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# Introduction

## Background

As part of the URLLC package, features have been introduced to support link operation at very low BLER (10^-5 in release 15) as well as ultra-low latency. Part of the objectives of the RAN4 Rel-16 WI are to assess the testability of the low BLER requirements and propose solutions:

Phase 1:

Study the test methodology for both BS and UE [RAN4]

Test methodology for the test metric of 99.999% reliability with testing time into consideration

Test methodology for low latency requirements

For the low latency requirements, it was concluded that low latency is not directly testable (but that requirements will be introduced for low latency features). At RAN4#93, some further agreements were made on the scope of the testability investigations:

|  |
| --- |
| * Introduce PUSCH low BLER high confidence requirement   + If feasible, define [1] test case to verify 10^-5 BLER     - Target BLER: 10^-5     - Target test confidence level: 99.999%     - Propagation conditions: Static channel     - MCS: MCS5 from MCS Table 2 for PUSCH     - Duplex mode: Both TDD and FDD       * FFS TDD patterns     - SCS:       * TDD: 30KHz         + FFS 15kHz       * FDD: 15KHz         + FFS 30KHz     - Test method: refer to R4-1915866 (ad hoc minutes for NR URLLC test feasibility)       * Method 1: Consider aggregation 1 or 2, but no HARQ for non-boosted SNR       * Method 2: No aggregation or HARQ for boosted SNR.   FFS whether to use method 1 or method 2 for testing (as described below). Adjustment of the baseline parameters for the long test after simulations is not precluded.  Methods:  1. SINR set to target 10^-5 BLER. RAN5 test methodology adapted so that pass/fail decision is evaluated every N error reports instead of every error report  2. SINR set to target BLER much lower than 10^-5. RAN5 test methodology re-used with early pass expected. Potentially allow for early pass even with zero error reports, after sufficient sub-frames observed.  • This kind of test is observing lack of error floor, not testing SNR vs BLER  3. Other optimizations not precluded as long as they are in line with the existing methodology. |

## Moderators observations

Based on contributions to this meeting, the following observations are made:

* There is some variation in the estimations of test time:
  + Intel: 20 mins minimum to 13.4 hours maximum (N=1)
  + Rohde and Schwarz: Worst case 9.5 hours, can be shorter
  + Huawei: 6-18 second for “bad” DUT (10^-3), 1-2 hours for “good” DUT (10^-6), long time for marginal DUT
  + Nokia: For marginal DUTs with common uplink TDD pattern: Method 1: 60 hours, method 2: 2.5 hours
  + Ericsson: Method 1: 10-20 hours for longest tests, Method 2: 10s of minutes or 1-2 hours depending on underlying error rate
  + Qualcomm: For 90% of good UEs (which have error rate between 10^-5 and 10^-6), 1 hour
* The variation depends on whether average, worst case or best case is considered. It also depends on the assumptions on parameters such as aggregation factor, SCS, TDD pattern etc.
* Method 2 is not clearly defined (whether it means define a specific SINR to make more devices “good” devices or aim for zero BLER)
* The following parameters for the ultra-low BLER test have already been agreed:
  + Propagation conditions: Static channel
  + MCS: MCS5 from MCS Table 2 for PUSCH
  + Duplex mode: Both TDD and FDD
    - FFS TDD patterns
  + SCS:
    - TDD: 30KHz
      * FFS 15kHz
    - FDD: 15KHz
      * FFS 30KHz
  + HARQ: No HARQ
  + Slot aggregation: no aggregation or aggregation factor 2.
* The following parameters remain to be agreed for the ultra-low BLER test:
  + TDD pattern
  + SCS
  + Slot aggregation factor
  + Transform precoding enable/disabled
  + Antenna configuration
  + DM-RS & PT-RS configuration
  + Time and frequency domain resource assignment

## E-mail discussion plan

The aim of this e-mail discussion will be two-fold:

* Agree as many parameters as possible for the ultra-low BLER test; this will facilitate convergence on the estimations of test times
* Agree on the test methodology, the number of requirements and whether an ultra-low BLER CQI requirement is needed.

List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round

* 1st round:
  + Key parameters
    - Pass/fail decision evaluation frequency (whether every error or otherwise)
    - Whether to apply slot aggregation for the ultra-low BLER test
    - SCS applicability for the ultra-low BLER test
    - TDD pattern for ultra-low BLER test
      * Elaborate “DL heavy” and “UL heavy” pattern if needed
  + Other parameters
    - Aim to make progress on other parameters for the ultra-low BLER test (the parameters have less or little impact on the test time)
  + Definition of method 1 and method 2
  + First views on how many requirements to define, which method to use and whether to define CQI requirements for ultra-low BLER
* 2nd round:

Conclude on the following (plus any left-over from first round):

* + How many requirements and tests to define for ultra-low BLER
  + Whether to define CQI requirements for ultra-low BLER
  + Whether to take method 1 or method 2a or 2b

