based phase noise compensation (CPE) for different values of MCS. The following observations are made.

Observation 8: For lower MCS range with QPSK modulation, there is almost no performance gain with phase noise compensation, while slight gain can be observed for mid-range MCS with 16QAM and significant gain is observed for high MCS with 64QAM for all the SCS values.

Observation 9: For higher SCS values, simply increasing the density of PT-RS in frequency domain doesn’t improve the throughput performance in comparison to lower density of PT-RS resources in frequency domain.

###### [[10], Nokia]

With ICI compensation, it’s observed:

*Observation 5: Both 960 kHz SCS and 480 kHz SCS provide robust performance with ICI compensation. However, for a wideband scenario (which is the main use case for a high SCS), 960 kHz SCS provides up-to 0.8 dB gain compared to 480 kHz SCS.*

*Observation 7: ICI cancellation enables 120kHz SCS for at least up to 64-QAM.*

###### [[11], Mitsubishi]

Note the evaluation is done for a 500 MHz BW.

Observation 2: *Around Fc=60GHz, SCS=120kHz and with 16QAM 2/3, block-based PT-RS with cyclic sequence is able of matching the FER performance of the Rel.15 pattern with de-ICI Wiener filtering with a significantly lower overhead (up to 3 times less in some of the simulated scenarios).*

Observation 3: *For Fc=60GHz and SCS=120kHz, the PN compensation with block-based PT-RS and cyclic sequence significantly outperforms in spectral efficiency both CPE compensation and de-ICI Wiener filtering with distributed PT-RS, even when the density of the scattered pattern is increased above the Rel.15 defined density.*

Observation 4: *For Fc=70GHz and SCS=120kHz, the CPE compensation with distributed PT-RS does not reach FER=0.1 whereas the PN compensation with block-based PT-RS and cyclic sequence reaches significantly outperforms de-ICI Wiener filtering.*

Observation 5: *For Fc=70GHz and SCS=240kHz, the PN compensation with block-based PT-RS and cyclic sequence significantly outperforms both the de-ICI Wiener filtering and the CPE compensation.*

###### [[12], Intel]

Observation 11

* *Advanced phase noise compensation methods, such as direct de-ICI compensation method, may not be suitable for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.*

###### [[14], Ericsson]

Evaluated with 400 and 1600 MHz BW.

Proposal 10 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: Effective mitigation of ICI caused by phase noises for OFDM can be performed using the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PT-RS structure.

Proposal 11 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: Systems with smaller sub-carrier spacing equipped with simple ICI compensation is on par or better than systems with larger sub-carrier spacing equipped with only CPE compensation.

Proposal 40 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: A clustered PT-RS structure does not offer any performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PT-RS structure.

###### [[18], Samsung]

Observation 4: ICI compensation has performance gain over CPE compensation.

Observation 5: Performance with the new PT-RS pattern (e.g. chunk based PT-RS pattern) is better than the Rel-15 pattern since it enables ICI compensation in addition to CPE compensation.

###### [[19], OPPO]

Observation 8: with legacy PTRS pattern, phase noise impact is more visible for MCS 22.

Observation 9: the ICI compensation can further reduce the BLER floor compared with simple CPE compensation, but displays a 2~2.5 dB gap to phase noise off performance.

###### [[23], MediaTek]

Observation 1: A simple, 3-tap BLS ICI equalizer is able to eliminate the error floor caused by the ICI, and in turn allows proper operation using current NR numerology (e.g., SCS = 120KHz).

Observation 2: When 3-tap BLS ICI equalizer is used at the receiver, R-15 PTRS design and block PTRS design offer identical performance.

Observation 3: More complicated ICI equalization technique (e.g., DFE), together with the block PTRS design, may further reduce the performance degradation due to phase noise.

###### [[25], NTT DOCOMO]

Observation 1: Following observations are derived according to the link-level simulation results.

* On SCS with 400 MHz carrier bandwidth: Under the PN model and linear channel/PN estimation methods used in the evaluations, similar performance is achieved with 120 kHz and 240 kHz SCS, which is superior to remaining configurations.
* On ECP with 960 kHz SCS: BLER performance gain can be observed with ECP configuration. However, when taking ECP overhead into the consideration (14% additional overhead introduced by ECP compared with normal CP), ECP does not introduce significant throughput gain to compensate the throughput loss caused by the additional overhead.
* On PTRS & PN compensation: With 400 MHz carrier bandwidth, the BLER cannot reach 0.01 for higher MCS levels such as MCS 22, and it cannot reach 0.1 for higher MCS levels with 2 GHz carrier bandwidth. Advanced receiver and/or enhanced PTRS should be further studied to improve the link performance.

###### [[26], Qualcomm]

Observation 6: With a block PTRS pattern and ICI compensation algorithm,

* The performance of block PTRS improves as the number of clusters increases, due to the higher frequency diversity.
* For the same block PTRS pattern, Algorithm 1 (direct de-ICI filtering) outperforms Algorithm 2 (ICI filter approximation).
* For the same ICI compensation algorithm, the legacy PTRS pattern outperforms the block PTRS pattern.

Observation 7: For ICI compensation (direct de-ICI filtering) with the legacy PTRS pattern,

* The performance improves with the increasing number of de-ICI filter taps (3 to 5 taps).
* With a fixed transport block size, the performance improves as the PTRS overhead decreases.
  + The performance loss due to increased effective code rate is more pronounced at higher MCSs.
* With a fixed effective code rate, the performance slightly improves as the PTRS overhead increases.

Observation 8: When ICI compensation is applied to 120kHz SCS,

* At MCSs 22 and 24, 120kHz SCS with ICI compensation performs almost equal to 960kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation.
* At MCS 26, 120kHz SCS with ICI compensation suffers from residual ICI and is outperformed by 960kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation.

###### [[57], InterDigital]

*Observation 2: Increased PT-RS density in frequency domain based on Rel-15 configuration does not provide significant performance benefits.*

###### [[62], LG]

Observation #1: Performance improvement that can be acquired from ICI compensation schemes is negligible for higher SCS.

Observation #2: The performance of clustered PTRS allocation is worse than that of Rel-15 PT-RS based ICI compensation scheme.

Observation #3: The performance of subcarrier nulling allocation is similar or superior (up to 2 dB gain especially in the scenarios with low PTRS overhead, K=4) to that of Rel-15 PT-RS based ICI compensation scheme.

###### [[65], Apple]

*Observation 1: Modifying the PTRS pattern to allow adjacent PTRS symbols in frequency with an ICI compensation filter gives better performance at a lower SCS than the existing Rel-15 PTRS pattern with CPE compensation only.*

##### Summary of observations for discussion:

For CP-OFDM, the following are observed with respect to phase noise compensation and PTRS.

