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# Introduction

In RAN#94-e meeting, a new Rel-18 WID on MIMO [1] was agreed. From 7 objectives, there are two objectives for DMRS enhancements, as shown below.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Study, and if justified, specify larger number of orthogonal DMRS ports for downlink and uplink MU-MIMO (without increasing the DM-RS overhead), only for CP-OFDM,  * Striving for a common design between DL and UL DMRS * Up to 24 orthogonal DM-RS ports, where for each applicable DMRS type, the maximum number of orthogonal ports is doubled for both single- and double-symbol DMRS   […]   1. Study, and if justified, specify UL DMRS, SRS, SRI, and TPMI (including codebook) enhancements to enable 8 Tx UL operation to support 4 and more layers per UE in UL targeting CPE/FWA/vehicle/Industrial devices  * Note: Potential restrictions on the scope of this objective (including coherence assumption, full/non-full power modes) will be identified as part of the study. |

The agreements in the 1st round are listed in sect. 6 in [28]. This document contains summary of the company’s proposal and FL proposals for round 2 discussion.

# Evaluation methodology (EVM)

EVM for LLS and SLS is agreed by email on May 13. However, there is FFS of precoding assumption of PDSCH/PUSCH in LLS. We should resolve this within RAN1#109e. There was a proposal of simulation method for MU-MIMO LLS, and it would impact on the following FFS, FL suggestion is to discuss FL proposal#2-1-6 in sect. 2.1 first.

**Agreement: (RAN1#109e)**

* **Following evaluation assumptions are used for LLS for increasing DMRS ports in AI 9.1.3.1 in Rel.18.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| Precoding and precoding granularity | For PDSCH: Companies can select and need to report which option(s) are used between   * [ZF or SVD] based sub-band precoding (with 4PRB precoding granularity) on ideal channel knowledge * CSI codebook based sub-band precoding (with 4PRB precoding granularity) on ideal CSI feedback.   For PUSCH: Companies can select and need to report which option(s) are used between   * [ZF or SVD] based wide-band precoding on ideal channel knowledge * Codebook based wide-band precoding on ideal CSI feedback. |

## Simulation method for MU-MIMO LLS

ZTE commented in 1st round discussion that simulation method for MU-MIMO LLS should be aligned between companies.

Please provide your views on whether/how to align simulation method for MU-MIMO LLS, with the following as a start point.