# Topic #1: Key parameters for ultra-low BLER test time estimation

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000370 + R4-2000371 (submitted to AI 8.9.1.2) | Intel | **Proposal #1: Introduce test cases with 30KHz SCS for TDD and FDD mode to reduce test time**  **Proposal #2: Introduce performance requirements for testing 10-5 BLER for URLLC**  **Proposal #3: To achieve overall confidence level of 99.999% define statistical testing methodology based on D=4e-7 and N=1**  **Observation #1:** By increasing N, overall CL of 5-9s can be achieved with lower value of D and smaller maximum testing time, at the same time minimum testing time increases.  **Observation #2:** Overall CL of 5-9s can be achieved with very small D (4e-7) and testing at every error observed.  **Observation #3:** The BLER achieved at SNR specified in performance tests is usually lower than requirement  **Observation #4:** The testing time for target BLER < 1e-5 is shorter than target BLER of 1e-5  **Observation #5:** The average testing time for 1e-5 BLER is reasonable and max testing time is smaller than that derived from statistical method  **Observation #6:** Method 2 would test for error floor rather than performance and would be a functional test.  **Proposal #1: Introduce PDSCH demodulation test cases for target BLER 10-5  with the following parameters: Target BLER: 10^-5; Target test confidence level: 99.999%**  **Propagation channel: Static; MCS: MCS5 from MCS table 3**  **SCS: 30KHz for both FDD and TDD**  **Duplex mode: Both TDD and FDD. For TDD mode use DL heavy DL:UL configuration**  **HARQ: no ReTx**  **Aggregation level on PDSCH: 1**  **Proposal #2: Introduce PUSCH demodulation test cases for target BLER 10-5  with the following parameters: Target BLER: 10^-5; Target test confidence level: 99.999%**  **Propagation channel: Static; MCS: MCS5 from MCS table 2**  **SCS: 30KHz for both FDD and TDD**  **Duplex mode: Both TDD and FDD. For TDD mode use UL heavy DL:UL configuration**  **HARQ: no ReTx**  **Aggregation level on PUSCH: 1** |
| R4-200566 | Rohde and Schwarz | **Observation 1:** The absolute maximum test time is around 9.5 hours.  **Observation 2:** The actual test times depend on DUT behaviour, but are likely much shorter than the maximum.  **Observation 3:** The shortest test time can be achieved when checking the pass/fail criteria after every error. |
| R4-2001178 | Ericsson | **Observation 1: Evaluating the pass/fail only after each N errors reduces the theoretical maximum test time, but does not appear to reduce the mean or longest test time in practice.**  **Observation 2: Raw test time (i.e. just the time taken to transmit the total number of needed slots) is in the order of hours on average, or 10-20 hours longest.**  **Observation 3: Actual time needed for testing will be some factor larger than raw test time.**  **Observation 4: If the SINR is biased for the error floor test, then it is essential to define other demodulation requirements to verify demodulation performance at higher BLER and/or lower confidence level.**  **Observation 5: Biasing the SINR to get lower BLER can reduce the expected test time to hours or tens of minutes.**  **Proposal 1: For the error floor test, use sufficient SINR to ensure a BLER well below target (potentially even zero BLER) and hence avoid long test time.**  **Proposal 2: Adopt the test parameters proposed in section 3** |
| R4-2001483 + R4-2001484 (submitted to AI 8.9.1.2) | Huawei | **Observation 1: For bad DUTs (BLER=10^-3) with FDD mode, the test can be stopped when ne=7.**  **Observation 2: the test time is short for bad DUTs with FDD mode.**  **Observation 3: For good DUTs (BLER=10^-6) with FDD mode, the test can be stopped when ne=7.**  **Observation 4: For good DUTs (BLER=10^-6) with FDD mode, the test time is 2.21 hours.**  **Observation 5: For bad DUTs (BLER=10^-3) with TDD mode, the test can be stopped when ne=7.**  **Observation 6: the test time is short for bad DUTs with TDD mode.**  **Observation 7: For good DUTs (BLER=10^-6) with TDD mode, the test can be stopped when ne=7.**  **Observation 8: For good DUTs (BLER=10^-6) with FDD mode, the test time is 1.02 hours.**  **Observation 9: As for non-marginal DUTs, the test can be stopped at a very early stage (e.g. ne=7), we propose N=1.**  **Observation 10: Method 1 is effectively shorten the test time for non-marginal DUTs**  **Observation 11: For marginal DUTs, the long test is still needed.**  **Proposal 1: The pass/fail criterion reports results after observing every error, N=1.**  **Proposal 2: We prefer to use Method 1 to test the high reliability.**  **Proposal 1: Using existing TDD pattern ‘7D1S2U (S=6:4:4)’ for SCS 30 KHz.**  **Proposal 2: Only 15 KHz SCS is configured for FDD.**  **Proposal 3: 5 MHz bandwidth is used for TDD and 10 MHz bandwidth is used for TDD.** |
