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# Introduction

In this contribution, we summarize issues regarding PDSCH/PUSCH enhancements for new SCSs on supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz for the following email discussion in RAN1 #106-e.

[106-e-NR-52-71GHz-05] Email discussion/approval on defining maximum bandwidth for new SCSs, timeline related aspects adapted to each of the new numerologies 480kHz and 960kHz and reference signals with checkpoints for agreements on August 19, 24 and 27 – Huaming (vivo)

Note that the scope of agenda 8.2.5 including defining maximum bandwidth for new SCSs, time line related aspects adapted to each of the new numerologies 480kHz and 960kHz, reference signals, scheduling particularly w.r.t. multi-PDSCH/PUSCH with a single DCI, HARQ, etc. In this summary, only issues related to bandwidth for new SCSs, time line related aspects adapted to each of the new numerologies 480kHz and 960kHz and reference signals are summarized. Issues related to scheduling particularly w.r.t. multi-PDSCH/PUSCH with a single DCI, HARQ are not in the scope of this summary.

# PDSCH/PUSCH enhancements for new SCSs

In this section, we provide a summary of issues, observations and proposals related to PDSCH/PUSCH enhancements for new SCSs discussed in the submitted contributions.

As in WID, the related objectives for this summary of agenda 8.2.5 are the following.

* Physical layer aspects including [RAN1]:
  + In addition to 120kHz SCS, specify new SCS, 480kHz and 960kHz, and define maximum bandwidth(s), for operation in this frequency range for data and control channels and reference signals, only NCP supported.

Note: Except for timing line related aspects, a common design framework shall be adopted for 480kHz to 960kHz

* + Time line related aspects adapted to 480kHz and 960kHz, e.g., BWP and beam switching timing, HARQ timing, UE processing, preparation and computation timelines for PDSCH, PUSCH/SRS and CSI, respectively.
  + Evaluate, and if needed, specify the PTRS enhancement for 120kHz SCS, 480kHz SCS and/or 960kHz SCS, as well as DMRS enhancement for 480kHz SCS and/or 960kHz SCS.

## 2.1. Channel bandwidth(s) related

### Individual observations/proposals

The following are individual observations/proposals from the contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sources | Observations/proposals |
| [22, Apple] | Conclusion 1: On the issue of maximum and minimum channel bandwidths, based on RAN4 feedback, the following can be concluded:   * Minimum Channel BW for 120 kHz: 100 MHz * Minimum Channel BW for 480 kHz: 400 MHz * Minimum Channel BW for 960 kHz: 400 MHz * Maximum Channel BW for 120 kHz: 400 MHz * Maximum Channel BW for 480 kHz: 1600 MHz   + BWs are applicable to both licensed and unlicensed channels subject to further review of licences spectrum block sizes.   The following issues are still pending:   * Maximum Channel BW for 960 kHz * Questions on channelization and # of RBS for each BW |

### Summary on bandwidth(s) related

In RAN1#104-e meeting, the following were agreed.

* From RAN1 perspective, for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
  + The maximum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz SCS is 400 MHz
  + The maximum channel bandwidth for 480 kHz SCS is 1600 MHz
  + The maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS is one of the following options
    - 2000 MHz
    - 2160 MHz
* Send LS to RAN4 to inform about RAN1’s agreement of maximum channel bandwidth and ask RAN4 to decide and feedback the exact value of maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS, the corresponding numbers of RBs for the maximum channel bandwidth of SCS(s) supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
* From RAN1 perspective, for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, at least the following options on minimum channel bandwidth are identified.
  + for 120 kHz SCS
    - Option 1-1: 100 MHz
    - Option 1-2: 200 MHz
    - Option 1-3: 400 MHz
  + for 480 kHz SCS
    - Option 2-1: 200 MHz
    - Option 2-2: 400 MHz
  + for 960 kHz SCS
    - Option 3-1: 400 MHz
    - Option 3-2: 800 MHz
    - Option 3-3: same value as the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz SCS
* Further study in RAN1 the above options’ implications on RAN1 design and specification
* Send LS to RAN4 to inform about RAN1’s identified options of minimum channel bandwidth and ask RAN4 to decide and feedback the minimum channel bandwidth

Only one contribution [22, Apple] submitted to this meeting discussed issues related to channel bandwidth where [22, Apple] concluded several bandwidth aspects based on RAN4’s reply LS and identified the remaining issues related to channel bandwidth(s).

Moderator’s comment:

It is moderator’s understanding that the remaining issues (the maximum channel bandwidth for 960 kHz and channelization etc.) are under the responsibility of RAN4 and no further discussion/agreement is needed in RAN1 before RAN4’s feedback.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes, we agree with the moderator’s comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree that this discussion is now in the hands of RAN4 |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the moderator’s comment |
| Intel | Agree with moderator, issue is assumed to be handled in RAN4.  On a side note, RAN4 has agreed to [2000] GHz for max CBW for 960kHz in last meeting (R4#99e). |
| Futurewei | Agree that RAN1 wait for RAN4 decision on the maximum channel bandwidth for 960kHz and channelization etc. |
| Samsung | We agree with moderator’s assessment. |
| Ericsson | Agree with moderator's assessment |
| DOCOMO | Agree with moderator’s assessment |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with moderator’s assessment |
| Apple | We are fine with the moderator’s assessment |
| vivo | Agree with moderator’s assessment |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with moderator’s assessment |
| InterDigital | We are fine with moderator’s assessment. |
| CATT | Agree with moderator’s assessment |

## 2.2. Timeline

### Individual observations/proposals

The following are individual observations and proposals from the contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sources | Observations/proposals |
| [1, Huawei] | Proposal 1: The absolute time of 120 kHz SCS timelines should be adopted by default unless the reduced value for specific timeline(s) can be verified by implementation.  Proposal 2: For single slot scheduling with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS, N1, N2 and N3 values providing same absolute processing time as that of 120 kHz SCS in FR2 is preferred. The values should be further studied for the case of multi slot scheduling after the detailed schemes are clear, which includes the position of DMRS, the number of PUCCHs for HARQ feedback, PTRS pattern.  Proposal 3: The value range of k0 and k2 should be extended to 0~128 and 0~256 for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS respectively.  Proposal 4: The value range of k1 should be defined for DCI format 1\_0, 1\_1 and 1\_2 separately:  For DCI format 1\_0: define a new set with scaled values for 480 kHz and 960 kHz respectively;   * {4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32} for 480 kHz * {8, 16, 24, 32, 40, 48, 56, 64} for 960 kHz   For DCI format 1\_1: define -1~63 and -1~127 as the value range of k1 for 480 kHz and 960 kHz;  For DCI format 1\_2: define 0~63 and 0~127 as the value range of k1 for 480 kHz and 960 kHz.  Proposal 5: For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS, Z1, Z2 and Z3 values providing same absolute processing time as that of 120 kHz SCS in FR2 is preferred. |
| [3, vivo] | Proposal 7: To design the timeline, we may need to investigate more on the target performance for a given UE and UE capability limitation.  Proposal 8: The default set for PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator should be adapted to the SCS of PDSCH. |
| [7, Lenovo] | Proposal 12: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, following enhancements should be supported to efficiently utilize UE’s limited processing capability to reduce latency and efficiently handle processing/preparation of CSI reports associated with multiple numerologies in parallel:   * Same reference symbols duration (possibly the shortest duration corresponding to maximum supported SCS value) could be used for checking CPU availability corresponding to different CSI reports associated with different SCS values |
| [8, Samsung] | Proposal 1: At least for PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2) and HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3), RAN1 strives to define a single value for each timeline per SCS with the consideration of worst case.  Proposal 2: Support SCS-specific K1/K2 by reusing existing default/configured K1/K2 plus a SCS specific offset. |
| [9, CATT] | Proposal 1: Compared with the processing time of 120 KHz SCS, considering the maximum system bandwidth and maximum PRB number can be scheduled, N1/N2 is proposed as follows   * For SCS=480 KHz, the N1/N2 can be 1.5 times as 120 KHz N1/N2 value. * For SCS=960 KHz, the N1/N2 can be 1.25 times as 480 KHz N1/N2 value.   Proposal 2: The range of k1 value specified for PDSCH HARQ process operation for 480 KHz/960 KHz SCS should take the N1 processing time into account with the starting slot from the value.  Proposal 3: The range of k2 value specified for PUSCH process for 480 KHz/960 KHz SCS should take the N2 processing time into account with the starting slot from the value. |
| [10, ZTE] | Proposal 7: For above 52.6GHz, a new UE capability for timeline related aspects should be defined based on slot (or symbol)-group granularity.  Proposal 8: Consider the phase noise estimation and compensation time on timeline design when PTRS is configured.  Proposal 9: The following methods can be considered to interpret k0, k1 and k2, and we prefer Method 1.   * Method 1: slot-group level unit can be defined for the value of k0, k1 and k2, that is the value indicated in the DCI is not the slot offset but the slot group offset. One slot group can include M slots. * Method 2: some new candidate values of k0, k1 and k2 should be defined considering the UE processing capability. * Method 3: the value range of k0, k1 and k2 is not changed and the unit is still the slot, but the actually used k0, k1 and k2 is an offset of the indicated value in the DCI, and the offset value is different for different SCS. |
| [13, Ericsson] | Observation 19 UE PDSCH/PUSCH processing timelines for SCS > 120 kHz need to be tightened compared to those for 120 kHz SCS to enable high performance NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.  Proposal 27 RAN1 should strive to narrow down the range of UE processing latencies as soon as possible, particularly those related PDSCH/PUSCH processing (N1, N2, N3), to enable multi-PDSCH/PUSCH design to proceed. A reasonable starting point for discussion is an exponential function a∙2^(b∙μ) fitted to the Rel-15 values that provides extrapolated values of N1, N2, and N3 for 480 and 960 kHz (µ = 5 and 6, respectively). The actual values to be specified can be discussed on a case-by-case basis. |
| [14, Futurewei] | Proposal 17. The absolute time duration for 120 kHz SCS, which now serves as the upper bound, can be directly used for 480kHz/960kHz SCSs without reductions, at least for the single-PDSCH/PUSCH cases.  Proposal 18. The slot configuration period is reused for 480kHz/960kHz SCS and the number of configuration slots is scaled accordingly. |
| [15, Nokia] | Proposal 13: Increase the maximum number of DL and UL HARQ processes from 16 to 32, for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs.  Table 3. Proposed processing times for PDSCH and PUSCH    Proposal 14: Consider proposing times shown in Table 3 for PDSCH and PUSCH.  Observation 2: CSI computation delay has relation with PDCCH decoding complexity including BD/CCE limit.  Proposal 15: Consider CSI computation delay parameters for new SCSs only after determination of BD/CCE limit for new SCSs.  Observation 3: Rel-15/16 schemes for CPU can be reused for 480kHz and/or 960kHz SCS.  Proposal 16: Deprioritize the discussion on the additional processing timelines below.   * UE PDSCH reception preparation time with cross carrier scheduling with different subcarrier spacings for PDCCH and PDSCH * SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH, PRACH cancellation with dynamic SFI * ZP CSI Resource set activation/deactivation * Application delay of the minimum scheduling offset restriction * timing aspects related to cross carrier operation |
| [18, Qualcomm] | Proposal 12: Revisit K1 values for SCS 480kHz and 960kHz after the discussions on the PDSCH processing timeline.  Proposal 24: The timeline calculations need to take into account the different cases for PDCCH monitoring, i.e., per-slot or multi-slot. This will require either one of the following   * Timeline is calculated based on the worst case * gNB and UE applies different processing timeline depending on PDCCH monitoring periodicity   Proposal 26: RAN1 design for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS, should assume a timeline similar to the absolute timeline of 120kHz. |
| [19, LG] | Proposal #20: Consider additional UE PDSCH processing procedure time (i.e., N1 symbols) when UE is required to perform both of CPE and ICI compensation, e.g., for 120 kHz SCS and 64 QAM.  Proposal #21: Indicated (or configured) value(s) for k0/k1/k2 can be interpreted as multiplied by M where M denotes the number of slots in a slot-group (if configured).  Proposal #22: The configured and default value of k1 (or PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback), should be adjusted to practical value considering the increased N1, e.g., ceil(N1/14) or floor(N1/14).  Proposal #23: The configured and default value of k2 should be adjusted to practical value considering the increased N2, e.g., ceil(N2/14) or floor(N2/14).  Proposal #24: The configured value of k0 should be adjusted to practical value considering the UE PDSCH reception preparation time with cross carrier scheduling with different numerologies for PDCCH and PDSCH.  Proposal #25: Consider the dependence of each other when determining the value range of k0 and k1.  Proposal #26: Consider CSI processing timeline enhancements for better availability for CPUs for multiple CSI reports associated with different numerologies. |
| [20, MediaTek] | Proposal 11: Support the absolute processing time duration for 120 kHz SCS as the basic UE capability on the processing timelines for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.   * FFS: the necessity of advanced timelines and the methodology for evaluation if advanced timelines are needed |
| [22, Apple] | Proposal 1: the absolute time duration of 120 kHz is adopted as the timeline for all UE processing timelines under consideration.   * The values of N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z1’, Z2, Z2’, Z3, and Z3’ should be set to the same absolute time as the same timeline for the 120 kHz SCS * Any tighter timelines that are proposed should be based on an additional UE capability.   Proposal 2: there should be a single set of timelines with no need to differentiate between single and multiple PDSCH scheduling.  Proposal 3: discuss and decide the values of k0/k1/k2 after N1/N2/N3 and multi-slot PDCCH monitoring details have been decided. |

### Summary on timeline

#### N1, N2 and N3

[1, Huawei] proposed that for single slot scheduling with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS, N1, N2 and N3 values providing same absolute processing time as that of 120 kHz SCS in FR2 is preferred. The values should be further studied for the case of multi slot scheduling after the detailed schemes are clear. Similarly, [14, Futurewei], [18, Qualcomm], [20, MediaTek] and [22, Apple] all proposed to take the same absolute time duration of 120 kHz as the timeline for 480 and 960 kHz.

On the other hand, [13, Ericsson] observed that UE PDSCH/PUSCH processing timelines for SCS > 120 kHz need to be tightened compared to those for 120 kHz SCS to enable high performance NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz. Furthermore, [13, Ericsson] took an exponential function a∙2^(b∙μ) fitted to the Rel-15 values that provides extrapolated values of N1, N2, and N3 for 480 and 960 kHz (µ = 5 and 6, respectively) as starting point for discussion.

[15, Nokia] analysed the relationship between UE processing timeline and the number of HARQ process and provided some example values of N1 and N2. [9, CATT] provided their values of N1 and N2 based on an analysis on the impact of channel bandwidth, the number of PRB and LDPC coding to UE processing timeline, where for SCS=480 KHz, the N1/N2 can be 1.5 times as 120 KHz N1/N2 value and for SCS=960 KHz, the N1/N2 can be 1.25 times as 480 KHz N1/N2 value.

Regarding whether the same timeline for single slot scheduling can be applied to multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, [8, Samsung] proposed that at least for PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2) and HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3), RAN1 strives to define a single value for each timeline per SCS with the consideration of worst case. Similarly, [22, Apple] proposed there should be a single set of timelines with no need to differentiate between single and multiple PDSCH scheduling. [18, Qualcomm] proposed the timeline calculations need to take into account the different cases for PDCCH monitoring, i.e., per-slot or multi-slot and it proposed two options: timeline is calculated based on the worst case or gNB and UE applies different processing timeline depending on PDCCH monitoring periodicity. On the same topic, [10, ZTE] proposed for above 52.6GHz, a new UE capability for timeline related aspects should be defined based on slot (or symbol)-group granularity.

The proposed values of N1, N2 and N3 from companies are summarized in the following tables.

Table 1 PDSCH processing time arrange for PDSCH processing capability 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | PDSCH decoding time *N1* [symbols] | |
| *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* = pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in both of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB* | *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* ≠ pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in either of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB*  *or if the higher layer parameter is not configured* |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 | 24 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 ([1, Huawei], [14, Futurewei], [18, Qualcomm], [20, MediaTek], [22, Apple])  30 ([9, CATT])  37 ([13, Ericsson])  40 ([15, Nokia]) | 96 ([1, Huawei], [14, Futurewei], [18, Qualcomm], [20, MediaTek], [22, Apple])  36 ([9, CATT]) |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 ([1, Huawei], [14, Futurewei], [18, Qualcomm], [20, MediaTek], [22, Apple])  42 ([9, CATT])  50 ([13, Ericsson])  80 ([15, Nokia]) | 192 ([1, Huawei], [14, Futurewei], [18, Qualcomm], [20, MediaTek], [22, Apple])  50 ([9, CATT]) |

Table 2 PUSCH preparation time for PUSCH timing capability 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | PUSCH preparation time *N2* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 36 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 144 ([1, Huawei], [14, Futurewei], [18, Qualcomm], [20, MediaTek], [22, Apple])  60 ([9, CATT])  91 ([13, Ericsson])  52 ([15, Nokia]) |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 288 ([1, Huawei], [14, Futurewei], [18, Qualcomm], [20, MediaTek], [22, Apple])  72 ([9, CATT])  144 ([13, Ericsson])  108 ([15, Nokia]) |

Table 3 Minimum gap between the second detected DCI and the beginning of the first PUCCH resources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline *N3* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 ([1, Huawei], [14, Futurewei], [18, Qualcomm], [20, MediaTek], [22, Apple])  37 ([13, Ericsson]) |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 ([1, Huawei], [14, Futurewei], [18, Qualcomm], [20, MediaTek], [22, Apple])  50 ([13, Ericsson]) |

Moderator’s comment:

During RAN1#104b-e, there’s a proposal “At least for PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2) and HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3), RAN1 strives to define a single value for each timeline per SCS. This single value of each timeline per SCS applies to both single PDSCH/PUSCH and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.”. No agreement was achieved as some companies don’t agree to such principle without knowing the details of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

During that discussion, one comment questioned the meaning of “single value for each timeline per SCS” and mentioned that there is another set of N1(N2) values for UE capability 2 captured in TS 38.214 Table 5.3-2(6.4-2). It is moderator’s understanding that only UE capability 1 is applicable to FR2 and hence for 480/960 kHz SCS (FR2-2), only PDSCH processing time (N1) for PDSCH processing capability 1 and PUSCH preparation time (N2) for PUSCH timing capability 1 should be defined. To clarify the scope and to align understanding among companies, the following proposal is formulated.

##### Proposal 2-1-1 (closed):

For NR operation in FR2-2 with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, value(s) for PDSCH processing time (N1) for PDSCH processing capability 1 and PUSCH preparation time (N2) for PUSCH timing capability 1 are to defined.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal 2-1-1 |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The proposal is fine but we already know that we need to define these values, so there is little point in agreeing to the proposal itself, unless we agree with the values at the same time. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Agree with proposal.  As for the values themselves. We are generally supportive of lower values (compared to what is available for 120kHz). At the same time, we understand this may have hardware implications. Therefore, open for discussions. In case identical time units as 120kHz case needs to be supported, we believe a secondary set of values for more advanced UEs should be then also supported. |
| Futurewei | Support that for PxSCH processing capacity 1, N1 and N2 are to be defined. |
| Moderator | Discussion closed. Please refer to Chair’s note for the relevant agreement. |

Moderator’s comment:

On the values of N1, N2 and N3, majority of companies proposed to take the same absolute time duration of 120 kHz SCS for 480 and 960 kHz without any further reduction. Note that the absolute time duration of 120 kHz SCS has been agreed as the upper bound previously. Formulate the following proposal to have the timeline values at least for single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling while keep the option open for any additional tightened timeline.