**FL proposal#2-1-6:**

**Following simulation method for MU-MIMO LLS of PDSCH can be considered:**

1. **Generate N channels associated with N UE, each channel with a number of random parameters and one set of cluster angle, i.e. ZOA, ZOD, AOA, AOD;**
2. **Different PDSCH/DMRS ports for different UEs associated with different channels, and independent PMI calculation based on different channel for each UE.**
3. **For UE1, other PDSCH with respective precoding is treated as interference, a power ratio P can be considered, e.g. 0dB, 3dB, 6dB or other values.**
4. **The PDSCH received by UE1 is , MMSE or other receiver types can be adopted, and the BLER or throughput is performed based on PDSCH of UE1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE (round1) | For MU-MIMO link level simulation, the simulation method should be decided first for the results alignment in the later simulation. So we give our suggestion as follows:   1. Generate N channels associated with N UE, each channel with a number of random parameters and one set of cluster angle, i.e. ZOA,ZOD,AOA,AOD; 2. Different PDSCH/DMRS ports for different Ues associated with different channels, and independent PMI calculation based on different channel for each Ues. 3. For UE1, other PDSCH with respective precoding is treated as interference, a power ratio P can be considered, e.g. 0dB, 3dB, 6dB or other values. 4. The PDSCH received by UE1 is , MMSE or other receiver types can be adopted, and the BLER or throughput is performed based on PDSCH of UE1.   It will be appreciated if other companies shares the MU simulation method for the results alignment. |
| ZTE2(round1) | We would like to ventilate that this setting aims for controllable interference leakage between multiple channels when MU-MIMO, so it is closer to the real scenario when compared ZF. In additional, as we mentioned in section 2.1.3, the outcome of this proposal should be taken into consideration of PDSCH precoding method in proposal#2-1-3. |
| Ericsson(round1) | Regarding the proposal to emulate MU MIMO with N channels, so in our view, this is not needed. Because we only concerned about interference at one UE, and all the interference should go through the same channel associated with the desired UE. (As illustrated below in the Figure)  グラフ, レーダー チャート  自動的に生成された説明  Therefore, only the channel for the desired UE needs to be generated. And the interference from other UEs can be emulated by transmitting different DMRS ports intended for other UEs on the same single channel with different precoders. It is not trivia to specify different precoder for different UEs because depend on the UE location and other factors. The end effect of different precoders is the power leakage between UE channels. Therefore, in our view, this can be achieved by using a same precoder with different power ratios for different UE. We think this is much simpler and easier to setup and compare between companies. |
| Samsung(round1) | We are fine with having detailed MU-MIMO simulation set-up since MU-MIMO simulation is baseline in 2.1.3 MIMO setting. We would like to recall our comment to Ericsson in 2.1.3 MIMO setting. Since the other UE’s precoders can be decided by other UE’s channel (i.e., N-1 channels), it would be generated. Same precoders for UEs scheduled by MU-MIMO seems not appropriate. We would like to see other companies’ view on this. |
| Ericsson 1 | Maybe there’s some miss understanding on precoder setting. The UEs are using different precoder, as in the figure, w1 , w2 , w3 are the different precoders for each UE, but for the targeting UE we are interested, we are evaluating the interference caused by co-scheduled UEs. At the target UE, the effective interference is caused by leakage from the co-scheduled UE, though the UE uses different precoder, has different channels, the interfering part relevant to **the target UE** can be modeled as different power ration using same precoder and same channel.  With such approach we could compare companies MU-MIMO result by using same setting of power ratios as the interference from co-scheduled UEs.  Hope this explains better our proposal. |
| ZTE | In principle, the interference caused by around UEs should be reflected as real as possible.  By comparing ZF and SVD, our proposed method aims for evaluating the realistic MU-MIMO by taking independent PMI as well as power ratio of other channels into account of SVD. Given that CSI codebook on ideal CSI feedback has already been one endorsed option, interference from other UEs in MU-MIMO will be marginal when taking ZF as another option. Hence the meaning of the MU-MIMO evaluation results will be agnostic if both CSI codebook on ideal CSI feedback and ZF are to be optional simultaneously.  W.r.t the precoders of UE1 and its co-scheduled UEs, we think it should be independent/different. In addition of power leakage from other channels, spatial diversity is another critical aspect which should be considered for interference in MU-MIMO scenario. That is, if precoders of UE1 and its co-scheduled UEs is mandatory to be the same, UE1 cannot be able to identify the spatial filter/beam of its channel-1, and then the interference from other UEs will be inevitable even taking larger DMRS ports. Thus, both PMI and power ratio of each channel should be independent for MU-MIMO simulation to approach the real MU-MIMO. |
