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**1 Background**

This draft TP captures comparison of PMI performance under SU-MIMO scenario for different spatial channel model parts.

**2 Draft TP**

6 Comparison of Spatial Channel Models

**6.2 SU-MIMO (PMI Aspects)**

This section provides comparison results for different spatial channel modes with simulation assumptions captured in Table 6.2-1.

**Table 6.2-1: Common simulation assumptions for PMI**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Unit | Value |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 40 |
| Subcarrier spacing | kHz | 30 |
| Duplex Mode |  | TDD |
| TDD DL-UL configurations |  | 7D1S2U S=6D+4G+4U |
| Antenna configuration |  | 8 x 4(M, N, P, Ms, Ns) = (1, 4, 2, 1, 1) |
| NZP CSI-RS for CSI acquisition | CSI-RS resource Type |  | Periodic |
| Number of CSI-RS ports (*X*) |  | 8 |
| CDM Type |  | CDM4 (FD2, TD2) |
| Density (ρ) |  | 1 |
| First subcarrier index in the PRB used for CSI-RS (k0, k1, k2, k3) |  | Row 8, (4,6) |
| First OFDM symbol in the PRB used for CSI-RS (l0) |  | Row 8, (5) |
| CSI-RSinterval and offset | slot | 10, 1 |
|  |  |  |
| cqi-FormatIndicator |  | Wideband |
| pmi-FormatIndicator |  | Not configured for eType IIWideband for Type I |
| Sub-band Size | RB | 8 |
| csi-ReportingBand |  | 11111111111111 |
| Codebook configuration | Codebook Type |  | 1. typeII-r16
2. typeI-SP
 |
| eType II CB config | *paramCombination-r16* |  | 6(L =4, *pν* =1/2, β=1/2 ) |
| R*(numberOfPMISubbandsPerCQISubband-r16)* |  | 1 |
| (CodebookConfig-N1,CodebookConfig-N2) |  | (4,1) |
| (CodebookConfig-O1,CodebookConfig-O2) |  | (4,1) |
| CodebookSubsetRestriction |  | 0x FFFF |
| RI Restriction (typeII-RI-Restriction-r16) |  | Rank 2: 0010Rank 4: 1000 |
| Physical channel for CSI report |  | PUSCH |
| CQI/RI/PMI delay  | ms | 7 |
| Maximum number of HARQ transmission |  | 4 |
| PDSCH & PDSCH DMRS Precoding configuration for random Precoding |  | Type I: Random and Follow PMI.eType II: Folow PMI |
| Note: Use DM-RS based FOE and compensation. |

Table 6.2-2: Simulation assumptions for CDL channel

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| FR / Carrier frequency | FR1,3.5GHz |
| UE speed and movement direction | 3km/h, ($^{}^{}$) |
| Channel Geometry |  LCS UE | α = 180°, β=0°, γ = 0° |
| LCS gNodeB | α = 0°, β=10°, γ = 0° |
| GCS UE | Height = 1.5 m; Azimuth = 0; X Coordinate = 100 m |
| GCS gNodeB | Height = 25 m; Azimuth = 0; X Coordinate = 0 m |
| BS Antenna Polarisation | Cross Polarized antenna elements with +/-45 degrees polarization slant angles |
| BS Radiation Pattern | Defined Table 7.3-1 in TS 38.901 |
| UE Antenna Polarisation | cross-polarized antenna elements with +90/0 degrees polarization slant angles |
| UE Antenna Radiation Pattern | Omnidirectional |
| Antenna Panel Placement | YZ Plane |

The BS antenna configuration for CDL comparison is one antenna element per subarray.

* 8Tx : (M, N, P, Ms, Ns) = (1, 4, 2, 1, 1).

The following comparison test cases are included this chapter:

* FR1 SU-MIMO PMI 8Tx 4Rx 4 layers with Type I.
* FR1 SU-MIMO PMI 8Tx 4Rx 4 layers with eType II.
* FR1 SU-MIMO PMI 8Tx 4Rx 2 layers with Type I.
* FR1 SU-MIMO PMI 8Tx 4Rx 2 layers with eType II.

**Table 6.2-3: Simulation result summary for FR1 SU-MIMO PMI 8Tx 4Rx with 4 layers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ChannelModel | Doppler/Speed | PMI | Gamma at 90% Norm. Throughput |
| Source #1 | Source #2 | Source #3 | Source #4 | Source #5 | Source #6 | Source #7 | Source #8 | Source #9 |
| rCDL-C | 3km/h | Type I | 1.8 |  |  |  |  | 1.8 |  | 1.7 |  |
| eType II | 1.8 |  |  |  |  | 1.7 |  | 1.4 |  |
| xTDL-C | 10Hz | Type I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.4 |  |
| eType II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 |  |
| TDLC-300 low | 10Hz | Type I | 1.3 |  |  |  |  | 1.1 |  |  |  |
| eType II | 1.3 |  |  |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 Med | 10Hz | Type I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| eType II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 XP Med | 10Hz | Type I | 1.9 |  |  |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |
| eType II | 1.8 |  |  |  |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 XP High | 10Hz | Type I | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.1 |  |
| eType II | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 |  |

Based on current simulation results are provided by companies, we have the following observation.