##### Proposal 2-1-2:

For NR operation in FR2-2, adopt the values of N1, N2 and N3 as in the following tables at least for single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

* FFS whether applicable to multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
* FFS whether to introduce additional UE capability with smaller values considering at least the following factors
  + PDCCH monitoring capability
  + Mix numerology scheduling
  + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
  + Cross-carrier scheduling

Table 2-2.1 PDSCH processing time arrange for PDSCH processing capability 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | PDSCH decoding time *N1* [symbols] | |
| *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* = pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in both of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB* | *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* ≠ pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in either of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB*  *or if the higher layer parameter is not configured* |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 | 24 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 | 96 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 | 192 |

Table 2-2.2 PUSCH preparation time for PUSCH timing capability 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | PUSCH preparation time *N2* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 36 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 144 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 288 |

Table 2-2.3 Minimum gap between the second detected DCI and the beginning of the first PUCCH resources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline *N3* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal 2-1-2 |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal |
| MediaTek | We are supportive to moderator’s proposal in general. In our view, we have following comments and suggestion for modification.   1. For the first FFS, in our understanding, it comes from Huawei, HilSilicon’s Tdoc R1-2106446, where the aspect of the gap between the DMRS location and the ending of the scheduled PDSCH varies with SCSs when multi-PDSCH scheduling is considered as shown in the figure below. Basically, such gap becomes shorter when SCS becomes larger due to the reduced symbol length. In our view, this observation should apply to single scheduled PDSCH as well. Furthermore, R1-2106446 also proposes the processing time should further increase if UE performs joint DMRS detection. In our view, both observation are potentially valid (even though DMRS enhancements are under discussion) and we think those aspects will contribute to longer processing time. 2. For the second FFS, we understand some companies want to reduce the processing timeline further and we are open to discussion. However, the factors listed in the sub-bullets seem to contradict the purpose from a UE vendor’s point of view. In particular, mix-numerology and cross-carrier scheduling should increase the processing complexity instead of reducing it. In fact, in Rel-15/16, both mix-numerology and cross-carrier scheduling have been addressed in the processing time formula specified in clause 5.3 TS 38.214. Furthermore, companies [R1-2107331 Qualcomm] [R1-2107727 Apple] also mention the potential need of studying cross-carrier scheduling, which we also support.   Based on the above comments, we suggest the following modification to the moderator’s proposal: Proposal 2-1-2: For NR operation in FR2-2, adopt the values of N1, N2 and N3 as in the following tables ~~at least~~ for single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.   * ~~FFS whether applicable to multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling~~ * FFS whether to introduce extra processing time in addition to N1, N2 and N3 considering at least the following factors for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling   + Gap between the last DMRS symbol and the ending symbol of PDSCH   + Mix numerology scheduling   + Cross-carrier scheduling   + Joint DMRS detection for multi-PDSCH scheduling * FFS whether to introduce additional UE capability with smaller values considering at least the following factors   + PDCCH monitoring capability   + ~~Mix numerology scheduling~~   + ~~Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling~~   + ~~Cross-carrier scheduling~~ |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We are generally fine with the proposal and would like to add an FFS.  FFS: Considering UE additional burden for ICI compensation at least at high MCS |
| Intel | While we are not objecting to Proposal 2-1.2, we think the removal of FFS on additional capability is critical issue for agreeing to the proposal. We believe it is technically feasible for certain UEs to support faster processing for 480 and 960kHz (with current state of art implementation), and to only support these cases that are same as 120kHz seem to be limiting technology that can be deployed in 60GHz.  We think the FFS should be removed and agree to supporting additional capability on top of Proposal 2-1.2. |
| Futurewei | Support to adopt values N1, N2, N3 in Table 2-2.1.  Fine with continue study whether additional UE capability is needed considering the aspects listed in the FFS. |
| Moderator | Based on the comments received during GTW session, formulate the following proposal 2-1-2a. |

##### Proposal 2-1-2a:

For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of N1, N2 and N3 as in the following tables for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

* RAN1 strives to study and introduce additional smaller values for UE capability 1 considering at least the following factors
  + PDCCH monitoring capability
  + Mix numerology scheduling
  + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
  + Cross-carrier scheduling

Table 2-2.1 PDSCH processing time arrange for PDSCH processing capability 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | PDSCH decoding time *N1* [symbols] | |
| *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* = pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in both of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB* | *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* ≠ pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in either of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB*  *or if the higher layer parameter is not configured* |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 | 24 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 | 96 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 | 192 |

Table 2-2.2 PUSCH preparation time for PUSCH timing capability 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | PUSCH preparation time *N2* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 36 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 144 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 288 |

Table 2-2.3 Minimum gap between the second detected DCI and the beginning of the first PUCCH resources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline *N3* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Intel | Ok with proposal 2-1-2a.  On the issue on whether the new values should be considered as capability 2. From our understanding the main difference between capability 1 and 2 is not only the faster timing but also how TBS is handled. For capability 2, gNB configured a specific cell to enable this for the UE, and how peak throughput is handled is quite different (see TS38.214 Section 5.1.3 and 6.1.4). The handling of TBS and per-celll enablement configuration is one of the key differences for capability 2.  Because of this, we think we should still work with capability 1 framework, as capability 2 is not supported for FR2 but only supported in FR1.  So what we are discussing is potentially additional set of values for capability 1. |
| Samsung | We are supportive to moderator’s proposal in general. Just need a clarification for the bullet part:   * RAN1 strives to study and introduce additional smaller values for UE capability 1 considering at least the following factors   + PDCCH monitoring capability   + Mix numerology scheduling   + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling   + Cross-carrier scheduling   We share the same view with MTK, at least some of these factors will increase the complexity instead of decreasing. While we understand the reason for this bullet, just wondering what is the result for this agreement if the aggregation of all factors will contribute as additional delay for the timeline?  Alt1) We end up with two set of N1/N2/N3 tables for UE capability 1   * 1. Apply smaller N1/N2/N3 table without these factors   2. Apply current N1/N2/N3 table with these factors   Alt2) Absorb all these factors. Keep current N1/N2/N3 value or squeeze value into smaller value if possible, assuming absolutely time for 120kHz is a good absolutely upper bound.  Alt3) Keep current value or squeeze table value to a smaller value, but put those factors with additional complexity into the timeline formulation.  The current proposal reads like 2 but we think 3 may be another choice.  We want to point out actual timeline is not exactly N1/N2/N3 value in 38.214, for example, for PDSCH processing time , it is defined as:    where and are used for adjusting extra delays due to factor like shorter PDSCH duration, overlapping with higher priority of PUCCH, LBT time , etc..  The approach like alt2) gives us a cleaner and simpler timeline but it reduces the flexibility due to different condition in current timeline formula. Is alt3) still under scope after this proposal? |
| MediaTek | Thanks Moderator’s proposal and we apologize that we misunderstood the wording of previous proposal. However, similar to Samsung, we still have some clarification question and comments regarding the following bullet   * RAN1 strives to study and introduce additional smaller values for UE capability 1 considering at least the following factors   First, we understand some companies would like to introduce more stringent processing timeline requirement and we are open to discuss it as long as the basic processing capabilities listed in the proposal are supported to ensure we have some fundamental processing requirement in the end of this WI. However, we fail to find the use cases which need much lower latency requirement than eMBB and it is still no clear to us the need for a lower latency requirement than what we have for FR2-1. In our view, it will be helpful to proceed the discussion of the additional advanced UE processing capability if companies can provide some information regarding the use cases with the latency requirements as potentail design target.  Second, assuming we do see the need to introduce additional smaller values for UE processing timeline capability, how to evaluate the processing timeline should be discussed in order to finalize the values. For example, it might be beneficial if we can come out with a specific evaluation setup, e.g., BD/CCE limit for single or multi-slot PDCCH monitoring, mix-numerology with the SCS ranges, instead of having the high level description on those aspects. In our view, without the specific evaluation setup, it might be difficult to converge the timeline values.  We also have the same clarification question as Samsung on the consequence of this bullet. If we eventually introduce an additional smaller value than the table listed in the proposal, does it mean we have two timeline values for UE capability 1 and UE can report the smaller value as optional UE capability? If that is the case, then what is the difference to introducing capability 2 to address the additional smaller value?  For the purpose of capability 2, we have different view from Intel. In our understanding, the purpose of capability 2 is to serve URLLC type low latency requirement. The condition on the RB size of capability 2 is to ensure UE can achieve such low latency timeline and URLLC service might not need large resource allocation.  Regarding the extra processing time pointed out by Samsung, we share the same view that need to be specified on top of N1/N2 values to complete the timeline discussion.  Therefore, we suggest the following modification on Proposal 2-1-2a Proposal 2-1-2a (high priority): For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of N1, N2 and N3 as in the following tables for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling as basic UE capability.   * RAN1 strives to study and introduce additional smaller values for optional UE capability 1 with a specific configuration setup considering at least the following factors for timeline evaluation   + PDCCH monitoring capability   + Mix numerology scheduling   + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling   + Cross-carrier scheduling * Specify the extra processing time in addition to N1, N2, and N3 at least for the following factors for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling   + Short PDSCH processing procedure   + Overlapped PUCCH/PUSCH resource with different priority(   + PUSCH resource and DM-RS multiplexing pattern   + BWP switching time ()   + Cross-carrier scheduling   + Mix numerology scheduling |
| Ericsson | We don't think the proper approach is being followed. Previously RAN1 agreed on an upper bound for the processing timelines as follows:  *RAN1 use the absolute time duration for 120 kHz SCS as the upper bound for the discussion of UE processing timelines*  So, the correct approach would be to now agree on a lower bound for the processing timelines, and then further discuss what value(s) to support within that range. This was the approach that was followed in Rel-15, for example for PDCCH monitoring capabilities.  Hence, our preference would be to adjust the proposal as follows, where the lower bound is a sort of "compromise" between companies that proposed lower values of N1/N2/N3, e.g., Nokia, Ericsson, CATT. Revised Proposal 2-1-2a (high priority): For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, further discuss adopting ~~at least the~~ value(s) of N1, N2 and N3 within the ranges ~~as~~ in the following tables for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.   * RAN1 to study and ~~strives to study and introduce additional smaller~~ decide on the value(s) for UE capability 1 considering at least the following factors   + PDCCH monitoring capability   + Mix numerology scheduling   + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling   + Cross-carrier scheduling   Table 2-2.1 PDSCH processing time arrange for PDSCH processing capability 1   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | PDSCH decoding time *N1* [symbols] | | | *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* = pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in both of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB* | *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* ≠ pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in either of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB*  *or if the higher layer parameter is not configured* | | 3 (120 kHz) | 20 | 24 | | 5 (480 kHz) | 40-80 | 48-96 | | 6 (960 kHz) | 80-160 | 96-192 |   Table 2-2.2 PUSCH preparation time for PUSCH timing capability 1   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | PUSCH preparation time *N2* [symbols] | | 3 (120 kHz) | 36 | | 5 (480 kHz) | 72-144 | | 6 (960 kHz) | 144-288 |   Table 2-2.3 Minimum gap between the second detected DCI and the beginning of the first PUCCH resources   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline *N3* [symbols] | | 3 (120 kHz) | 20 | | 5 (480 kHz) | 40-80 | | 6 (960 kHz) | 80-160 | |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. Also ok with striving to study and introduce additional smaller values. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with the proposal. |
| Apple | In general we are supportive of the proposal and the numbers proposed. However, similar to Samsung and MTK, we would like clarification on if the additional smaller numbers would be a separate set of numbers and if in that case the UE can select not to use the smaller numbers (effectively a UE capability without the additional elements that Intel points out). Ideally, this should not be specified based on the recent agreement made.  We support with MTK’s update to the proposal especially on the extra processing time addition elements. |
| vivo | For proposal 2-1-2a, needs clarification if introduced additional smaller values.  Values in tables as baseline and smaller values may replace the baseline, or  Values in tables as baseline for UE capability x, while smaller values can be applied according to the UE capability y.  Our understanding is that this will be discussed if RAN1 decide to introduce smaller values. |
| Nokia/NSB | For further progress, we are fine to support the simple scale up for processing time.  However, we think that there is a need to discuss the number of HARQ processes at the same time. It’s clear that 16 HARQ processes is not enough for such processing times ( 32 HARQ processes are need).  The example below shows the UE and gNB processing times in a multi-PDSCH scenario with the following assumptions:   * PDCCH monitoring periodicity: 8 slots * SCS = 960 kHz * 32 HARQ processes * N1 = 160 (OFDM symbols) * gNB processing time for UCI detection & PDSCH preparation = 160 OFDM symbols (this is quite tight already)   It can be noted that for given N1, contiguous DL transmission cannot be supported with 16 HARQ processes. Similar findings apply for PUSCH scheduling as shown in R1-2107108 (Section 4)    For the lower value, we think it should be clarified if the values are separate UE capability or define new UE capability. The red sentence is unclear.   * RAN1 strives to study and introduce additional smaller values for UE capability 1 considering at least the following factors |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | After the GTW session, our understanding of the sub-bullet “RAN1 strives to study and introduce additional smaller values for UE capability 1” is still unclear, as already pointed out by Samsung and Mediatek. If the additional smaller values are alternatives (Alt 1 from Samsung) to the values in the proposed tables, then these additional smaller values would constitute a separate (more demanding) capability. Even if these additional smaller values are specified under capability 1, the UE would only report one value between the larger or smaller value (i.e. the smaller value would be optional).  Since Rel-15 the more demanding capability has been called capability 2, so we are not sure why it is proposed to squeeze two capabilities inside one definition instead. As commented on the GTW session, we currently don’t think it is practical for a UE to support significantly smaller processing timelines compared to the values in the proposed tables (scaled from 120 kHz SCS). If the additional smaller values are only marginally smaller then it may not be worth introducing such capability.  We agree with Samsung and Mediatek that values for d1,1,d2,d2,1, and d2,2 need to be discussed before discussing additional smaller values of N1 and N2. In our view, defining multiple values for N1 and N2 has been precluded by the agreement on proposal 2-1-1, and we support the scaled values provided in the table of proposal 2-1-2a.  The main bullet proposes the same values of N1, N2 and N3 for multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling as for single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. We guess this actually means the following for N1 and N2:   * Alt1: For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of N1, N2 [and N3] as in the following tables for single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and for each PDSCH/PUSCH with multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling   Or it could mean the following (sufficient in our view):   * Alt2: For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of N1, N2 [and N3] as in the following tables for single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and for the first PDSCH/PUSCH with multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling   Practically Alt2 should be sufficient for defining N1 and N2 for the first PDSCH/PUSCH, because as long as the gNB ensures sufficient time for the first PDSCH/PUSCH then sufficient time will also be ensured for the PDSCHs/PUSCHs that are scheduled in later slots by the same DCI. Alt1 would also work even though N1 and N2 might be slightly larger than necessary for the second and subsequent PDSCHs/PUSCHs.  Timeline N3 could be handled with a separate bullet, because it is not obvious why it is relevant to single or multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling. |
| InterDigital | We support MediaTek’s updated proposal.  In addition, we do not sympathize the motivation to define additional values in addition to the proposed values under UE capability 1. As Huawei pointed out, complex UE implementation capability has been called as UE capability 2. If RAN1 need to define two sets of values, then we prefer to reuse the existing framework (i.e., UE capability 1 and UE capability 2) instead of having multiple values under UE capability 1. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal in principle. As mentioned by many companies, more clarifications are needed for the values of UE capability 1 and 2 |
| CATT | We have to first decide if only one set of values are going to be chosen, or two sets (larger + small). If only one set of value is going to chosen , which looks like it’s going to happen, then we should not only choose the upper bound value.  In this sense we share some of the view from Ericsson, right now it looks like only the upper bound value are going to be adopted. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | 1. Respond to question/comments from Samsung, MediaTek, Apple, vivo, Nokia, Huawei, InterDigital and Qualcomm on clarification to UE capability 1 and 2:  First of all, the intention of previous agreement on proposal 2-1-1 is to assure we define values for N1 and N2 following existing UE capability 1 framework as in TS 38.214.  On the potential outcome of the bullet, it is up to RAN1 as a group to decide whether we can agree on some smaller values after the study with consideration on those factors. If agreed to be introduced, again, it is up to RAN1 to decide whether we replace values in the proposed tables with smaller values or allow different set of values. If agreed to have multiple set of values for N1/N2/N3, it is still up to RAN1 to decide how we put them as UE capability.  The intention of the bullet is to keep the door open for any further potential reduction of timeline. This bullet is not intending to imply any baseline or optional UE capability discussion which may happen later.  2. Respond to comments from Samsung on potential extra delay:  We agreed that the absolute time duration of 120 kHz SCS is the upper bound. I believe companies are confident that they can achieve that with consideration of potential aspects in other AI of this WI. Furthermore, on the factors of e.g., PDCCH monitoring and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, I noticed companies made relevant proposals already with timeline consideration. On your speculation of “if the aggregation of all factors will contribute as additional delay”, if that happens, RAN1 will then discuss and decide accordingly.  3. Respond to comments from Samsung, MediaTek, Apple and Huawei on other timelines:  Thanks for bring up those other timelines. As we agreed in RAN1#104, N1/N2/N3, k0/k1/k2 and Z1/Z2/Z3 are prioritized. If we can make progress on those prioritized timelines, we may have time to discuss on other aspects. However, I don’t see why those timelines should be coupled into the proposal for values for N1/N2/N3.  4. Respond to Ericsson and CATT:  On Ericsson’s proposal to agree on a range instead of values, I’m not sure that’s much progress compared to the table I summarized based on contributions. We still need to decide what value to take even we were to agree the range for now.  It has been three meetings since we discussed timelines. We made some progress on prioritization for discussion, upper bound of timeline and case-by-case study methodology. However, we don’t have the values of N1/N2/N3 so that other discussion topics can proceed, e.g., k0/k1/k2 and Z1/Z2/Z3, let alone other timelines.  On whether this is “proper” approach, as the moderator, I summarized and make proposal based on all companies’ input. The proposal is already a “compromise” which acknowledged the upper bound agreement and keep it open for further tightening considering some companies want even relax timelines.  5. Respond to Huawei’s comment on multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling:  I originally made proposal 2-1-2 for the exact reason as the definition of N1/N2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling is not finalized. Proposal 2-1-2a is based on the comment raised in GTW session to cover multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling as well. I believe the intention is to make a bit more progress by have the same values for both cases.  With that, I don’t see why put N3 in the main bullet cause any problem. For single and/or multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, the values of N1/N2/N3 are listed in the proposed tables. I’m not sure I get your point that N3 defined as “Minimum gap between the second detected DCI and the beginning of the first PUCCH resources” is not relevant to single or multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling.  I’ll put Alt1 and Alt2 as FFS sub-bullets for the definition of N1/N2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.  6. Respond to Nokia:  Number of HARQ process for multi-PDSCH scheduling is in the scope of another email discussion.  Wording updated below to address comments. |

##### Proposal 2-1-2b:

For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of N1, N2 and N3 as in the following tables for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

* Down select between the following two options of N1/N2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
  + N1/N2 correspond to each PDSCH/PUSCH
  + N1/N2 correspond to the first PDSCH/PUSCH
* RAN1 strives to study and introduce smaller values considering at least the following factors
  + PDCCH monitoring capability
  + Mix numerology scheduling
  + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
  + Cross-carrier scheduling

Table 2-2.1 PDSCH processing time arrange for PDSCH processing capability 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | PDSCH decoding time *N1* [symbols] | |
| *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* = pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in both of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB* | *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* ≠ pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in either of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB*  *or if the higher layer parameter is not configured* |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 | 24 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 | 96 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 | 192 |

Table 2-2.2 PUSCH preparation time for PUSCH timing capability 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | PUSCH preparation time *N2* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 36 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 144 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 288 |

