

# 3GPP TSG RAN WG1 Meeting #126

## Maastricht, Netherlands, August 24th – 28nd, 2026

R1-2606311

---

**Agenda Item:** 10.6.1.1  
**Source:** EURECOM  
**Title:** Discussion on design of WUS with OFDM based sequence  
**Document for:** Discussion and Decision

---

## 1 Introduction

In this contribution, we discuss sequence-based WUS design. We first give a brief summary of the sequence-based WUS in Rel-19 before proposing potential avenues for a 6G WUS.

Below a summary of the previous agreements:

### Agreement:

RAN1#125

Study at least the following sequence families for 6GR DL WUS design,

- Zadoff-Chu sequences, or its variants
- m-sequences, or its variants
- Gold sequences, or its variants

At least with respect to,

- Link level performance (MDR, FAR, FDR), including time and frequency errors
- Maximum number of available OFDM sequences for carrying information,
- Sequence lengths and T/F mapping,
- UE/BS complexity and energy consumption,
- Overhead,
- Co-existence with other 6GR signals and channels.

Other aspects are not precluded.

### Agreement:

RAN1#125

The following Missed Detection Rate, False Alarm Rates and False Detection Rates are assumed for EE processing in link level simulations:

- MDR: 0.5%, 1%
- FAR: 1%, 5%, 10%
- FDR: 1%, 5%, 10%

Companies to report impact on UE energy savings and NW resource overhead of different performance FAR and FDR values.

**Agreement:****RAN1#125**

Study for DL WUS coverage, considering, e.g., by

- Time domain (repetitions and/or sequence extension),
- Frequency domain or alternation (hopping),
- Spatial (transmit and receive) diversity,
- Power boosting.
- Sequence types.

**Agreement:****RAN1#124**

Study the following aspects of DL WUS design:

- Time or frequency domain sequence definition
- Time and frequency resource allocation
- Multiplexing and coexistence with other signals and channels, including DL WUS
- PAPR and BS/UE processing complexity
- Network overhead and NW&UE energy efficiency
- Other aspects are not precluded

**Agreement:****RAN1#124**

The same SCS is assumed for DL WUS as for the 6GR Sync signals in the same band if sync signals and data channels use the same SCS.

FFS SCS of DL WUS if sync signals and data channels use different SCS in FR2-1

**Agreement:****RAN1#124-bis**

For OFDM-based WUS sequence, further study time domain (e.g., DFT preprocessing) definition and frequency domain (w/o DFT preprocessing) definition with respect to the following aspects:

- Link-level performance
- BS implementation complexity
- UE detection complexity
  - Frequency domain and time domain receiver processing
- PAPR performance and relevancy
- Multiplexing and coexistence with other signals and channels

## 2 Overview of Rel-19 Sequence-based LP-WUS Design

In this section, we briefly review the sequence-based LP-WUS design in Rel-19 which will serve as a baseline scheme in our evaluations.

## 2.1 OOK Encoding

Consider  $B$  information bits  $\mathbf{b} = [b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{B-1}]$  transmitted in  $L$  OFDM symbols over  $N_{SC}^{WUS}$  sub-carriers. There are  $M \in \{1, 2, 4\}$  OOK time-domain symbols per OFDM symbol. The encoding procedure consists of three steps:

1. Channel Coding
2. Rate-Matching (RM)
3. Line Coding (Manchester Coding)

Channel coding uses the NR small-block length coding schemes and RM will truncate the encoder output to  $E = G/2$  bits with  $G = LM$  denoting the total number of OOK symbols of the WUS. Line coding will map one input bit to two output bits by applying Manchester coder resulting in  $G$  encoded bits. This part is referred to as OOK encoding in the example is given in Figure 1.

A pure sequence-based WUS design will not use this OOK encoding scheme. Channel coding is used in OOK encoding to meet the requirements on False-Alarm Rate (FAR) and Missed-Detection Rate (MDR) and is *not* used in the sequence encoding as subsequently described.




Figure 1: Example of WUS encoding with  $B = 5, L = 4, M = 4$  and  $N_{seq} = 4$ .

