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# Introduction

This WF capture all agreements and open issues for the following topics in [102-e][325] NR\_NTN\_Demod.

* Topic #2: Satellite Access Node demodulation requirements
  + Issue 2-1: General assumptions
  + Issue 2-2: PUSCH requirements
  + Issue 2-3: PUCCH requirements
  + Issue 2-4: PRACH requirements

The agreed WFs on NTN SAN demodulation requirements in previous meetings are listed as following.

* R4-2203043, RAN4#101bis-e

# Topic #2: Satellite Access Node demodulation requirements

## Issue 2-1: General assumptions

**Issue 2-1-1: Doppler shift model**

*Tentative agreements*

* Consider 200Hz as the maximum Doppler shift for UL in service link

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Do not consider the residual Doppler error for UL in feeder link
  + Option 2: Consider the residual Doppler error for UL in feeder link. 0.5pp. is the worst case.

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We prefer option1, how to model the residual Doppler error, During the test, it is up to TE implementation In our understanding, the Test uncertainty can cover the impact of residual error for UL. Meanwhile, from performance aspect, we do not think the residual Doppler error will have impact |

**Issue 2-1-2: Delay spread model**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Single delay spread
    - Option 1a: 100ns
    - Option 1b: 250ns
  + Option 2: Different delay spread
    - Option 2a: 10ns/50ns/150ns
    - Option 2b: 10ns/50ns/250ns.

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We are open to further discussion, Firstly, we don't think we need to cover all possible delay for each test cases, so, one value of delay spread is specified for one test, different delay spread can be considered in the different cases |

## Issue 2-2: PUSCH requirements

**Issue 2-2-1: Scope of PUSCH requirements**

*Tentative agreements*

* Not to consider the requirements for mapping Type B with non-slot transmission

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Do not consider 2 step RACH case
  + Option 2: Consider the 2 step RACH case

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We support option 1. we do not think it is a typical scenario for NTN with 2 step RACH, which is targeting to reduce the access delay with small payload. |

**Issue 2-2-2: Channel model for PUSCH**

*Tentative agreements*

* Select NTN-TDL-A and NTN-TDL-C as the channel model for PUSCH requirements

*Candidate options*

* N/A

*Recommended WF*

* No need for 2nd round discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We can use it as starting point |

**Issue 2-2-3: SCS/CBW set for PUSCH requirements**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: 15kHz SCS: SCS 5MHz/10MHz/20MHz, 30kHz SCS: 10MHz/20MHz
  + Option 2: a few of PRBs for all SCS.

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We are ok with option 1, while for test, we can reuse the test applicability rule |

**Issue 2-2-4: Modulation order for PUSCH requirements**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Select MCS4 for PUSCH requirements
  + Option 2: others

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Ok with option 1 as starting point |

**Issue 2-2-5: Antenna configuration for PUSCH requirements**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: UE 1Tx – SAN 1Rx and UE 1Tx – SAN 2Rx
  + Option 2: UE 1Tx – SAN 2Rx
  + Option 3: UE 2Tx – SAN 2Rx, UE 2Tx – SAN 4Rx and UE 2Tx – SAN 8Rx
* Moderator’s note: companies can agree with UE with 1Tx first? Satellite companies’ input are encouraged.

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We prefer to focus on 1Tx and 2Rx. |

**Issue 2-2-6: Test parameters for NTN PUSCH**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* N/A

*Recommended WF*

* Postpone the discussion until having the conclusion for channel model, MCS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-2-7: Test parameters for NTN UL timing adjustment**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* N/A

*Recommended WF*

* Postpone the discussion until having the conclusion for channel model, MCS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-2-8: Test parameters for NTN PUSCH repetition type A**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* N/A

*Recommended WF*

* Postpone the discussion until having the conclusion for channel model, MCS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-2-9: Test parameters for NTN msgA PUSCH for 2-step RA type**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* N/A

*Recommended WF*

* Postpone the discussion until having the conclusion for channel model, MCS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

## Issue 2-3: PUCCH requirements

**Issue 2-3-1: Scope of PUCCH requirements**

*Tentative agreements*

* In addition to PUCCH format 0/1/2/3/4, RAN4 to define NTN multi-slot PUCCH demodulation requirements
* Prioritize UCI with HARQ on PUCCH demodulation requirement

*Candidate options*

* N/A

*Recommended WF*

* No need for 2nd round discussion

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Just one clarification, “Prioritize UCI with HARQ on PUCCH demodulation requirement” UCI including both CSI part1 and CSI part 2, or only include CSI part 1similar as Rel-15 ? |

**Issue 2-3-2: Channel model for PUCCH requirements**

*Tentative agreements*

* RAN4 to use one NTN-TDL channel model for PUCCH requirements definition

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Select NTN-TDL-A and NTN-TDL-C
  + Option 2: select one of channel model from NTN-TDL-A and NTN-TDL-C

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Option 2  Since different channel is covered in PUSCH requirement, there is no need to duplicate the channel model for PUCCH requirement. Since only QPSK for PUCCH, we can use the channel model specified for PUSCH |

**Issue 2-3-3: SCS/CBW set for PUCCH requirements**

*Tentative agreements*

* To follow the same SCS/CBW set as PUSCH as the start point

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: follow the same SCS/CBW set as PUSCH and no need to reduce test
  + Option 2: follow the same SCS/CBW set as PUSCH and need to reduce test cases (specify if any)

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We are ok with option 1, the frequency hopping is considered, the performance with different CBW may be different |

**Issue 2-3-4: Antenna configuration for PUCCH**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: UE 1Tx – SAN 1Rx and UE 1Tx – SAN 2Rx
  + Option 2: UE 1Tx – SAN 2Rx
  + Option 3: UE 2Tx – SAN 2Rx, UE 2Tx – SAN 4Rx and UE 2Tx – SAN 8Rx
* Moderator’s note: companies can agree with UE with 1Tx? Satellite companies’ input are encouraged.

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Option 2, the test purpose can be fulfilled by 1Tx with 2Rx, there is no requirement for PUCCH with 2Tx |

**Issue 2-3-5: Test parameters for NTN PUCCH format 0/1/2/3/4**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* N/A

*Recommended WF*

* Postpone the discussion until having the conclusion for channel model, MCS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-3-6: Test parameters for NTN PUCCH multi-slot PUCCH format 1**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* N/A

*Recommended WF*

* Postpone the discussion until having the conclusion for channel model, MCS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

## Issue 2-4: PRACH requirements

**Issue 2-4-1: Channel model for PRACH**

*Tentative agreements:*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Define NTN SAN PRACH demodulation requirement for AWGN and NLOS multi-path channel.
  + Option 2: Define NTN SAN PRACH demodulation requirement for one multi-path channel.

*Recommended WF*

* Companies are encouraged to provide the views on this issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We can ok with option 1 |

**Issue 2-4-2: Test parameters for NTN PRACH demodulation requirement**

*Tentative agreements*

* N/A

*Candidate options*

* N/A

*Recommended WF*

* Postpone the discussion until having the conclusion for channel model, MCS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
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