Table 2-2.3 Minimum gap between the second detected DCI and the beginning of the first PUCCH resources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline *N3* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| MediaTek | Thanks Moderator’s reply to our previous question and comments on the bullet   * RAN1 strives to study and introduce smaller values considering at least the following factors   However, we still have concerns on the consequence of the bullet.  Based on the explanation provided by Moderator, the potential smaller value discussed in the future will lead to  outcome1. replace the larger values as the only processing timeline or  outcome2. introduce another capability to capture the smaller value  depending on RAN1 discussion.  As a UE vendor, outcome1 has a severe impact on our implementation since the processing timeline requirements are the most fundamental aspect which should not be changed from time to time. Once our products are designed based on the larger processing timeline values, it is impossible to suddenly change the design based on the reduced processing timeline. We would also like to remind companies that we only have 3 meeting (including the ongoing one) left for the timeline discussion. We are not confident that we can converge to a smaller timeline values before the end of the WI for Rel-17 product and we definitely don’t prefer to change the only processing timeline requirements even in the beginning of next year. Therefore, we should not leave any door open for the outcome1 and we suggest the following modification to facilitate the discussion of more stringent timeline values. Proposal 2-1-2b (high priority): For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of N1, N2 and N3 as in the following tables for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling as basic UE capability.   * RAN1 strives to study and introduce smaller values for optional UE capability considering at least the following factors with a specific configuration setup for timeline evaluation   + PDCCH monitoring capability   + Mix numerology scheduling   + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling   + Cross-carrier scheduling   Regarding the bullet   * Down select between the following two options of N1/N2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling   + N1/N2 correspond to each PDSCH/PUSCH   + N1/N2 correspond to the first PDSCH/PUSCH   We think the PDSCH and PUSCH should be discussed separately.  For PUSCH, two options are equivalent (in our view).  For PDSCH, we already agreed that K1 values signaled in the DCI will indicate the slot gap between the last scheduled PDSCH and the HARQ information transmission resource. Therefore, we think N1 should correspond to the last scheduled PDSCH, i.e., the minimum time gap between the last scheduled PDSCH to the PUCCH resource carrying the HARQ information |
| Moderator | Respond to MediaTek’s comment:  I assume MediaTek will join the future discussion to decide how to proceed on potential small values for N1/N2/N3 if agreed by RAN1. In that case, you will have chance to speak against outcome1 if you still have concern on replacing with smaller values by then. 3GPP is consensus based. I don’t get what’s the concern on the consequence of the bullet when you are part of the decision group.  On your suggested “basic/optional UE capability”. I don’t know how to interpret “basic” given support of 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS may be optional to begin with. Currently, there’s only one set of values in the proposal. It does not make sense to mention basic/optional UE capability when we don’t have another set of values to discuss.  Thanks for your comment regarding N1/N2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, I’ll let other companies comment first and will address that in my next round of revision of proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the Proposal 2-1-2b |
| Apple | We agree with MediaTek on the issue of outcome 1 on UE implementation. We are fine with the numbers proposed in the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We support the main bullet and the second bullet “striving to reduce ….”. However, we want more clarification for the second bullet for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. We don’t see why the N1 can only be applied to certain PDSCH/PUSCH(s).  Taking N1 as an example, in our understanding, the N1 represents the required time to decode PDSCH and prepare HARQ-ACK. If UE can decode PDSCH right after reception of the PDSCH, the N1 is directly applied and we can estimate the earliest time when HARQ-ACK can be reported. Therefore, in our understanding, the key point for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling is: when UE can start processing each PDSCH, and when can UE starting transmitting PUSCH? We would like to check what is the common understanding among the following for N1 and N2 each.   * For multi-PDSCH scheduling, can UE starting process each PDSCH separately (i.e. the first PDSCH can be processed after reception of the first PDSCH) or after reception of all PDSCHs (i.e. the first PDSCH can be processed after reception of the last PDSCH)?   + For the former case, we don’t think N1 needs separate consideration for any scheduling case. It surely can be applied for any PDSCH. And this is our understanding for multi-PDSCH reception.   + For the latter case, N1 value represents the required time to process multiple PDSCHs. The value will be dependent on number of scheduled PDSCHs. * For multi-PUSCH scheduling, can UE transmit PUSCH based on prepared state for the specific PUSCH, or based on prepared state of all PUSCHs?   + If UE can transmit a PUSCH according to preparation of the PUSCH itself, regardless of whether the last PUSCH has been prepared or not, N2 surely can be applied for any PUSCH. And this is our understanding for multi-PUSCH.   + If UE can transmit the first PUSCH only after all PUSCHs have been processed, N2 value represents the required time to process multiple PUSCHs. The value will be dependent on number of scheduled PDSCHs. |
|  |  |
| Moderator2 | Respond to DOCOMO:  Thanks for DOCOMO’s comment. Apologies for my mix of N1/N2 to k0/k1/k3 definition for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. You were right, given N1/N2 is UE capability, it applies to any scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH.  Wording update below into proposal 2-1-2c. |

##### Proposal 2-1-2c (closed):

For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of N1, N2 and N3 as in the following tables for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

* Note: N1/N2 applies to any PDSCH/PUSCH for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
* RAN1 strives to study and introduce smaller values considering at least the following factors
  + PDCCH monitoring capability
  + Mix numerology scheduling
  + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
  + Cross-carrier scheduling

Table 2-2.1 PDSCH processing time arrange for PDSCH processing capability 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | PDSCH decoding time *N1* [symbols] | |
| *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* = pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in both of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB* | *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* ≠ pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in either of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB*  *or if the higher layer parameter is not configured* |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 | 24 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 | 96 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 | 192 |

Table 2-2.2 PUSCH preparation time for PUSCH timing capability 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | PUSCH preparation time *N2* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 36 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 144 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 288 |

Table 2-2.3 Minimum gap between the second detected DCI and the beginning of the first PUCCH resources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline *N3* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| LG Electronics | Regarding introducing smaller values in the 2nd bullet, we are in favor of studying/introducing smaller values, whether as separate capabilities or separate sets.  We also support the approach of setting the lower bound as in Ericsson's comment above (for 2-1-2a). Of course, it will be easier to determine k0,k1,k2 after the values of N1,N2,N3 are determined, but I think it would be sufficient to discuss based on the upper/lower bound. Not sure if we can discuss k0,k1,k2 only after we set the values of N1,N2,N3 correctly.  Regarding the extra processing time (d1,1, d2, d2,1, d2,2), we are supportive to discuss after determining N1,N2,N3. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | Support the proposal |
| Apple | We are in general fine with the proposal. On the issue of introducing smaller values, we feel that any smaller values should be optional. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Intel | Generally ok with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| MediaTek | Thanks to Moderator’s reply to our previous comment and let us try to clarify our intention a little bit more.  In our previous comment, we simply showed our concerns regarding changing the fundamental processing timeline from a UE vendor perspective and we don’t intend to force companies to take our preference as agreement. In fact, we value all the comments from companies and try to find out a way forward to address the concerns from different companies and facilitate the discussion.  From our observation, companies do have separated views on the timeline values but it seems like we don’t see any company have concerns on introducing two capabilities where one considers larger values and the other one considers smaller values. In fact, The same type of debating occurred in Rel-15 timeline discussion and the conclusion is to have two capabilities for 15kHz, 30kHz, and 60kHz to address the scenarios with different latency requirements. We think the same strategy can be considered and the benefits can be:   1. Facilitate the discussion of the stringent timeline (smaller value): In our view, it can be hard to design a single timeline to accommodate all concerns from the companies. If we can have a flexible timeline for scheduling under most of the cases for majority of UEs, then we can focus the discussion on how to proceed with the evaluation of stringent timeline. Otherwise, companies will still evaluate the timeline based on their own simulation assumptions and propose different values in the next meeting. Then a lots of time will be spent on whether to replace the only one timeline, which can be a very hard decision (similar to SSB SCS discussion, in our view) 2. Ensure we have a stable timeline for Rel-17 implementation: As we mentioned before, due to the lack of meeting time resource and physical discussion with other companies, it might be beneficial to have at least one stable timeline before the end of WI and companies can begin the implementation based on it. The other issue of changing timeline requirement is the related scheduling design, e.g., whether BD/CCE limit need to adjust, whether HARQ ID number need to decrease/increase, which can draw a lot of discussion only one value can be agreed.   We agree with Moderator’s assessment that all our concerns on changing timeline can be addressed later but we simply would like to check with companies that whether having two separated timelines can be the consensus to move forward. If no companies object it, then we can have some modification on top of Moderator’s proposal with the benefit mentioned above. |
| Moderator | Respond to MediaTek:  As you mentioned, Rel-15 defined two UE capabilities for 15kHz, 30kHz, and 60kHz to cover eMBB and URLLC. Note that UE capability 2 is not applicable to 120 kHz, which is why we made the agreement on 2-1-1 to ensure we define UE processing capability for 480 and 960 kHz SCS following UE capability 1 framework.  I don’t know if any company have concerns on introducing two capabilities where one considers larger values and the other one considers smaller values. Up to this meeting, I haven’t seen any company proposing two sets of timeline values for consideration as two UE capabilities. Without the 2nd set of values on the table, I don’t know what to formulate on supporting two separated timelines.  I encourage other companies to provide input on this. |
| Ericsson | We would like to provide 2 comments:   1. As we raised on the reflector, one concern we have about the simple scaling of N1/N2/N3 from 120 kHz is that when N1 becomes so large, it can easily lead to HARQ process starvation, and hence degraded peak continuous throughput which is not good from a technology capability perspective. Hence we think that the issue of increasing the number of HARQ processes should be discussed in parallel with the N1/N2/N3 timeline discussion. We are concerned about the fact that these are currently discussed separately and in separate agenda items. 2. I think MediaTek raises a good point, and it is also related to LGE's comment about discussion a range of values (based on our comment). It seems too early to lock onto only one set of values that only follow the simple scaling rule from 120 kHz. I don't think the intention of the below agreement was to stop discussion on potentially having 2 sets of values. At least during the GTW there were questions on what this agreement meant, and the response was that the framework is used, but it didn't sound to me like there was no scope for discussing potentially different sets of values – one with simple scaling, and one more tight.   Agreement:  For NR operation with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, value(s) for PDSCH processing time (N1) for PDSCH processing capability 1 and PUSCH preparation time (N2) are to be defined for PDSCH/PUSCH timing capability 1 only. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal.  Taking into account MediaTek’s good comments, if all four factors within the second bullet need to be considered and concluded, it does not seem very feasible that a smaller set of values can be introduced by the end of Rel-17. Some prioritizations over the factors might be helpful. |
|  |  |
| Moderator2 | Respond to Ericsson:  1. Thanks for raising this issue. I guess some guidance from Chair is needed here on how to proceed.  2. I don’t see how this proposal 2-1-2c limit to only one set of values. In fact, the intention of the bullet “RAN1 strives to study and introduce smaller values considering at least the following factors…” is to encourage RAN1 study further on different values.  Yes, your understanding is correct that previous agreement on 2-1-1 you quoted does not prevent discussion on potentially different set of values. I have already clarified in my response to multiple companies for proposal 2-1-2a. I copied below again.  “On the potential outcome of the bullet, it is up to RAN1 as a group to decide whether we can agree on some smaller values after the study with consideration on those factors. If agreed to be introduced, again, it is up to RAN1 to decide whether we replace values in the proposed tables with smaller values or allow different set of values. If agreed to have multiple set of values for N1/N2/N3, it is still up to RAN1 to decide how we put them as UE capability.”  So, potential tightened values are not precluded. Neither is a different set of values.  Given some companies have strong preference to agree on a range instead of value for now. I formulated the following proposal 2-1-2c.Alt which is copied from Ericsson’s proposal in their comment to proposal 2-12a with note added on N/1N2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.  Note that only one of proposal 2-1-2c and 2-1-2c.Alt is to be chosen. Companies are encouraged to provide their preference toward proposal 2-1-2c or 2-1-2c.Alt, or their version of potential agreeable proposal. |
| Moderator3 | Discussion is closed. Refer to Chair’s notes for the agreement. |

##### Proposal 2-1-2c.Alt (closed):

For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, further discuss adopting value(s) of N1, N2 and N3 within the ranges in the following tables for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

* Note: N1/N2 applies to any PDSCH/PUSCH for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
* RAN1 to study and decide on the value(s) considering at least the following factors
  + PDCCH monitoring capability
  + Mix numerology scheduling
  + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
  + Cross-carrier scheduling

Table 2-2.1 PDSCH processing time arrange for PDSCH processing capability 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | PDSCH decoding time *N1* [symbols] | |
| *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* = pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in both of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB* | *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* ≠ pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in either of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB*  *or if the higher layer parameter is not configured* |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 | 24 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 40-80 | 48-96 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 80-160 | 96-192 |

Table 2-2.2 PUSCH preparation time for PUSCH timing capability 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | PUSCH preparation time *N2* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 36 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 72-144 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 144-288 |

Table 2-2.3 Minimum gap between the second detected DCI and the beginning of the first PUCCH resources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline *N3* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 40-80 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 80-160 |

Note that only one of proposal 2-1-2c and 2-1-2c.Alt is to be chosen. Companies are encouraged to provide their preference toward proposal 2-1-2c or 2-1-2c.Alt, or their version of potential agreeable proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Intel | Between 2-1-2c and 2-1-2c.Alt, our preference is 2-1-2c.  However, we do recognize that is issue is important for UE and gNB vendors all alike. We would be also ok to accept 2-1-2c as well as it does incorporate our concern on not being able to consider additional values for cap#1 from the original 2-1-2 proposal. |
| InterDigital | We prefer the original proposal 2-1-2c. |
| CATT | We agree with MTK we need to first decide if one set or two set of values are to be chosen. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer the original proposal 2-1-2c |
| LG Electronics | We prefer 2-1-2c.Alt |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine to study with smaller values, but without promising candidate values the feasibility of the new values is questioning. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer the original proposal 2-1-2c. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer Proposal 2-1-2c, as it ensures some progress by agreeing now on values that we know are feasible, and allows RAN1 to further discuss smaller values, for which we assume proponents will provide an analysis (and not just a wish list) to convince us and other companies of the feasibility at a later meeting.  In response to Ericsson’s comment, we recognize that there is a potential HARQ process starvation issue with scaled values of proposal 2-1-2c, and we also recognize that increasing the number of HARQ processes to 32 would solve that problem and therefore we would be supportive of that, especially since we expect that the NR NTN agreement to support 32 HARQ processes would naturally apply to terrestrial networks once implemented in the Rel-17 specifications as it comes with no additional specification complexity. |
| Moderator | Discussion is closed. Refer to Chair’s notes for the agreement based on proposal 2-1-2c. |

#### k0, k1 and k2

[3, vivo] proposed the default set of PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing (k1) indicator should be adapted to the SCS of PDSCH. Similarly, [19, LG] proposed that the configuration and default value of k1 and k2, should be adjusted to practical value considering the increased N1 and N2 respectively, examples are given as ceil(N1/14) or floor(N1/14) for k1 and ceil(N2/14) or floor(N2/14) for k2. [9, CATT] proposed the range of k1 (k2) value specified for PDSCH (PUSCH) HARQ process operation for 480 kHz/960 kHz SCS should take the N1 (N2) processing time into account with the starting slot/offset from the value ⌊N1/14⌋ (⌊N2/14⌋). [8, Samsung] also proposed to support SCS-specific K1/K2 by reusing existing default/configured K1/K2 plus a SCS specific offset.

[10, ZTE] proposed multiple methods to interpret k0, k1 and k2 where their preferred method is to define slot-group level unit for the value of k0, k1 and k2, that is the value indicated in the DCI is not the slot offset but the slot group offset where one slot group can include M slots. [19, LG] proposed that the indicated (or configured) value(s) for k0/k1/k2 can be interpreted as multiplied by M where M denotes the number of slots in a slot-group (if configured).

[1, Huawei] proposed value range of k0 and k2 considering scaled TDD configuration and non-continuous resource mapping in time domain. [1, Huawei] also proposed values of k1 for DCI format 1\_0, 1\_1 and 1\_2 separately. [9, CATT] thought the range of K0 value should not be changed for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS. While [19, LG] proposed the configuration and default value of k0 should be adjusted to practical value considering the UE PDSCH reception preparation time with cross carrier scheduling with different numerologies for PDCCH and PDSCH.

[18, Qualcomm] proposed to visit K1 values for SCS 480kHz and 960kHz after the discussions on the PDSCH processing timeline while [22, Apple] proposed to discuss and decide the values of k0/k1/k2 after N1/N2/N3 and multi-slot PDCCH monitoring details have been decided.

Proposed values of k0, k1 and k2 are summarized in the following table.

Table 4 k0, k1 and k2 values

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Notation** | **Range** | **Default value** |
| k0 | * Option 1: 0 ~ 128 for 480 kHz, 0 ~ 256 for 960 kHz ([1, Huawei]) * Option 2: 0 ~ 32 ([9, CATT]) |  |
| k1 | * Option 1 ([1, Huawei]):   for DCI format 1\_0: {4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32} for 480 kHz and {8, 16, 24, 32, 40, 48, 56, 64} for 960 kHz  for DCI format 1\_1: -1~63 for 480 kHz and -1~127 for 960 kHz  for DCI format 1\_2: 0~63 for 480 kHz and 0~127 for 960 kHz   * Option 2 ([3, vivo], [8, Samsung], [9, CATT], [19, LG]): existing range + offset where offset is ceil(N1/14) or floor(N1/14) |  |
| k2 | * Option 1 ([1, Huawei]): 0 ~ 128 for 480 kHz, 0 ~ 256 for 960 kHz * Option 2 ([8, Samsung], [9, CATT], [19, LG]): existing range + offset where offset is ceil(N2/14) or floor(N2/14) | * ([8, Samsung], [9, CATT], [19, LG]):   ceil(N2/14) or floor(N2/14) |

Moderator’s comment:

There’s proposal to defer the discussion due to relationship between some of the values of k0/k1/k2 to UE processing time (N1/N2/N3). Although it may be difficult to agree upon value ranges of k0/k1/k2, it may be useful to see whether we can keep the definition/interpretation of k0/k1/k2. Formulate the following proposal on the definition of k0/k1/k2.