* Compared to no phase noise compensation, CPE compensation shows little gain at low and medium MCSs for all the evaluated SCS values; while significant gain is observed for high MCS (64QAM) for all the evaluated SCS values.
  + Two sources ([57, InterDigital], [11, Mitsubishi])) reported that increased PTRS density in frequency domain based on Rel-15 configuration does not provide significant performance benefits.
* For MCS 22 evaluation of the same SCS, performance gain of ICI compensation with additional complexity of multi-tap filtering compared to CPE-only compensation is observed when there is sufficient number of PTRS in the frequency domain for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS.
  + Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.
  + One source ([61, Ericsson]) showed performance gain of ICI compensation compared to CPE-only compensation for all evaluated SCS
  + One source ([68, Huawei]) evaluated ICI compensation and compared with CPE-only compensation. It reported performance gain for all evaluated SCS.
  + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) compared the performance of CPE and ICI compensation for 120 kHz SCS reported performance gain of ICI compensation.
  + One source ([64, OPPO]) compared the performance of CPE and ICI compensation for all SCS. It reported performance gain of ICI compensation for 240 kHz and 480 kHz SCS. It reported performance gain of ICI compensation in CDL-B but a performance loss in TDL-A for 960 kHz SCS. It also reported that 120 kHz SCS still cannot meet 10% BLER target with ICI compensation.
  + One source ([10, Nokia]) reported performance gain of ICI compensation for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS. It also reported performance gain of ICI compensation for 960 kHz SCS at 2GHz bandwidth and a performance loss of ICI compensation for 960 kHz SCS at 400MHz bandwidth.
  + One source ([65, Apple]) evaluated ICI compensation for different SCS with a new PTRS pattern. It report improvement of ICI compensation compared to CPE-only compensation.
  + One source ([18, Samsung]) evaluated 120 kHz and 240 kHz SCS performance with ICI compensation based on some new PTRS pattern and reported performance improvement.
  + One source ([1, Futurewei]) compared ICI performance among SCS. It reported performance gain of multi-tap ICI filter over CPE compensation for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS
  + One source ([12, Intel]) evaluated performance of de-ICI method for MCS 22 with small RB allocations for 240, 480 and 960 KHz SCS. It is observed that the de-ICI method do not work when there isn’t sufficient number of PTRS tones in the frequency domain.
* For MCS 22 with normal CP when delay spread is not large, it is observed that ICI compensation of multi-tap filtering is required for 120, 240 and/or 480 kHz SCS to achieve comparable performance (< 1 dB difference) to that of 960 kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation for 10% BLER target
  + Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.
  + 2 sources ([61, Ericsson], [10, Nokia]) reported comparable performance of 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation in 1600 MHz bandwidth
  + 2 sources ([64, OPPO], [10, Nokia]) reported comparable performance of 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation in 400 MHz bandwidth
  + One source ([68, Huawei]) reported comparable performance of 240 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation in 400 MHz bandwidth
  + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) evaluated and compared 120 KHz SCS with ICI compensation to larger SCS with CPE compensation. It reported that at MCSs 22 and 24, 120 kHz SCS with ICI compensation performs almost equal to 960 kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation in 400 MHz bandwidth.
  + One source ([1, Futurewei]) reported comparable performance of 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation in TDL-A 5 and 10ns as well as in CDL-D 30ns in 400 MHz bandwidth.
* At very high MCS (e.g., MCS 26 or MCS 28), three sources ([12, Intel], [26, Qualcomm], [69, Huawei]) compared ICI and CPE compensation using the Rel-15 PTRS.
  + Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.
  + One source ([12, Intel]) evaluated the phase noise compensation performance with MCS 28 when delay spread is not large. It is observed that de-ICI technique with 3-taps filter for smaller subcarrier spacing (240 kHz) fails even though there are sufficient number of PTRS tones available for ICI covariance construction.
  + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) compared the performance of CPE and ICI compensation and reported for MCS 26, 120kHz SCS with ICI compensation suffers from residual ICI and is outperformed by 960kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation when delay spread is not large.
  + One source ([68, Huawei]) showed that for MCS 28, de-ICI technique with large number of taps (11, 9 and 7 taps for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS respectively) outperforms 960 kHz with CPE compensation only when delay spread is not large. It also reported that with large delay spread (50ns in CDL), ECP and ICI compensation with at least 3 taps filter are needed for 960 kHz SCS to reach 1% BLER target for MCS 26.
* For high MCS (64QAM) with normal CP when delay spread is large (TDL-A with 40 ns and/or CDL-B with 50ns), 4 sources compared performance of smaller SCS (120, 240 and/or 480 kHz) with ICI compensation to that of 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation and reported worse performance of 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation for 10% BLER target.
  + Note: the following are references used when derive the observations.
  + One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported a performance gain of 5 dB in TDL-A 40ns and 0.3 dB in CDL-B 50ns for 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation compared to 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation in 1600 MHz bandwidth
  + One source ([68, Huawei]) reported a performance gain of 2.6 dB (for 240 kHz SCS) and 1.6 dB (for 120 kHz SCS) in CDL-B 50ns with ICI compensation compared to 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation
  + One source ([64, OPPO]) reported a performance gain of 1 dB in CDL-B 50ns for 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation compared to 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation. It also reported the performance of 120 kHz with ICI compensation cannot meet the 10% BLER target.
  + One source ([1, Futurewei]) reported the performance of 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation cannot meet the 10% BLER target. It also reported that the performance of 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation cannot meet the 10% BLER target in TDL-A 40ns. With ICI compensation, it also reported comparable performance of 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS in CDL-B 50ns and comparable performance of 120 and 240 kHz SCS in TDL-A 40ns.
* Multiple sources evaluated and compared ICI compensation schemes using the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure and/or new PTRS patterns. The results from different sources are not aligned on whether new PTRS patterns perform better than existing Rel-15 PTRS structure when ICI compensation is used.
  + Note: the following are reference used when derive the observations.
  + One source ([11, Mitsubishi]) evaluated with 120 and 240 kHz SCS and reported that the PN compensation with block-based PTRS and cyclic sequence significantly outperforms in spectral efficiency both CPE compensation and de-ICI Wiener filtering with distributed PTRS, even when the density of the scattered pattern is increased above the Rel.15 defined density.
  + One source ([14, Ericsson]) reported that 3-tap direct de-ICI compensation with Rel-15 PTRS outperforms ICI filter approximation approach with clustered PTRS. 3-tap direct de-ICI compensation with a clustered PTRS structure does not offer any performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure.
  + One source ([23, MediaTek]) reported that with a 3-tap BLS ICI equalizer, a clustered PTRS structure does not offer any performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure.
  + One source ([62, LG]) reported that the performance of clustered PTRS allocation is worse than that of Rel-15 PTRS based ICI compensation scheme and further showed that the performance of subcarrier nulling allocation is similar or superior (up to 2 dB gain especially in the scenarios with low PTRS overhead, K=4) to that of Rel-15 PTRS based ICI compensation scheme.
  + Two sources ([18, Samsung], [65, Apple]) evaluated the performance with some new PTRS patterns (e.g. chunk based PTRS pattern to allow adjacent PTRS symbols in frequency) and reported that the performance with ICI compensation based on new PTRS patterns is better than the Rel-15 pattern with CPE compensation only.
  + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) reported that for the same ICI compensation algorithm, the legacy PTRS pattern outperforms the block PTRS pattern. It showed that for ICI compensation (direct de-ICI filtering) with the legacy PTRS pattern, the performance improves with the increasing number of de-ICI filter taps (3 to 5 taps). It also observed that with a fixed transport block size, the performance improves as the PTRS overhead decreases (the performance loss due to increased effective code rate is more pronounced at higher MCSs) and with a fixed effective code rate, the performance slightly improves as the PTRS overhead increases.
* For high MCS (64QAM) with normal CP, 2 sources ([61, Ericsson], [10, Nokia]) compared performance of 480 and 960 kHz SCS in 1600 MHz bandwidth when ICI compensation is used based on Rel-15 PTRS.
  + When delay spread is not large, both sources reported a smaller than 1 dB performance gain of 960 kHz SCS for both 10% and 1% BLER target in TDL-A. One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported that for CDL-B, there is up to 1.1 dB gain at 1% BLER target for 960 kHz SCS.
  + When delay spread is large (TDL-A with 40 ns DS), one source ([61, Ericsson]) reported 480 kHz SCS performed 3.6 dB better than 960 kHz SCS at 10% BLER target and 960 kHz SCS cannot meet the 1% BLER target.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views | |
| LG Electronics | At least from three sources ([14, Ericsson], [65, Apple], and [26, Qualcomm]), it can be observed that 480 kHz SCS when ICI compensation is used and/or new PT-RS is applied shows comparable or better performance, compared to 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation. This observation seems to be able to be captured as well. | |