| OPPO | We also think modeling of N channels are not mandatory. In LLS, it is difficult to model the practical MU-MIMO scheduling as in SLS. Even when N independent channels are generated, the orthogonality among UEs cannot be guaranteed. The precoders derived from N channels with random parameters and random angles are similar to random precoders actually. Hence, we propose to use random precoders for co-scheduled UEs instead of N random channels. |
| Lenovo | We think it is not easy to make refined simulation for MU-MIMO interference since the MU pairing/scheduling algorithm, UE dropping may be not realized in LLS. So we prefer Ericsson’s proposal for further discussing since it can reduce simulation realization complexity and be beneficial for calibrating the simulation results between companies. In detail, the inter-user interference is reflected by power ratio and precoder. To reflect interference with precoding, we prefer random precoding for interference (i.e. random precoding for w2, w3 for Ericsson’s example) as OPPO’s suggestion. Furthermore, we have a detail question on modelling for the power ratio (i.e. what’s the distribution for power ratio?). |
| vivo | According to the antenna setup and port layouts at gNB agreed, it implies that there would be an analog beam from the gNB side. Therefore, it is more appropriate to generate the different channel corresponding to different UEs with the same set of cluster angle, i.e. ZOA, ZOD, AOA, AOD in LLS evaluation. We would like to clarify that different channel corresponding to different UEs can be generated simultaneously as a full channel with all DMRS ports. Regarding the precoding, we support to generate N different precoders to reflect the realness as much as possible. Finally, the interference from other UEs on the target UE would be naturally modeled after precoding. The only issue is that how to determine the power ratio P of different UEs, we suggest that the P of the target UE is 1, and P of other UEs can be selected from a set, e.g., {0dB, 1dB, 2dB, 3dB, 6dB}. |
| Xiaomi | Support to model the interference as different power ration using same precoder and same channel, as proposed by Ericsson, for the sake of reducing simulation realization complexity. |
| ZTE2 | Regarding the setup of power ratio (denoted as “*p*i”), we would like to further share our opinions by the following two alternatives:  **Alt. 1:** *p*1 = *p*2 = ... = *p*N  **Alt. 2:** the power ratio of each co-scheduled UE depends on its CQI. In other words, the higher CQI, the lager power ratio.  For Alt. 1, that means the power ratio of each co-scheduled UE is to be equal from the perspective of NW scheduling, which is straight and simple. For Alt. 2, power ratio is distributed proportionally by CQI, it requests CQI of each co-scheduled UE should be calculated and compared. To make simulation easier, we prefer Alt. 1.  In addition, it should be noted that due to the power ratio determination above, independent precoding is needed for power leakage from other UEs. |
| CATT | Agree with Ericsson and OPPO, the channel of the target UE is mandatorily modelled in MU-MIMO LLS. Modeling of all the other N-1 channels of co-scheduled UEs is not necessary.  If our goal is just to improve the accuracy of evaluation and to reflect the performance in practical MU-MIMO operation, generating N channels associated with N UE in LLS may not be the right choice. The reasons lie in several aspects:  1. The performance of MU-MIMO depends largely on the strategy of scheduling which is barely modeled in LLS. In practical system, depending on the scheduling algorithm, the N UEs may not even be scheduled together. Therefore, without the modeling of scheduling, modeling of N UEs’ channels solely is still not meaningful to the improvement of evaluation accuracy.  2. To our understanding, “**independent PMI calculation based on different channel for each UE**” implies single-user precoding rather than multi-user precoding. If that is the case, the residual inter-user interference after MU precoding is never reflected in the whole simulation.  Based on the analysis above, seems the outcome of the modeling of N channels in LLS is just higher complexity in generating more channels in simulation, rather than accuracy improvement. If so, we would rather use SLS to model the whole procedure of MU scheduling and MU precoding than using such kind of complicated but inaccurate LLS. However, the operation of channel estimation is not modeled in SLS usually. And as there are many other factors having impact on the final performance, we may not deduce the reason for influencing the performance of different DMRS patterns easily from SLS.  So, the main reason for using LLS rather than SLS is to help us to focus on the impact of directional or spatial selective inter-user interference with different leakage levels on the performance of channel estimation of DMRS in MU-MIMO. To achieve that, no fundamental difference between 1-channel and N-channel modeling can be foreseen. Therefore, to better trade off the accuracy against complexity, modeling of the channel of one target user is sufficient to us.  If only the channel of the target UE is modeled, random precoding is preferred for other co-scheduled UEs. With regard to power ratio, we support to introduce a fixed power ratio (e.g. 0dB, 3dB, 6dB or other values) for other co-scheduled UEs in the simulation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Remaining issue of EVM for LLS