##### Proposal 2-2:

Keep the existing definition of k0, k1 and k2 for FR2-2. That is

* the value of k0 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PDSCH in number of slots
* the value of k1 indicates the slot offset between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK in number of slots
* the value of k2 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PUSCH in number of slots

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to above proposal 2-2 and/or potential agreeable proposals on the value ranges and/or default values for k0, k1 and k2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal 2-2 |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with proposal, we would like to add  FFS: extending the range of values of k0/k1/k2 for SCS 480kHz/960kHz |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal and would prefer to have another discussion on the range of values of k0/k1/k2 rather than having an FFS, or otherwise add a note (if this was Qualcomm’s intent):  *Note: the range of values of k0/k1/k2 for SCS 480kHz/960kHz is to be further discussed, and it should be discussed separately for DCI format 1\_0 and DCI format 1\_1* |
| LG Electronics | We agree with the proposal. Qualcomm’s FFS is also fine. |
| Intel | Ok with Proposal 2-2. |
| Futurewei | The definitions in Proposal 2-2 needs to be clearer, since there can be seperate k0’s, k1’s, and k2’s for multiple PxSCH. Consider specify that these ki’s indicate slot offset(s) between DCI and its scheduled PDSCH(s) in a multi-slot. |
| Moderator | Wording update based on comments received during GTW session into proposal 2-2a. |

##### Proposal 2-2a:

* For single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, keep the existing definition of k0, k1 and k2 for NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS. That is
  + the value of k0 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PDSCH in number of slots
  + the value of k1 indicates the slot offset between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK in number of slots
  + the value of k2 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PUSCH in number of slots
* FFS the definitions for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to above proposal and/or potential agreeable proposals on the value ranges and/or default values for k0, k1 and k2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Intel | Ok with Proposal 2-2a |
| Samsung | We don’t mind agreeing with the proposal, but we didn’t see an essential progress by agreeing on the proposal… The most controversial/interesting part is in the FFS. |
| Ericsson | Sort of agree with Samsung that it doesn't seem to move the needle forward to much. I understand that the intention is to agree that k0/k1/k2 are measured in slots rather than OFDM symbols or slot groups, and it seems like we could do that for both single and multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. For multi-PDSCH, it seems that we will still need the notion of a slot offset, but the open question is whether the slot offsets are relative to the first PDSCH, the last PDSCH, or some other PDSCH. That question is being addressed in Seonwook's agenda item for the TDRA table design. |
| DOCOMO | We are generally fine with the proposal. And we hope to keep the same slot unit for k0/k1/k2 definition applied for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling case. |
| ZTE, Sanechip | We agree with the proposal. |
| Apple | Agreeing that kx is based on slots and not multiple slots for the multi-PxSCH case can be seen as progress. Otherwise agree with the previous commenters that the current agreement is not much change. |
| vivo | Suggest to reformulate as below for the 2nd bullet.  FFS the unit of k0, k1 and k2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling after the definitions for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling are decided. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the proposal could simply be:  **For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, k0, k1 and k2 are signalled in the unit of slot for single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, and for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling by a single DCI.**  The proposal could stop after the comma if we want to take the discussion separately for multi-slot scheduling by a single DCI, but as other companies have commented we think we can make progress for both single slot and multiple slots scheduling.  Huawei was one of the original proponents for changing the unit of k0, k1 and k2 to multiple slots in case of multi-slot scheduling with a single DCI. But after reviewing the analysis from other companies we acknowledge that this may introduce undesirable scheduling restrictions. Keeping the unit as one slot and increasing the range of values of k0, k1 and k2 is a preferable alternative. The values of k1 should be discussed separately for DCI format 1\_0 and DCI format 1\_1. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| CATT | We agree with the proposal. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to comments from Samsung, Ericsson, Apple and Huawei:  I take that your comments are not objecting this proposal but prefer more progress in terms of agreement for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH part.  First of all, the discussion of how to interpret (i.e. definition) of k0/k1/k2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling is on-going in another email discussion.  Reading from all contributions, even for single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, companies have different assumption/interpretation when they proposed value ranges for k0/k1/k2. Some proposed the range assuming slot while others proposed to keep the existing range but interpret value as slot-group. How can we agree on the value range if we don’t even have a common understanding on the definitions?  Wording update below (removed FFS bullet as that is in the scope of another email discussion). |

##### Proposal 2-2b (closed):

* For single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, keep the existing definition of k0, k1 and k2 for NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS. That is
  + the value of k0 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PDSCH in number of slots
  + the value of k1 indicates the slot offset between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK in number of slots
  + the value of k2 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PUSCH in number of slots

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to above proposal and/or potential agreeable proposals on the value ranges and/or default values for k0, k1 and k2.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views | |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the Proposal 2-2b | |
| DOCOMO | Support Proposal 2-2b. | |
| Apple | We are okay with the proposal | |
| Ericsson | We support Proposal 2-2b | |
| LG Electronics | We are okay with the proposal.  In fact, we prefer to take the discussion for single- and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling together like Huawei. In this case, we agree with the HW’s comment that it may be more efficient to have a slot unit rather than a slot-group unit. However, if the discussion is made separately, the FL proposal is also fine to us. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | We support the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Intel | Ok with proposal. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Seems proposal 2-2b is acceptable.  Given several comments proposing to include multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling as well, I formulate below Proposal 2-2b.Alt to see if we can move a bit further. |
| Moderator2 | Discussion is closed. Refer to Chair’s notes for the agreement based on proposal 2-2b.Alt. |

##### Proposal 2-2b.Alt (closed):

* When defining value ranges and/or default values for k0/k1/k2 for NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, RAN1 assumes the following definitions
  + the value of k0 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PDSCH in number of slots
  + the value of k1 indicates the slot offset between the slot of the last PDSCH scheduled by the DCI and the slot carrying the HARQ-ACK information corresponding to the scheduled PDSCHs in number of slots
  + the value of k2 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PUSCH in number of slots

Companies are encouraged to provide comments to above proposal and/or potential agreeable proposals on the value ranges and/or default values for k0, k1 and k2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | Support Proposal 2-2b.Alt in principle, but one question: What is the intention of "default values?" |
| Futurewei | Support Proposal 2-2b.Alt. Note that there is an ongoing discussion within 8.2.5(2) on moving certain timeline-related issues to 8.2.5(1). It might be good to coordinate to avoid missing a discussion from both threads. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal 2-2b |
| Moderator | Respond to Ericsson:  It simply refers to the discussion/decision work for RAN1 on k0/k1/k2 as we laid out in RAN1#104-e “configuration(s)/default values of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH)”. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal 2-2b.Alt |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the proposal 2-2b.Alt |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Proposal 2-2b.Alt. Our understanding is that the default values are the values that apply for DCI Format 1\_0 and DCI Format 0\_0. |
| Moderator2 | Discussion is closed. Refer to Chair’s notes for the agreement. |

#### Z1, Z2 and Z3

[1, Huawei] proposed that for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS, Z1, Z2 and Z3 values providing same absolute processing time as that of 120 kHz SCS in FR2 is preferred. [18, Qualcomm] proposed that RAN1 design for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS, should assume a timeline similar to the absolute timeline of 120kHz.

[15, Nokia] thought CSI computation delay has relation with PDCCH decoding complexity including BD/CCE limit and proposed to consider CSI computation delay parameters for new SCSs only after determination of BD/CCE limit for new SCSs.

Moderator’s comment:

Similar to the case of N1 and N2, current specification defines two CSI computation delay requirement captured in TS 38.214 Table 5.4-1 and 5.4-2, where the CSI computation delay requirement 1 in NR is defined for a very restricted/simplistic scenario in which only wideband CQI corresponding to up to 4 CSI-RS port in a single CSI resource without CRI report is requested and only single-panel codebook is configured.

It is moderator’s understanding that CSI computation delay requirement 2 is applicable to FR2-2. To clarify the scope and to align understanding among companies, the following proposal is formulated.

##### Proposal 2-3-1 (closed):

For NR operation in FR2-2 with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, value(s) for CSI computation delay requirement 2 are to be defined.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal 2-3-1 |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The proposal is fine but we already know that we need to define these values, so there is little point in agreeing to the proposal itself, unless we agree with the values at the same time. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We would be ok to accept the proposal 2-3-1. |
| Futurewei | Agree that the CSI computation delay requirement 2 is applicable to FR2-2. |
| Moderator | Discussion closed. Please refer to Chair’s note for the relevant agreement. |

Moderator’s comment:

On the values of Z1, Z2 and Z3, with very limited input on these values, it is not easy to derive any agreeable values. Two approaches can be considered:

1. Choose the values of Z1/Z2/Z3 for 480 and 960 kHz SCS to maintain the same absolute time duration as that of 120 kHz SCS in FR2. The logic is similar to the case of N1/N2/N3 and also considering the relevant agreement of UE reported capability *beamReportTiming* and *beamSwitchTiming* (both are related to CSI computation time as captured in TS 38.214 Table 5.4-2) for 480 and 960 kHz are scaled from that of 120 kHz SCS.
2. Defer the discussion/decision of Z1/Z2/Z3 values until the details of other aspects (e.g., PDCCH monitoring capability, multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling) are clear.

##### Discussion point 2-3-2:

Companies are encouraged to provide comments and/or proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We have preference for the 1st approach where the absolute time duration is same as that of 120kHz SCS in FR2 |
| Qualcomm | We prefer the 1st approach |
| MediaTek | We prefer the 1st approach |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We also prefer the first approach |
| LG Electronics | We prefer the 1st approach |
| Intel | We are ok with approach 2. As for approach 1, if we are going to take similar case as N1/N2/N3 then we should consider additional UE capability for this as well. |
| Futurewei | Ok with deferring the issue. |
| Moderator | Based on the above provided majority view in comments, formulate the following. |

##### Proposal 2-3-2:

For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of Z1, Z2 and Z3 as in the following table for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling to maintain the same absolute time duration as that of 120 kHz SCS in FR2.

* Note: is UE reported capability *beamReportTiming*; KB3 and KB4 is UE reported capability *beamSwitchTiming* for 480 and 960 kHz SCS respectively.
* RAN1 strives to study and introduce additional smaller values for CSI computation delay requirement

Table 2-4. CSI computation delay requirement 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Z1* [symbols] | | *Z2* [symbols] | | *Z3* [symbols] | |
| *Z1* | *Z'1* | *Z2* | *Z'2* | *Z3* | *Z'3* |
| 3 | 97 | 85 | 152 | 140 | min(97, *X*3+ KB2) | *X*3 |
| 5 | 388 | 340 | 608 | 560 | [min(388, *X*5+ KB3)] | [*X*5] |
| 6 | 776 | 680 | 1216 | 1120 | [min(776, *X*6+ KB4)] | [*X*6] |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Moderator | “[]” are put for Z3 and Z’3 values for now pending the decision of any additional *beamReportTiming* and/or *beamSwitchTiming* other than those scaled values from that of 120 kHz SCS. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We missed providing input prior to the updated proposal, but our preference is also to defer until there is more stability on the other processing time lines (N1/N2/N3) and beam management related capabilities. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The principle in the main bullet is acceptable, although we are not sure that it needs to be expressed in terms of single/multi PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. Maybe the definition of Z1, Z2 and Z3 has no dependency on whether a DCI schedules one or multiple PDSCH/PUSCH?  Similar as comments on N1/N2/N3, we think that striving for additional smaller values should not be a priority for the remaining work in Rel-17. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Respond to Huawei’s comment:  The main bullet says nothing about the definition changes for Z1/Z2/Z3. It simply says for both single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, the values are proposed as in the table. I don’t understand what is the concern here.  Again, the 2nd sub-bullet is meant to keep it open in case companies may find some smaller values agreeable to the group. It’s up to each company whether they want to contribute or not.  On the comment to defer the decision:  To make progress on this topic and for better understanding, it’d be good if companies want to defer the discussion/decision can state their detailed reasoning. Seems to the moderator, this proposal is not conflicting with on-going discussion/proposal and/or potential agreement on N1/N2/N3 and/or beam management capabilities. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| Intel | Similar view as Ericsson. I think we should first get further progress on N1/N2/N3 and beam management capabilities. |
| Futurewei | Agree with Intel’s view. |
| CATT | Prefer to defer the issue as FW, Ericssson and Intel. |
| Moderator2 | Question to Ericsson, Intel, Futurewei and CATT:  Now that we made some agreement on N1/N2/N3 and given “[]” are put there for Z3 and Z’3 values pending the beam management discussion/decision, do you still have concerns on proposal 2-3-2? |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Proposal 2-3-2 for the sake of progress. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with Proposal 2-3-2 given the agreement on N1/N2/N3 be made. |
| Moderator3 | Thanks to Ericsson and Futurewei for being flexible here.  Made minor wording update into proposal 2-3-2a (to the 2nd bullet to align the wording used for the N1/N2/N3 agreement). |

##### Proposal 2-3-2a:

For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of Z1, Z2 and Z3 as in the following table for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling to maintain the same absolute time duration as that of 120 kHz SCS in FR2.

* Note: is UE reported capability *beamReportTiming*; KB3 and KB4 is UE reported capability *beamSwitchTiming* for 480 and 960 kHz SCS respectively.
* RAN1 to study (until RAN1#106b-e) and possibly introduce smaller values for CSI computation delay requirement

Table 2-4. CSI computation delay requirement 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Z1* [symbols] | | *Z2* [symbols] | | *Z3* [symbols] | |
| *Z1* | *Z'1* | *Z2* | *Z'2* | *Z3* | *Z'3* |
| 3 | 97 | 85 | 152 | 140 | min(97, *X*3+ KB2) | *X*3 |
| 5 | 388 | 340 | 608 | 560 | [min(388, *X*5+ KB3)] | [*X*5] |
| 6 | 776 | 680 | 1216 | 1120 | [min(776, *X*6+ KB4)] | [*X*6] |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments especially if they cannot accept this proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Moderator | Question to Intel and CATT:  Now that we made some agreement on N1/N2/N3 and given “[]” are put there for Z3 and Z’3 values pending the beam management discussion/decision, do you still have concerns on proposal 2-3-2a? |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Other issue(s)

Several contributions mentioned some other issues related to timelines.

[7, Lenovo] raised an issue and thought it is critical to handle CPU availability check for UEs when it is required to process multiple CSI reports associated with different SCS values ranging from 15kHz to 960kHz in a parallel manner. It proposed same reference symbols duration (possibly the shortest duration corresponding to maximum supported SCS value) could be used for checking CPU availability corresponding to different CSI reports associated with different SCS values. Regarding CSI processing unit (CPU), [15, Nokia] argued that CPU is the UE capability for simultaneous CSI calculations which is indicated as and is related to channel variation or UE mobility rather than scheduling/subcarrier spacings. Therefore, there is no reason to increase the frequency of CSI reporting or rule for calculation of CSI occupancy. Given is independent from numerology, [15, Nokia] proposed that the existing specification can be reused for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS.

[14, Futurewei] proposed the slot configuration period in UL/DL configuration is reused for 480kHz/960kHz SCS and the number of configuration slots is scaled accordingly.

Moderator’s comment:

With limited input on these issues, suggest companies to study further and provide input to discuss.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views | |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Indication of number of CPUs is UE capability, however the intervals at which CPU availability is checked is related to symbol duration. Now, with the introduction of higher SCS up to 960kHz, the CPU availability check with 960kHz and 480kHz can be much more frequent in comparison to lower SCS. Therefore, the absolute opportunities could vary quite significantly. Therefore, the proposal to have same intervals/granularity for CPU availability check regardless of SCS should be supported.  Also, this is quite a simple enhancement and doesn’t impact how the actual processing timeline, but just fairer in terms of CPU availability check for all SCS values. | |
| Futurewei | Ok with further study. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok to discuss further | |
| LG Electronics | Support to study further |