## 2.2 Sequence Encoding

The NR sequences in TS 38.211 are reused (known as cyclically extended Zadoff-Chu (ZC) sequences). The  $c^{th}$  ON-sequence  $\mathbf{r}_c$  of length  $M_{ZC}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{r}_c(n) = \mathbf{x}_q([n + n_{cs}] \bmod N_{ZC})$$

$$\mathbf{x}_q(i) = e^{-j \frac{\pi q i (i+1)}{N_{ZC}}}$$

with  $N_{ZC}$  denoting the largest prime s.t.  $N_{ZC} < M_{ZC}$ ,  $q \in \{1, 2, \dots, N_{ZC} - 1\}$  is the root and  $n_{cs}$  is the cyclic shift of the ZC sequence,  $n = 0, 1, \dots, M_{ZC} - 1$  and  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N_{ZC} - 1$ . Hence sequence  $\mathbf{r}_c$  is

determined by root  $q$  and cyclic shift  $n_{cs}$ . To achieve the best correlation performance, the sequences are chosen such that the offset between adjacent cyclic shift values is maximized, i.e.

$$n_{cs} = (c \bmod P) \left\lfloor \frac{N_{zc}}{P} \right\rfloor$$

with  $c = 0, 1, \dots, N_{seq} - 1$  and  $P = N_{seq}/N_{root}$  where  $N_{root} \in \{1, 2\}$  is the number of configurable roots.

Different sequences  $\mathbf{r}_c$  are used to *directly* encode the information bits  $\mathbf{b}$ . The maximum number of sequences allowed  $N_{seq}^{max}$  depends on  $M$  as  $N_{seq}^{max} = \{16, 8, 4\}$  for  $M \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ , respectively. The reason is that a longer sequence (smaller values of  $M$ ) supports more sequences with good correlation properties than a short sequence. The configured number of sequences  $N_{seq} \in \{2, 4, 8, 16\} \leq N_{seq}^{max}$  can encode  $\delta = \log_2 N_{seq}$  bits per OOK ON-symbol. Therefore,  $\lceil B/\delta \rceil$  ON-symbols are required to encode the payload. Hence, the coded bits  $\mathbf{d}_s = [d_{s,0}, d_{s,1}, \dots, d_{s,N_s-1}]$  of length  $N_s = B + B_p$  are obtained by prepending  $B_p = (-B \bmod \delta)$  zeros, i.e.  $\mathbf{d}_s = [\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}]$ . Note that zeros are added before the MSB so that both  $\mathbf{d}_s$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  still encode the same subgroup IDs. Subsequently, rate-matching is repeating  $\mathbf{d}_s$  to obtain  $\mathbf{f}_s$  as

$$f_{s,i} = d_{s,i \bmod N_s}$$

with  $i = 0, 1, \dots, E_s - 1$  where  $E_s = E\delta$  and  $E = LM/2$  is the number of OOK ON symbols available. In the next step,  $\mathbf{f}_s$  is segmented into blocks of  $\delta$  bits such that  $\mathbf{f}_s = [\mathbf{f}_{s,0}, \mathbf{f}_{s,1}, \dots, \mathbf{f}_{s,E-1}]$  where block  $m = 0, 1, \dots, E - 1$  is given by

$$\mathbf{f}_{s,m} = [f_{s,\delta m}, f_{s,\delta m+1}, \dots, f_{s,\delta(m+1)-1}]$$

Each block  $\mathbf{f}_{s,m}$  is encoded with sequence index  $c_m \in \{0, 1, \dots, N_{seq} - 1\}$  as

$$c_m = (\mathbf{f}_{s,m})_{(10)}$$

where  $(\mathbf{b})_{(10)}$  converts the binary sequence  $\mathbf{b} = [b_0, b_1, \dots]$  into its decimal representation with  $b_0$  as MSB. Therefore, the sequence  $\mathbf{r}$  of OOK ON-symbol  $m$  is given by  $\mathbf{r}_{c_m}$ . An example of the encoding process for payload  $\mathbf{b} = [11110]$  is shown in Figure 1.