We need to resolve the FFS in EVM for LLS in RAN1#109e agreement. Alt.3 is based on FL proposal#2-1-6 (if agreed). Since FL proposal#2-1-6 only considers DL precoding of PDSCH, it is not applied to PUSCH.

**FL proposal#2-1-3a:**

* **For LLS assumptions for increasing DMRS ports in AI 9.1.3.1 in Rel.18:**
  + **Precoding assumption of PDSCH, “**[ZF or SVD]**” in RAN1#109e agreement is updated by**
    - **Alt.1-1: ZF**
    - **Alt.1-2: SVD**
    - **Alt.1-3: SVD based independent PMI calculation for each UE (in FL proposal#2-1-6)**
  + **Precoding assumption of PUSCH, “**[ZF or SVD]**” in RAN1#109e agreement is updated by**
    - **Alt.2-2: ZF**
    - **Alt.2-2: SVD**

Please provide your views on the FFS part.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (round1) | For the **Precoding and precoding granularity** part, considering the practical scenario, ‘practical channel knowledge with real channel estimation’ rather than ‘ideal channel knowledge’ may be more appropriate. Furthermore, for PDSCH Alt.1, we think ZF-based rather than SVD-based precoding should be considered. |
| ZTE2(round1) | For precoding method of PDSCH, it should be noted that if proposal#2-6-1 (unified simulation method) can be acceptable to companies as a consensus, it should be used to replace ZF here for companies’ alignment. |
| vivo(round1) | For precoding, it is better to align the same non-codebook precoder for PDSCH and PUSCH, i.e., both using ZF or SVD. |
| Samsung | We are fine with either methods but prefer down-selecting one precoding assumption to reduce simulation effort. |
| ZTE | According to our previous elaborations of FL’s proposal#2-6-1, due to ZF algorithm is too ideal and far away the real-field deployment, we support Alt.1-3 for PDSCH and Alt.2-2 for PUSCH to approach the real MU-MIMO. |
| OPPO | We prefer Alt 1-2 for PDSCH to be compared with the results based on codebook.  For PUSCH, SVD should be applied and how to apply ZF at UE side needs further clarification. |
| Lenovo | In principle, either ZF or SVD can be used for precoding assumption of PDSCH and PUSCH. For ZF schemes, it is a realistic MU-MIMO precoding scheme and the inter-user interference is modelled accurately. But the simulation realization complexity is high (such as MU-MIMO UE selection/paring based on interference if considered) and more alignment may be needed since there may be different realization schemes, such as, ZF scheme, regular ZF scheme, etc. For SVD scheme, it is simple but the inter-user interference needs further considered for modeling such as schemes discussed in section 2.1. If the inter-user interference modeling can be accepted by companies, we prefer SVD scheme to save simulation effort and easy calibrating simulation results between companies. |
| QC | For DL, we prefer Alt 1-3. Just an editorial comment: It seems the following is more accurate to capture the intention of Alt 1-3?  **Alt.1-3: SVD based ~~on~~ independent PMI calculation for each UE (in FL proposal#2-1-6)**  For UL, we prefer Alt.2-2.  In our understanding, ZF precoder would amplify noise which will degrade performance. We are not sure what is the benefit of using ZF precoder. Can proponents of ZF precoder please clarify? |
| Moderator | Updated by QC’s input. |
| vivo | We are confused about the Alt 1-3. Since we have agreed “CSI codebook based sub-band precoding (with 4PRB precoding granularity) on ideal CSI feedback”, why we need Alt 1-3 which is based on codebook (PMI)?  Regarding ZF, SVD precoding, both are ok for us. If to choose one as the unique assumption, we slightly prefer SVD precoding which can provide better performance than ZF generally. |
| Xiaomi | Both ZF and SVD are acceptable for us. |
| CATT | Support the proposal, and SVD based precoding for only one target user is preferred for DL. If random precoding is agreed for co-scheduled UEs in FL proposal#2-1-6, Alt.1-3 can be removed.  For UL, Alt.2-2 is preferred. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Specifying objective #3 (increasing DMRS ports)

## Other proposals in the 1st round

Companies’ inputs in the 1st round are summarized in the following table. It is observed that most popular proposals are proposal 1 and proposal 4. Meanwhile, some companies mentioned it is better to discuss after RAN1 decides how to increase the DMRS ports. For the proposal 4, it is pointed out that it is premature to decide to re-use the existing table before deciding how to increase the DMRS ports. Hence, the scope of this discussion is to agree on “study”.

For proposal 2) and 3), the proposals are only valid, if Opt.1/Opt.5 using FD-OCC is agreed.

Considering that the study of 1) and 4) would be useful, irrespective of which option to increase the DMRS ports is to be supported, FL suggestion is to focus on 1) and 4).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposals** | **Companies** |
| 1. **Support dynamic indication between Rel.18 DMRS ports and Rel.15 DMRS ports** | **Support:** Futurewei, ZTE, vivo, Samsung, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI(after down selection), OPPO, Lenovo, NEC, CMCC, Intel, Huawei/HiSilicon, QC (but later), Docomo (13), Samsung (after finalizing FL proposal 3.3), CATT (after down selection)  **Not support:** Spreadtrum (depends on performance different b/w R15 and R18), New H3C(after finalizing FL proposal 3.3) (4) |
| 1. **DM-RS EPRE enhancement in case of Sparser frequency allocation (increase the number of CDM groups)** | **Support:**CATT, Xiaomi, Fraunhofer (after down selection), ZTE(if FDM is agreed), LGE, Docomo(if FDM is agreed) (6)  **Not support:** CATT (after down selection), Xiaomi (after down selection), New H3C(after finalizing FL proposal 3.3) (3) |
| 1. **Study whether to indicate the length of FD-OCC to UEs** | **Support:**NEC, Lenovo, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE(if FDM is agreed) , Docomo(if FDM is agreed) (5), Samsung  **Not support:** CATT (after down selection), New H3C(after finalizing FL proposal 3.3) (3) |
| 1. **Reuse the antenna port indication table in 38.212 as much as possible for both PDSCH and PUSCH** | **Support:**Apple, Samsung, Futurewei, Intel (But, later), Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, LGE (7)  **Not support:** CATT (after down selection), New H3C(after finalizing FL proposal 3.3) (2) |
| 1. **Study on designing DMRS table entries focusing on utilizing MU-MIMO** | **Support:**Samsung, ZTE (2)  **Not support:** CATT (after down selection), New H3C(after finalizing FL proposal 3.3) (2) |