| Nokia, NSB | Based on the results, most of the companies show that 480kHz SCS requires ICI compensation for higher MCS (64-QAM), because with CPE compensation there is clear performance loss. But 960kHz SCS can be used with CPE compensation only. | |
| Mitsubishi | As a further explanation that might not be obvious from the reported conclusions here-above, please not that we observed performance improvement when passing from a block PTRS structure with random sequence to a block PTRS structure with cyclic structure. The receiver of the block PTRS structure with cyclic sequence is less complex than the de-ICI filter for block structure with random sequence as explained in the contribution. Our contribution did not explicitly show the results of block PTRS with random structure since they were close (only slightly better) than de-ICI filtering onto legacy PTRS sequence, with an identical 5-tap receiver. | |
| Moderator | Respond to LG/Nokia’s comment, improvement of 480 KHz with ICI compensation is added into the 2nd bullet. | |
| InterDigital | We also agree with Nokia that 960 kHz SCS can be used with CPE compensation only while 480 kHz requires ICI compensation for higher MCS. Another minor cosmetic comment is that we prefer to use one wording of PT-RS (i.e., PTRS or PT-RS) for the clarity. | |
| Qualcomm | The observation on the ICI compensation for very high MCSs can be separated out; two sources ([12, Intel] and [26, Qualcomm]) have similar observation that, at very high MCSs (e.g., MCS 26 or MCS 28), the ICI compensation with small SCS (e.g., 120kHz or 240kHz) does not work well, while the high SCS with CPE compensation still performs well. | |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Since many companies show that 480kHz SCS requires ICI compensation for higher MCS (64-QAM), the complexity of ICI compensation e.g. the number of de-ICI-filter taps required to reach a certain level of compensation needs to be captured. | |
| Moderator2 | Wording aligned as commented by InterDigital.  Bullet added as commented by Qualcomm.  Wording updated as commented by Lenovo/Motorola Mobility. | |
| LG Electronics | Question for clarification for the main bullet (as quoted below): Is this observation drawn by comparing between performance with CPE compensation and performance without CPE compensation? If this is the case, we think CPE compensation performance gain increases as SCS increases.   * For PTRS based CPE, phase noise compensation shows little gain at low and medium MCSs for all the evaluated SCS values. While significant gain is observed for high MCS (64QAM) for all the evaluated SCS values.   One more minor comment: As commented in Section 2.1.2.2, “1-tap ICI filter” or “1-tap filter” can be changed to “CPE compensation” to avoid potential confusion, even though it’s obvious. | |
| Ericsson 3 | The following corrections are needed for our evaluations:   * For MCS 22, it is observed that ICI compensation with additional complexity of multi-tap filtering is required for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS to achieve comparable performance to that of 960 kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation   + Note: the following are reference when derive the observations.   + One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported up to 1 dB gain ~~comparable performance~~ of 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation compared to ~~and~~ 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation   + One source ([68, Huawei]) reported comparable performance of 240 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation.   + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) evaluated and compared 120 KHz SCS with ICI compensation to larger SCS with CPE compensation. It reported that at MCSs 22 and 24, 120 kHz SCS with ICI compensation performs almost equal to 960 kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation.   + One source ([64, OPPO]) reported a performance gap of 0.8~1 dB between 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation where the latter performs better   + One source ([1, Futurewei]) reported comparable performance of 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with 1-tap filter   …   * For high MCS (64QAM) with normal CP, 4 sources evaluated large delay spread (TDL-A with 40 ns and/or CDL-B with 50ns) with ICI compensation.   + One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported results for SCS 480 and 960 kHz and showed a 3.6 dB gain for 480 at 10% BLER target. A gain of 5 dB is shown for 480 + ICI vs. 960 + CPE at 10% BLER target. ~~offer similar performances, which are better than those of smaller SCS (120 and 240 kHz).~~   + One source ([68, Huawei]) reported similar performances for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS, and they are better than that of 960 kHz.   + One source ([1, Futurewei]) report similar performance for 120, 240 and 480 kHz. It also reported the BLER for 960 kHz SCS is not acceptable.   + One source ([64, OPPO]) reported similar performances of 240 and 480 kHz SCS, and they are better than that of 960 kHz. It also reported the performance of 120 kHz cannot meet the 10% BLER target. * Multiple sources evaluated and compared ICI compensation schemes using the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure and/or new PTRS patterns. The results from different sources are not aligned on whether new PTRS patterns perform better than existing Rel-15 PTRS structure when ICI compensation is used.   + Note: the following are reference when derive the observations.   + One source ([11, Mitsubishi]) evaluated with 120 and 240 kHz SCS and reported that the PN compensation with block-based PTRS and cyclic sequence significantly outperforms in spectral efficiency both CPE compensation and de-ICI Wiener filtering with distributed PTRS, even when the density of the scattered pattern is increased above the Rel.15 defined density.   + Two sources ([14, Ericsson] with Direct de-ICI compensation and ICI filter approximation, [23, MediaTek] with a 3-tap BLS ICI equalizer) reported a clustered PTRS structure does not offer any performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure. In ([14, Ericsson]) it is shown direct de-ICI compensation with Rel-15 PTRS outperforms ICI filter approximation approach with clustered PTRS.   + One source ([62, LG]) reported that the performance of clustered PTRS allocation is worse than that of Rel-15 PTRS based ICI compensation scheme and further showed that the performance of subcarrier nulling allocation is similar or superior (up to 2 dB gain especially in the scenarios with low PTRS overhead, K=4) to that of Rel-15 PTRS based ICI compensation scheme.   + Two sources ([18, Samsung], [65, Apple]) evaluated the performance with some new PTRS patterns (e.g. chunk based PTRS pattern to allow adjacent PTRS symbols in frequency) and reported that the performance with ICI compensation based on new PTRS patterns is better than the Rel-15 pattern with CPE compensation only.   + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) reported that for the same ICI compensation algorithm, the legacy PTRS pattern outperforms the block PTRS pattern. It showed that for ICI compensation (direct de-ICI filtering) with the legacy PTRS pattern, the performance improves with the increasing number of de-ICI filter taps (3 to 5 taps). | |
| Moderator 3 | Wording updated based on LG’s comment.  Respond to Ericsson 3’s comment:  Updated as your 2nd and 3rd suggested changes.  On your first suggested changes, when I compared 480 + ICI (from Table 2 in [61]) to 960 + CPE (from Table 1 in [61]) for MCS 22 for 10% BLER target. I didn’t observe “up to 1 dB” difference. I copied the relevant part below.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Tdoc /  Source | MCS | Channel | 480 kHz/1.6 GHz w/ ICI | 960KHz / 1.6 GHz | |  | 22 | TDL-A, 5ns | 16.1/18.0 | 16.1/18.2 | | TDL-A, 10ns | 15.8/17.5 | 15.9/17.8 | | TDL-A, 20ns | 15.6/17 | 16.1/18.0 | | CDL-B, 20ns | 15.7/17.6 | 15.4/17.5 | | CDL-B, 50ns | 15.2/16.6 | 15.5/17.4 | | CDL-D, 20ns | 13.5/14.9 | 13.6/15.0 | | CDL-D, 30ns | 13.5/14.9 | 13.5/14.9 |   Meaning of comparable “(< 1 dB difference)” and “for 10% BLER target when delay spread is not large” are added for clarity as they were used for my comparison. | |
| Moderator 4 | Observations updated related to [10]. | |
| Ericsson 4 | Comment #1:  We disagree with the wording "large number of RB allocations" in the following and suggest the change marked in red:   * For MCS 22 evaluation of the same SCS, performance gain of ICI compensation compared to CPE-only compensation is observed with ~~large number of RB allocations~~ when there is sufficient number of PTRS in the frequency domain for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS.   We have evaluated ICI compensation vs. CPE compensation for MCS 22 with TDL-A 10 ns for 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, and 64 PRBs for 120, 240, 480, and 960 kHz SCS. We found that ICI compensation has performance on par or better than CPE compensation when the number of PRBs is 18 or greater (for K = 1). Hence, we do not think that the RB allocation needs to be *large* to achieve improved performance with ICI compensation. We acknowledge that for very small allocations (e.g., 6 PRBs) for 960 kHz, there may not be a sufficient number of PTRS samples for effective averaging, but we also point out that this may be a corner case. One can always increase the allocation slightly and lower the MCS to avoid an issue.  Comment #2:  We think the wording "that ICI compensation with additional complexity of multi-tap filtering" is a bit misleading. If only comparing the *per OFDM symbol* complexity of ICI compensation, then yes, extra operations (multiply/adds) are required for ICI compensation. However, comparing, e.g., 960 vs. 480 for the same bandwidth, twice as many OFDM symbols are needed for 960 to achieve the same data rate. When factoring in this, as well as the fact the FFT is running at twice the speed for 960, we have found that the complexity in terms of multiply/adds *per sec* for 480 + ICI is less than that for 960 + CPE.   * For MCS 22, it is observed that ICI compensation with ~~additional complexity~~ of multi-tap filtering is required for 120, 240 and/or 480 kHz SCS to achieve comparable performance (< 1 dB difference) to that of 960 kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation for 10% BLER target when delay spread is not large | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our suggestions on the observations are provided below, mostly to make the main observations points written in a more consistent manner, and to clarify results from Huawei and to reflect our updated results provided in [69]. We have also provided some revisions on observations from results from other companies based on our understanding of their Tdocs.  