

# TAE Requirements

Richard Tse

Microsemi

Sept 25, 2017

IEEE 1914.1 TF



# Compliance with IEEE Standards Policies and Procedures

**Subclause 5.2.1 of the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws* states, "While participating in IEEE standards development activities, all participants...shall act in accordance with all applicable laws (nation-based and international), the IEEE Code of Ethics, and with IEEE Standards policies and procedures."**

The contributor acknowledges and accepts that this contribution is subject to

- The IEEE Standards copyright policy as stated in the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws*, section 7, <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/bylaws/sect6-7.html#7>, and the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*, section 6.1, <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/opman/sect6.html>
- The IEEE Standards patent policy as stated in the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws*, section 6, <http://standards.ieee.org/guides/bylaws/sect6-7.html#6>, and the *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*, section 6.3, <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/opman/sect6.html>

**IEEE 1914**  
**Next Generation Fronthaul Interface**  
**Jinri Huang, huangjinri@chinamobile.com**

TAE Requirements

**Date:** 2017-09-25

**Author(s):**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Phone [optional]</b>	<b>Email [optional]</b>
Richard Tse	Microsemi		<a href="mailto:Richard.Tse@Microsemi.com">Richard.Tse@Microsemi.com</a>

# Outline

- Liaison Updates
- Suggested Network TAE Targets
- Problems Defining TAE Requirements
- How Can We Define the Nodal Requirements?
- How Can We Get the Values?
- Motions

# Liaison from P1914 to ITU-T SG15/Q13

- Next Q13 meeting is in October. Our request to see C-259 will be dealt with at that meeting.
- SG15 member and new P1914 member, Tim Frost (Calnex), indicated that more statistically-significant analyses is to be done for the C-259 scenarios

# Liaison Response from 3GPP to ITU

- Sept 2017 liaison response from 3GPP to ITU-T SG15 stated that  $\pm 1.5\mu\text{s}$  is still the common TAE requirement for 5G radios. This value is the same as for 4G radios.
- The TAE requirements for Carrier Aggregation and CoMP (and other enhanced communication methods) are still being studied.

# Suggested Network TAE Targets

Given:

- the lack of new progress in 3GPP
- that all current views for 5G TAE are the same as those for 4G (CPRI, 802.1CM, discussions in ITU)
- that location services have the most stringent requirements we have yet seen

we should work with the following TAE requirements (values given are for the radio):

- $\pm 10\text{ns}$  from closest common BC, for location
- $\pm 32.5\text{ns}$  from closest common BC, for MIMO and Tx diversity
- $\pm 65\text{ns}$  from closest common BC, for intra-band contiguous carrier aggregation
- $\pm 130\text{ns}$  from any PRTC or ePRTC, for intra-band non-contiguous and inter-band carrier aggregation
- $\pm 1500\text{ns}$  from any PRTC or ePRTC, for generic services

# Problems Defining TAE Requirements

- Many factors affect system performance:
  - ePRTC vs PRTC
  - Number of hops
  - Fiber asymmetry (unidir vs bidir, wavelengths) and compensation
  - Availability of SyncE or eSyncE
  - Full or partial network support for PTP
  - Static and dynamic timestamping errors
- Carriers build their networks differently
- Specifying nodal/device performance requirements may be incompatible to or overly stringent for each network implementation



# How Can We Define Nodal Requirements?

- Not too difficult for single-hop scenarios:
  - Fiber asymmetry (unidir vs bidir, wavelengths) and compensation
  - Model single-hop SyncE or eSyncE wander
  - Static and dynamic timestamping errors
- Need to limit options for multi-hop scenarios:
  - 10 hops and 20 hops?
  - All have eSyncE?
  - Full network support for PTP? Definitely
  - Partial network support for PTP (i.e. GNSS)? Probably

# How Can We Get the Values?

- Wait for ITU-T's continuation of C-259 simulations
- Request ITU-T's continuation of C-259 simulations to be run with our selected scenarios
- Run our own simulations or thought-experiments
  - Accurately modeling the behaviour of SyncE/eSyncE wander through many hops may be the most difficult aspect. This is something the ITU-T has in their portfolio.
  - Model without SyncE/eSyncE and assume there is full network support for PTP

# Motion # \_\_\_\_\_

- Limit multi-hop scenarios to the following:
  - 10 hops and 20 hops
  - All have eSyncE
  - Full network support for PTP
  - Partial network support for PTP (i.e. use GNSS)
- Mover: Richard Tse
- Secunder:
- Yes:\_\_\_ No:\_\_\_ Abstain:\_\_\_

## Motion # \_\_\_\_\_

- Request ITU-T to run statistically significant simulations (as per C-259) for our selected multi-hop scenarios.
- Mover: Richard Tse
- Seconder:
- Yes:\_\_\_ No:\_\_\_ Abstain:\_\_\_

## Motion # \_\_\_\_\_

- Perform our own modeling, assuming there is full network support for PTP and no SyncE/eSyncE
- Mover: Richard Tse
- Seconder:
- Yes:\_\_\_ No:\_\_\_ Abstain:\_\_\_