## 2.3. PTRS

### Individual observations/proposals

The following are individual observations/proposals from the contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sources | Observations/proposals |
| [1, Huawei] | Observation 8: Block PTRS with the designed circular sequence has better BLER and spectrum efficiency than distributed PTRS when power boosting is applied.  Proposal 14: Support block PTRS as one type of PTRS pattern for 120 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS of CP-OFDM. The use of block PTRS can be indicated by MCS, scheduled bandwidth, and power boosting scheme. The PTRS sequence is composed of ZC sequence and circular part based on ZC sequence for block PTRS.  Observation 9: With more PTRS groups and less PTRS samples per PTRS group denoted as (, ) = (16, 2), the BLER performance of all the SCSs are improved significantly.  Proposal 15: A new PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups and less PTRS samples per PTRS group denoted as (, ) = (16, 2) within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol should be supported for large scheduling bandwidth and high scheduled MCS.  Observation 10: Due to Rx timing shift, (at least part of) a PTRS group placed at the tail of the transmitter’s DFT-s-OFDM symbol, may wrap-around to the head of the symbol from the receiver’s perspective, thus spoiling the original intention of the design and unnecessarily increasing Rx complexity, as well as deteriorating PN compensation performance, especially for the high MCS.  Observation 11: New PTRS location which is in the middle of each interval can solve the influence on BLER performance caused by Rx advance timing shift.  Proposal 16: For PTRS with , the mapping of last PTRS group should consider potential Rx timing shift and avoid the last X pre-DFT symbol(s). |
| [2, Mitsubishi] | [Observation 1: In bands above 52.6GHz, the ICI component of the phase noise becomes predominant on CPE.](#_Toc77780148)  [Observation 2: Distributed PT-RS pattern shows poor performance results with CPE phase noise estimation, regardless of the PT-RS pattern density.](#_Toc77780149)  [Observation 3: For a distributed PT-RS pattern, at small carrier allocations, the performance is poor even with de-ICI filtering, due to an insufficient number of PT-RS samples. Increasing the distributed pattern density partially improves the situation, but cyclic block patterns still yield better results.](#_Toc77780150)  [Observation 4: For a distributed PT-RS pattern, de-ICI Wiener filtering outperforms CPE in all cases, but high MCS still not reach FER=0.1.](#_Toc77780151)  [Observation 5: Distributed PT-RS patterns are not robust enough to ensure system performance in bands above 52.6GHz, especially with high MCS and/or at 70GHz.](#_Toc77780152)  [Observation 6: For a similar overhead, block PT-RS (with any ordinary non-cyclic sequence) is outperformed by distributed PT-RS pattern when a same de-ICI Wiener filter is used at the receiver side. There is no interest in supporting block non-cyclic sequences.](#_Toc77780153)  [Observation 7: PT-RS blocks with a ZP pattern outperforms the distributed PT-RS pattern, even with dense distributed patterns.](#_Toc77780154)  [Observation 8: Block PT-RS with cyclic sequence significantly outperforms the distributed PT-RS pattern with ICI compensation. The gain increases with the carrier frequency.](#_Toc77780155)  [Observation 9: Block PT-RS with cyclic sequence outperforms block PT-RS with ZP pattern.](#_Toc77780156)  [Observation 10: Block PT-RS with cyclic sequence requires lower complexity phase noise compensation filtering than the de-ICI filter needed for the distributed PT-RS pattern.](#_Toc77780157)  Proposal 1: Support block PT-RS with cyclic sequence for OFDM waveform. FFS exact sequence.  Proposal 2: A PT-RS sequence for OFDM waveform composed of KP samples includes a cyclic prefix of floor(KP/2) samples.  Proposal 3: Support density extension of current Rel.15 PT-RS for DFTsOFDM waveform. |
| [3, vivo] | Observation 1:   * The performance of de-ICI (3-tap filter) with K\_PTRS = 2 is worse than K\_PTRS = 1 or K\_PTRS = 0.5 when PDSCH RB number <= 16; * When PDSCH RB number <= 16, CPE only with K\_PTRS = 2 has much better performance than de-ICI with K\_PTRS = 1 or K\_PTRS = 0.5. * For all evaluated cases, the preferred method for PN compensation (with the best performance) is shown in Table 4. The best performance is obtained with legacy PTRS density in frequency, i.e. K\_PTRS = 2. There’s no motivation to justify higher PTRS density in frequency domain for small RB allocation.   Table 4 Preferred PN compensation method when number of RB <=32   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | SCS (kHz)/MCS | 7 | 16 | 22 | 26 | | 120 | CPE only (K\_PTRS=2) | CPE only (K\_PTRS=2) | CPE only (K\_PTRS=2) | no method to achieve 10% BLER. | | 480 | CPE only (K\_PTRS=2) | CPE only (K\_PTRS=2) | CPE only (K\_PTRS=2) | If PDSCH RB num <= 16, use CPE only (K\_PTRS=2); else, use de-ICI (K\_PTRS=2). | | 960 | CPE only (K\_PTRS=2) | CPE only (K\_PTRS=2) | CPE only (K\_PTRS=2) | If PDSCH RB num <= 16, use CPE only (K\_PTRS=2); else, use de-ICI (K\_PTRS=2). |   Proposal 1: There is no need to introduce higher PTRS frequency density as K\_PTRS = 1 or K\_PTRS = 0.5 for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz in Rel-17.  Observation 2: With current simulation parameters, the performance of de-ICI with Rel-15 PTRS pattern outperforms the performance of block-based PTRS pattern with cyclic ZC sequence.  Proposal 2: Do not support block-based PTRS pattern with cyclic ZC sequence for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz in Rel-17.  Observation 3: For block-based PTRS pattern with zero-power RE, the performance of ‘6dB power boosting’ is around 2.5 dB worse than that of ‘full power boosting’ for SNR achieving 10% BLER.  Proposal 3: Do not support block-based PTRS pattern with zero-power RE for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz in Rel-17.  Observation 4: For MCS-7, MCS-16 and MCS-22, the performance gap is less than 0.8 dB between (CN, CS) = (8, 4) and the configuration with the best performance.  Observation 5: For MCS-26 and PUSCH RB number as 256, configuration (CN, CS) = (16, 4) achieves best performance.  Proposal 4: The necessity to introduce more PTRS chunk number needs further discussion as there is no significant performance benefit. If a new configuration with more PTRS chunk number needs to be added, the SCS and MCS should be within the condition of applying this configuration. |
| [5, InterDigital] | Proposal 18: Rel-17 NR operation in 52.6-71 GHz follow Rel-15/Rel-16 PT-RS design, at least when allocated RBs > 32.  Proposal 19: The need of PT-RS enhancement for small RB allocation (< 32 RBs) should be carefully evaluated. |
| [8, Samsung] | Observation 1: At 60GHz, two block PTRS patterns with ICI approximation filter show some performance gain comparing to Rel-15 PT-RS with de-ICI algorithm. The gains are widened at 70GHz.  Observation 2: Block PTRS patterns 2 (cyclic PTRS sequence with 3dB power boost) provides better performance than block PTRS pattern 1 (patterns with ZP tones in both side) at 10% target BLER. The performance order reverses at 1% target BLER.  Proposal 3: Support block PTRS patterns can be considered for further performance improvement and UE complexity reduction comparing to legacy PTRS.  Observation 3: For small RB allocations (32RB/16RB/8RB) and legacy PTRS frequency density (K=2 and K=4), CPE compensation outperforms the one with ICI compensation.  Observation 4: For 16 RBs and 8RBs allocations, K=1 configuration provides better performance compared with legacy PTRS frequency density.  Proposal 4: For 16RB and 8RB allocations, support K=1 for performance improvement. |
| [9, CATT] | Proposal 19: For NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with OFDM, PTRS enhancement is not supported. |
| [10, ZTE] | Observation 1: When PRB number is not larger than 32, CPE compensation with lower PTRS density can achieve similar or better performance than ICI compensation with higher PTRS density.  Proposal 10: Do not increase PTRS frequency density for small RB allocations for CP-OFDM.  Observation 2: Block PTRS with cyclic sequence cannot provide performance gain compared with legacy PTRS.  Observation 3: Block PTRS with power boosting cannot achieve better performance than legacy PTRS.  Proposal 11: Reuse the Rel-15 legacy PTRS pattern for 52.6GHz~71GHz.  Observation 4: Increasing PTRS groups for DFT-s-OFDM waveform can bring benefit to performance of 120kHz SCS and MCS 22.  Proposal 12: Support to increase the number of PTRS groups for DFT-s-OFDM. |
| [13, Ericsson] | **Observation 20 Even for small RB allocation, enhanced PTRS structure with K = 1 or K=0.5 does not provide additional performance gain over the existing Rel-15 PTRS structure (K = 2 and K=4).**  **Observation 21 For every tested scenario, Rel-15 PTRS + direct de-ICI receiver with multiple settings for the PTRS density can be used to outperform the best settings for square and orthogonal circulant PTRS with square and orthogonal circulant ICI filter approximation without significant phase noise compensation complexity increase or even decreased phase noise compensation complexity.**  **Observation 22 For every tested scenario, best setting for orthogonal circulant PTRS with 3 dB power boosting does not provide additional gain over the best setting for existing Rel-15 PTRS structure + direct de-ICI receiver.**  **Observation 23 The performance of square and orthogonal ICI filter approximation is worse than Rel-15 PTRS structure with direct de-ICI filtering because of the various fundamental design issues identified in Annex A:**  **1. ICI filter approximation with block PTRS does not fully utilize all received PTRS symbols.**  **2. Phase noise compensation with ICI filter approximation approach relies on an auto-deconvolution assumption that is not valid in practice.**  **3. The construction of a circulant matrix with cyclic block PTRS sequence relies on an assumption that is invalid for frequency selective channels.**  **4. The approximate filter estimation with circulant PTRS matrix involves anti-match-filter combining, which amplifies noises from clusters and subcarriers with weak received SNR.**  **Observation 24 The ICI filter approximation receiver with single-tone PTRS (see Annex A.5) requires excessive power boosting which can result in both substantial link performance losses and severe out-of-band intermodulation leakages.**  Proposal 28 Retain the same Rel-15 distributed PTRS design for OFDM for all RB allocations. Additional PTRS structure(s) are not needed.  Observation 25 Complexity of ICI mitigation is dominated by frequency domain de-ICI filtering. Matrix inversion constitutes no more than 2% of the total complexity for realistic filter lengths and PXSCH allocations. |
| [14, Futurewei] | Observation 1. For PDSCH with 120kHz SCS, de-ICI does not necessarily work better than de-CPE method for cases when the number of RBs is small, e.g., 8 or 16.  Observation 2. For PDSCH with 120kHz SCS, increasing the density of PTRS to (K=0.5, L=1) does not provide performance gain, while increasing the density of PTRS to (K=1, L=1) can provide performance gain over the current maximum allowed density (K=2, L=1) for cases when the number of RBs is small, e.g., 8, 16, or 32.  Proposal 1. For PDSCH with 120kHz SCS and a small number of RBs, consider increasing the density of PTRS to (K=1, L=1).  Observation 3. For PDSCH with 480kHz/960kHz SCS, de-CPE mostly works better than de-ICI counterparts for BLER performance.  Proposal 2. For PDSCH with 480kHz/960kHz SCS and a small number of RBs, consider reuse the legacy PTRS density of (K=2, L=1) (de-CPE is enough compared to de-ICI).  Observation 4. For each SCS with 64QAM, the PTRS density (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) offers better performance than the legacy density, although the gain is more notable for the smaller SCS. For each SCS with 16QAM, the PTRS density (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) has only comparable performance with legacy density (Ng = 8, Ns = 4, L = 1). For QPSK, it is possible that the legacy density provides the best performance, e.g., for the 960kHz SCS case.  Proposal 3. Increasing PTRS density to (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) can be considered for PUSCH in B52/FR2-2 if 64QAM is used; for lower order modulations such as 16QAM and QPSK, the legacy density (Ng = 8, Ns = 4, L = 1) offers fine performance, thus can be reused. |
| [15, Nokia] | Observation 4. Existing PTRS configurations provide good allocation flexibility to achieve good performance for any bandwidth, SCS, or MCS.  Observation 5. Considerable benefit from increasing PTRS density to K=1 is observed only in a single case when high-order modulation is used and PRBs=16 and ICI compensation is used.  Observation 6. No gain is achieved using K=0.5.  Observation 7. Using small PRB allocations with high MCSs is a corner case and should not be considered to motivate new PTRS configurations  Proposal 17. Do not consider increasing frequency density for small PRB allocations (<32).  Proposal 18: Consider introducing a PTRS mapping unit in terms of fraction or multiple of DFTsOFDM symbols, to flexibly control PTRS overhead and allocation.  Observation 8. PUSCH performance of DFT-s-OFDM may be improved by increasing the maximum number of PTRS groups with well affordable PTRS overhead.  Observation 9. New PTRS configurations can give performance gains for high order modulations.  Observation 10. Performance can be significantly improved by combinations of existing PTRS patterns.  Proposal 19. Consider increasing number of PTRS groups for DFT-s-OFDM to make high order modulations robust to phase noise when a large number of PRBs is used.  Proposal 20. If 48 PTRS REs are being considered enough for maximum PTRS overhead, consider supporting the new PTRS configurations as combinations of existing PTRS configurations to a single configuration. |
| [18, Qualcomm] | Observation 1: Comparing the different PTRS patterns   * The best performance is obtained with block PTRS pattern with zero-power tones. * The legacy pattern performance is very close to block PTRS pattern with zero-power tones.   Observation 2: The block PTRS pattern with ZP tones and the legacy pattern outperform the cyclic patterns based on ZC sequences.  Observation 3: With 7 clusters each with 9 tones, 8 ZP PTRS tones and a single NZP tone in the centre, the two algorithms with the clustered pattern have almost the same performance, and they slightly outperform the legacy pattern.  Observation 4: With 7 clusters each with 9 tones, 8 ZP PTRS tones and a single NZP tone in the centre, power boosting the NZP tone by 6 dB can matches the performance in of the legacy PTRS pattern.  Observation 5: For clustered PTRS pattern with ZP tones, power boosting NZP tones will not increase CM or PAPR.  Observation 6: For small RB allocation, e.g., 16 or 8 RBs, sending the PTRS over every RB, i.e., K=1, enhances the performance as it helps in having more accurate ICI filter calculations or CPE estimates. In addition, the performance is degraded when the density is increased with K=0.5 due to the large overhead and increase coding rate.  Observation 7: For MCS 22, there is no significant enhancement for increasing the total number of PTRS samples to 64, while small gains can be observed with MCS 24. In addition, increasing the number of PTRS samples beyond 64 is not helping the performance.  Observation 8: With total of 16 samples, the pattern with 8 chunks outperforms the one with 4 chunks, i.e., distributing samples over time domain enhances the performance, but still the legacy pattern with 32 samples is outperforming.  Proposal 1: For SCS 120kHz, the complexity of phase noise ICI compensation and its effects on the UE processing timeline need to be considered.  Proposal 2: Support introducing a new PTRS pattern, clustered based with ZP tones, to reduce the ICI compensation complexity.  Proposal 3: As PTRS enhancement for assisting ICI compensation, increasing the frequency domain density, of Rel. 15 PTRS, for small RB allocation can be considered. |
| [19, LG] | Proposal #16: Retain the existing distributed PT-RS structure for all SCS in FR2-2. It seems that further improvement either by advanced estimation algorithms or by new PT-RS pattern cannot achieve a noticeable improvements.  Observation #2: Based on the performed evaluation research, PTRS frequency density K=0.5 or 1 does not provide enough performance gain, or provide marginal gain by 0.1 dB in very specific situations.  Proposal #17: Do not support K=0.5 and K=1  Observation #3: Complexity analysis of the de-ICI filtering approaches has shown that the main contribution to the overall number of operations comes from the application of the filter and not from the taps estimation procedure. Thus, for the advanced Nulling (or zero-padded) PTRSs scheme, the computation gain with respect to the baseline Rel-15 is typically less than 3%. |
| [21, Intel] | Proposal 11: RAN1 to introduce UE capability of supporting high MCS/rank combinations in FR2-2. Details of the capability signal is FFS.  Observation 1: De-ICI filtering performance can be improved by using conjugate anti-symmetric filter.  Observation 2: De-ICI filtering performance can be improved by using CP-based linear phase ramp pre-compensation.  Observation 3: De-ICI performance can be improved by applying the unit-magnitude de-ICI compensation in time domain.  Observation 4: all the MCSs can be supported with rank 1 without any enhancements in the specification with advanced PN compensation technique.  Observation 5: MCSs up to MCS22 for CP-OFDM can be supported with rank 2 and SCS120kHz using frequency domain de-ICI filtering.  Observation 6: MCSs up to MCS25 for CP-OFDM can be supported with rank 2 and SCS120kHz using the combination of CP-based pre-compensation, conjugate antisymmetric de-ICI filter property and the unit-magnitude de-ICI compensation in time domain.  Observation 7: MCS26 for CP-OFDM and above cannot be supported with rank 2 and SCS120kHz by any means of a realistic UE implementation.  Observation 8: MCSs up to MCS24 for CP-OFDM can be supported with rank 2 and SCS960kHz using frequency domain de-ICI filtering.  Observation 9: MCSs up to MCS26 for CP-OFDM can be supported with rank 2 and SCS960kHz using the combination of CP-based pre-compensation, conjugate antisymmetric de-ICI filter property and the unit-magnitude de-ICI compensation in time domain.  Observation 10: MCS27 and above cannot be supported with rank 2 and SCS960kHz by any means of a realistic UE implementation for CP-OFDM.  Proposal 12: Adopt block PT-RS pattern for use in FR2-2.  Observation 11: 6dB PT-RS power boosting improves the MCS22 PN compensation performance from 0 to 0.7 dB depending on PT-RS block size.  Proposal 13: RAN1 to continue studying PT-RS power boosting aspects.  Observation 12: Unequal distribution of PN estimation error among DFT-s-ODFM samples may lead to systematic unbalance between code blocks’ BLERs.  Observation 13: PUSCH PTRS patterns with only 4 and 8 PTRS groups provide acceptable performance with 120kHz SCS.  Observation 14: Code blocks interlacing within a DFT-s-OFDM symbol provides performance gain from 0.5dB to 1.7dB at MCS22.  Proposal 14: RAN1 to consider code blocks interlacing for PUSCH with transform precoding. |
| [22, Apple] | Observation 1: At lower SNRs, there is a trade-off between the overhead of the PTRS selected and the throughput. Achieving the best throughput performance requires a lower value of K (K =1 ) than is currently available in the Rel-15 specification.  Proposal 7: RAN1 should support K = 1 for smaller frequency allocation sizes for PTRS in CP-OFDM. |

### Summary on PTRS

#### For CP-OFDM

In RAN1#104-e meeting, the following was agreed.

* At least existing PTRS design for CP-OFDM is supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* Companies are encouraged to study the need of potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM with respect to phase noise compensation performance considering at least the following aspects:
  + PTRS density/pattern (e.g. distributed, block-based) and sequence (e.g. cyclic sequence)
  + Frequency domain power boosting and its impact to PDSCH performance and PDSCH to DMRS EPRE
  + Receiver complexity, including possible aspects related to supporting both existing PTRS design and potential PTRS enhancement
  + Possible specification impact of supporting potential PTRS enhancement in addition to existing PTRS design
  + Note: PTRS overhead should be accounted for in the evaluations, e.g. by showing spectral efficiency results and/or reporting effective coding rate

The following sources submitted to this meeting evaluated and compared different PN compensation performance using the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PTRS structure against new PTRS patterns and/or new sequence.

[1, Huawei] compared BLER performance of Rel-15 PTRS with K=4 and a block PTRS with cyclic sequence when ICI PN compensation is used. When a 3dB power boosting was applied in the simulation for both PTRS patterns, it observed a performance gain for block PTRS with cyclic sequence compared to Rel-15 PTRS with K=4.

Moderator’s observations from the reported numerical results: the performance gain (for 10% BLER target) is shown to be 0.2~0.4 dB for large RB allocation (256 RB for 120 and 480, 160 RB for 960 kHz) with MCS 22. The gain increased to 1.5~3 dB as the number of RB allocation decreased to 64 for MCS 22. When a 3dB power boosting was applied in the simulation for block PTRS pattern but not for Rel-15 PTRS, it reported at least 0.7dB gain of block PTRS with cyclic sequence when scheduled bandwidth is 128RB.

[2, Mitsubishi] compared phase noise compensation performance for the following cases with 120 kHz SCS: CPE-based for Rel-15 PTRS, de-ICI for Rel-15 PTRS, de-ICI for block PTRS, de-ICI for ZP block PTRS and ICI filtering for block PTRS with cyclic sequence. It is observed that for a similar overhead, block PTRS (with any ordinary non-cyclic sequence) is outperformed by distributed Rel-15 PTRS pattern when a same de-ICI filter is used at the receiver side. It also observed that with de-ICI, PTRS blocks with a ZP pattern outperforms the distributed Rel-15 PTRS pattern. Furthermore, it observed that ICI filtering for block PTRS with cyclic sequence outperforms de-ICI for block PTRS with ZP pattern.

It is stated in [2, Mitsubishi] that “for medium MCS we observe gains in order of 1-2dB for FER target 10-1” and “for high MCS, in some scenarios only block PT-RS with cyclic sequence reaches target FER of 10-1”.

[3, vivo] compared CP-OFDM performance for CPE with Rel-15 PTRS, de-ICI (5-tap) filter with Rel-15 PTRS, de-ICI (5-tap) with a block PTRS with cyclic ZC sequence for 120 kHz SCS. When 3 dB power boosting is applied to PTRS for all three schemes, it observed that the performance of de-ICI with Rel-15 PTRS pattern outperforms (~1 dB at 10% BLER target for different DS observed based on the reported results in table 6 in [3]) the performance of block-based PTRS pattern with cyclic ZC sequence. [3, vivo] also evaluated performance for a block PTRS with ZP. It observed that a significant performance loss for block PTRS of 7 clusters with 9 tones (8 ZP and 1 NZP) when power boosting is 6 dB for that 1 NZP RE compared to full power boosting.

[8, Samsung] compared the performance of three schemes: Rel-15 PTRS pattern with K=4 and no power boosting for PTRS, block PTRS with zeros tones and , with 9.54dB power boosted for NZP-PTRS, and block PTRS with cyclic sequence and , with 3dB power boosted for PTRS. For the case evaluated (120 kHz SCS with 256 RB, TDL-A 5 ns, MCS22, 60 GHz), it observed performance gain about 0.5~0.6 dB for both block PTRS patterns for 10% BLER target.

[10, ZTE] evaluated PDSCH with CP-OFDM performance with the legacy PTRS and block PTRS with cyclic ZC sequence for 120 and 480 kHz SCS with MCS 22. The evaluation was performed with different ICI estimation filter tap number, block number and sequence length for each block. It is observed that the performance of ICI compensation based on legacy PTRS is always better than block PTRS with cyclic sequence. It also compared the performance of block PTRS with 3dB power boosting with that of legacy PTRS without power boosting and showed that the performance of legacy PTRS without power boosting is still better than block PTRS with 3 dB power boosting.

[13, Ericsson] provided evaluation results on clustered-PTRS with cyclic sequence and investigated power boosting aspects for 120 KHz SCS with MCS 22. Comparing the performance of Rel-15 PTRS and a block-PTRS with cyclic sequence, it is observed that for every tested scenario, Rel-15 PTRS + direct de-ICI receiver with multiple settings for the PTRS density can be used to outperform (about 0.5 ~ 1 dB gain observed based on the reported results in table 10 to 13 in [13]) the best settings for square and orthogonal circulant PTRS with square and orthogonal circulant ICI filter approximation without significant phase noise compensation complexity increase or even decreased phase noise compensation complexity. Regarding power boosting, it observed that for every tested scenario, best setting for orthogonal circulant PTRS with 3 dB power boosting does not provide additional gain over the best setting for existing Rel-15 PTRS structure + direct de-ICI receiver. Finally, with respect to block PTRS with ZP, it is observed that the ICI filter approximation receiver with single-tone PTRS requires excessive power boosting which can result in both substantial link performance losses and severe out-of-band intermodulation leakages.

[13, Ericsson] observed that complexity of ICI mitigation is dominated by frequency domain de-ICI filtering. Matrix inversion constitutes no more than 2% of the total complexity for realistic filter lengths and PXSCH allocations.

[13, Ericsson] also observed that the performance of square and orthogonal ICI filter approximation is worse than Rel-15 PTRS structure with direct de-ICI filtering due to various identified issues: ICI filter approximation with block PTRS does not fully utilize all received PTRS symbols; phase noise compensation with ICI filter approximation approach relies on an auto-deconvolution assumption that is not valid in practice; the construction of a circulant matrix with cyclic block PTRS sequence relies on an assumption that is invalid for frequency selective channels; ICI filter approximation with circulant PTRS matrix involves anti-match-filter combining, which amplifies noise from clusters and subcarriers with weak received SNR. On the issues identified above, [2, Mitsubishi] provided counter arguments to issue 3 (channel equalization) and issue 4 (average over PTRS blocks) and claimed issue 3 and 4 are solved.

[18, Qualcomm] evaluated ICI compensation performance for 120 kHz SCS at MCS 22/24/26 with multiple PTRS patterns: clustered PTRS with different number of ZP tones, block PTRS with cyclic sequence and Rel-15 PTRS with K=4. It observed that the best performance is obtained with block PTRS pattern with zero-power tones and the legacy pattern performance is very close to block PTRS pattern with zero-power tones (about 0~0.3 dB gap for 10% BLER target observed based on the reported results in table 2 and 3 in [18]). It also observed that block PTRS pattern with zero-power tones and the legacy pattern outperforms (about 0.1 ~ 0.2 dB for 10% BLER target with MCS 22 and about 0.3 ~ 0.4 dB for MCS 24/26 based on the reported results in table 2 and 3 in [18]) the cyclic patterns based on ZC sequences.

It observed that with 7 clusters each with 9 tones, 8 ZP PTRS tones and a single NZP tone in the center, power boosting the NZP tone by 6 dB can matches the performance of the legacy PTRS pattern. Furthermore, it observed that for clustered PTRS pattern with ZP tones, power boosting NZP tones will not increase CM or PAPR. It then proposed to introduce a new PTRS pattern, clustered based with ZP tones, to reduce the ICI compensation complexity.