**1st round (by May 13)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | We think further study is needed for dynamic indication between Rel.18 DMRS and Rel.15 DMRS. The required max DMRS ports number doesn’t seem to change dynamically. |
| Samsung | Regarding 1), we are fine to study a dynamic indication between Rel-15 and Rel-18 DMRS types since Rel-18 DMRS type may have degraded performance when it is used for SU due to a sparser DMRS REs or larger length of OCC. Hence, fallback operation into Rel-15 from Rel-18 DMRS should be studied and supported.  Regarding 2), if we consider the direction #2 (increase the number of CDM groups) in section 3.3 above, it would be natural extension to be considered. Hence, it can be discussed after finalizing FL proposal 3.3.  Regarding 3), it seems a specific way to indicate dynamically between Rel-15 and Rel-18 DMRS.  Regarding 4), we tend to agree with reusing existing tables as much as possible.  Regarding 5), since Rel-18 DMRS is mainly used for MU-MIMO and the number of DMRS ports indicated by tables would be much larger than those of Rel-15, deleting some table entries which may not be used for MU-MIMO can be deleted. |
| Lenovo | We also support to make study on proposal 1 and 3. |
| NEC | We support to study 1). And Regarding 3), we share similar view with Samsung that 3) is a way to indicate dynamic switching between Rel-15 and Rel-18. So we think 1) and 3) can be jointly discussed. |
| CMCC | We support to study 1). |
| Futurewei | We support to study 1) and 4) |
| Intel | 1 and 4 can be further considered but only after Options in 3.2 are more mature. Without detailed design it’s premature to re-use legacy design fully. |
| CATT | Next-level details can be further studied after down-selection among options listed in FL proposal#3-3. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2) can be discussed after the DMRS patterns to support lager number of DMRS ports are decided. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support further studying (1) and/or (2) after down-selection of options in Proposal#3-3 |
| Spreadtrum | For proposal 1, the support of dynamic indication may also depends on the performance difference of channel estimation between Rel.18 DMRS ports and Rel.15 DMRS ports. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Samsung on 1). This is beneficial since there is a channel estimation performance loss with Rel.18 DMRS and it is unfortunate if the UE needs to take the hit of this loss in every slot. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support to study 1), 3) and 4). |
| ZTE | 1. Considering the DMRS ports are indicated in the DCI field, different DMRS pattern may have different performance in different scenarios, so it is better to support indicate the DMRS port are Rel.18 DMRS or Rel.15 by DCI signaling. 2. Can be discussed if FDM is agreed in section 3.3. 3. Can be discussed when FD-OCC is agreed in section 3.3. 4. Antenna port indication table in 38.212 should be a baseline. 5. Agree to study. |
| QC | Comment on Proposal 1: is the intention of proposal 1 to allow dynamic switch between Rel-15 and Rel-18 ports via “antenna ports” field in DCI? If so, we support this intention in general. But we think this is signaling detail and it can be discussed after the scheme to double # antenna ports is finalized.  Mod: Yes, I think it is the intention. |
| LGE | We support to study 2) and 4) |
| New H3C | Those 5 proposals should be treated after the design direction on increasing DMRS ports is decided. |
| vivo | Support to study 1).  The dynamic indication is important when the traffic or the number of UEs in MU-MIMO is changed dynamically, which would affect the performance of channel estimation based on DMRS. |
| Docomo | Support 1) to study.  Support 2) and 3) to study, but it should be discussed after RAN1 agree to support FD-OCC. |

**2nd round (by Monday GTW in 2nd week)**

For FL proposal#3.1.1, dynamic indication is clarified as DCI-based dynamic antenna port indication.