### 3 Potential WUS Design

We propose to use a product-code, where the  $B$  input bits are encoded *independently* in frequency-domain (vertical) and time-domain (horizontal). This vertical and horizontal coding (VHC) strategy allows the two components to be decoded independently which reduces the receiver complexity.

More precisely, separate the input bits  $B = B_0 + B_1$  into  $B_0$  and  $B_1$  bits associated with the frequency and time dimension, respectively. This split is *optional* but can provide two levels of error protection (e.g. high-level grouping info on  $B_0$  and refinement on  $B_1$ ), where by the  $B_0$  bits can be decoded with lower error probability than the  $B_1$  bits.

Without loss of generality, the transmit message  $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, M - 1\}$ ,  $M = 2^B$ , is given by  $m = m_0 + m_1 B_0$  with  $M_0 = 2^{B_0}$  and  $M_1 = 2^{B_1}$ . The transmit signal  $\mathbf{R}_m \in \mathbb{C}^{Q \times L}$  of message  $m$  for  $Q$  sub-carriers and  $L$  OFDM symbols is given by

$$\mathbf{R}_m = \mathbf{F}_{m_0} \text{diag}(\mathbf{w}_{m_1}),$$

where  $\mathbf{F}_{m_0} \in \mathcal{F}^{Q \times L} = \{\mathbf{F}_0, \mathbf{F}_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}_{M_0-1}\}$  is the code sequence  $m_0$  in frequency domain and  $\mathbf{w}_{m_1}$  is codeword  $m_1$  of time-domain code  $\mathbf{W} = [\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{M_1-1}] \in \mathbb{C}^{L \times M_1}$ .

The design of codes  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathbf{W}$  depend on the transmission requirements and the number of available dimensions. For instance,  $\mathcal{F}$  could be designed for good cross-correlation properties or low PAPR. Another criterion is to limit the number of non-zero elements in  $\mathcal{F}$  to reduce both decoding complexity and the effects of multi-path propagation.

The time-domain code (or outer code)  $\mathbf{W}$  can be orthogonal if  $QL \geq M$  or non-orthogonal if  $QL < M$ . In the non-orthogonal case, a non-coherent code can be used and the  $B_1$  bits  $\mathbf{d} = [d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{B_1-1}]$  are encoded as

$$\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{d}\mathbf{G}$$

where  $\mathbf{G}$  is the generator matrix and  $\mathbf{c}$  are the coded bits. Subsequently, the modulated  $N$ -PSK symbol  $w_{m_1 l}$  of message  $m_1$  and symbol  $l$  is obtained by

$$w_{m_1 l} = e^{i2\pi c_n / N}$$

where  $c_n$  is the  $n^{th}$  entry of  $\mathbf{c}$ . Finally, the transmitted sequence  $\mathbf{r}_{ml}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{r}_{ml} = \mathbf{f}_{m_0 l} \cdot w_{m_1 l}$$

where  $\mathbf{f}_{m_0 l}$  is the sequence on symbol  $l$  corresponding to message  $m_0$ . As an example, consider  $N = 4$  (e.g. QPSK),  $B_1 = 8$  and  $L = 14$ , a good generator matrix in base-4 is given by

$$\mathbf{G} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

Before evaluating the different transmission schemes, we will discuss receive algorithms and their associated complexity.

## 4 Receiver Algorithms and Complexity

This section discusses the different receive algorithms and their associated complexity for the reception and decoding of the WUS.

The complex base-band received signal vector  $\mathbf{y}_{l,p} \in \mathbb{C}^K$  for  $K$  sub-carriers, on receive antenna  $p = 1, 2, \dots, P$  and OFDM symbol  $l$  can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{y}_{l,p} = \mathbf{H}_{l,p} \mathbf{x}_{l,m} + \mathbf{n}_{l,p},$$

where  $\mathbf{H}_{l,p} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}_{l,p})$  with  $\mathbf{h}_{l,p} \in \mathbb{C}^K$  the vector of complex channel responses on sub-carriers  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{l,m} \in \mathbb{C}^K$  is the transmit vector for message  $m$  and  $\mathbf{n}_{l,p}$  the noise vector.