The statement that “The results from different sources are not aligned on whether new PTRS patterns perform better than existing Rel-15 PTRS structure when ICI compensation is used” could be clarified in our view. At least we didn’t see any performance degradation in terms of BLER with the use of new PTRS patterns such as block-PTRS, which allow for some receiver complexity reduction in case ICI compensation is implemented at the UE.  For CP-OFDM, the following are observed with respect to phase noise compensation and PTRS.   * Compared to no phase noise compensation, CPE compensation shows little gain at low and medium MCSs for all the evaluated SCS values; while significant gain is observed for high MCS (64QAM) for all the evaluated SCS values.   + Two sources ([57, InterDigital], [11, Mitsubishi])) reported that increased PTRS density in frequency domain based on Rel-15 configuration does not provide significant performance benefits. * For MCS 22 evaluation of the same SCS, performance gain of ICI compensation compared to CPE-only compensation is observed with large number of RB allocations when there is sufficient number of PTRS in the frequency domain for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS.   + Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.   + One source ([61, Ericsson]) showed performance gain of ICI compensation compared to CPE-only compensation for all evaluated SCS   + One source ([68, Huawei]) evaluated ICI compensation with a block-based PTRS and compared with CPE-only compensation. It reported performance gain for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS.   + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) compared the performance of CPE and ICI compensation for 120 kHz SCS reported performance gain of ICI compensation.   + One source ([64, OPPO]) compared the performance of CPE and ICI compensation for all SCS. It reported performance gain of ICI compensation for 240 kHz and 480 kHz SCS. It reported performance gain of ICI compensation in CDL-B but a performance loss in TDL-A for 960 kHz SCS. It also reported that 120 kHz SCS still cannot meet 10% BLER target with ICI compensation.   + One source ([10, Nokia]) reported performance gain of ICI compensation for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS. It also reported performance gain of ICI compensation for 960 kHz SCS at 2GHz bandwidth and a performance loss of ICI compensation for 960 kHz SCS at 400MHz bandwidth.   + One source ([65, Apple]) evaluated ICI compensation for different SCS with a new PTRS pattern. It report improvement of ICI compensation compared to CPE-only compensation.   + One source ([18, Samsung]) evaluated 120 kHz and 240 kHz SCS performance with ICI compensation based on some new PTRS pattern and reported performance improvement.   + One source ([1, Futurewei]) compared ICI performance among SCS. It reported performance gain of multi-tap ICI filter over CPE compensation for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS   + One source ([12, Intel]) evaluated performance of de-ICI method for MCS 22 with small RB allocations for 240, 480 and 960 KHz SCS. It is observed that the de-ICI method do not work when there isn’t sufficient number of PTRS tones in the frequency domain. * For MCS 22 with normal CP when delay spread is not large, it is observed that ICI compensation with additional complexity of multi-tap filtering is required for 120, 240 and/or 480 kHz SCS to achieve comparable performance (< 1 dB difference) to that of 960 kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation for 10% BLER target   + Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.   + 3 sources ([61, Ericsson], [64, OPPO], [10, Nokia]) reported comparable performance of 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation   + One source ([68, Huawei]) reported slightly better performance of 240 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation. It was observed that block-PTRS (with the same density as Rel-15 PTRS) helps in reducing the complexity of the ICI compensation algorithm.   + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) evaluated and compared 120 KHz SCS with ICI compensation to larger SCS with CPE compensation. It reported that at MCSs 22 and 24, 120 kHz SCS with ICI compensation performs almost equal to 960 kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation.   + One source ([1, Futurewei]) reported comparable performance of 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation in TDL-A 5 and 10ns as well as in CDL-D 30ns. * At very high MCS (e.g., MCS 26 or MCS 28), three sources ([12, Intel], [26, Qualcomm], [69, Huawei]) compared ICI and CPE compensation using the Rel-15 PTRS when delay spread is not large.   + Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.   + One source ([12, Intel]) evaluated the phase noise compensation performance with MCS 28. It is observed that while CPE technique work well for these high SNR regions, de-ICI technique with 3-taps filter for smaller subcarrier spacing (240 kHz) fails even though there are sufficient number of PTRS tones available for ICI covariance construction.   + One source ([69, Huawei]) showed that for MCS28 with Rel-15 PTRS, de-ICI technique with higher order (9, 7, or 5 taps) allows lower SCS (120, 240, 480) to outperform 960 kHz with CPE compensation only, where higher tap order is necessary for lower SCS. De-ICI technique is also required for 960 kHz to reach BLER below 10% in CDL-B (20 ns, 50 ns) and CDL-D (20 ns, 30 ns).   + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) compared the performance of CPE and ICI compensation and reported for MCS 26, 120kHz SCS with ICI compensation suffers from residual ICI and is outperformed by 960kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation. * For high MCS (64QAM) with normal CP when delay spread is large (TDL-A with 40 ns and/or CDL-B with 50ns), 4 sources compared performance of smaller SCS (120, 240 and/or 480 kHz) with ICI compensation to that of 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation and reported worse performance of 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation for 10% BLER target.   + Note: the following are references used when derive the observations.   + One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported a performance gain of 5 dB in TDL-A 40ns and 0.3 dB in CDL-B 50ns for 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation compared to 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation   + One source ([68, Huawei]) reported a performance gain of 2.6 dB (for 240 kHz SCS) and 1.6 dB (for 120 kHz SCS) in CDL-B 50ns with ICI compensation compared to 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation   + One source ([64, OPPO]) reported a performance gain of 1 dB in CDL-B 50ns for 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation compared to 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation. It also reported the performance of 120 kHz with ICI compensation cannot meet the 10% BLER target.   + One source ([1, Futurewei]) reported the performance of 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation cannot meet the 10% BLER target. It also reported that the performance of 480 kHz SCS with ICI compensation cannot meet the 10% BLER target in TDL-A 40ns. With ICI compensation, it also reported comparable performance of 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS in CDL-B 50ns and comparable performance of 120 and 240 kHz SCS in TDL-A 40ns. * Multiple sources evaluated and compared ICI compensation schemes using the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure and/or new PTRS patterns. The results from different sources are not aligned on whether new PTRS patterns perform better than existing Rel-15 PTRS structure when ICI compensation is used.   + Note: the following are reference used when derive the observations.   + One source ([11, Mitsubishi]) evaluated with 120 and 240 kHz SCS and reported that the PN compensation with block-based PTRS and cyclic sequence significantly outperforms in spectral efficiency both CPE compensation and de-ICI Wiener filtering with distributed PTRS, even when the density of the scattered pattern is increased above the Rel.15 defined density.   + One source ([14, Ericsson]) reported that direct de-ICI compensation with Rel-15 PTRS outperforms ICI filter approximation approach with clustered PTRS.   + One source ([23, MediaTek]) reported that with a 3-tap BLS ICI equalizer, a clustered PTRS structure does not offer any performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure.   + One source ([62, LG]) reported that the performance of clustered PTRS allocation is worse than that of Rel-15 PTRS based ICI compensation scheme and further showed that the performance of subcarrier nulling allocation is similar or superior (up to 2 dB gain especially in the scenarios with low PTRS overhead, K=4) to that of Rel-15 PTRS based ICI compensation scheme.   + Two sources ([18, Samsung], [65, Apple]) evaluated the performance with some new PTRS patterns (e.g. chunk based PTRS pattern to allow adjacent PTRS symbols in frequency) and reported that the performance with ICI compensation based on new PTRS patterns is better than the Rel-15 pattern with CPE compensation only.   + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) reported that for the same ICI compensation algorithm, the legacy PTRS pattern outperforms the block PTRS pattern. It showed that for ICI compensation (direct de-ICI filtering) with the legacy PTRS pattern, the performance improves with the increasing number of de-ICI filter taps (3 to 5 taps), and it was also observed that with a fixed transport block size, the performance improves as the PTRS overhead decreases (the performance loss due to increased effective code rate is more pronounced at higher MCSs) and with a fixed effective code rate, the performance slightly improves as the PTRS overhead increases. | |