**FL proposal#3.1.1:**

* **To increase the max. number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH larger than Rel.15,** 
  + **Study whether/how to support DCI-based dynamic antenna ports indication of Rel.18 DMRS ports and/or Rel.15 DMRS ports.**

**FL proposal#3.1.4:**

* **To increase the max. number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH larger than Rel.15,** 
  + **Study whether/how to reuse the antenna port indication table in 38.212 as much as possible for both PDSCH and PUSCH**
  + **The design of the enhanced antenna port indication table in 38.212 take MU scheduling restrictions into account. FFS details on MU scheduling restrictions.**

Please provide your views on the above FL proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Docomo | Support both proposals to study. |
| Apple | We are fine with both proposal to study |
| Samsung | Support to study both proposals. Btw, our position of original 1) and 3) in Round 1 are both supportive. We think that original 3) can be one way of achieving 1). |
| ZTE | Support both proposals. |
| OPPO | Support both proposals. |
| Lenovo | Support both proposals. |
| QC | The original wording of proposal#3.1.1 can be interpreted as the dynamic indication is indicating either Rel-15 (old) ports or Rel-18 (new) ports, while not both. I assume the intention is to enhance Rel-15 antenna port indication to indicate all the following: Rel-15 ports, or Rel-18 ports, or Rel-15 + Rel-18 ports? If so, I suggest the following editorial change.  **FL proposal#3.1.1:**   * **To increase the max. number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH larger than Rel.15,**    + **Study whether/how to support DCI-based dynamic antenna port indication ~~between~~ Rel.18 DMRS ports and/or Rel.15 DMRS ports.**   **For proposal #3.1.4, when we design the new antenna port indication table, we need consider the MU scheduling restriction, as we agreed in previous round. The table is where we capture the MU scheduling restrictions. So I suggest the following update. The reason that “restriction” is put in square bracket is because I am not sure if everyone prefers to call this a “restriction”. To us, it is a restriction. But we are open to discuss other wording.**  **FL proposal#3.1.4:**   * **To increase the max. number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH larger than Rel.15,**    + **Study whether/how to reuse the antenna port indication table in 38.212 as much as possible for both PDSCH and PUSCH**   + **The design of the enhanced antenna port indication table in 38.212 take MU scheduling [restrictions] into account. FFS details on MU scheduling [restrictions].** |
| NEC | Support the proposals. |
| CMCC | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Moderator | FL proposals are updated by QC’s suggestion. I removed [ ] in QC’s suggestion because “MU-scheduling restriction” itself is FFS. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the updated FL proposals. |
| vivo | Support the updated proposal. |
| Sharp | Support both updated proposals. |
| Xiaomi | Support FL proposal#3.1.1 and proposal#3.1.4. |
| CATT | Support both proposals in principle. The intention and the meaning of DCI-based dynamic antenna port indication between Rel.18 DMRS ports and Rel.15 DMRS ports in FL proposal#3.1.1 should be further clarified. One understanding is that antenna ports (e.g., ports 11-23 or ports 0-11) can be indicated dynamically. Another understanding is that DMRS table of Rel.15 and Rel.18 can be indicated dynamically. |
|  |  |

# Specifying objective #5 (>4 layers PUSCH DMRS)

Based on the companies tdocs, the following DMRS enhancement can be considered to support more than 4 layers PUSCH. Whether to support more than 4 layers PUSCH is to be discussed in AI 9.1.4.2 (SRI/TPMI enhancement for enabling 8 TX UL transmission), hence, the following proposals can be specified after AI 9.1.4.2 agrees to support more than 4 layers PUSCH in Rel.18.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposals** | **Companies** |
| 1. **Extend DMRS port allocation table** **for rank 5~8 (Note: DL DMRS table can be a reference)** | Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, Xiaomi, Samsung, LGE, Lenovo, CMCC, DOCOMO, Intel, Ericsson |
| 1. **Enhancement for DMRS to PTRS mapping** | ZTE, Xiaomi, Samsung, OPPO, LGE, Ericsson |
| 1. **Study codeword-to-layer mapping** | Samsung, LGE |
| 1. **Alt.1: Utilize Rel.18 DMRS (or, both R15/18 DMRS)**   **Alt.2: Utilize Rel.15 DMRS only** | Alt.1: ZTE, Lenovo, DOCOMO, Intel, vivo  Alt.2: ~~vivo~~ |

After AI 9.1.4.2 agrees to support more than 4 layers PUSCH, to discuss smoothly normative work in this AI, it is good to study the potential specification impacts for DMRS.