#### 4.1 Non-Coherent Detection

In the absence of channel state information at the receiver, a near-optimal receive algorithm for the estimate  $\hat{m}$  of message  $m$  is given by

$$\hat{m} = \arg \max_m \sum_{p=1}^P \left\| \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{y}_{l,p}^H \mathbf{x}_{l,m} \right\|^2$$

Essentially, we compute the correlation of the received signal with all  $M = 2^B$  possible transmit signals and choose the message which maximizes the power of the correlation. In terms of complex multiplications (MUL), the non-coherent receiver requires  $K_{NKP} PLM$  MUL, where  $K_{NKP}$  are the sub-carriers in the transmit signal with *non-zero* power.

#### 4.2 Non-Coherent Detection with Reduced Complexity

With the proposed product code, where the messages in frequency and time-domain can be decoded independently, the NCD can be simplified to reduce the complexity. First the estimate  $\hat{m}_0$  of message  $m_0$  corresponding to the  $B_0$  bits encoded in frequency-domain are computed as

$$\hat{m}_0 = \arg \max_{m_0} \sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{l=1}^L \left\| \mathbf{y}_{l,p}^H \mathbf{f}_{l,m_0} \right\|^2$$

where  $\mathbf{f}_{l,m_0}$  is the frequency-domain code sequence for  $m_0$  in OFDM symbol  $l$ , i.e. the  $l$ th column of  $\mathbf{F}_{m_0}$ . This estimation requires  $K_{NKP} PLM_0$  MUL.

With the estimate  $\hat{m}_0$  the message  $m_1$  corresponding to the remaining  $B_1$  bits can be estimated according to

$$\hat{m}_1 = \arg \max_{m_1} \sum_{p=1}^P \left\| \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{y}_{l,p}^H \mathbf{r}_{l,\hat{m}_0+m_1M_0} \right\|^2$$

where  $\mathbf{r}_{l,\hat{m}_0+m_1M_0}$  is the  $l$ th column of  $\mathbf{R}_{l,\hat{m}_0+m_1M_0} = \mathbf{F}_{\hat{m}_0} \text{diag}(\mathbf{w}_{m_1})$ , i.e. the transmit signal for message  $m_1$  conditioned on the estimate  $\hat{m}_0$ . This detection requires only  $LPM_1$  MUL since  $\mathbf{y}_{l,p}^H \mathbf{r}_{l,\hat{m}_0+m_1M_0} = \mathbf{y}_{l,p}^H \mathbf{f}_{l,\hat{m}_0} \mathbf{w}_{l,m_1}$  and the term  $\mathbf{y}_{l,p}^H \mathbf{f}_{l,\hat{m}_0}$  has already been computed.

The performance the low-complexity receiver can be improved by creating a list of several hypothesis for  $\hat{m}_0$ . In [1], we show that with a single hypothesis, i.e.  $N_{\hat{m}_0} = 1$ , the reduced complexity NCD performs within a fraction of a dB compared to the full NCD and with  $N_{\hat{m}_0} = 2$ , the performance is identical. Table 1 provides complexity comparison in terms of complex multiplications.

|                 | Reduced Complexity NCD (RC-NCD)           |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | NCD             |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|
|                 | $L P K_{NKP} M_0 + N_{\hat{m}_0} L P M_1$ |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | $K_{NKP} L P M$ |
| $N_{\hat{m}_0}$ | 1                                         | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     |                 |
| $K_{NKP} = 1$   | 7392                                      | 14560 | 21728 | 28896 | 36064 | 43232 | 50400 | 57568 | 57344           |
| $K_{NKP} = 3$   | 7840                                      | 15008 | 22176 | 29344 | 36512 | 43680 | 50848 | 58016 | 172032          |
| $K_{NKP} = 6$   | 8512                                      | 15680 | 22848 | 30016 | 37184 | 44352 | 51520 | 58688 | 344064          |
| $K_{NKP} = 12$  | 9856                                      | 17024 | 24192 | 31360 | 38528 | 45696 | 52864 | 60032 | 688128          |

Table 1: NCD complexity comparison in terms of complex multiplications,  $L = 14$ ,  $P = 2$ ,  $B = 11$ ,  $B_0 = 3$  ( $M_0 = 8$ ),  $B_1 = 8$  ( $M_1 = 256$ ).