| R4-2001695 | Nokia | 1. Marginal DUTs are almost always decided in the “bin” covering the last decision coordinate. Hence, netarget dominates the number of required error samples, and virtually no early termination is observed.   Due to fewer decision coordinates, and hence less risk accumulation, the netarget values are reduced, when compared to the unmodified methodology, however the gain is surprisingly low. For BLER=1e-5 with CLtest = 1-1e-5 we extrapolate a required number of error observations of 513, which is a reduction of 15%, when compared to the unmodified test methodology (“607”, see [3, Table 6]). This value also approximately holds for the number of samples, i.e., testing time, that is evaluated later.  The expected testing time using M1 for the scenario (PUSCH, marginal DUTs, 30kHz SCS, aggregation factor n2, TDD pattern 7D1S2U) is 42.1e6 x 0.5ms x 2 x 10/2 = 60 hours.  The expected testing time using M2 for the scenario (PUSCH, perfect DUTs, 30kHz SCS, aggregation factor n1, TDD pattern 7D1S2U) is 1.15e6 x 0.5ms x 1 x 10/2 = 1.6 hours.  The expected testing time using M2 for the scenario (PUSCH, BLERtarget/10 good DUTs, 30kHz SCS, aggregation factor n1, TDD pattern 7D1S2U) is 1.75e6 x 0.5ms x 1 x 10/2 = 2.5 hours.  M1 has to deal with a test scenario, where the tested DUTs are marginal DUTs. M2 has an advantage, as the removal of channel uncertainty improves the BLER performance in the test environment, due to back-off from design targets. Thus, it is a reasonable assumption that M2 will terminate with less observed error events, i.e., faster, than M1 and within a practical timeframe of less than 3 hours.   1. RAN4 to adapt method 2 or declare high reliability KPI not testable. |
| R4-2002115, R4-2002142 (Submitted to AI 8.9.1.2) | Qualcomm | **Proposal 1: Use Method 1 for testing 99.999% reliability with 99.999% confidence level.**  **Observation 1: For bad UEs, 90th percentile of time taken to early fail for 1e-5 test requirement is < 10 minutes, which is reasonable test time.**  **Observation 2: For good UEs with BLER between 1e-5 and 1e-6, 90th percentile of time taken to early fail for 1e-5 test requirement is ~1 hour, which is reasonable test time.**  **Observation 3: For very good UEs, it takes a long time to get the first error instance resulting into very long test time. This can be shortened by setting a threshold on number of slots without any error.**  **Proposal 1: Define CQI reporting tests for testing 99.999% reliability under AWGN condition.**  **Proposal 2: Define a lower bound for median reported CQI in the CQI reporting tests for 99.999% reliability.**  **Observation 1: Only one long test needs to be run for testing CQI reporting under AWGN condition for 1e-5 BLER with 99.999% confidence level.**  **Proposal 3: Define CQI reporting test under AWGN condition with 99.999% confidence level.**  **Observation 2: It is possible to have an applicability rule between CQI reporting test and FMCS test under AWGN.**  **Proposal 4: Consider evaluating the UE performance with and without HARQ. If they are similar, we can have an applicability rule between CQI reporting test and FMCS test under AWGN to reduce the number of tests.**  **Proposal 5: Only consider aggregation factor of 1 for low BLER high confidence level test. Define a separate test case for testing aggregation factor.** |
| R4-2000313  (Submitted to AI 8.9.1.3) | Samsung | **Proposal 1: Reuse the existing TDD pattern defined in the NR Rel-15 demodulation requirement to specify PUSCH lower BLER high confidence requirement as**  **TDD: 30 KHz SCS: 7D1S2U, S=6D: 4G: 4U**  **Only FDD with 15 KHz SCS and TDD with 30 KHz SCS configuration are considered to introduce PUSCH lower BLER high confidence requirement.** |
| R4-2000944  R4-2001197 (submitted to AIs 8.9.2.1, 8.9.3.1) | DoCoMo | **Proposal 1: Following TDD configs should be supported for URLLC in order to avoid CLI.**   * **1st priority**   + **30kHz SCS: DDDSUUDDDD, S=6D:4G:4U**   + **120kHz SCS: DDDSU, S=10D:2G:2U** * **2nd priority**   + **30kHz SCS: DSUU, S=12D:2G**   **Proposal 1: For URLLC requirements, consider the following SCS:**   * **15/30/60(FR2)/120kHz SCS**   **NOTE: For FR1, the same requirements are applicable to both TDD and FDD.**  **Proposal 2: For URLLC requirements, the following TDD UL-DL patterns are used as simulation assumptions:**   * **15kHz SCS: 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U** * **30kHz SCS: 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U** * **60kHz SCS: 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U** * **120kHz SCS: 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U** |
| R4-20001696 (Submitted to 8.9.3.1) | Nokia | PUSCH low BLER high confidence requirement   1. **RAN4 to not define requirements and/or test cases for 1e-5 PUSCH BLER with high confidence requirement.** 2. With a large amount of resources spent on testing and accepting feature introduction delays, it can be conceivable to define requirements and/or test cases for 1e-5 PUSCH BLER with high statistical confidence requirements using test method 2.   MCS table to be used  **Observation 2:** It is not clear from the adhoc minutes of RAN4#93, if PUSCH MCS was agreed to be chosen from the low SE table or not. The captured discussion and agreements seem to not align.  **Proposal 6: RAN4 to clarify that the low spectral efficiency MCS tables are to be used for feasibility evaluation and eventual requirement definition.** |