| Moderator 5 | Respond to Ericsson 4’s comments:  Wording updated as suggested in comment#1.  Regarding comment#2, the “additional complexity” is referring to ICI compensation compared to CPE compensation for the same SCS. I moved to the 2nd bullet. No need to debate whether 480+ICI is more or less complex than 960+CPE as this summary is on performance observations. I believe observation/study on complexity is in the scope of 8.2.1 where multiple sources made comparisons.  Respond to Huawei’s comment:  Regarding the comment on clarifying “The results from different sources are not aligned on whether new PTRS patterns perform better than existing Rel-15 PTRS structure when ICI compensation is used.”, I don’t see how this can be interpreted as new PTRS make performance worse. My understanding of “not better than” is not equal to worsen the performance.    W.r.t. the suggested wording “slightly better” to the 3rd sub-bullet of the 3rd bullet, I copied Table 1 (kept relevant part) from R1-2009459 below. Please explain why it’s not correct by saying “One source ([68, Huawei]) reported comparable performance of 240 kHz SCS with ICI compensation and 960 kHz SCS with CPE compensation.” The criteria “comparable performance (<1 dB difference)” is clearly stated in the 3rd bullet and is used consistently for all comparisons under the 3rd bullet.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | MCS | Channel | 120 kHz  @400 MHz | | 240 kHz  @400 MHz | | 480 kHz  @400 MHz | | 960 kHz  @400 MHz | | PHN | CPE | ICI | CPE | ICI | CPE | ICI | CPE | | 22 | CDL-B, 20ns | NAN | 16.8/20 | NAN | 15.3/17.2 | 17/-- | 17/19 | 15.7/18 | | CDL-D, 20ns | NAN | 11.9/12.7 | NAN | 12.3/13.0 | 13.7/-- | 12.6/13.3 | 12.5/13.1 | | CDL-D, 30ns | NAN | 12.5/12.9 | NAN | 11.8/12.4 | 13.2/14.8 | -- | 12.1/12.5 |   W.r.t. the changes suggested “It was observed that block-PTRS (with the same density as Rel-15 PTRS) helps in reducing the complexity of the ICI compensation algorithm.” to the 3rd sub-bullet of the 3rd bullet, Could you please point to me which observation and/or where is the statement in R1-2009459 saying block-PTRS reducing complexity of ICI compensation? I didn’t find any statement matching such observation. Furthermore, could you please clarify which Figures/tables are corresponding to Rel-15 PTRS and/or which are based on a new block-based PTRS? It’s not clear to me whether all ICI compensation results are based block-based PTRS or not.  W.r.t the changes suggested on MCS 28 (the 4th bullet) evaluation in R1-2009459, I made the changes as commented and put in [] (the 4th sub-bullet) as it’s not clear whether such evaluation (Figure 6, 7 and Table 2) in R1-2009459 was done on Rel-15 PTRS or a new block-based PTRS. The tap numbers are also corrected based Figure 6, 7 and Table 2 in R1-2009459 which I copied here below.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | MCS | Channel | 120 kHz  @400 MHz | 240 kHz  @400 MHz | 480 kHz  @400 MHz | | 960 kHz  @400 MHz | | | ICI-11 | ICI-9 | ICI-5 | ICI-7 | CPE | ICI-3 | | 28 | CDL-B, 20ns | -- | 24.3/28.8 | 25.5/33.7 | 25.1/28.8 | NAN/NAN | 25.3/30.5 | | CDL-D, 20ns | -- | 19.6/21.2 | 20.1/22.4 | 19.7/21 | 26/NAN | 19.7/21.4 | | CDL-D, 30ns | 19.3/20.7 | 19.6/21.3 | 20.1/22.4 | 19.8/21 | 26/NAN | 19.8/21.2 | | |
| Moderator 6 | Bracket [] for the 4th sub-bullet of the 4th bullet is removed as Huawei clarified on the email reflector that all ICI compensation other than Figure 5 in R1-2009459 was done based on Rel-15 PTRS. | |
| Ericsson 5 | Comment #1  The following observation proposed by Nokia was agreed today in the GTW for the case of CPE compensation only for the case of large BW (1600 and 2000 MHz):   * For high MCS (64QAM), 4 sources ([61, Ericsson], [56, vivo], [10, Nokia], [18, Samsung]) compared performance of 480 and 960 kHz SCS in 1600 or 2000 MHz bandwidth. 4 out of 4 sources reported performance gain around 4 ~ 5 dB of 960 kHz SCS for 10% BLER target. All 4 sources also reported that 480 kHz SCS cannot meet 1% BLER target.   As discussed in the GTW, we would like to capture a parallel observation for the case of ICI compensation when operating with large BW (1600 MHz):   * For high MCS (64QAM) with normal CP and Rel-15 PTRS, 1 source ([61, Ericsson]) compared performance of 480 and 960 kHz in 1600 MHz bandwidth with ICI compensation (3-tap de-ICI filter) for TDL-A with 5, 10, and 20 ns delay spread. Comparable performance (0 to 0.5 dB gap) was reported for 480 and 960 kHz for both 10% and 1% BLER. For large delay spread (TDL-A with 40 ns DS), 480 kHz performed 3.6 dB better than 960 kHz at 10% BLER, and 960 kHz does not meet the 1% BLER target.   Comment #2  There may have been some confusion about one of our Ericsson 3 comments where ours and MediaTek's observations seem to have been separated. We made a similar observation as MediaTek, hence we would like to make the following update to correct this:   * One source ([14, Ericsson]) reported that 3-tap direct de-ICI compensation with Rel-15 PTRS outperforms ICI filter approximation approach with clustered PTRS. 3-tap direct de-ICI compensation with a clustered PTRS structure does not offer any performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure. * One source ([23, MediaTek]) reported that with a 3-tap BLS ICI equalizer, a clustered PTRS structure does not offer any performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure. |
| Moderator 7 | Respond to Ericsson 5’s comment #1:  The comparison of 480+ICI and 960+CPE kHz SCS from [61] has already been done based on the evaluation of 1600 MHz BW.  Some wording on the evaluated bandwidth for performance comparison were added for clarity.  On the suggested comparison of 480+ICI vs 960+ICI for wider bandwidth, a bullet is added. Note that the difference is larger than 1 dB in some case. I referred Table 2 in [61] copied below of relevant part..   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Tdoc /  Source | MCS | Channel | 480 kHz/1.6 GHz w/ ICI | 960KHz / 1.6 GHz w/ ICI | |  | 22 | TDL-A, 5ns | 16.1/18.0 | 15.6/17.4 | | TDL-A, 10ns | 15.8/17.5 | 15.4/16.9 | | TDL-A, 20ns | 15.6/17 | 15.5/16.9 | | CDL-B, 20ns | 15.7/17.6 | 14.8/16.5 | | CDL-B, 50ns | 15.2/16.6 | 14.8/16.1 | | CDL-D, 20ns | 13.5/14.9 | 13.1/14.3 | | CDL-D, 30ns | 13.5/14.9 | 13.0/14.3 |   Respond to Ericsson 5’s comment #2:  Revised as commented.  Updated description of the 3rd sub-bullet of the 2nd bullet for the observation in [68] where ICI gain is shown for 960 kHz SCS as well. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The observation provided earlier under 2.1.2 including ICI for 960 kHz SCS could not be included in 2.1.2 so we suggest adding this observation in section 2.1.4 relevant to ICI compensation.   * At very high MCS (e.g., MCS 26 or MCS 28), three sources ([12, Intel], [26, Qualcomm], [69, Huawei]) compared ICI and CPE compensation using the Rel-15 PTRS when delay spread is not large.   + Note: the following references are used when derive the observations.   + One source ([12, Intel]) evaluated the phase noise compensation performance with MCS 28. It is observed that while CPE technique work well for these high SNR regions, de-ICI technique with 3-taps filter for smaller subcarrier spacing (240 kHz) fails even though there are sufficient number of PTRS tones available for ICI covariance construction.   + One source ([26, Qualcomm]) compared the performance of CPE and ICI compensation and reported for MCS 26, 120kHz SCS with ICI compensation suffers from residual ICI and is outperformed by 960kHz SCS with CPE-only compensation.   + One source ([68, Huawei]) showed that for MCS28, de-ICI technique with large number of taps (11, 9 and 5 taps for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS respectively) outperforms 960 kHz with CPE compensation only. The results showed that with large delay spread (50ns in CDL) using the Rel-15 NR PTRS structure, ECP is necessary and ICI compensation is needed with at least 3 taps filter for 960 kHz SCS to reach BLER of 1% at high MCS (MCS26). | |
| Moderator 8 | Observation in [68] was added as commented by Huawei’s comment above. Moved the condition “when delay spread is not large” from the main 4th bullet to sub-bullets for source [12], [26] as [68] observed for large delay spread case as well. | |
| Ericsson 6 | Comment #1:  Thank-you for inserting the paragraph for 1.6 GHz BW including E/// and Nokia results. To be more accurate, we propose the following wording to cover which channel types that were evaluated by each source. Note: as per moderator's convention, "comparable" means up to 1 dB gap.   * For high MCS (64QAM) with normal CP, 2 sources ([61, Ericsson], [10, Nokia]) compared performance of 480 and 960 kHz SCS in 1600 MHz bandwidth when ICI compensation is used based on Rel-15 PTRS. For TDL-A, both sources reported that when the delay spread is not large, comparable performance is reported between 480 and 960 kHz for both 10% and 1% BLER. One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported that for CDL-B, there is a 1.1 dB gain at 1% BLER for 960 kHz. ~~2 out of 2 sources reported slight performance gain up to 1.1 dB of 960 kHz SCS for 10% and 1% BLER target when delay spread is not large.~~ One source ([61, Ericsson]) reported 480 kHz SCS performed 3.6 dB better than 960 kHz at 10% BLER target and 960 kHz SCS cannot meet the 1% BLER target when delay spread is large (TDL-A with 40 ns DS).   Comment #2:  I have a question to Intel regarding the highlighted part of the following bullet:   * + One source ([12, Intel]) evaluated the phase noise compensation performance with MCS 28. It is observed that while CPE technique work well for these high SNR regions, de-ICI technique with 3-taps filter for smaller subcarrier spacing (240 kHz) fails even though there are sufficient number of PTRS tones available for ICI covariance construction.   Looking at Figure 17 of [12] it seems that 960 kHz + CPE compensation shows a 20% BLER floor which doesn't seem consistent with "work well." Or is there a different Figure I should look at? | |
| Moderator 9 | Respond to Ericsson 6’s comment #1:  For the last bullet of performance comparison of 480+ICI vs. 960+ICI in 1600 MHz BW, I took the same treatment as for the performance comparison of 480+CPE vs 960+CPE in 1600/2000 MHz BW in section 2.1.1.2. The style of description is consistent: reporting which one is better and further stating how much in dB of the performance gap.  I separated comparison of different channel model as commented for clarity as only one source evaluated CDL.  Respond to Ericsson 6’s comment #2:  For the observation of results from [12], I extracted the description/observation directly above Figure 17 of [12]. Thanks for checking, I removed highlighted wording “while CPE technique work well for these high SNR regions” for now. I’ll let the sourcing company of [12] to comment if they have different figure/results on which their observation is based. | |
| Apple | Edit:   * One source ([65, Apple]) evaluated ICI compensation for different SCS with a new PTRS pattern. It reported improvement of ICI compensation compared to CPE-only compensation. | |
| Nokia | Huawei observation requires further update. | |
|  | * + One source ([68, Huawei]) showed that for MCS 28, de-ICI technique with large number of taps (11, 9 and 7 taps for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS respectively) outperforms 960 kHz with CPE compensation only when delay spread is not large. It also reported that with large delay spread (50ns in CDL), ECP and ICI compensation with at least 3 taps filter are needed for 960 kHz SCS to reach 1% BLER target for MCS 26. When delay spread is not large (CDL/BDL-20ns), 960kHz with 3-tap ICI compensation has comparable performance to other SCS and the 3-tap ICI compensation is the least complex. | |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Fine with the updated summary of observations. | |