It can be observed, that the RC-NCD features a significantly reduced complexity compared to the full NCD, especially if the number of non-zero sub-carriers in the frequency-domain sequences increases.

**Observation 1: The proposed transmission scheme has low complexity because detection in time and frequency domain can be efficiently separated.**

## 5 Information other than Wake-up

Both PEI and LP-WUS deliver up to 8 and 5 bits, respectively, to allow for group-based wake-up. Since an OFDM-based WUS design is more spectrally efficient, a larger payload ( $> 8$  bits) would be beneficial e.g. to enhance the wake-up functionality by allowing for enhanced grouping or UE-specific wake-up. Even small amounts of data or (wake-up related) control signaling may be considered to further improve potential power-saving gains.

**Proposal 1: Study the benefits of increased payload capacity for 6G WUS.**

## 6 Simulation Results

In this section, we evaluate the BLER performance of different sequence-based WUS designs. We assume the same WUS BW as in NR Rel-19, i.e. 11 PRB. The simulation assumptions are summarized in Table 2.

The link-level evaluations, the following parameters have been agreed in RAN1#124-bis.

Agreement:

RAN1#124-bis

At least the following assumptions are made of EE mode for DL WUS link level evaluations:

|                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |         |        |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| Carrier frequency          | 700 MHz                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 3.5 GHz | 7 GHz  |
| WUS SCS                    | 15 kHz                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 30 kHz  | 30 kHz |
| Channel model              | [TDL-A, 30 ns delay spread]<br>TDL-C, 300 ns delay spread                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |        |
| UE velocity                | 3km/h                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |         |        |
| MDR/FAR assumptions        | Baseline miss-detection rate (MDR) of DL WUS is FFS %<br>Baseline false-alarm rate (FAR*) of DL WUS is FFS %<br><br>*FAR, to be defined<br><br>FFS if additional values need to be specified for RRC CONNECTED and/or RRC IDLE/INACTIVE modes, respectively |         |        |
| DL WUS BW                  | Up to 12, 24 or 48 PRBs<br>Max 10 MHz BW<br>Time domain resource to be reported by companies                                                                                                                                                                |         |        |
| Impairment modelling       | Residual Frequency error up to [5] ppm, lower values to be reported by companies with the corresponding power assumptions<br>Residual timing error up to [2] $\mu$ s, lower values to be reported by companies with the corresponding power assumptions     |         |        |
| Number of information bits | up to companies to report                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |        |
| Number of Rx antennas      | 1, 2                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |         |        |

The baseline configuration for PDCCH is given in the subsequent agreement.

**Agreement:****RAN1#124-bis**

The baseline reference configuration for link level coverage assessment of EE processing for DL WUS detection includes the following parameters referred to NR common PDCCH.

|                           |                         |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Aggregation level         | 8                       |
| # Rx antennas (PDCCH)     | 4                       |
| CORESET                   | Refer to TR38.830       |
| PDCCH payload             | 40-bits (excluding CRC) |
| # Tx antennas (WUS+PDCCH) | 2                       |

We evaluate BLER, i.e. the WUS is in error if at least one bit is decoded incorrectly. This metric is somewhat related to FAR, since one incorrect bit will result in falsely waking up (or not waking up) a UE or a group of UEs. However, it does not distinguish between the number of groups/UE falsely woken up or not woken up.

Our evaluation in Figure 2 assumes a larger payload of  $B = 15$  information bits, which could for instance indicate the wake-up for a specific UE. Encoding 15 bits with a sequence-based design is challenging because of the limited amount of resources, e.g.  $132 \times 14 = 1848$  REs, as well as the higher receiver complexity of correlating with  $2^{15}$  sequences.