## Open issues summary

There are a number of key parameters that impact the estimates of test time. These include the decision evaluation frequency, SCS, TDD pattern, aggregation factor. An agreement on these will facilitate convergence of views on test time. Note that discussing and aligning on parameter assumptions does not presuppose that an ultra-low BLER test will be created.

### Sub-topic 1-1 Decision frequency

The decision frequency is whether early pass/fail is evaluated on every block error, or every N block errors.

**Issue 1-1: Decision frequency**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Intel, Ericsson, Rohde & Schwarz, Huawei): Make pass/fail decision every error (N=1)
  + Option 2: Make pass/fail decision every 10th error (N=10)
  + Option 3: Make pass/fail decision every 100th error (N=100)
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 1-2 Sub-carrier spacing for FR1

The sub-carrier spacing will impact the symbol and slot lengths and the test duration. Note: The discussion in this thread on SCS concerns only the ultra-low BLER/ultra-high confidence requirement and tests. Other URLLC requirements will be discussed in the relevant thread.

**Issue 1-2: SCS for FR1**

This issue is split into BS and UE, since handling of FDD and TDD may be different.

* Proposals for UE (PDSCH) for FR1:
  + Option 1 (Intel): 30kHz SCS only
  + Option 2 (Huawei, Samsung): FDD 15kHz, TDD 30kHz
  + Option 3: FDD both 15 and 30kHz, TDD 30kHz
* Recommended WF
* Proposals for BS (PUSCH) for FR1:
  + Option 1 (Intel): 30kHz SCS only
  + Option 2: 15kHz SCS only
  + Option 3 (Ericsson, NTT DoCoMo): Both 15kHz and 30kHz (with applicability rule)
  + Option 4 (Huawei): 15kHz for FDD, 30kHz for TDD [Moderator note: Requires creating FDD requirements for the BS spec]
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 1-3 Sub-carrier spacing for FR2

The sub-carrier spacing will impact the symbol and slot lengths and the test duration. Note: The discussion in this thread on SCS concerns only the ultra-low BLER/ultra-high confidence requirement and tests. Other URLLC requirements will be discussed in the relevant thread.

**Issue 1-3: SCS for FR2**

* + Option 1: 60kHz SCS only
  + Option 2: 120kHz SCS only
  + Option 3 (NTT DoCoMo): Both 60kHz and 120kHz (with applicability rule)
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 1-4 TDD patterns

Note: The discussion in this thread on TDD pattern concerns only the ultra-low BLER/ultra-high confidence requirement and tests. Other URLLC requirements will be discussed in the relevant thread.

The issue is split for FR1 and FR2, since few proposals have been submitted for FR2. The agreement may be unified into one. If needed, BS testing and UE testing can be split.

**Issue 1-4: TDD patterns**

* Proposals FR1
  + Option 1 (Samsung, DoCoMo): 3D1S1U (S=10:2:2) for 15kHz, 7D1S2U (S=6:4:4) for 30kHz (as applicable depending on SCS decision)
  + Option 2 (Huawei): 7D1S2U (S=6:4:4) for 30kHz
  + Option 3 (Intel): DL heavy pattern when testing PDSCH (7D1S2U (S=6:4:4)), UL heavy pattern when testing PUSCH (please elaborate proposed patterns)
* Recommended WF
* Proposals FR2
  + Option 1 (DoCoMo):3D1S1U (S=10:2:2) for 60 and 120kHz (as applicable depending on SCS decision)
  + Option 2
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 1-5 Slot aggregation

Note: The discussion in this thread on slot aggregation factor concerns only the ultra-low BLER/ultra-high confidence requirement and tests. Other URLLC requirements will be discussed in the relevant thread.