[19, LG] compared the performance difference between ideal cases (no PN or ideal filter estimation) and de-ICI and CPE-only compensation based on Rel-15 PTRS for all SCSs with MCS 22 and showed that the potential performance gain by advanced estimation algorithms or by new PT-RS pattern is well bounded (< 1 dB). [19, LG] also looked at the computational complexity aspect and observed that for de-ICI filtering approaches, the main contribution to the overall number of operations comes from the application of the filter and not from the taps estimation procedure. Thus, for the advanced Nulling (or zero-padded) PTRSs scheme, the computation gain with respect to the baseline Rel-15 is typically less than 3%.

[21, Intel] compared two PN compensation methods: PN spectrum-based and direct de-ICI filter coefficients estimation with different PTRS block sizes for 120 kHz with MCS 22 and 24. It observed that the performance of PN-spectrum based estimation algorithm drastically varies among the PTRS block sizes. It showed that PN-spectrum based approach is inferior to the direct one at the small PT-RS block sizes, while it outperforms the competing algorithm at large PTRS blocks. However, for large PT-RS block size, it is observed that PN-spectrum based approach is not the overall winner in a fading channel (TDL-A). It also observed that in almost flat LoS channel (TDL-E, optional channel for evaluation), the PN-spectrum based algorithm can significantly (~1.5dB at MCS22) outperform the direct coefficients estimation.

[21, Intel] argued that given grouping PT-RS tones into blocks is required for PN spectrum-based de-ICI filter estimation and LoS condition is common in mmWave communication, block PTRS should be supported in FR2-2. Note in their evaluation, the original Rel-15 PTRS Gold sequence was used. It also observed that 6 dB PTRS power boosting improves the MCS22 PN compensation performance from 0 to 0.7 dB depending on PTRS block size.

Summary of observations:

* Comparing block PTRS with cyclic sequence against Rel-15 PTRS
  + Under the same power condition (i.e., no or the same value of power boosting) for PTRS
    - 2 sources ([1, Huawei], [2, Mitsubishi]) showed notable (> 0.5 dB for 10% BLER target) performance gain
    - 4 sources ([3, vivo], [10, ZTE], [13, Ericsson], [18, Qualcomm]) showed notable (> 0.5 dB for 10% BLER target) performance loss
  + When 3 dB power boosting is applied to block PTRS with cyclic sequence but not to Rel-15 PTRS
    - 2 sources ([1, Huawei], [8, Samsung]) showed notable (> 0.5 dB for 10% BLER target) performance gain
    - 2 sources ([10, ZTE], [13, Ericsson]) showed performance loss for block PTRS with cyclic sequence against Rel-15 PTRS. The performance gap is about 0.1 ~ 1 dB for 10% BLER target for different scenarios.
* Comparing block PTRS with ZP tones against Rel-15 PTRS under the condition of the same total power for PTRS
  + 2 sources ([2, Mitsubishi], [8, Samsung]) showed notable (> 0.5 dB for 10% BLER target) performance gain
  + 1 source ([18, Qualcomm]) showed minor (~0.3 dB for 10% BLER target) performance gain
  + 1 source ([3, vivo]) showed minor (0.2~0.4 dB for 10% BLER target) performance loss
* Regarding ICI computation complexity aspect
  + 4 sources ([1, Huawei], [2, Mitsubishi], [8, Samsung], [18, Qualcomm]) showed the benefit of cyclic sequence or ZP tones
  + 2 sources ([13, Ericsson], [19, LG]) counter argued and stated that the computation gain of cyclic sequence or ZP tones are < 3% of the total complexity of ICI mitigation
* Regarding power boosting for block PTRS with ZP tones
  + 1 source ([18, Qualcomm]) showed power boosting the NZP tone by 6 dB can matches the performance of the legacy PTRS pattern
  + 1 source ([3, vivo]) showed notable (> 0.5 dB for 10% BLER target) performance loss for block PTRS of 7 clusters with 9 tones (8 ZP and 1 NZP) when power boosting is 6 dB for that 1 NZP RE compared to full power boosting which is still worse than legacy PTRS
  + 1 source ([13, Ericsson]) argued that the ICI filter approximation receiver with single-tone PTRS requires excessive power boosting which can result in both substantial link performance losses and severe out-of-band intermodulation leakages.
  + 1 source ([18, Qualcomm]) showed power boosting NZP tones will not increase CM or PAPR for clustered PTRS pattern with ZP tones

Based on the contributions, companies’ view to support block PTRS with cyclic sequence are summarized below.

Yes: [1, Huawei] (ZC sequence and circular part based on ZC sequence), [2, Mitsubishi] (a sequence of KP samples includes a cyclic prefix of floor(KP/2) samples), [8, Samsung] (no preference indicated for sequence)

No: [3, vivo], [9, CATT], [10, ZTE], [13, Ericsson], [18, Qualcomm], [19, LG]

Based on the contributions, companies’ view to support block PTRS with ZP tones are summarized below.

Yes: [8, Samsung], [18, Qualcomm]

No: [3, vivo], [9, CATT], [10, ZTE], [13, Ericsson], [19, LG]

Based on the contributions, companies’ view to support block PTRS are summarized below.

Yes: [8, Samsung], [21, Intel]

No: [3, vivo], [9, CATT], [10, ZTE], [13, Ericsson], [19, LG]

Moderator’s comment:

Looking at the available evaluation results and views expressed from contributions, it’s clear that companies have split views on whether there’s performance gain of block PTRS, the sequence of PTRS and in general the benefit/necessity of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM.

Given that companies have had at least two meetings to consider, evaluate and debate the proposed PTRS enhancement, and that there has not been a shift in company positions to form a clear majority for any of the proposed schemes, moderator don’t see a chance for an agreement on any of the schemes yet. With that, moderator suggest companies continue discussion to see if any new aspects/arguments can be identified in this meeting. Otherwise, it’d be better to conclude and close the discussion point considering limited time of this WI.

##### Discussion point 3-1-1:

Companies are encouraged to provide comments and/or potential agreeable proposal if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with the moderator’s comment that if no consensus can be reached by end of this meeting, then this discussion should be closed |
| Qualcomm | We support introducing the new block PTRS pattern with ZP tones to reduce the complexity of filter coefficient calculations  The ICI compensations consists of two steps   1. Filter coefficient estimation 2. Applying the filter coefficient on rx tones   The second step is common between different algorithms and patterns and there are multiple ways to implement such vector multiplication efficiently  The complexity of the first step differs based on the algorithm and the pattern; therefore it should have higher impact of the decision among the different patterns. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | More discussion would be useful first to understand the discrepancy among the evaluation results provided by different companies. For example, we noticed that in Ericsson’s evaluations the performance of Rel-15 PTRS (red curves) is different in Figures 12 and 26, whereas the same evaluation assumptions are applied. In the same figures, the performance of “orthogonal circulant, K=2 eq., L=3” is also different (black curve in Fig 14 vs. blue curve in Fig 26). |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the moderator’s comment that if no consensus can be reached by end of this meeting, then this discussion should be closed.  Regarding the complexity, the filter tap estimation has relatively small portion of overall complexity and main computational load comes from applying the filter, so the computation gain of cyclic sequence or ZP tones is not significant. |
| Futurewei | Since comb-PTRS does not guarantee to lead to the best performance in all cases, it is restrictive to disallow block-PTRS. There is possibility that there exists new sequences that work better with block-PTRS. Therefore, we would like to keep block-PTRS a viable choice. |
| Intel | Disagree with Moderator’s comment about closing the discussion if no consensus is reached this meeting.  We think the source of discrepancy among the companies’ evaluation results and views is that many companies evaluate block PT-RS with non-optimal block size and with non-optimal de-ICI filter estimation algorithm. The results in our Tdoc shows that the different choice of the combination of these two can lead to the opposite conclusions. Also, we found that block PT-RS pattern has more advantage in the channel with low frequency selectivity, e.g., a LoS channel. In our view, having block PT-RS performance gain just in LoS is enough to justify its adoption, because LoS links are common in mmWave communication.  To overcome the split between companies’ views, we propose to agree on the set of assumptions focused specifically on block PT-RS evaluation:   1. Make a LoS channel model mandatory for block PTRS evaluations. 2. Compare Rel-15 PTRS with direct de-ICI filter estimation algorithm to block PTRS of the block size *NB* ~ 40 with PN-based coefficients estimation algorithm. 3. Use high MCS with rank 2 as a focus area of PT-RS enhancements evaluation.   We encourage companies to evaluate block PT-RS till the next meeting using these assumptions. If no substantial performance gain is observed by the companies with this setup, the discussion should be closed at the next meeting. |
| Samsung | In our evaluation, performance gain for power boosted block PTRS and complexity reduction on block PTRS with ZP tones are valid. The performance improvement on 70GHz is wider in both cases. Therefore, we support to keep block-PTRS a viable choice. |
| Mitsubishi | We do not agree with the moderator’s comment about closing the discussion.  Several companies show important gain with cyclic block PTRS with different sequences when a fit combo of sequence/pattern/receiver is used. Performance gap is even more important at 70GHz.  On the results themselves, there are differences in the evaluation settings (receiver, sequence optimization etc) that may explain a certain amount of misalignment. In Ericsson’s evaluations for example on the part on “square circulant” sequences, annex A.3 describes some averaging among equalized samples y leading to an anti-match filter combiner, which is different from the receiver detailed in section 2.4.2 in our contribution, as we explained in our section 2.4.4.  While in the past meetings the group decided based on simulation results that increasing the density of the Rel.15 pattern is not useful for large RB allocations, such a conclusion has not been drawn for all block sequences. There is no reason to force all the cyclic block pattern to an equivalent K=2 or 4 if other (for example higher) densities provide spectral efficiency gains, which seems to be the case at least with the “square circulant” sequence. In our contribution we show for example significant spectral efficiency gain with 16x16 patterns/256RB or 8x12/64RB, which is different from patterns based on equivalent K=2 or 4. Some pattern optimization based on spectral efficiency may be needed without imposing strict K equivalence.  The principles of cyclic block PTRS should be supported, and further refinement of the sequence / optimization of the number of blocks/block length should be conducted. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with Moderator that the discussion should be closed if no consensus is achieved by the end of this meeting. At this stage, we should concentrate on comparing evaluation results based on mandatory parameters in agreed evaluation assumption rather than propose some new evaluation parameters. As for the PTRS density of block PTRS and legacy PTRS, K=2 will result in a PTRS sequence of total length 128, which will be enough to derive different combinations of block number and block size, so we don’t see the necessity to allocate a different PTRS density for block PTRS. |
| Ericsson | We agree with the moderator about closing the discussion if consensus is not achieved by the end of the meeting. We feel that extensive evaluations have been performed for a wide range of scenarios, and the Rel-15 solution is very robust. We don't see a need for further enhancement.  @Huawei  Thank-you for your careful checking of our results. We think you refer to Figs. 14 and 26 in both of your comments (not Fig. 12). We went back and check, and yes, we made a small plotting error. We have regenerated the results and include updated Figs 14 and 26 here. There is no change to our conclusions.  Chart, line chart  Description automatically generatedChart, line chart  Description automatically generated  Figure 14: BLER and spectral efficiency (SE) plots for the best Rel-15 PTRS-based, best square circulant PTRS structure, and best orthogonal circulant PTRS structure for 120 kHz SCS MCS 22 and 60 GHz carrier frequency in TDL-A channel with 10 ns DS for 64-RB allocation    Figure 26: BLER and SE plots for the best Rel-15 PTRS, best orthogonal circulant PTRS, and best orthogonal circulant PTRS with 3 dB power boosting for 120 kHz SCS MCS 22 and 60 GHz carrier frequency in TDL-A channel with 10 ns DS for 64-RB allocation. |
| vivo | Agree with the moderator’s comment. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine to further discuss.  We think the complexity of UE receiver should be considered as important aspect with the given comparable performance among schemes. We slightly prefer the block-PTRS with ZP tones when considering complexity and potential power boosting gain. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thank you Ericsson for clarifying and fixing the discrepancy in the curves based on the same simulation assumptions.  We are seeing some differences in the evaluation assumptions and thus are planning on running more evaluations with aligned assumptions. As a quick comment, we anticipate that de-ICI filtering (A.1 in Ericsson’s Tdoc) would perform better (albeit with higher complexity) than Orthogonal circulant ICI filter approximation (A.4) when applied to Orthogonal circulant PTRS. |
| Mitsubishi | @ZTE: You state that “we don’t see the necessity to allocate a different PTRS density for block PTRS”. Yet, in our contribution, you can see in Fig. 7-12 that for the cyclic block sequence (labelled “square circulant” in Ericsson’s results) doubling the density with respect to K=2 constantly brings a gain of >1dB in SNR and more than 10% in spectral efficiency. This alone can explain the discrepancies in the results, since cyclic block was often simulated by different companies with non-optimized patterns and at 60GHz only.  We feel that some sequence optimization, picking the right combo sequence/pattern/receiver and looking deeper into the results at 70GHz would be helpful in aligning the results. |
| Ericsson | @Mitsubishi  Thank-you for your comment on perceived receiver differences. What we have found is that by straightforward linearity of the LS estimator, post-estimation averaging gives the same result (and thus same performce) as pre-estimation averaging just with more computational complexity. For the -th block, minimizing gives a local LS estimate of  The final estimate of pooling across all blocks is given by |
| CATT | We agree with Moderator that the discussion should be closed if no consensus is achieved by the end of this meeting. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Thanks all for providing comments.  Based on all the input, I don’t see a shift of company positions. I understand that each company express their view/preference based their own analysis/evaluations. However, with all the discrepancy in the reported results and company views, it’s not possible for me, as the moderator, to recommend any proposed PTRS enhancement here for now.  I see some companies want to continue discussion/evaluation and don’t agree with my suggestion to close this discussion if no consensus by the end of this meeting. We did this discussion for three meetings already. We started with agreeing what aspects to consider/to evaluate in RAN1#104-e. We then tried to align evaluation assumptions with agreement made in RAN1#104b-e. The results are submitted in this meeting. My concern is on the limited time for this WI. There’re multiple proposed PTRS enhancements on the table. Even if we somehow agree on the principle of some kind of PTRS enhancement in next meeting, there’re many details to be decided.  There’re proposals to align more assumptions (e.g., block size, channel model, MCS choice, sequence/pattern/receiver, etc.). I guess the intention is to find a case to show the benefit of PTRS enhancement. The fundamental question I think the proponent need to answer in order to convince the whole group is: is the system broken if no PTRS enhancement is adopted.  Although there’s already views expressed disagreeing with such proposal on further evaluation. I encourage companies to continue discussion. |
| Mitsubishi | @Ericsson  I understand the linearity argument you are stating, but I think that there might be a missing step in your description.  After channel equalization, there is still some residual channel (mainly due to the ICI phase noise effect, since in the frequency domain the phase noise applies as a convolution and not as a point-wise product). This effect is expected to be enhanced when increasing the carrier frequency. Let us simply model this residual channel as a coefficient specific to each block . The fact that this coefficient is different from a block to another is the cause of the lack of coherence that you are highlighting and this is why a simple compensation of this residual coefficient is needed BEFORE averaging (otherwise, there would be some non-coherent averaging as the one you are describing).  More clearly, the initial PN estimate for the block is :  This residual channel can be deduced easily from , e.g. because it is the sample of greatest power. This provides the coherent PN estimate for the block (without AWGN) :  The final PN estimate is the average of all this local PN estimates. This avoids the non-coherent summation. The issue you are mentioning may occur if you ignore the residual channel. If we take the residual channel into account, then the average process should not be performed before obtaining local PN estimate for each block.  To our point of view, the lack of performance observed from companies simulations with our pattern may come from differences in the receiver (e.g. ignoring the residual channel or other differences) and/or from a lack of sequence optimization (e.g. density, Ng, Ns…). As I previously pointed out in my answer to ZTE, we saw at least 1dB/10% spectral efficiency improvement of our proposed sequence with equivalent K=1 over equivalent K=2 for example.  @Moderator  I am a bit worried about the “is the system broken” approach, which is something that we usually deal with in the CR phase when we made bad decisions in the WI phase. Right now in the WI phase, and in order to avoid that kind of discussion during maintenance, we should strive to come up with an performant design rather than settling in for average performance (that several companies already shown that we can significantly improve) just because it is already there. As per a standing agreement, we are supposed to make a decision “*based on performance benefit, receiver complexity and specification effort aspects of enhanced PT-RS design together and not purely on the considerations of the specification effort caused by supporting potential enhanced PT-RS design in addition to existing PT-RS design”.* May I also remind that the reason why this topic could not progress in the past meeting is because contributions on the topic were not allowed. I would also like to point out that only 2 companies looked into the 70GHz performance, which should not be ignored in the current WI, and that the reasons for result misalignment is still under investigation and seems so far explicable. |
|  |  |
| Moderator 2 | Summary of company positions based on comments provided:  Support block PTRS with cyclic sequence.  Yes: Huawei (ZC sequence and circular part based on ZC sequence), Mitsubishi (a sequence of KP samples includes a cyclic prefix of floor(KP/2) samples), Samsung (no preference indicated for cyclic sequence)  No: LG, ZTE, Ericsson, vivo, CATT, Qualcomm  Support block PTRS with ZP tones  Yes: Samsung, Qualcomm, Nokia  No: vivo, CATT, ZTE, Ericsson, LG  Support block PTRS  Yes: Samsung, Intel  No: vivo, CATT, ZTE, Ericsson, LG  Conclude in RAN1#106 to not introduce PTRS enhancement if no consensus on any PTRS enhancement:  Yes: Lenovo, LG, ZTE, Ericsson, vivo, CATT  No: Intel, Futurewei, Huawei, Samsung, Mitsubishi, Nokia  It seems the best we can do is to further study and conclude at next meeting. |

##### Proposal 3-1-1:

Further study and conclude on whether to introduce any PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM by RAN1#106b.