### DMRS impact

Multiple sources submitted evaluation results impact on DMRS based on the agreed LLS evaluation assumptions. The following are observations directly extracted from these sources.

###### [[2], Lenovo]

It evaluated the performance for higher SCS values between front-loaded DMRS type 1 and with ideal channel estimation to show the impact of different SCS values on DM-RS based channel estimation performance for both 400MHz and 2GHz bandwidth. The following observations are made.

Observation 10: For higher SCS values with both 400MHz and 2GHz bandwidth, BLER performance difference between the ideal channel estimation and real channel estimation varies for different SCS values, where, as the subcarrier spacing is increasing, the performance degradation with real channel estimation also increases which could be attributed to the performance of DM-RS configuration with different SCS values.

###### [[7], InterDigital]

*Observation 5: The performance loss from channel estimation error gets reduced as DM-RS density increases especially when a higher modulation order is used.*

###### [[57], InterDigital]

*Observation 1: Increased number of DM-RS symbols mitigates performance degradation from the channel estimation error and the RF impairments especially for higher modulation order and smaller bandwidth.*

###### [[12], Intel]

Proposal 6

* *For subcarrier spacing 480 kHz and 960 kHz, PDSCH (and potentially PUSCH) reception performance is impacted by frequency domain OCC in DMRS, and therefore we suggest that RAN1 further investigate on frequency domain OCC for DMRS.*

###### [[14], Ericsson]

Proposal 42 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808. For 480 kHz SCS and below with large delay spread, the room for performance improvement with a change to the Rel-15 DMRS design is very limited.

###### [[26], Qualcomm]

“Due to the poor interpolation and loss of orthogonality among CDMed DMRS ports, the performance loss are significant, especially when the CDM is enabled and the channel delay spread is large.”

###### [[66], NTT DOCOMO]

**Observation 1:** *Extended SCS of NR on 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz is comparable with coherent bandwidth for typical scenarios on 70 GHz band, which causes performance loss for DMRS based channel estimation with DMRS structure specified in Rel-15 NR.*

* *FDM (incl. comb) and FD-OCC may introduce severe performance loss in such conditions.*

##### Summary of observations for discussion:

For CP-OFDM, the following are observed regarding the impact of DMRS to BLER performance.

* One source ([57, InterDigital]) reported performance improvement with increased number of DMRS symbols or increased DMRS density especially for higher modulation order.
* One source ([14, Ericsson]) reported for 480 kHz SCS and below with large delay spread, the room for performance improvement with a change to the Rel-15 DMRS design is very limited.
* One source ([12, Intel]) reported a performance drop when frequency domain OCC is enabled especially for higher order modulation such as 64 QAM (MCS 22). The performance gap increases when channel delay spread increases.
* One source ([26, Qualcomm]) reported performance improvement with a new DMRS pattern featured by high frequency density (i.e., every RE) and 2-FD-OCC across adjacent REs.
* One source ([10, Nokia]) reported that with Rel-15 DMRS type-1, different delay spread values (10ns and 20ns) have a negligible impact to the demodulation performance of PDSCH for a high SCS (such as 960 kHz).

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Nokia, NSB | The results shown in [10] (Section 2.3) illustrate that with Rel-15 DMRS type-1, different delay spread values (10ns and 20ns) have a negligible impact to the demodulation performance of PDSCH for a high SCS (such as 960 kHz). Therefore, it can be concluded that the existing Rel-15 DMRS type-1 RE-pattern is a feasible solution for 60 GHz scenario also with a high SCS. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. It seems that companies’ observations are well aligned, while Nokia has different observation. Maybe a new bullet can also be added to capture Nokia’s observation. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We are fine with moderator’s proposal. We see that the enhancement for DM-RS configuration is needed to cope with the observed performance drop especially at high SCS and high delay spread scenarios. |
| NTT DOCOMO | The channel characteristic results from system-level simulations show that for both indoor and outdoor scenarios, 20ns DS only covers about 50% of UEs. The DS of UE channels may reach 80ns considering the 95%-tile UEs, even if most of the links in 60 GHz network are LoS. Therefore, we think the results with larger DS such as 40ns should be considered as well.  Based on the results in our updated contribution [R1-2009062], we observed significant performance degradation of 960 kHz SCS with the increasing DS from 5ns to 40ns. Applying ECP for 960 kHz can mitigate such performance loss neither. Therefore, the performance degradation caused by channel estimation error based on current NR DMRS design is not a negligible issue in our view. |
| Moderator | A new bullet was added to capture observations from [10]. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with proposed conclusion |
| Moderator 2 | Please refer to Chairman’s notes for agreement. |

## 2.2. SSB performance

Multiple sources submitted evaluation results on SSB performance based on the agreed LLS evaluation assumptions.

The following are observations directly extracted from these sources regarding SSB and PBCH performance.

###### [[5, 56], vivo]

It compared link budget of different SCS with different DS in TDL-A channel. The following observations are made.

Observation 10: For SSB detection, when the coarse frequency offset searcher range equals to the fine frequency offset compensation value, higher SCS (larger bandwidth) shows better performance.

Observation 11: For SSB channel, CP length and SCS will affect the autocorrelation of PSS sequence, thereby affecting the SSB detection performance.

Observation 12: For Cell ID detection, when the coarse frequency offset searcher range equals to the fine frequency offset compensation value, various SCS and DS have little effect on the cell ID BLER performance.

###### [[14], Ericsson]

The link budgets for different SCS are computed assuming a PBCH detection requirement of 10% block error rate (BLER), where successful detection is conditioned on successful detection of PSS and SSS. The used channel model is a TDL-A 3km/h channel.

Proposal 31 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: It is beneficial for SSB coverage to reuse the FR2 already supported subcarrier spacings of 120kHz and 240kHz.

###### [[19], OPPO]

Observation 1: From the SSB detection simulation, the FR2 SCS has comparable performance to 480KHz or 960KHz. Phase noise and mobility are not critical issue for FR2 SCS based SSB.

###### [[21], Apple]

*Observation 8: As expected, the PBCH BLER performance difference between 240 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz is less than 0.5 dB.*

###### [[25], NTT DOCOMO]

Observation 2:

* *For SS detection, PBCH DMRS detection and PBCH BLER performances, all candidate SCSs show comparable performances in TDL channel.*

###### [[26], Qualcomm]

Observation 3: For the PSS and SSS detection performance of different numerologies in the high frequency regime (Section 2.2.3 in [26]),

* The performance is degraded as the SCS increases due to the enhanced frequency selectivity.
  + The impact is more pronounced in NLOS channels (i.e., CDL-B and TDL-A) with larger delay spreads: ~2dB loss for 960kHz SCS compared to 120kHz SCS.
  + Antenna Config 2 is more sensitive as the post-beamforming delay spread is likely to be larger than Config 1.

Observation 4: For the PBCH performance of different numerologies in the high frequency regime (Section 2.2.4 in [26]),

* The performance is degraded as the SCS increases due to the enhanced frequency selectivity.
  + The impact is more pronounced in NLOS channels (i.e., CDL-B and TDL-A) with larger delay spreads: ~1.7dB loss for 960kHz SCS compared to 120kHz SCS.
  + Antenna Config 2 is more sensitive as the post-beamforming delay spread is likely to be larger than Config 1.

##### Summary of observations for discussion:

7 sources ([61, Ericsson], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [64, OPPO], [21, Apple], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel]) reported evaluation results of PSS/SSS detection performance in terms of SINR in dB achieving cell ID detection probability of 90% by one-shot detection from PSS/SSS. 4 sources ([61, Ericsson], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [21, Apple]) reported PBCH performance in terms of SINR in dB achieving PBCH BLER target of 10%. 2 sources ([5, vivo], [14, 61, Ericsson]) compared link budget of SSB for difference SCS.

The following are observed.

* For PSS and SSS detection performance, all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz) show comparable performances with the baseline channel models and delay spread values.
  + The performance degrades as the increase of SCS.
  + Note: the following is reference when derive the observations.
  + 6 out of 7 sources reported minor performance difference (< or ~ 1 dB) between adjacent SCS for all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz). The other source ([21, Apple]) reported more than 3 dB performance gap of 960 KHz SCS compared to other 120, 240 and 480KHz SCS. It also reported that the gap of 960 KHz increases as the delay spread increases.
* For PBCH BLER performance, all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz) show comparable performances with the baseline channel models and delay spread.
  + The performance degrades as the increase of SCS.
  + All 4 sources reported minor performance difference (< or ~ 1 dB) between adjacent SCS for all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz).
  + The performance gap between 120 and 960 KHz is up to ~ 1.8 dB.
* In terms of SSB link budget, smaller SCS (120 and 240 KHz) have better coverage than larger SCS (480 and 960 KHz)
  + The MCL and MIL difference between smaller SCS (120 and 240 KHz) and 480 KHz SCS is about 5 dB. The MCL and MIL difference between smaller SCS (120 and 240 KHz) and 960 KHz SCS is about 8 dB.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | The above observations on MCL apply to MIL as well. |
| Moderator | Wording updated as commented by Ericsson. |
| Nokia, NSB | The comprehensive set of results provided by the contributing companies show that performance of PSS/SSS and PBCH have acceptable performance at 960 kHz although degraded form 120 kHz. Should the same SCS be maintained both data and control, the 960 kHz would be adequate for the indoor environments that are being simulated. Alternatively, mixed numerology would also be acceptable where SSB is retained at 120 kHz SCS and multiplexed with higher SCS for data. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Since SSB is transmitted using the same number of symbols irrespective of the subcarrier spacing, larger SCS results in less transmitted energy and thus reduced coverage compared to smaller SCS. |
| Moderator | Please refer to Chairman’s notes for agreement on SSB. |

## 2.3. PRACH performance

Multiple sources submitted evaluation results on PRACH detection performance based on the agreed LLS evaluation assumptions.

The following are observations directly extracted from these sources.

###### [[68], Huawei]

*Observation 5: The detection performance gap between 960 kHz and 120 kHz is about 1.3dB under CDL-B, and the detection performances for different SCSs are almost the same under CDL-D.*

###### [[13, 60], ZTE]

Observation 7: Phase noise and delay spread have limited impact on PRACH performance, the performance of SCS 120 kHz, 240 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz is similar.