**Issue 1-5: Slot aggregation factor**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Intel, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Huawei, Nokia for method 2): 1 (no slot aggregation)
  + Option 2 (Nokia for method 1): aggregation factor = 2
* Recommended WF

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 1-2: For the BS, our proposal to do 15 and 30 is considering both FDD and TDD. For the BS, we defined up to now requirements only with a TDD pattern but for both SCS. We could do an applicability rule that only 1 SCS is tested. Regarding option 4; this would necessitate an FDD test pattern; if we would create that then we would be OK.  For the UE, we are OK with option 2.  Sub topic 1-3: Again if we define a requirement for both SCS but with an applicability rule such that only 1 SCS is tested, we are OK.  Sub-topic 1-4: We are OK to use existing TDD patterns. One unanswered question is whether we define an FDD pattern for the BS (which may correspond to Intel’s UL heavy pattern)  ….  Others: |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1-1: Nokia also proposes option 1.  Our analysis showed negligible and/or negative gains when reducing the decision frequency.  1-2 (BS only). Nokia agrees with option 3. Considering allowing possibly accelerated testing configurations, we are opposed to options that require distinction between FDD and TDD.  1-3: Nokia does not think it is necessary to test both FR1 and FR2 in the ultra low BLER regime. So either FR1 or FR2.  1-4 (FR1): Nokia agrees with option 1. We don’t see a reason to abandon the patterns used in eMBB requirements.  1-4 (FR2): Nokia agrees with option 1, with the caveat that we only see FR1 or FR2 required for test.  1-5: Nokia’s goal is to have at least one high reliability related feature activated, during the low BLER test. Looking at the WF from last time, we would have aggregation turned off and MCS table 2 (not low SE), which would not make this requirement a high reliability requirement. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Sub topic 1-1: We prefer Option 1.  Sub topic 1-2: For UE, we are OK with Option 2. For BS, basically common requirements can be used for both FDD and TDD. We can reuse applicability rule for SCS from the existing. i.e., only 1 SCS will be tested.  Sub topic 1-4: For UE, for FR1 30kHz SCS, we prefer DDDSUUDDDD, S=6D:4G:4U and for FR2, we prefer 3D1S1U (S=10:2:2) .  For BS, for FR1 30kHz SCS, if the requirements are applicable for any TDD patterns including DDDSUUDDDD, S=6D:4G:4U and DSUU, S=12D:2G, we prefer Option 1. If not applicable, we need further discussion on how to support other TDD patterns. For FR2, we prefer 3D1S1U (S=10:2:2).  Sub topic 1-5: We prefer method 1 with aggregation factor = 1. |
| Huawei | Issue 1-2: (BS) We change to option 3.  Issue 1-3: For low BLER test, Huawei prefer only test FR1 or FR2.  Issue 1-4: (FR1) We change to option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Sub topic 1-1: We also prefer N = 1 so that early pass/fail could happen as soon as possible.  Sub topic 1-2: We prefer Option 2 (FDD 15kHz, TDD 30kHz) for UE PDSCH.  Sub topic 1-3: We prefer not to define/deprioritize any test for FR2 to minimize the number of long tests as most UEs will initially support URLLC in FR1.Sub topic 1-4: We prefer Option 2 (7D1S2U) for FR1. |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | Tentative agreements:  Candidate options:  Recommendations for 2nd round: |

Recommendations on WF/LS assignment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised” |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised” |

# Topic #2: Other parameters for ultra-low BLER test

## Companies’ contributions summary

See section 1.1 for a full list of relevant contributions.

## Open issues summary

There are a number of other parameters that need to be agreed for the ultra-low BLER test. These are not critical to estimating test time but may have some impact. The other parameters are discussed in this e-mail thread to prevent the URLLC discussion threads overlapping, and in case they have some impact to the testability discussion. Note that discussing and aligning on parameter assumptions does not presuppose that an ultra-low BLER test will be created. Also, the parameter decisions for the ultra-low BLER requirement may not be the same as the parameter decisions for the other URLLC requirements.

### Sub-topic 2-2 Transform precoding for PUSCH

For PUSCH, transform precoding or not

**Issue 2-1: Transform precoding (for PUSCH)**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson, Nokia, Samsung): Disabled
  + Option 2 (Huawei): Enabled
  + Option 3: Both
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 2-2 Antenna configuration for PUSCH

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

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

### Sub-topic 2-3 Antenna configuration for PDSCH

**Issue 2-3: Antenna configuration for PDSCH**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Huawei, Intel): 2x2 ULA low
  + Option 2:

Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 2-4 Reference signal configuration for PUSCH

**Issue 2-4: PT-RS and DM-RS configuration**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson, Nokia):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DM-RS configuration type | 1 |
| DM-RS duration | single-symbol DM-RS |
| Additional DM-RS position | pos1 |
| Number of DM-RS CDM group(s) without data | 2 |
| Ratio of PUSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPRE | -3 dB |
| DM-RS port | {0} |
| DM-RS sequence generation | NID0=0 |
| PT-RS | TBD |

* + Option 2 (Huawei): DM-RS type 1, zero additional DM-RS
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 2-5 Reference signal configuration for PDSCH

**Issue 2-5: PT-RS , CSI-RS and DM-RS configuration**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Huawei, Intel):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PDSCH DMRS configuration | DMRS Type | Type 1 |
| Number of additional DMRS | 0 |
| CSI-RS configuration | PeriodicityAndOffset | 5 slots, 0 slots |
| nrofPorts | 2 |
| frequencyDomainAllocation | Row3, ‘000001 |
| firstOFDMSymbolInTimeDomain | 7 |
| cdm-Type | CDM2 |
| Density | 1 |