**1st round (by May 13)**

**FL proposal#4 (1st round):**

* **Study the following potential DMRS enhancement to support more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH.**
  + **1) Extend DMRS port allocation table for rank 5~8**
    - **Note: DL DMRS table can be a reference**
  + **2) Enhancement for DMRS to PTRS mapping**
  + **3) Codeword-to-layer mapping**
* **Study whether to utilize Rel.18 DMRS ports for more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | Our view is to re-use PDSCH design for more than 4 layers as much as possible except PTRS-DMRS association. |
| Lenovo | Support the proposal |
| NEC | Regarding DMRS table, we’d like to clarify whether the extended DMRS table is similar as current UL DMRS table (i.e. per layer indication) or similar as DL DMRS table (i.e. joint indication for different number of layers)? We think this should also be studied. |
| CMCC | For 8 TX UL transmission, whether restriction on maximum number of orthogonal DMRS ports per UE in MU-MIMO is needed or not can be studied. We prefer to add a sub-bullet:   * + **4) Maximum layer per UE for MU-MIMO** |
| InterDigital | Need to wait for 9.1.4.2 |
| Futurewei | Support to reuse PDSCH design for more than 4 layers as much as possible. |
| Intel | Ok with the sub-bullet 1) and 2). For sub-bullet 3), more discussion is needed and maybe it should be discussed in AI 9.1.4.2. |
| CATT | Fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Samsung to re-use as much as possible existing specification for this work. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal, but all these detailed discussions should depend the agreements made in 9.1.4.2. |
| Spreadtrum | The enhancement can be studied after more than 4 UL layers is supported. |
| Docomo | We think it is beneficial to use Rel.18 DMRS (instead of Rel.15 DMRS) for 8Tx PUSCH, because we can avoid to use double symbol DMRS, which has more DMRS overhead than single symbol DMRS. |
| Moderator | Re NEC’s question, both options can be considered for study. But, as noted, DL DMRS table can be a reference.  Re CMCC’s comment, I couldn’t understand why the number of layers per UE should be restricted in MU-MIMO scenario. In current DMRS design, I think there is no such restriction, and the number of layers per UE does not change, depending on SU-MIMO or MU-MIMO. Could you elaborate the reason? |
| Ericsson | We agree to reuse the DL DMRS design as much as possible. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support to treat DL DMRS table as a reference and detailed discussions can be conducted after some agreements have been achieved in 9.1.4.2. |
| ZTE | Since Rel.18 DMRS ports may be supported in objective #3, we think Rel.18 DMRS ports with more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH should not be excluded. and the DMRS port indication and PTRS-DMRS association should be also studied. |
| QC | We think it is better to wait the decision on whether support >4 layers PUSCH in 9.1.4.2, before discuss this aspect. |
| MediaTek | For items 1) and 2), we prefer to wait for the outcome of 9.1.4.2, while for 3) we prefer to leave this codeword-to-layer mapping issue to be exclusively discussed under 9.1.4.2, not here. |
| CMCC | Re Moderator’s comment, in Rel-15, although up to 8 layers are supported for SU-MIMO in DL, it has been additionally restricted that the maximum number of orthogonal DMRS ports per UE in MU-MIMO is 4 for DL. For UL, since up to 4 layers transmission are supported in Rel-15, so no restriction is needed for MU-MIMO. However, to enable 8 TX UL operation to support up to 8 layers UL transmission, whether restriction on maximum number of orthogonal DMRS ports per UE in MU-MIMO is needed or not can be studied. |
| LGE | Support the proposal |
| New H3C | Support this proposal. |
| vivo | Support the proposal, except 3).  Regarding 3), we think it should be discussed in 9.1.4.2. |
| CMCC | In Rel-15, we have agreements regarding maximum number of ports per UE in SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO. The restriction for MU-MIMO is specified in TS38.214 Section 5.1.6.2 DM-RS reception procedure with yellow highlight part.    We would like to clarify when enabling up to 8 layers UL transmission, whether restriction on maximum number of orthogonal DMRS ports per UE in MU-MIMO is needed or not. It is appreciated if this can be discussed in 9.1.3.1.    **Agreement: #90bis**  Any configured DMRS port indication table supports SU-MIMO scheduling.  The maximum number of ports per UE in SU-MIMO   * DMRS configuration type 1 with 1-symbol DMRS   + 4 for DL, 4 for UL * DMRS configuration type 1 with 2-symbol DMRS   + 8 for DL, 4 for UL * DMRS configuration type 2 with 1-symbol DMRS   + 6 for DL, 4 for UL * DMRS configuration type 2 with 2-symbol DMRS   + 8 for DL, 4 for UL     **Agreement: #90bis**  The maximum number of orthogonal ports per UE in MU-MIMO for   * DMRS configuration type 1 with 1-symbol DMRS   + 2 for DL * DMRS configuration type 1 with 2-symbol DMRS   + 4 for DL * DMRS configuration type 2 with 1-symbol DMRS   + 4 for DL * DMRS configuration type 2 with 2-symbol DMRS   + 4 for DL     For DM-RS configuration type 1,  -    if a UE is scheduled with one codeword and assigned with the antenna port mapping with indices of {2, 9, 10, 11 or 30} in Table 7.3.1.2.2-1 and Table 7.3.1.2.2-2 of Clause 7.3.1.2 of [5, TS 38.212], or  -    if a UE is scheduled with one codeword and assigned with the antenna port mapping with indices of {2, 9, 10, 11 or 12} in Table 7.3.1.2.2-1A and {2, 9, 10, 11, 30 or 31} in Table 7.3.1.2.2-2A of Clause 7.3.1.2 of [5, TS 38.212], or  -    if a UE is scheduled with two codewords,  the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE.  For DM-RS configuration type 2,  -    if a UE is scheduled with one codeword and assigned with the antenna port mapping with indices of {2, 10 or 23} in Table 7.3.1.2.2-3 and Table 7.3.1.2.2-4 of Clause 7.3.1.2 of [5, TS38.212], or  -    if a UE is scheduled with one codeword and assigned with the antenna port mapping with indices of {2, 10, 23 or 24} in Table 7.3.1.2.2-3A and {2, 10, 23 or 58} in Table 7.3.1.2.2-4A of Clause 7.3.1.2 of [5, TS 38.212], or  -    if a UE is scheduled with two codewords,  the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE. |