###### [[14, 61], Ericsson]

It compared link budget of PRACH for different SCS. The following observation is made.

Proposal 33 Include the following Observation in TR 38.808. Maximum isotropic loss (MIL) and maximum coupling loss (MCL) degrade as the subcarrier spacing is increased, negatively impacting coverage. PRACH 120 kHz SCS is defined for FR2 already in Rel-15 and for the 52.6–71 GHz range yields 4–5 dB better coverage than 480 kHz SCS and 8–9 dB better coverage than 960 kHz SCS.

###### [[19], OPPO]

It calculated the link-budget of PRACH for different SCSs according to link-budget template with the SNR provided for the case of “TDL-A 10ns, PRACH format A1”, the PSD limit of 13dBm/MHz as specified by regulation and the maximum transmit power is 26dBm. It is observed that the larger SCSs seem not introduce much performance loss.

Observation 12: it is beneficial to introduce larger SCSs for PRACH transmission.

###### [[25], NTT DOCOMO]

Observation 3:

* *For PRACH preamble detection performances, all candidate SCSs show comparable performances in TDL channels with the same PRACH format. The performance would be improved by increasing the number of PRACH sequence repetitions.*

###### [[26], Qualcomm]

Observation 5: For the PRACH performance of different numerologies in the high frequency regime (Section 2.2.5 in [26]),

* No noticeable difference in the misdetection performance is identified among SCSs.
* With the same CINR, the false alarm rate increases as the SCS or sequence length (i.e., bandwidth) increases.

###### [[56], vivo]

Observation 13: For PRACH channel at low SNR, the preamble sequence correlation shows great effect on the detection performance. The higher SCS, the worse the correlation.

Observation 14: For PRACH channel at high SNR, the bandwidth shows great effect on the detection performance. The larger bandwidth, the better the performance.

Observation 15: For PRACH channel, with the increase of DS, the higher the SCS, the more obvious the performance degradation.

##### Summary of observations for discussion:

8 sources ([61, Ericsson], [68, Huawei], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [60, ZTE], [64, OPPO], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel]) reported evaluation results of PRACH preamble detection performance in terms of SINR in dB achieving PRACH preamble misdetection probability of 1% with evaluation assumptions and parameters as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808. Two sources ([14, 61, Ericsson], [19, OPPO]) compared link budget of PRACH for difference SCS.

The following are observed.

* For PRACH preamble detection performances for the same PRACH format, all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 kHz) show comparable performances
  + Note: the following are reference when derive the observations.
  + 7 out of 8 sources reported minor performance difference (< or ~ 1 dB) between adjacent SCS for all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 kHz). The other source ([64, OPPO]) reported minor performances difference among all SCS for TDL-A with 5 and 10ns DS. It reported infinite SINR for 960 kHz SCS and comparable SINR for 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS in TDL-A with 20ns DS using the metrics of preamble miss detection probability of 1% and the estimated timing error is within [-Tcp/2, Tcp/2].
* For PRACH link budget of the same PRACH format and the same sequence length, maximum isotropic loss (MIL) and maximum coupling loss (MCL) degrade as the subcarrier spacing is increased, negatively impacting coverage.
  + Two sources ([14, 61, Ericsson], [19, OPPO]) reported that with UE power limitation of 25 dBm EIRP, the MCL difference between 120 KHz SCS and 480 KHz SCS is about 4 to 5 dB; the MCL difference between 120 KHz SCS and 960 KHz SCS is about 8 dB.
  + One source ([14, 61, Ericsson]) reported that without UE power limitation of 25 dBm EIRP (but still under regulatory limits), the MCL difference between 120 kHz SCS and 480 kHz SCS is less than 2.5 dB; the MCL difference between 120 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS is less than 1 dB.
  + One source ([14, 61, Ericsson]) reported that without UE power limitation of 25 dBm EIRPs (but still under regulatory limits), compared to short PRACH sequence length, longer PRACH sequence length improve MCL/MIL significantly for 120 kHz SCS due to wider bandwidth for a given SCS.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | Comment #1: Regarding the above link budget observations, the values for the degradation of MCL/MIL as SCS is increased are for the case of PRACH sequence length L = 139. For length L = 571, the comparison is as follows for 480 kHz vs. 120 kHz:  With UE specific power limits: 4 dB degradation for 480 kHz  Without UE specific power limits (but still regulatory limits): 2.4 dB degradation for 480 kHz  Comment #2: An additional observation is that for the case without UE specific power limits (25 dBm EIRP, 21 dBm conducted power), but still with regulatory limits, longer PRACH sequence lengths (L = 571/1151) improve MCL/MCL significantly due to wider bandwidth, thus allowing larger conducted power in FCC regulatory regime. |
| Moderator | Respond to Ericsson’s comment #1:  This is supposed to the summary of observations on results. I hope we don’t need to state too much details as that could be referred to the source. Some wording update.  Respond to Ericsson’s comment #2:  My understanding of PRACH performance study is on the impact of different SCS on PRACH. Your comment #2 seems comparing the impact of PRACH sequence lengths for a given SCS. Anyway, a third sub-bullet is added to the 2nd bullet. |
| Nokia, NSB | The comprehensive set of results provided by the contributing companies show that performance of PRACH has acceptable performance at 960 kHz. Should the same SCS be maintained both data and control, the 960 kHz would be adequate for the indoor environments that are being simulated. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Since a given PRACH format is transmitted using the same number of symbols irrespective of the subcarrier spacing, larger SCS results in less transmitted energy and thus reduced coverage compared to smaller SCS. |
| LG Electronics | In general, we are OK with observation suggested by Moderator. In the second bullet, “UE-specific power limits” is understood as UE power limitation of 25 dBm EIRP defined in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808, so it can be changed to wording friendly to TR. Additionally, one error “MCL/MIL” can be fixed. In this context, we suggest the following update for the second bullet.   * For PRACH link budget of the same PRACH format and the same sequence length, maximum isotropic loss (MIL) and maximum coupling loss (MCL) degrade as the subcarrier spacing is increased, negatively impacting coverage.   + With UE power limitation of 25 dBm EIRP, the MCL difference between 120 KHz SCS and 480 KHz SCS is about 4 to 5 dB; the MCL difference between 120 KHz SCS and 960 KHz SCS is about 8 dB.   + Without UE power limitation of 25 dBm EIRP (but still under regulatory limits), the MCL difference between 120 kHz SCS and 480 kHz SCS is less than 2.5 dB; the MCL difference between 120 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS is less than 1 dB.   + Without UE power limitation of 25 dBm EIRPs (but still under regulatory limits), compared to short PRACH sequence length, longer PRACH sequence length improve MCL/MIL significantly due to wider bandwidth for a given SCS. |
| OPPO | **1)** Our evaluation for PRACH detection with format A1 for 960 kHz SCS in TDL-A with 20ns DS is provided in the following figure. If we only consider the metric of preamble miss detection probability of 1%, the required SNR would be about -6.4 dB. If we consider the metrics of preamble miss detection probability of 1% and the estimated timing error is within [-Tcp/2, Tcp/2], we failed to find a SNR to meet the requirements. We used the second metrics, that is why we report infinite SINR for 960 kHz SCS in TDL-A with 20ns DS in [64, OPPO].    **2)** We would like to update our observation regarding link budget in [19, OPPO] as following, and propose to add it in the summary:   * + With UE-specific power limits and PSD limits, the MIL difference between 120 KHz SCS and 480 KHz SCS is about 5 dB; the MIL difference between 120 KHz SCS and 960 KHz SCS is about 8 dB. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We suggest aligning the format with the agreement made on observations for SSB performance by including the list of sources within the observation.  We agree with LG’s suggestion to clarify the power limits explicitly for the two cases with/without power limits as part of the sub-bullets, since the TR just has (25 dBm EIRP with 21 dBm max TxP), and (Optional: 40dBm EIRP with 21 dBm max TxP). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine with the observations. It might be better to add the source company and reference number for the 3 sub-bullets of the second main bullet, so that it would be easier to track the observation related results. |
| Moderator 2 | Wording updated as LG commented.  Source reference added.  Description of metric used in [64] is added. Observation on [19] is added. |
| Ericsson 3 | We have a minor update on the last bullet:  One source ([14, 61, Ericsson]) reported that without UE power limitation of 25 dBm EIRPs (but still under regulatory limits), compared to short PRACH sequence length, longer PRACH sequence length improve MCL/MIL significantly for 120 kHz SCS due to wider bandwidth for a given SCS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We would suggest including the details of the performance definition in the first bullet point, e.g., or as an additional sub-bullet:   * For PRACH preamble detection performances for the same PRACH format, all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 kHz) show comparable performances, where PRACH preamble detection performance was evaluated in terms of SINR in dB achieving PRACH preamble misdetection probability of 1% with evaluation assumptions and parameters as in Table A.1-1 of TR 38.808 |
| Apple | Minor Typos:  Note: the following ~~is~~ are the references ~~when~~ used to derive the observations.  The other source ([64, OPPO]) reported minor performance differences among all SCS for TDL-A with 5 and 10ns DS. |
| Moderator 3 | Wording updated. |
| Moderator 4 | Please refer to Chairman’s notes for agreement on PRACH. |

# Remaining issues of evaluation assumptions

### Link level

#### Phase noise model

To compare the impact of different phase noise models, [[14, 61], Ericsson] used the following three sets of phase noise models:

* PN model set 1
  + BS: Ex2 BS
  + UE: Ex2 UE
* PN model set 2
  + BS: Ex2 BS
  + UE: R4-2011494 (ref R4-2011494)
* PN model set 3
  + BS: R4-2010176 DM=0 dB (ref R4-2010176)
  + UE: R4-2010176 DM=5 dB (ref R4-2010176)

###### [[14], Ericsson]

Proposal 9 Capture the following in TR 38.808: Link evaluation based on phase model Ex 2, with characteristics not reflecting realistic devices or current state of the technology, can lead to pessimistic assessment of smaller sub-carrier spacings. It is important for 3GPP to adopt more suitable phase noise models in the discussion and system designs for NR operation in 52.7 – 71 GHz range.