* + Option 2:

Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 2-6 Time and frequency domain configuration for PUSCH

**Issue 2-6: Time and frequency domain resource assignment for PUSCH**

For the BS (PUSCH):

* Proposals (Differences between the proposals are highlighted red)
  + Option 1 (Ericsson):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time domain resource assignment | PUSCH mapping type | A, B |
| Start symbol | 0 |
| Allocation length | 14 |
| Frequency domain resource assignment | RB assignment | 25 RB |
| Frequency hopping | Disabled |

* + Option 2 (Nokia):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time domain resource assignment | PUSCH mapping type | B |
| Start symbol | 0 |
| Allocation length | 5 |
| Frequency domain resource assignment | RB assignment | Full applicable test bandwidth  25MHz / 65 PRB |
| Frequency hopping | Disabled |

* Option 3 (Samsung):
  + Mapping type A
  + Symbol length 14
  + 10MHz for 15k SCS, 40MHz for 30k SCS, [use all available PRBs] ?
* Option 4 (Huawei):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PUSCH configuration | Mapping type | Type B |
| Starting symbol (S) | 0 |
| Length (L) | 4 |
| SCS and BW | | FDD:15KHz, 5MHz  TDD:30KHz,10MHz |
| Frequency domain resource | | Full BW |

* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 2-7 Time and frequency domain configuration for PDSCH

**Issue 2-7: Time and frequency domain resource assignment for PDSCH**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Huawei, Intel):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PDSCH configuration | Mapping type | Type B |
| Starting symbol (S) | 2 |
| Length (L) | 4 |
| SCS and BW | | FDD:15KHz, 5MHz  TDD:30KHz,10MHz |
| Frequency domain resource | | Full BW |

* + Option 2:

Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 2-8 MCS table

**Issue 2-8: MCS table**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Nokia): Use low spectrum efficiency MCS tables for ultra-low BLER requirement evaluation and definition
  + Option 2:

Recommended WF

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 2-6: The Nokia proposal of 65 PRBs implies >10MHz bandwidth for 15k SCS, which is too large. I see Huawei and Nokia propose short slots; could you explain more the rationale behind that ?  Sub topic 2-8: Option 1 is OK for us  Update 2020-02-25:  Sub-topic 2-6: Comment/Questions to Nokia  Clearly Type B and 5 symbols is advantageous for latency. However, this test is aiming at high reliability. We are discussing some tests for Type B and fewer symbols in the other thread. It is not obvious to us that we would need to mix the two here.  From a link budget perspective, transmitting in more symbols is advantageous as more energy is transmitted. The SNR for achieving 10^-5 is likely to be relatively large, so link budget may be more the concern.  Regarding frequency diversity and 65 PRBs; of course, there may be greater frequency diversity depending on the channel. However, the PSD scales down with the number of PRBs and so the link budget may be more degraded. So, in relatively flat fading channels, fewer PRBs may be more optimal. Do you have some reference to the channels/use case (maybe from RAN1) ?  Sub-topic 2-7: We agree with DoCoMo that we should consider more symbols for similar reasons to the BS. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 2-1: Nokia remains with option 1. No transform precoding.  2-2: Nokia remains with option 1. 1T2R.  2-4: Nokia remains with option 1. For high reliability use cases, a higher number of DM-RS is beneficial. 2 is max up to 7 symbols.  2-6: Nokia remains with option 2. Type B is advantageous for high reliability with low latency in mind, since we can have 2 DM-RS symbols starting from 5 symbols. Allocation length 5 is advantageous for high reliability with low latency in mind, since we have already 2 DM-RS symbols for only 5 symbols. Full applicable test bandwidth is advantageous for high reliability, since frequency diversity is required in real systems. We should take the use case into account, even though this is not an issue in AWGN only.  2-8 (MCS table) The high reliability test should have at least one URLLC feature activated. We assumed the discussion in the last meeting had concluded with MCS 5 from the low spectral efficiency table, but this is contradicted by the last WF. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Sub topic 2-1: We support Option 2. For URLLC scenario, DFT-s-OFDM is more typical than CP-OFDM because of the benefits of low PAPR.  Sub topic 2-2: We support Option 1.  Sub topic 2-3: We support Option 1.  Sub topic 2-4: For DMRS, we prefer 1 additional DMRS for FR1 and 0 additional DMRS for FR2. For PTRS, we prefer to adopt "with PTRS".  Sub topic 2-5: Number of additional DMRS can be discussed after PDSCH symbol length is agreed.  Sub topic 2-6 (for BS): We prefer to adopt both mapping type A and B with the same CBW sets as existing normal PUSCH demodulation. i.e., 5/10/20MHz for FR1 15kHz SCS, 10/20/40/100MHz for FR1 30kHz SCS, 50/100MHz for 60kHz SCS, 50/100/200MHz for 120kHz SCS. Applicability rule can be considered to test only one case.  Sub topic 2-7 (for UE): We prefer PDSCH mapping type A with 12 symbols. Regarding SCS and CBW, we prefer 10MHz for FDD 15kHz SCS and 40MHz for TDD 30kHz SCS. |
| Huawei | Issue 2-1: Huawei prefer option 1. No transform precoding.  Issue 2-2: We change to option 1.  Issue 2-4: The DM-RS configuration relates to the mapping type and symbol length. Although mapping type B with mini-slot can reduce the latency, the test here is defined to test high reliability. Huawei is ok with mapping type A with DM-RS reused from the existing configuration for PUSCH. This test is defined under AWGN condition to test the ultra-low BLER target, there is no necessary to adopt PT-RS.  Issue 2-6: (PUSCH) Huawei is ok with using existing configuration for PUSCH which is configured with both mapping type A and B with start symbol of 0 and length of 14. Full bandwidth is allocated. For this test, it is not necessary to support both mapping types. We prefer mapping type A.  Issue 2-7: (PDSCH) Huawei is ok with using existing configuration for PDSCH. For FR1, mapping type A and B with start symbol of 2 and length of 12 are configured in Rel-15. To test the low BLER target, we prefer mapping type A.  Issue 2-8: MCS table. From the last WF, we agreed to use MCS5 from table 3 for PDSCH and using MCS5 from table 2 for PUSCH. |
| Qualcomm | Sub topic 2-3: We are ok with 2x2 ULA low. However, we are wondering how to test the UE for bands which mandate 4Rx. So, we are ok to define the test for 2x2 and we further ask to discuss whether to define the test for 2x4 or not.  Sub topic 2-5: We prefer 1 additional DMRS.  Sub topic 2-7: We prefer full slot PDSCH Type A allocation as this is only high reliability test. We should test PDSCH Type B grant in low latency test cases. Also, I am wondering why we cant reuse default BW/SCS configurations that we have been using so far, i.e., 10MHz/15kHz for FDD and 40MHz/30kHz for TDD.  Sub topic 2-8: We are ok with Option 1 (MCS Table 3). |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | Tentative agreements:  Candidate options:  Recommendations for 2nd round: |