* Note: details of specification impact for any proposed PTRS enhancement shall be provided to facilitate drawing conclusion in RAN1#106b

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal 3-1-1 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| Mitsubishi | OK with the proposal. I hope that more companies will be able to evaluate (including 70GHz range) until the next meeting |
| Intel | Support the proposal, including the note on providing specification impact details.  Suggest adding the second note for better results alignment and inclusion of an important propagation environment for 52.6–71GHz:   * Note: the following evaluation assumptions are recommended for block PT-RS evaluation:   + Line-of-sight channel model (T/C)DL-D/E   + Rank 2 Tx, 64QAM   + PT-RS block size *Kp* ∈ [35, 45]   + ICI filter approximation approach to de-ICI filter estimation   The corresponding de-ICI filter estimation algorithm is actually referred in different ways, namely: PN spectrum-based filter estimation [21, Intel], ICI filter approximation [13, Ericsson][18, Qualcomm][8, Samsung], Alg-2 [1, Huawei], PN compensation filtering [2, Mitsubishi].  We believe obtaining the results with the provided assumptions in addition to the already generated data would allow the group to have a complete performance landscape view to make a decision next meeting. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal 3-1-1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal 3-1-1 |
| Moderator | Respond to Intel:  On your suggestion of the 2nd note, some clarification questions and comments:  1. Is the intention to specify/mandate a particular UE receiver algorithm if block PTRS is supported? As if the performance benefits of block PTRS are only shown for a particular receiver algorithm, it may require the corresponding algorithm to be specified to ensure the performance benefits if block PTRS is supported.  2. On other suggestions of evaluation assumptions, they are already allowed in the agreed assumption list. I hope we don’t repeat the debate on which assumption is more appropriate and/or mandatory vs. optional evaluation assumptions. It has been extensively discussed already in SI phase.  3. On the suggestion of block size for block PTRS, it was agreed in RAN1#104-e that “Companies are asked to report details of PN compensation method(s) with corresponding receiver complexity and details of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM if evaluated. For example, for block-based PTRS enhancement, the number of PTRS blocks per OFDM symbol, the number of PTRS REs per block, and the placement of PTRS blocks in each OFDM symbol are required to be provided if evaluated.” Is it agreeable now to all companies that block size for block PTRS is in the proposed range of [35, 45]? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In the study phase the TR summarized results obtained by various companies on the potential gains of PTRS enhancements. Due to the lack of alignment among companies it wasn’t possible to draw a conclusion on whether to support PTRS enhancements. We are still seeing some different observations with the same evaluation assumptions.  We ran more simulations over the past few days to align with Ericsson’s assumptions. The results for TDLA (10 ns, 3km/h) at 60 GHz with 120 kHz SCS, 64 RBs with rank 1 and MCS22 are shown below, where the best ICI order was found to be order 7 with power boosting applied, using the de-ICI algorithm (A.1 in Ericsson’s Tdoc):  cid:image012.png@01D79813.E6BD86A0  We also ran the same evaluations with MCS26, where a larger gain can be observed:  cid:image013.png@01D79813.E6BD86A0  Referring to the results provided in Figure 4 for CLD-D in our Tdoc R1-2107663, we agree with Intel’s observations that with LOS the gains are larger and are worth pursuing.  Although it is possible to make a binary decision (support or don’t support), updated observations of the potential gains (with different receiver assumptions) based on the updated results from all companies would be beneficial before making a decision. There might still be cases where an error floor is observed. The discussion in 3-1-2 may anyway require such observations for combinations of (SCS, BW, MCS, rank), which may need to be subject to UE capability reporting.  In any case, a uniform decision should be made on 3-1-1 and 3-2, either continue studying both or stop studying both. If a decision is made to stop studying PTRS enhancements for CP-OFDM, then either RAN1 should continue investigating combinations of (SCS, BW, MCS, rank) that would result in an error floor, or inform RAN4 about the risk that not all UE implementations may be able to support all combinations of (SCS, BW, MCS, rank) without an error floor. |
| Intel | @Moderator  1. Of course we don’t have an intention to mandate/specify any receiver algorithm. The intention is only to make a fair comparison of the PT-RS structures in their best performing conditions.  According to our results, block PT-RS with direct de-ICI filter coefficients estimation (non-optimal algorithm for block PT-RS) show no loss comparing to Rel-15 PT-RS with the same estimation algorithm. That means, if a UE doesn’t have the optimal algorithm implemented, it just doesn’t get the block PT-RS gains in LoS. Instead, it gets the performance similar to Rel-15 PT‑RS. So, the potential adoption of block PT-RS pattern doesn’t mandate the support of any new filter estimation algorithm but left the UE vendors to decide whether they want to improve the peak data rate performance in LoS or not.  2/3. We believe, the common goal of the group is to evaluate the proposed enhancements from different angles and capture as many of the performance traits as possible. We found that block PT­-RS wasn’t previously evaluated in the particular conditions we suggest in the note, so it would be beneficial to add the observations in these conditions to the common picture. The assumptions we suggest shouldn’t be read as restrictive (other *Kp* values/filter estimation algorithms/channel conditions can surely be evaluated as well). They just highlight the particular point of interest we found during our evaluation work. We believe, it would be in line with the common goal to cross-check our findings by the companies. Having the complete & verified performance landscape should help RAN1 to make a mature data-driven decision the next meeting. |
| Moderator2 | A clarification question to Huawei:  On your comment about “a uniform decision should be made on 3-1-1 and 3-2, either continue studying both or stop studying both.”. I assume it’s a typo, should be 3-1-2, not 3-2. Given proposal 3-1-1 has a deadline (by RAN1#106b), is your suggestion to have the same deadline (by RAN1#106b) as well for discussion point 3-1-2 which is about UE capability?  Respond to Intel:  Thanks for your clarification on the receiver algorithm.  I believe we all want a fair comparison. As we already agreed, the decision “will be made based on performance benefit, receiver complexity and specification effort aspects of enhanced PTRS design together”. So the group will look at all these aspects and make the decision, but not just based on performance benefit.  On your suggested note of recommended evaluation assumptions, we made the agreement in RAN1#104b-e “recommended to strictly follow and evaluate at least based on assumptions which are not optional in previous agreed LLS assumptions”. Even with that, there’re some companies didn’t follow that with their submitted results to this meeting. I understand every company has their own preferred evaluation assumption based on their point of interest. Unless it’s a common thing agreeable to all, I don’t intend to list recommended evaluation assumptions if it’s just some companies’ preference.  I’ll let other companies to comment and see if they agree with the addition of your suggested note into proposal 3-1-1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal 3-1-1.  We don’t think the note is needed, these optional parameters are already in agreed simulation assumption, we can consider to evaluate optional parameters but it would help more to focus on mandatory evaluation assumptions. As for the block size, we already tried different combinations of block number and block size, including what intel suggests, we are not convinced that the block size in the range [35, 45] always has the best performance. |
| Mitsubishi | We are fine with the current proposal.  Concerning the note, we can be supportive of some general suggestion encouraging companies to look into some directions which (although not mandatory in the initial LLS assumptions) are quite pertinent for the 52-71 GHz, like LOS channels and 70GHz carrier frequency. As Intel, we have seen that ICI filter approximation performs better than direct de-ICI on block PTRS.  We do not think that a specific block size should be recommended, every company can report the optimized Ng x Ns pattern that is better performing for a given sequence (I don’t think that for example ZP, cyclic block with both pre and postfix and cyclic block with prefix only have the same optimal Ng x Ns pattern). |
| Ericsson | We are fine with proposal 3-1-1 as is, and would prefer not to add more notes about different evaluation scenarios.  We have the below agreement from RAN1#104bis-e, and companies are free to bring in results for whatever scenario they want. As the moderator points out, not even the first bullet was strictly followed in all cases. Hence, it doesn't make sense to start adding more scenarios.  Agreement:   * It is recommended to strictly follow and evaluate at least based on assumptions which are not optional in previous agreed LLS assumptions for study of potential RS enhancements for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.   + Note: evaluation based on optional model/scenario/parameter values are not precluded from being considered for discussion and decisions * Companies are encouraged to report results (along with previously reported aspects and cubic metric for power boosting aspects) at least for SINR in dB achieving PDSCH/PUSCH BLER of 10% in a numerical and tabular way (e.g. adapted from LLS result report template in SI).   + Note: other ways of presentation of results (e.g. BLER curve) is not precluded |

##### Discussion point 3-1-2:

[21, Intel] observed that de-ICI filtering performance could be improved via several receiver implementation based PN compensation methods. It then evaluated performance of high MCS for rank 1 and rank 2 using existing PTRS with direct de-ICI filter estimation. The following are observed.

* All the MCSs can be supported with rank 1 without any enhancements in the specification with advanced PN compensation technique.
* MCSs up to MCS22 for CP-OFDM can be supported with rank 2 and SCS120kHz using frequency domain de-ICI filtering.
* MCSs up to MCS25 for CP-OFDM can be supported with rank 2 and SCS120kHz using the combination of CP-based pre-compensation, conjugate antisymmetric de-ICI filter property and the unit-magnitude de-ICI compensation in time domain.
* MCS26 for CP-OFDM and above cannot be supported with rank 2 and SCS120kHz by any means of a realistic UE implementation.
* MCSs up to MCS24 for CP-OFDM can be supported with rank 2 and SCS960kHz using frequency domain de-ICI filtering.
* MCSs up to MCS26 for CP-OFDM can be supported with rank 2 and SCS960kHz using the combination of CP-based pre-compensation, conjugate antisymmetric de-ICI filter property and the unit-magnitude de-ICI compensation in time domain.
* MCS27 and above cannot be supported with rank 2 and SCS960kHz by any means of a realistic UE implementation for CP-OFDM.

In summary, [21, Intel] observed that high MCSs may require a combination of several receiver implementation techniques to be supported with rank 2 Tx and some MCSs may not be supported in a practical implementation at all. Therefore, it proposed to introduce UE capability of supporting certain high MCS/rank combinations in FR2-2.

A similar point has been made in [18, Qualcomm] that “define a UE capability to support the high MCS that requires ICI compensation” as phase noise ICI compensation has some computation complexity which may affect timeline for 120 kHz SCS.

Moderator’s comment:

Although briefly touched upon during previous discussion in RAN1#104b-e, this issue has not been extensively discussed. Suggest other companies to provide input for discussion.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We see the merit of limiting certain higher MCS/rank in FR2-2 (based on UE capability) and are open to further discuss this. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Rather than putting such restriction, we should ensure that the design provides the possibility for a UE receiver that can effectively handle phase noise and support all MCS supported by the specs. |
| Futurewei | As this is observed by one company and it seems reasonable to limit higher MCS or rank for FR2-2, we suggest to further study. |
| Intel | We agree with HW that RAN1 should enable UEs to support as high MCS as possible by providing the needed features in the spec. However, our evaluation results give us enough confidence that support of at least MCS26-28 with rank-2 & 120kHz is very unlikely (at least by the means of PT-RS enhancements we discuss today in the WI).  Figure 4.1-4 of our Tdoc R1-2107581 contains “ideal de-ICI” curves. They correspond to using the PN realizations passed through the ideal high-pass filter with the stopband width equal to de-ICI filter bandwidth *BA* = SCS ‧ (2*u*+1). It’s intended to model a de-ICI filter with perfectly estimated taps, fully suppressing low frequency PN components within *BA*. Even this kind of perfect 7-tap filter cannot achieve 10% BLER at an SNR below 40dB when MCS26 is used with rank 2 & 120kHz. This isn’t likely to change by any PT-RS enhancement that improves the filter estimation.  So, in our view there will be some set of high MCSs that is not likely to be supported with rank 2 anyway, therefore the need for the UE capability is already clear. Of course, the upper bound of the potentially achievable MCS depends on the agreed PT-RS enhancements and could be discussed further. |
| Samsung | We are general ok with the direction. The value of “high” MCS and rank combination needs further discussion. |
| Mitsubishi | We are not opposed to the direction, but some further consideration is needed before putting this type of restriction. We should try and enable as many high MCS as possible by carefully designed PT-RS enhancements first and see how to deal with the ones that cannot be reasonably supported in a second step. |
| Ericsson | We do not see the need to introduce a UE capability. We don't think there should be such extreme focus on rank-2 + high MCS for 120 kHz SCS, and we don't see a RAN4 test being developed for such a scenario anyway. Furthermore, we believe that if there is a potential issue for a particular UE, e.g., inability to achieve 10% BLER, such an issue can easily be solved by gNB implementation, e.g., by means of outer loop link adaptation which will reduce the MCS for that users dynamically. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are not sure whether it’s desirable to optimize for such high MCS and high rank, since it requires further optimization on the receiver, the complexity should be carefully analyzed. |
| Apple | The question to ask is that should the UE capability indicate the MCS for ICI PN compensation or (if adopted) the ability to do ICI PN compensation (or advanced PTRS that support ICI PN compensation) ? |
| Nokia/NSB | We can discuss how to define such UE capability (e.g. ICI support or MCS limit) |
| CATT | We are fine to further consider this issue. In anyway, this will be deferred. |
| Intel | In response to Ericsson’s comments.  The main issue that we see is that the specification has the tools to allow to UE to report smaller peak throughput corresponding to use of lower MCS and such. However, this peak throughput is aggregated peak throughput for all band combinations that UE supports. Also there is nothing that stops gNB to schedule these higher MCSs from the specification perspective. While in some scenarios gNB could in fact not utilize higher MCS much, there is no guarantee that it will not use them. In such case UE needs to be able to handle these cases.  Therefore, this isn’t about optimizing specification, but making sure we are not asking the UE to support something that cannot be reasonably supported. Otherwise, we would be asking the UE to wildly complicate the transceiver implementation to support something that may be rarely utilized (according to Ericsson’s opinion). That can impact the first roll out of UEs for 60GHz.  RAN4 requirements and RAN5 conformance testing cannot cover all variables of the feature supported in the specification (obviously). However, it is still understood UE should be able to built to handle cases described in the specification. Not sure if not having RAN4 requirement is a good rule to determine whether UE can cut corners and not implement specific features. We think this would be a really dangerous path. |

#### For small RB allocation with CP-OFDM

In RAN1#104b-e meeting, the following was agreed.

* In Rel-17, for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz, conclude that increased PTRS frequency density is not supported for CP-OFDM at least for Rel-15 PTRS pattern when the allocated number of RB > 32
* Companies are encouraged to study whether to increase PTRS frequency density for small RB allocations for CP-OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with respect to phase noise compensation performance
  + CPE and ICI PN compensation
    - Note: Results for CPE compensation-only are to be reported for reference
  + (K = 0.5, L = 1), (K = 1, L = 1), (K = 2, L = 1),
    - Note: PTRS per K number of PRBs, and PTRS every L number of OFDM symbols
  + Number of RBs: 8, 16, 32
  + Other values of K and number of RBs are not precluded
* Study on other aspects of potential PTRS enhancement (e.g., decreased PTRS frequency density) is not precluded

On this subject, the following sources submitted to this meeting evaluated and compared different frequency density of Rel-15 PTRS pattern with different PN compensation schemes for small RB allocation.

[3, vivo] evaluated and compared the performance of different PTRS density (K=0.5, 1 and 2) with de-ICI (3 taps) and CPE only PN compensation methods with different number of PDSCH RB allocation and different MCS for all SCSs. It observed that while increased PTRS density (K = 0.5 or 1) may help improve the performance of de-ICI compared to K =2 when PDSCH RB number <= 16, a better performance is obtained for CPE only with K = 2 in this case. Given de-ICI with increased density (K = 0.5 or 1) is not the PN compensation method providing the best performance in any of the evaluated cases, it proposed not to increase PTRS density.

[8, Samsung] compared the performance of different PTRS density (K=1, 2 and 4) with de-ICI (3 taps) and CPE only PN compensation for 120 kHz SCS with MCS 22. It observed that for small RB allocations (32RB/16RB/8RB) and legacy PTRS frequency density (K=2 and K=4), CPE compensation outperforms the one with ICI compensation. It also observed that for 16 RBs and 8RBs allocations, K=1 configuration provides better performance for CPE compensation (for 10% BLER target, 1.5 dB gain reported at 8 RB and 2.1 dB gain reported at 16 RB) compared with legacy PTRS frequency density (K =2 and 4).

[10, ZTE] compared the performance of different PTRS density (K=0.5, 1 and 2) with de-ICI and CPE only PN compensation methods for small RB allocations. It observed when PRB number is not larger than 32, CPE compensation with lower PTRS density can achieve similar or better performance than ICI compensation with higher PTRS density.

[13, Ericsson] provided evaluation results on increased PTRS density for small RB allocation. It is observed that even for small RB allocation, enhanced PTRS structure with K = 1 or K=0.5 does not provide additional performance gain over the existing Rel-15 PTRS structure (K = 2 and K=4).

[14, Futurewei] observed that for most cases of PDSCH with 120/480/960 kHz SCS, de-ICI does not necessarily work better than de-CPE method for cases when the number of RBs is small. It observed a performance gain of 1 dB for (K=1, L=1) over (K=2, L=1) with 32 RB for 120 kHz SCS with MCS 22 and 5-tap de-ICI. No gain is observed for (K=1, L=1) for 8 and 16 RB. It proposed to support (K=1, L=1) for 120 kHz SCS with small RB allocation.

[15, Nokia] evaluated different PTRS density for small RB allocation. It observed benefit from increasing PTRS density to K=1 only in a single case when high-order modulation is used and PRBs=16 and ICI compensation is used. It observed no gain is achieved using K=0.5. Further, it argued that using small PRB allocations with high MCSs is a corner case and should not be considered to motivate new PTRS configurations.

[18, Qualcomm] evaluated PN compensation performance for 120 kHz SCS at MCS 22 and MCS 24 with multiple PTRS densities. It observed that for small RB allocation, i.e., 16 or 8 RBs, K=1 enhances the performance while the performance degrades for K=0.5. The performance gain of K=1 for 10% BLER target was reported as 0.5 dB for 8 RB with MCS 22, 0.2 dB for 16 RB with MCS 24 and 0.4 dB for 16 RB with MCS 24. The performance gain of K=1 for 1% BLER target was reported as 4.5 dB for 8 RB with MCS 22, 2.9 dB for 8 RB with MCS 24, 0.6~0.7 dB for 16 RB with MCS 22 and MCS 24.

[19, LG] compared the performance for different PTRS densities for small RB allocation. It observed that PTRS frequency density K=0.5 or 1 does not provide enough performance gain, or provide marginal gain by 0.1 dB in very specific situations.

[22, Apple] compared the performance for different PTRS densities for 480 kHz SCS with MCS 22 and 16 RB. It is observed there is an improvement in BLER performance with increased PTRS density while K = 1 has the highest spectral efficiency compared with K = 0.5 and K = 2 at low SNR. The performance gain of K=1 is > 1dB (moderator’s reading from Figure 7 in [22]) for 10% BLER target and <0.5 dB (moderator’s reading from Figure 8 in [22]) for spectral efficiency.

Companies’ results showing significant performance gain of increased PTRS density (i.e., K=1) for small RB (<=32) allocation are summarized below.

Yes: [8, Samsung] (for 120 kHz with MCS 22), [14, Futurewei] (for 120 kHz with 32 RB and MCS 22), [18, Qualcomm] (for 120 kHz with MCS 22 and 24), [22, Apple] (for 480 kHz with 16 RB and MCS 22)

No: [3, vivo], [10, ZTE], [13, Ericsson], [15, Nokia], [19, LG]

Companies’ view to support increased PTRS density (K=1) for small (<= 32) RB allocation are summarized below.

Yes: [8, Samsung], [14, Futurewei] (for 120 kHz only), [18, Qualcomm], [22, Apple]

No: [3, vivo], [10, ZTE], [13, Ericsson], [15, Nokia], [19, LG]

Moderator’s comment:

Compared to RAN1#104b-e, more evaluation results are submitted. Looking at the available evaluation results from contributions, the performance gain of K=1 are shown for some cases (e.g., small RB (<=32) allocation with high order modulation) by some sources while other sources showed no performance gain at all for those cases. Companies still have split views on whether there’s performance gain of increased PTRS density (K=1) for small RB allocation and hence no consensus to support K=1. Note that, this has already been extensively evaluated for two meetings.

Moderator suggest companies continue discussion to see if any new aspects/arguments can be identified to shift company views in this meeting. Otherwise, it’d be better to conclude and close the discussion point by extending the conclusion agreed in RAN1#104b-e to cover small RB allocation. That is, in Rel-17, for NR operation in FR2-2, conclude that increased PTRS frequency density for Rel-15 PTRS pattern is not supported for CP-OFDM when the allocated number of RB <= 32.