##### Moderator’s comment:

PN model Ex 2 has been agreed in RAN1 to be the baseline for evaluation. Note that other PN models can be optionally used by interested companies for their evaluation. An LS was sent to RAN4 from RAN1 and the investigation of suitable phase noise model is up to RAN4. It seems not in RAN1’s scope to make such statement.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Apple | Support Ericsson’s view |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with Moderator’s comment. The validity investigation of any other PN model is up to RAN4. |
|  |  |

#### Rank 2 transmission

In [[59], Intel], it is argued that use of polarized antennas and high probability of LOS links in short BS to UE distance in indoor deployments creates higher received signal and generates even more opportunities for rank 2 transmission than typically visible in outdoor deployments. So it proposes to add rank 2 transmission as an option in the link level simulation assumptions.

###### [[59], Intel]

Proposal 7:

* Propose to add rank 2 transmission as an option in the link level simulation assumptions.

##### Proposal for discussion:

* Add rank 2 transmission as an option in the link level simulation assumptions.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### System level

#### Factory scenario A

In [[14], Ericsson], it notes that in TR 38.808 Factory Scenario-A (InF-DL) assumes a BS antenna height of 1.5 meters and that the BS is ceiling mounted. It argues that this is not realistic considering the UE antenna height is also 1.5 meters. It proposes to use the InF-DH scenario instead.

###### [[14], Ericsson]

Proposal 7 In TR 38.808, change the system level evaluation assumption for Factory Scenario A from Dense Clutter & Low BS (InF-DL) to Dense Clutter & High BS (InF-DH) to be consistent with ceiling mounted gNBs.

Proposal for discussion:

* Change the system level evaluation assumption for Factory Scenario A from Dense Clutter & Low BS (InF-DL) to Dense Clutter & High BS (InF-DH).

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| InterDigital | As we commented during GTW session, we are not sure about the benefits by changing the evaluation assumption in the end of the SI. |
| Ericsson | Our thinking is to simply add a note to say that InF-DH can optionally be used to be consistent with ceiling mounted gNB. This can be used as guidance for further simulations during the WI.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | BS Antenna Pattern | For outdoor scenarios:  - Antenna power pattern given in Table 7.3-1 of TR38.901  (with exception of antenna element gain)  For indoor/factory scenarios:  - Antenna power pattern given in Table A.2.1-7 of TR38.802 for ceiling mount  (with exception of antenna element gain) |   Suggest the following:  **Indoor Factory Hall:**  **Scenario Factory-A)** Indoor factory with Dense cluster & low BS (InF-DL)  Grid, 300m x 150m x 10m factor hall  ISD 50m, BS height 1.5m, UE height 1.5m, Typical clutter size 2m, Clutter height 6m, Clutter density 60%  Note: InF-DH can optionally be used to be consistent with ceiling mounted gNB as stated under the evaluation assumption for "BS Antenna Pattern" |
| Intel | We think the ceiling mount for factor scenarios description in the BS antenna pattern is an error.  The factor dimensions are 300m x 150m x 10m, where ceiling height is 10m. For Factory A (InF-DL) the BS height is at 1.5m which is far from ceiling, and for Factory B (InF-SH) the BS height is at 8m also not at ceiling placement.  More consistent method would be to remove the factory scenario for BS antenna pattern, and just state companies to provide information about BS antenna pattern for factory scenarios.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | BS Antenna Pattern | For outdoor scenarios:  - Antenna power pattern given in Table 7.3-1 of TR38.901  (with exception of antenna element gain)  For indoor~~/factory~~ scenarios:  - Antenna power pattern given in Table A.2.1-7 of TR38.802 for ceiling mount  (with exception of antenna element gain)  For outdoor scenarios:  Companies to provide information on the antenna orientation and pattern used. | |
| Moderator | Proposal 3-1 formulated for discussion. |

##### Proposal 3-1 for discussion:

* Update BS Antenna Pattern in Table A.2-1 of TR 38.808 as the following.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BS Antenna Pattern | For outdoor scenarios:  - Antenna power pattern given in Table 7.3-1 of TR38.901  (with exception of antenna element gain)  For indoor~~/factory~~ scenarios:  - Antenna power pattern given in Table A.2.1-7 of TR38.802 for ceiling mount  (with exception of antenna element gain)  For factory scenarios:  Companies to provide information on the antenna orientation and pattern used. |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal. |

#### SLS metric

It is proposed in [[59], Intel] to use root mean square effective channel delay spread at the receiver as a metric for system level evaluation of NR in 52.6–71GHz. [[59], Intel] also proposes to use intersymbol interference signal to interference ratio as a metric for system-level evaluation with details given on assumptions of the acceptable intersymbol interference level criteria and of the dynamic FFT window placement for intersymbol interference SIR calculation.

###### [[59], Intel]

Proposal 1:

* Use root mean square effective channel delay spread at the receiver as a metric for system‑level evaluation of NR in 52.6–71GHz

Proposal 2:

* Use intersymbol interference signal to interference ratio as a metric for system-level evaluation of NR in 52.6–71GHz
* Assume the acceptable intersymbol interference level criteria is having 80% of links with intersymbol of 30dB SIR or higher

Proposal 3:

* Assume the dynamic FFT window placement based on the 40% CP length offset from the detected CIR peak for intersymbol interference SIR calculation

##### Moderator’s comment:

Proposal 1 and the 1st bullet of 2 in [59] are related to obtaining delay spread profiles and inter-symbol interference statistics. They are already agreed to be the secondary objective for SLS. Interested companies can for sure use them as the metrics in their evaluation. It seems no need for further discussion and agreement.

The 2nd bullet of proposal 2 and proposal 3 in [59] are detailed assumption in metric calculation which interested companies can use and report. It seems no need for further discussion and agreement as well.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Indoor scenario

[[59], Intel] also makes proposals on the description and inclusion of non-ceiling mounted BS for Indoor A Scenario. Another clarification proposal is made in [[59], Intel] regarding the antenna rotation of the BS for the Indoor A and C deployment scenario.

###### [[59], Intel]

Proposal 4:

* Update the indoor A description as follows:
* Office box 120m x 50 m, 12 BS per operator, 2 operator, BS height at 3m (ceiling), UE height 1m, x-axis ISD = 20m and y-axis ISD = 25m, where ISD is define by the distance between two adjacent 10m x 10m virtual box, BS randomly deployed within 10m x 10m virtual box, minimum distance between BS of different operators is 2m.”



Proposal 5:

* Companies are encouraged to provide ceiling mounted BS antenna rotation for indoor A and C deployment scenario.

Proposal 6:

* Proposed to include non-ceiling mounted BS as an option for indoor A scenario, to better reflect non-organized deployments of the multi-operator scenario.

Proposal for discussion:

* Update the indoor A description as follows:

Office box 120m x 50 m, 12 BS per operator, 2 operator, BS height at 3m (ceiling), UE height 1m, x-axis ISD = 20m and y-axis ISD = 25m, where ISD is define by the distance between two adjacent 10m x 10m virtual box, BS randomly deployed within 10m x 10m virtual box, minimum distance between BS of different operators is 2m.”



* Add ceiling mounted BS antenna rotation as an option for indoor A and C deployment scenario.
* Add non-ceiling mounted BS as an option for indoor A scenario.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Intel | The proposal for discussion should be separated into two different questions.  The indoor A, description is a simple correction of the description and figure.  The latter two bullets are suggestions from Intel to add optional configurations for the simulation configurations. |
| Moderator | Proposal 3-2 and 3-3 formulated for discussion. |

##### Proposal 3-2 for discussion:

* Update the indoor A description as follows:

Office box 120m x 50 m, 12 BS per operator, 2 operator, BS height at 3m (ceiling), UE height 1m, x-axis ISD = 20m and y-axis ISD = 25m, where ISD is define by the distance between two adjacent 10m x 10m virtual box, BS randomly deployed within 10m x 10m virtual box, minimum distance between BS of different operators is 2m.”



Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal. |
|  |  |

##### Proposal 3-3 for discussion:

* Add ceiling mounted BS antenna rotation as optional for indoor A and C deployment scenario.
* Add non-ceiling mounted BS as optional for indoor A scenario.
* Companies are encouraged to provide comments to the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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