Recommendations on WF/LS assignment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised” |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised” |

# Topic #3: Test method

## Companies’ contributions summary

See section 1.1 for a full list of relevant contributions.

## Open issues summary

Two methods were proposed at RAN4#93 for the ultra low BLER test. However, method 2 is not entirely clear and so for this discussion, it is proposed to split method 2 into method 2a and method 2b as described below to facilitate discussion:

Method 1: SNR identified to target 10^-5 BLER. Test SINR = Identified SINR + IM. RAN5 test methodology applied (with N=1 or some other N as decided for issue 1-1)

Method 2a: SNR identified to target 10^-5 BLER. Test SINR = Identified SINR + IM + X. RAN5 test methodology applied (with N=1 or some other N as decided for issue 1-1). X is an addition to the SNR to increase the proportion of “good” devices and ensure no excessively long test time. The value of X is TBD (but will be written in the spec as a fixed number, not a vendor declaration. X should aim to produce a lower error rate e.g. 10^-6 for most devices)

Method 2b: SNR applied is sufficiently large to ensure very low, possibly zero BLER. It is not important to specify the specific SNR level in the specification; the point is to demonstrate no error floor.

### Sub-topic 3-1 Test method

**Issue 3-1: Test method**

Nokia, Ericsson: Please clarify option 2a or 2b or both

Others: Please double check if you prefer option 1 or 2a with this definition

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Qualcomm, Samsung, Huawei, Intel): Method 1
  + Option 2: Method 2a
  + Option 3: Method 2b
* Recommended WF