**2nd round (by Monday GTW in 2nd week)**

For 3), I discussed with FL of AI 9.1.4.2, and AI 9.1.4.2 already discusses it. Following is FL proposal in AI 9.1.4.2 for your reference. Hence, we don’t need to discuss it in this AI, and I removed 3) from FL proposal#4.

|  |
| --- |
| **FL Proposal 3.1b: For 8TX UE uplink transmission with more than 4 layers, (if supported),**   * **support 2 CW transmission** * **reuse DL CW to layer mapping** |

Meanwhile, CMCC made a good point that in Rel.15, we have agreements regarding maximum number of ports per UE in SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO. It is also beneficial to study whether such restriction is needed to support more than 4 layers (please see the CMCC’s latest comment).

**FL proposal#4:**

* **Study the following potential DMRS enhancement for potential support of more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH.**
  + **1) Extend DMRS port allocation table for rank 5~8**
    - **Note: DL DMRS table can be a reference**
  + **2) Enhancement for DMRS to PTRS mapping**
* **Study whether to utilize Rel.18 DMRS ports for more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH.**
* **Study whether restriction on max. number of orthogonal DMRS ports per UE in MU-MIMO is needed**
* Note: the above study does not imply more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH is supported.

Please provide your views on the above FL proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Docomo | Support. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal to study |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. For UL DMRS ports with MU-MIMO, we think similar restriction to DL is needed. |
| Lenovo | Support the proposal. |
| QC | We still think it is better to wait the decision on whether support >4 layers PUSCH in 9.1.4.2, before discussing this aspect. But if majority want to perform this **study** in parallel with 9.1.4.2, we don’t object this proposal. But we request the following note to clarify this is just a study, which does not imply >4-layer PUSCH is supported already.  **FL proposal#4:**   * **Study the following potential DMRS enhancement ~~to support~~ for potential support of more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH.**   + **1) Extend DMRS port allocation table for rank 5~8**     - **Note: DL DMRS table can be a reference**   + **2) Enhancement for DMRS to PTRS mapping** * **Study whether to utilize Rel.18 DMRS ports for more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH.** * **Study whether restriction on max. number of orthogonal DMRS ports per UE in MU-MIMO is needed** * **Note: the above study does not imply more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH is supported.** |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Moderator | Updated by QC’s input. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the updated FL proposal. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the updated FL proposal. |
| CATT | Support FL’s proposal. |
|  |  |

# Other issues

This section contains other issues the companies want to highlight, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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