* The results show differences between the various channel models.
* All companies' results are very similar under the same channel model.

**Table 6.2-4: Simulation result summary for FR1 SU-MIMO PMI 8Tx 4Rx with 4 layers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ChannelModel | Doppler/Speed | PMI | SNR at 70% Norm. Throughput |
| Source #1 | Source #2 | Source #3 | Source #4 | Source #5 | Source #6 | Source #7 | Source #8 | Source #9 |
| rCDL-C | 3km/h | Type I | 12.4 | 11.0 | 10.4 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 10.2 | 9.8 |
| eType II | 14.0 | 14.3 | 10.3 | 11.6 | 10.1 | 10.8 | 8.2 | 13.8 | 10.8 |
| xTDL-C | 10Hz | Type I |  |  |  | 12.3 | 13.0 |  |  | 10.8 |  |
| eType II |  |  |  | 13.5 | 14.7 |  |  | 11.6 |  |
| TDLC-300 low | 10Hz | Type I | 12.6 |  |  |  |  | 13.2 |  |  |  |
| eType II | 12.8 |  |  |  |  | 15.7 |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 Med | 10Hz | Type I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| eType II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 XP Med | 10Hz | Type I | 12.7 |  |  |  |  | 18.9 |  |  |  |
| eType II | 12.8 |  |  |  |  | 24.5 |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 XP High | 10Hz | Type I | 18.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23.4 |  |
| eType II | 17.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.6 |  |

Based on current simulation results are provided by companies, we have the following observation.

* The results show differences between the various channel models, especially for rCDL-C and TDLC-300 XP High.
* All companies' results are very similar under the same channel model.

**Table 6.2-5: Simulation result summary for FR1 SU-MIMO PMI 8Tx 4Rx with 2**

 **layers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ChannelModel | Doppler/Speed | PMI | Gamma at 90% Norm. Throughput |
| Source #1 | Source #2 | Source #3 | Source #4 | Source #5 | Source #6 | Source #7 | Source #8 | Source #9 |
| rCDL-C | 3km/h | Type I | 2.0 |  |  |  |  | 2.3 |  | 1.7 |  |
| eType II | 1.9 |  |  |  |  | 2.4 |  | 1.6 |  |
| xTDL-C | 10Hz | Type I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 |  |
| eType II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| TDLC-300 low | 10Hz | Type I | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| eType II | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 Med | 10Hz | Type I |  |  |  |  |  | 1.05 |  |  |  |
| eType II |  |  |  |  |  | 1.4 |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 XP Med | 10Hz | Type I | 2.8 |  |  |  |  | 2.1 |  |  |  |
| eType II | 2.6 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 XP High | 10Hz | Type I | 6.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| eType II | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 |  |

Based on current simulation results are provided by companies, we have the following observation.

* The results show differences between the various channel models, especially for rCDL-C and TDLC-300 XP High.
* Companies' results are have a big difference under the TDLC-300 XP High.

**Table 6.2-6: Simulation result summary for FR1 SU-MIMO PMI 8Tx 4Rx with 2 layers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ChannelModel | Doppler/Speed | PMI | SNR at 70% Norm. Throughput |
| Source #1 | Source #2 | Source #3 | Source #4 | Source #5 | Source #6 | Source #7 | Source #8 | Source #9 |
| rCDL-C | 3km/h | Type I | 4.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.9 |  | 2.2 |  |
| eType II | 5.3 |  |  |  |  | 1.5 |  | 3.3 |  |
| xTDL-C | 10Hz | Type I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.3 |  |
| eType II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  |
| TDLC-300 low | 10Hz | Type I | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| eType II | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 Med | 10Hz | Type I |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| eType II |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 XP Med | 10Hz | Type I | 2.1 |  |  |  |  | 3.8 |  |  |  |
| eType II | 2.7 |  |  |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |  |
| TDLC-300 XP High | 10Hz | Type I | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 |  |
| eType II | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |

Based on current simulation results are provided by companies, we have the following observation.

* The results show differences between the various channel models, especially for rCDL-C and TDLC-300 XP High.
* Companies' results are have a big difference under rCDL-C channel model.

**3 Conclusion**

This draft TP captures comparison of PMI performance under SU-MIMO scenario for different spatial channel model part.