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 3-1:  At least from a network perspective, link level performance is only one part of an ultra-reliable connection. Aspects such as protocol software reliability, scheduler software behavior and reliability, internal interfaces in the BS and the wider network, hardware reliability will all need to be designed and tested. For safety or mission critical applications, a wider set of testing will be needed than the 3GPP demodulation requirements. For this reason, we are cautious about the amount of test time we bake into the specification for this ultra-low BLER test in isolation. We agree that regular demod tests are needed; hence the need for the “high BLER” tests as discussed in the other thread. After discussing the parameters more, we will get a better idea of test times, but for now we propose method 2a or 2b. Note that the “X” in 2b could be considered as a test tolerance in the test specification designed to allow testing within a reasonable time.  ….  Update 2020-02-25:  Comment to NTT DoCoMo:  Our understanding is that all of options 1, 2a, 2b verify the performance with 10^-5 BLER and 99.999 CL in the sense that they demonstrate that the BLER is achievable (in the case of 1 and 2a that it is achievable towards some standardized SNR). The question is then whether the requirement sets the lowest possible test SNR threshold or allows for SNR to be increased somewhat for testing to ensure that there are not marginal DUT that take an infeasibly long time (something like a test tolerance). For the network, as discussed above, for safety and mission critical applications a much wider scope of testing will be needed than just RAN4. For other types of URLLC application, we should take care that we do not bake into the specification costly and long testing when it is not fully clear how necessary it is. We do see the need for good SNR/BLER requirements and discuss some practically testable requirements in the other thread; in this thread the question is whether the added value of setting X=0 would justify the cost and complexity of very long testing. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 3-1: Nokia sees only ostensible differences between 2a and 2b. Hence, we are fine with either, as long as “X” in 2b is larger than 4dB. Our analysis has resulted in infeasibly high testing sample requirements for Method 1, so we cannot agree with M1 as a way forward. When talking about testing times, we recognize that “hours” was the wrong approach. The testing time in hours differs substantially between UL and DL (and configurations in general), even when starting from the same testing time in samples. Only method 2 (a or b) has a high enough probability to result in early termination, for all types of DUTs, to be usable in practical testing. We have a reliably feasible method in M2, no matter the true BLER. So, this one should be chosen to avoid unresolvable issues (e.g., undecidable DUTs) in conformance testing. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Sub topic 3-1: We support Option 1 to verify the performance with 10^-5 BLER and 99.999% CL. |
| Qualcomm | Sub topic 3-1: Based on our simulation results, testing times seem reasonable for most UEs under Method 1 and we prefer to use Method 1 as it establishes the performance requirement for SNR-BLER relationship. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

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

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

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | Tentative agreements:  Candidate options:  Recommendations for 2nd round: |

Recommendations on WF/LS assignment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised” |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised” |

# Topic #4: Tests to define

## Companies’ contributions summary

See section 1.1 for a full list of relevant contributions.

## Open issues summary

During RAN4#93, it was decided to create [1] test cases if feasible. Apart from the number of test cases, the number of requirements needs to be decided; it is possible to write more than 1 requirement but only 1 test case using an applicability rule, in order to account for different implementations. A further possibility remains to decide that the ultra-low BLER test is not feasible.

It has been proposed to also set a requirement on CQI reporting considering ultra-low BLER.

### Sub-topic 4-1 Number of ultra-low BLER requirements and tests

How many ultra-low BLER (10^-5) and ultra-high confidence (99.999%) tests and requirements to define.

**Issue 4-1: Number of requirements**

Nokia propose option 1 if method 2 not used.

* Proposals
  + Option 1: zero requirements/tests
  + Option 2: One requirement/test
  + Option 3: TBD requirements, but only one test (using applicability rule)
  + Option 4: more than one requirement and more than one test
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 4-2 CQI tests relating to ultra-low BLER

Whether to define CQI tests with ultra-low BLER and ultra-high confidence

**Issue 4-2: CQI testing at ultra-low BLER**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Qualcomm): Define CQI testing with ultra-low BLER
  + Option 2: Do not define CQI testing with ultra-low BLER
* Recommended WF

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 1-1:  Sub topic 1-2:  ….  Others: |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 4-1: Nokia prefers option 1, but can compromise to option 2 in case test method 2 (a or b) is used. Our analysis has resulted in infeasibly high testing sample requirements for Method 1; 60 hours to be able to be sure a device with design target BLER 1e-5 is decided, while testing with no undecidable DUTs remaining. Remark: When talking about testing times, we recognize that “hours” was the wrong approach. The testing time in hours differs substantially between UL and DL (and configurations in general), even when starting from the same testing time in samples. Nokia has disclosed the detailed formulae for calculating testing time (in samples and converting to hours). We encourage others to do the same we and consider our 60 hours (in UL) result to be valid and justified in the meantime.  Possibly a split in feasibility for UL and DL is required, since the testing times are one order of magnitude apart. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Sub topic 4-1: For BS, we prefer Option 3. For UE, we prefer Option 4. As discussed in other sub topics, multiple configurations can be considered. e.g., FDD/TDD, 15/30/120kHz SCS, etc.  Sub topic 4-2: We prefer Option 1. |
| Huawei | Issue 4-2: Huawei prefer option 2. The experiment of testing the ultra-low BLER target tells us it takes very long time to achieve 10^-5, as the CQI reporting test is more complex than the single BLER test, we propose do not test the CQI table with 10^-5 BLER target. |
| Qualcomm | Sub topic 4-1/4-2: We prefer to define CQI reporting test with ultra low BLER and high confidence level. As explained in our paper R4-2002142, we only need one long test for CQI reporting under AWGN. If we define both FMCS test and CQI reporting test at same SNR, we can define an applicability rule between those two tests to reduce the number of test cases. For example, if we define FMCS test for MCS5 and during CQI reporting test, we find that UE BLER for some MCS <=5 is > 1e-5, then UE automatically fails the FMCS test. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

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

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

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | Tentative agreements:  Candidate options:  Recommendations for 2nd round: |

Recommendations on WF/LS assignment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised” |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised” |