Thus, we evaluate the Rel-19 WUS sequence design assuming there is *no* Manchester coding and only a single OOK symbol per OFDM symbol (i.e.  $M = 1$ ) with  $N_{seq} = 32$  sequences. Hence, 5 bits are transmitted per OFDM symbol and all 15 bits can be decoded within 3 OFDMs symbols. The transmission is then repeated on the remaining OFDM symbols configured for the transmission. The receiver performs OFDM demodulation and correlates with all possible sequences per OFDM symbol. The obtained correlation values are then combined with the repetitions before choosing the highest correlation peak to decode the payload.

The proposed VHC scheme uses the low-complexity receiver with 2 hypotheses for the frequency-domain sequences (VHC-LC2). The BW of 11 PRBs allows for the transmission of  $B_0 = 7$  bits with orthogonal sequences and  $B_1 = 8$  bits are transmitted over the time-domain. In this simulation, we choose to encode  $B_0$  with different frequency offsets of a single non-zero power RE.




Figure 2: BLER Performance, TDL-C 30ns,  $B = 15$  bit, 11 PRBs.

From the results in Figure 2, we observe a 4dB performance gain @1%BLER of the proposed VHC-based WUS design compared to the Rel-19 solution. The  $B_0$  bits offer an additional 1dB gain. This gain results from the fact that the  $B_0$  bits are encoded in frequency domain and repeated over the entire transmission duration. The encoding of the  $B_1$  bits with a linear code designed for non-coherent detection further contributes to the strong overall performance.

We conclude, that there are efficient WUS designs available if the number of available resources is too small to encode the payload with a purely sequence-based approach.

**Observation 2: The proposed WUS transmission scheme significantly outperforms the WUS Rel-19 design.**

Figure 3 compares a 8-bit transmission of the Rel-19 sequence design over 11 PRBs and 4 symbols (with  $N_{seq} = 4$  sequences) to a VHC design over 1 PRB and 14 symbols (3 bits in frequency domain and 5 bits in time domain). It can be observed that the performance is very similar although the Rel-19 design consumes roughly 3 times more resources than the VHC design,  $11 \cdot 12 \cdot 4 = 528$  REs and 168 REs, respectively. This result suggests that there are more spectrally efficient ways to transmit the wake-up signal while maintaining low receiver complexity. However, in this example at the expense of a longer transmission time.

For comparison, the performance of the reference PDCCH configuration is plotted. It can be observed that both WUS-R19 and VHC design approximately match the PDCCH performance at 1%BLER.

**Proposal 2: Study sequence-based WUS designs that allow for increased payload capacity.**




Figure 3: BLER Performance, TDL-C 300ns, B=8 bits.

## 7 Conclusion

In this contribution, the following proposals and observations have been made:

**Observation 1:** The proposed transmission scheme has low complexity because detection in time and frequency domain can be efficiently separated.

**Proposal 1:** Study the benefits of increased payload capacity for 6G WUS.

**Observation 2:** The proposed WUS transmission scheme significantly outperforms the WUS Rel-19 design.

**Proposal 2:** Study sequence-based WUS designs that allow for increased payload capacity.

## 8 References

[1] RP-212941, "Discussion on DMRS-less PUCCH for UL Coverage Enhancements", EURECOM, RAN#94e, Dec, 2021.

## 9 Appendix

Link-Level simulation assumptions are shown in Table 2 below.

| Parameter                          | Value                                  |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Carrier Frequency                  | 2.6 GHz (FDD)                          |
| Channel BW                         | 20MHz (51 PRBs @ 30kHz SCS)            |
| SCS                                | 30 kHz                                 |
| Channel Model                      | TDL-C, 30ns/300ns Delay Spread, 0 km/h |
| Number of receive antennas at UE   | 2                                      |
| Number of transmit antennas at gNB | 2                                      |
| Payload size                       | 8/15 bits                              |
| Number of OFDM symbols             | 14                                     |
| WUS bandwidth                      | 11 PRB                                 |

*Table 2: Link-level simulation assumptions for WUS.*