##### Discussion point 3-2:

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with the moderator’s comment that if no consensus can be reached by end of this meeting, then this discussion should be closed |
| Qualcomm | We observe a significant gain from increasing the density to K=1 for small RB allocation, therefore, we support introducing K=1 for small RB allocations |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the moderator’s comment |
| Futurewei | It is fine to reuse the legacy PTRS density for small RB allocation cases. While it is better to allow K=1 for these cases given that there are evaluation results that show the performance gains. |
| Intel | We support increasing PT-RS frequency density to K=1. |
| Samsung | We observed reasonable performance gain for K=1 configuration in small RB allocation (<32) and the spec effort for this is not significant. We support introducing K=1 for small RB allocations. |
| Mitsubishi | Some companies have shown that a CPE approach seems to perform best with small allocations. CPE receiver is fit with any sequence/pattern and its performance varies with the PTRS density, but not necessarily with the sequence/pattern itself. From this perspective, this issue should be discussed after concluding on point 3-1-1 in order to avoid multiplying the designs. |
| Ericsson | We agree with the Moderator's view to close the discussion. We have not found gains for K = 1 compared to existing Rel-15 PTRS with K = 2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with moderator’s conclusion. We don’t see a need to introduce K=1 for small RB allocation. As shown in our evaluation results, CPE compensation shows better performance than ICI compensation when small RB is allocated, and CPE compensation can achieve good performance with existing PTRS density(K=2). |
| Apple | We also observe that CPE compensation shows better performance than ICI compensation with small RBs (similar to ZTE). However, we observe in some specific scenarios there is gain for K = 1 compared with K = 2 and no gains from K = 0.5 in small RB allocations (N\_RB = 16). As such, we can support introducing K =1 for small RBs. |
| vivo | We agree with Moderator’s comment.  @Qualcomm: What reference do you take for significant gain from de-ICI with K=1? |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the moderator’s proposal to conclude that do not introduce new K |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with Mitsubishi |
| CATT | We agree with the Moderator's view to close the discussion. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Summary of company positions based on comments provided:  Support increased PTRS density (K=1) for Rel-15 PTRS pattern with small (<= 32) RB allocation  Yes: Qualcomm, Futurewei, Intel, Samsung, Apple  No: vivo, ZTE, Ericsson, Nokia, LG  Conclude in RAN1#106 if no consensus to support K=1 for Rel-15 PTRS pattern:  Yes: Lenovo, LG, ZTE, Ericsson, vivo, Nokia, CATT  No: Intel, Futurewei, Samsung, Qualcomm, Apple  Discuss after concluding on 3-1-1: Mitsubishi, Huawei  Question to Mitsubishi and Huawei:  Why this should be decided after concluding on 3-1-1? 3-1-1 is on PTRS enhancement. While moderator’s suggested conclusion is “in Rel-17, for NR operation in FR2-2, conclude that increased PTRS frequency density for Rel-15 PTRS pattern is not supported for CP-OFDM when the allocated number of RB <= 32”.  It seems the best we can do is to further study and conclude at next meeting. |

##### Proposal 3-2:

Further study and conclude on whether to introduce K=1 for Rel-15 PTRS pattern for CP-OFDM with small (< =32) RB allocation by RAN1#106b.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal 3-2 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | Support proposal 3-2. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal 3-2. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| Mitsubishi | @Moderator: my comment was intended more for K=1 proponents who see CPE as best fit. I am OK with either original proposal or current proposal |
| Futurewei | We support the proposal 3-2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine with the proposal. |

#### For DFT-s-OFDM

In RAN1#104b-e meeting, the following was agreed.

Continue study at least the following aspects for potential PTRS enhancement for DFT-s-OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz

* The need of potential PTRS enhancement
* PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol when a large number of PRBs is scheduled
  + (Ng = 8, Ns = 4, L = 1), (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1), (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1),
  + Note: Ng number of PT-RS groups, Ns number of samples per PT-RS group, and PTRS every L number of DFT-s-OFDM symbols
  + Other patterns are not precluded
* Other aspects of PTRS enhancements are not precluded from further study

The following contributions submitted to this meeting evaluated and studied on the need of potential PTRS enhancement for DFT-s-OFDM.

[1, Huawei] evaluated a new PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol. It is observed that BLER performance of high MCS (e.g, MCS 22 and MCS 26) with large scheduled bandwidth can be improved by using a new pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol. The performance gain of (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) compared to (Ng = 8, Ns = 4, L = 1) is about 2.8, 1.4 and 0.2 dB for 120, 480 and 960 kHz SCS respectively with large RB allocation (256 RB for 120 and 480, 160 RB for 960 kHz) with MCS 22.

[3, vivo] compared PUSCH performance of DFT-s-OFDM with different PTRS configurations for 120 kHz SCS. It is observed that for MCS-7, MCS-16 and MCS 22, the performance gain of increasing PTRS chunk number is small (<0.8 dB). The gain is more noticeable for MCS 26 and with large RB allocation (e.g 256). However, a question on the motivation of PTRS enhancement for DFT-s-OFDM is raised in [3, vivo] when it is observed that DFT-s-OFDM is mainly used for UL coverage, it is unlikely that very high MCS, such as MCS 26, is typically used with DFT-s-OFDM.

[10, ZTE] evaluated DFT-s-OFDM PUSCH performance of 120 kHz with 64QAM and showed a gain (~0.5 dB for 10% BLER target and ~2 dB for 1% BLER target) at MCS 22 with TDL-A 10 ns.

[14, Futurewei] observed that for each SCS with 64QAM, the PTRS density (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) offers better performance than the legacy density, although the gain is more notable for the smaller SCS. It then proposed to consider increasing PTRS density to (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) for PUSCH in B52/FR2-2 if 64QAM is used; for lower order modulations such as 16QAM and QPSK, the legacy density (Ng = 8, Ns = 4, L = 1) offers fine performance, thus can be reused.

[15, Nokia] evaluated PUSCH performance of DFT-s-OFDM with different PTRS configurations and showed performance improvement of 64QAM with 120 kHz SCS by two different approaches: introducing a PTRS mapping unit in terms of fraction or multiple of DFT-s-OFDM symbols; increasing number of PTRS groups for DFT-s-OFDM to make high order modulations robust to phase noise when a large number of PRBs is used.

[18, Qualcomm] compared PUSCH performance of DFT-s-OFDM with different number of PTRS samples for 120 kHz SCS and observed no significant gain for increasing the total number of PTRS samples to 64 for MCS 22, while small gains (~0.2 dB for 10% BLER) for MCS 24. In addition, increasing the number of PTRS samples beyond 64 is not helping the performance.

[21, Intel] evaluated PUSCH performance of DFT-s-OFDM with different PTRS configurations and showed that PUSCH PTRS patterns with only 4 and 8 PTRS groups provide acceptable performance with 120kHz SCS.

Companies’ results showing notable performance gain of new PTRS configuration with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol when a large number of PRBs is scheduled with high MCS are summarized below.

Yes: [1, Huawei], [3, vivo] (for MCS 22 and 26 only), [10, ZTE], [14, Futurewei], [15, Nokia]

No: [18, Qualcomm]

Companies’ view to support new PTRS configuration with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol when a large number of PRBs is scheduled are summarized below.

Yes: [1, Huawei], [2, Mitsubishi], [10, ZTE], [14, Futurewei] (for 64QAM only), [15, Nokia]

No: [3, vivo], [18, Qualcomm]

Moderator’s comment:

Compared to RAN1#104b-e, more evaluation results are submitted. Majority of evaluation results showed some performance gain of (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) for large RB allocation and high order MCS. Although the motivation question still holds on this PTRS enhancement for DFT-s-OFDM, suggest the following to see if companies can agree to move forward.

##### Proposal 3-3-1:

* For NR operation in FR2-2 with DFT-s-OFDM, support (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) for large RB allocation and high order MCS.
  + Note: Ng number of PT-RS groups, Ns number of samples per PT-RS group, and PTRS every L number of DFT-s-OFDM symbols
  + FFS applicable to which RB allocation(s)
  + FFS applicable to which high order MCS(s)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are okay to support the proposal |
| Qualcomm | The overall performance with the legacy pattern of (Ng = 32, Ns = 4, L = 1) is better than the proposed pattern (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1). Therefore, we do not see a need to introduce such pattern. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support proposal 3-3-1 |
| LG Electronics | Although the evaluation results differ from company to company, the more PTRS groups in a symbol show slightly better performance under specific conditions (e.g., high MCS). However, the method of making a more PTRS group varies from company to company, choosing a specific method: (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) may be a hasty decision. In addition, it seems that the necessity of using high MCS in DFT-s-OFDM transmission should be clearly explained first. |
| Futurewei | For the number of PTRS group, support to increase to the maximal to Ng = 16. For the number of PTRS samples, further evaluation is suggested to verify if a lower density Ns = 2 is always better than a higher density Ns = 4. |
| Intel | We agree with Futurewei that more detailed comparison of (16,2) and (16,4) patterns is needed. Since each pattern can perform better than another in different conditions, the main applicability conditions should be clarified for 16 group PT-RS pattern. |
| Mitsubishi | We see the benefits of supporting Ng=16. We share Futurewei’s view on the Ns values. Rel.15 design with Ng=8 supports only Ns=4, which was evaluated in Rel.15 to be more robust than Ns=2 especially at medium SNR and/or large allocation sizes.  For DFTsOFDM, PTRS provides some useful features allowing time-domain tracking of phase effects within an DFTsOFDM symbol not limited to very high MCS (CFO effects, Doppler shifts etc). For this reason, the limitation per MCS (in the main bullet and in the FFS point) may not be needed).  We think that the FFS point on RB allocation (and the corresponding reference in the main bullet should be remoived: as per TS 38.214/6.2.3.2 a mechanism determining which sequence to be used based on configurable RB thresholds already exists. Limiting the use of the new sequence to certain RB allocations is already possible by extending the current design in a straightforward manner and can be handled by configuration. |
| Ericsson | We do not support the proposal. We agree with LGE’s comments that question the validity of high MCS for DFT-s-OFDM. DFT-s-OFDM is supported for rank-1 only and is intended for coverage scenarios. Optimizing for high MCS does not make sense.  Additionally, the current spec (38.214, TableTable 6.2.3.2-1) does not use different patterns depending on MCS. The patterns/density are varied based on RB allocation only, so the 2nd FFS does not make sense. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. As for increasing the number of samples from 2 to 4, we are open to discuss that since these 2 configurations both show performance gain compared to the existing pattern. |
| Apple | Based on a majority of the results and theory, there is some improvement in performance for high MCSs. Agree with LG that a motivation for high MCS with DFT-S-OFDM needs to be made. |
| Vivo | 1. Agree with LG that the necessity of using high MCS in DFT-s-OFDM transmission should be clearly explained first. 2. If it is necessary to use high MCS in DFT-s-OFDM transmission, we support proposal 3-3-1 because    1. The proposed pattern (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) has better performance than the legacy pattern (Ng = 8, Ns = 4, L = 1) for 64QAM.   The proposed pattern (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) and the pattern (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) have similar BLER performance for 64QAM, but pattern (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) can support higher peak UL T-put in very good channel status, thus we prefer pattern (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) than pattern (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1). |
| Nokia/NSB | This may be one option to consider. Although based on currently evaluated results it is difficult to say whether this is enough for the highest MCSs.  Assume UE’s high RF impairment in FR2-2, DFT-s-OFDM with low PAPR should be the major scheme for UL transmission. Even in FR1, rank 1 transmission is the practically used as a dominant scheme yet, rank limitation of DFT-s-OFDM is not a bit problem. Also, we are proposing rank extension for DFT-s-OFDM in Rel-18, so it can be already a good justification for DFT-s-OFDM with higher MCS. |
| CATT | Support the views from LG and Ericsson. The applicable scenario targeted need to be justified. Also the proposals still need considerable time to consolidate. Suggest to deprioritize. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Summary of company positions based on comments provided:  Support (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) for large RB allocation and high order MCS with DFT-s-OFDM  Yes: Lenovo, Huawei, ZTE, vivo (if necessity of high MCS in DFT-s-OFDM is justified)  OK with Ng=16, FFS Ns between 2 and 4: Futurewei, Intel, Mitsubishi  No: Qualcomm, LG, Ericsson, Apple, CATT |

##### Proposal 3-3-1a:

Further study and conclude on whether to introduce (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) and/or (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) for DFT-s-OFDM by RAN1#106b.

* Note: Ng number of PT-RS groups, Ns number of samples per PT-RS group, and PTRS every L number of DFT-s-OFDM symbols
* FFS applicable to which RB allocation(s) if agreed to introduce (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) and/or (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| Mitsubishi | Fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal to continue the study focusing on the identified configurations. |
| LG Electronics | Fine with the proposal | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We would like to note that with (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1), the issue of PTRS group placement due to Rx timing shift will be observed if Rel-15 placement is directly used. Therefore we would like to encourage companies to evaluate assuming with/without Rx timing shift and consider the proper PTRS group placement in their further evaluations.  We would thus suggest adding an FFS point to the proposal:  **Further study and conclude on whether to introduce (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) and/or (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) for DFT-s-OFDM by RAN1#106b.**   * **Note: Ng number of PT-RS groups, Ns number of samples per PT-RS group, and PTRS every L number of DFT-s-OFDM symbols** * **FFS applicable to which RB allocation(s) if agreed to introduce (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) and/or (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1)** * **FFS PTRS group placement in consideration of robustness to Rx timing shift** | |
| Moderator | Question to Huawei:  I don’t understand why PTRS group placement should be explicitly mentioned in FFS when decide whether to introduce (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1) and/or (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) for DFT-s-OFDM? Your proposal on PTRS group placement in discussion point 3-3-2 applies to all PTRS with .  Is the intention that PTRS group placement problem should only be considered in case of Ng=16? If that’s the intention, then I’ll suggest close discussion point 3-3-2. Otherwise, I recommend not to mix two issues as they are addressing different problems. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is correct that the issue appears generally with Ns=4, thus not only for (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1). If companies are going to further evaluate (Ng = 16, Ns = 4, L = 1) I was merely suggesting to investigate the issue of PTRS group placement for this pattern at the same time. It is not the intention to consider PTRS group placement problem only for Ng=16. In fact the issue will be more severe for smaller values of Ng. We can accept proposal 3-3-1a without an additional FFS. | |

##### Discussion point 3-3-2:

[1, Huawei] also brought up another issue of PTRS group placement for PTRS with It observed that due to Rx timing shift, (part of) a PTRS group placed at the tail of the transmitter’s DFT-s-OFDM symbol, may wrap-around to the head of the symbol from the receiver’s perspective, thus deteriorating PN compensation performance. It then proposed for PTRS with , the mapping of last PTRS group should consider potential Rx timing shift and avoid the last X pre-DFT symbol(s).

Moderator’s comment:

Currently, it is a single company proposal. Suggest other companies to study further on this and provide input for discussion.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Intel | We have done the study of this aspect and provided the details in our revised Tdoc R1-2108334 (Sec. 4.2.3). We compare edge-aligned versions of (8,4) and (16,2) PT-RS patterns (1st and last groups are at the symbol edges) vs center-aligned versions of those patterns (uniform groups placement at the center of each MPUSCH / Ng sample range). The evaluation shows that center-aligned patterns can outperform the edge-aligned ones by ~4dB at MCS25 within the typical Rx timing shift range 0 < Δt < 20% CP.  We support the proposal to adopt the center-aligned version of (8,4) pattern. We also think that in case (16,2) pattern will be adopted, it should be its center-aligned version.  This issue more prominent for larger subcarrier spacing as we expect relatively higher variability between received signals (from timing advance quantization error, tx transmit timing error, etc) with larger subcarrier from UEs in uplink. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As suggested by the Moderator, we agree that it would be beneficial if more companies provide evaluations for this problem, so that we can reach a conclusion at the next meeting, if results from Huawei and Intel are not deemed sufficient for making a decision at this meeting. |
| Mitsubishi | This issue has been already raised and evaluated in Rel.15 (please refer to section 2.4 of R1-1802252 for example). The results at that time showed that severe wrapping around can be avoided for 4x2/4x4 sequences and that it doesn’t have much impact for large number of chunks (8x4 for example, see Fig.6 in R1-1802252), from that perspective it is not sure that we do need a second Ng=8 sequence. When picking a new 16xNs sequence, we choose another placement (e.g. advancing the tail chunk, placing all chunks at the head at each of the Ng symbol segments, using middle placement etc), or simply keep the same head/tail sequence and choose an adapted receiver strategy, since the receiver is aware of the applied shift. The shifting (and created phase discontinuity) is also there for the middle/middle sequence placement or any other placement, some data samples are also affected if the receiver simply ignores the window shift. |
| Intel | @Mitsubishi  Rel.15 study in R1-1802252 deals with 16QAM transmission and lower carrier frequency, which is likely the reason edge-aligned (8,4) pattern doesn’t have a substantial loss from Rx timing shift. Our current evaluations [21] consider MCS25, Huawei’s evaluations – MCS26 [1], which show consistent >5dB loss due to just 10% CP timing shift. So, the issue is clearly present even for (8,4).  We agree with your note that some timing shift loss should be observed even without wrapping a PT-RS group around, but some data samples. We observe this effect as the required SNR for center-aligned pattern grows at Δt < 80% CP (R1-2108334, Fig. 4.2-11, top). However, it’s performance is still better than the edge-aligned pattern for reasonable Δt range below 50% CP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We would like to encourage companies to revisit this issue considering higher frequencies than discussed in Rel-15. In our Tdoc (Figure 21 in R1-2106446), we provided statistics of phase noise and showed that the variance is larger at 60 GHz compared to FR2-1. If RAN1 will continue discussion on 3-3-1a at the next meeting, then we suggest to continue this discussion at the same time, which also needs to be considered for (Ng = 16, Ns = 2, L = 1). |
| Moderator | Very limited input from companies on this issue.  Two companies observed that performance gain for very high MCS (e.g., MCS 25 or 26) with DFT-s-OFDM using different PTRS group placement when some notable RX timing shift is assumed. One company pointed out that similar issue has already been studied and evaluated in Rel-15 and questioned whether such treatment should be considered for FR2-2.  Suggest to continue study. |

##### Discussion point 3-3-3:

One contribution mentioned an issues related to PTRS for DFT-s-OFDM.

It is observed in [21, Intel] that due to code block concatenation, unequal distribution of PN estimation error among DFT-s-ODFM samples may lead to systematic unbalance between code blocks’ BLERs. It also showed performance gain from 0.5dB to 1.7dB for code block interlacing within a DFT-s-OFDM symbol at MCS22. It then proposed to consider code block interlacing for PUSCH with transform precoding.

Moderator’s comment:

Again, right now, it is a single company proposal. The proposal itself seems not proposing some PTRS enhancement but rather on bit/symbol mapping of code block. Suggest the proponent company to clarify and other companies to provide input for discussion.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Qualcomm | This proposal requires a lot of changes and is mainly related to rate match and CB mapping as mentioned by the moderator. Given the limited progress we have made so far, such discussion should be avoided during this release. |
| Futurewei | Agree with the FL’s view that the issue is not directly related to PTRS enhancement. |
| Intel | Although the proposed method is indeed not a PT-RS enhancement, it has substantial effect on PT-RS pattens’ PN compensation performance. For example, the use of per-OFDM symbol CBs interlacing allows to support the full range of MCSs with 960kHz SCS using the existing (8,4) PT‑RS pattern. So, in our view its natural to discuss it together with PT-RS pattern enhancements, because it can affect the PT-RS pattern choice.  In our revised Tdoc R1-2108334 (Sec. 4.2.2) we provide the evaluation of per-OFDM symbol CBs interlacing across different PT-RS patterns, MCSs, SCSs and FDRAs. We can confirm that éCBs interlacing provides performance gain in all the tested scenarios with zero increase of PT-RS overhead. The gain is pretty large in high data rate scenario (up to 10dB with (8,4) pattern, up to 3dB with (16,2) pattern at MCS27).  We encourage companies to cross-check our evaluations and provide their view on the details of the interlacing procedure (i.e., block interleaver depth, interlacing of CBs of unequal size etc.). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with moderator’s understanding and prefer to de-prioritize this issue. |
| vivo | Agree with moderator’s understanding |
| Nokia/NSB | The approach might potentially help ONLY in specific scenarios where we have clearly may code blocks in one OFDM symbol and code blocks not spanning over different OFDM symbols. Another issue is that if the maximum number of PTRS groups is increased, we believe that the (potential) benefit of this approach vanishes anyway. One more drawback of this method would be also that it would require new interleaving components at UE side requiring new UE capability.  Thus, we propose to conclude not to consider this approach. |
| Intel | @Nokia  The results in R1-2108334 (Fig. 4.2-5) show that the benefits of CBs interlacing are still present even for denser (16,2) PT-RS pattern. In particular, there is a significant ~3dB gain for MCS27 with 120kHz SCS. |
| Moderator | Summary of discussion:  One company (the proponent) clarified that the proposal is on code block interleaving and not on PTRS enhancement for DFT-s-OFDM. It showed some performance gain for high data rate scenario (e.g., with MCS 27). All other companies proposed to either de-prioritize or conclude not to consider it during Rel-17 due to concerns on the specification efforts for code block interleaving and considerations of current progress on PTRS itself with limited time for the WI.  Suggest to de-prioritize this discussion. |

## 2.4. DMRS

### Individual observations/proposals

The following are individual observations/proposals from the contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sources | Observations/proposals |
| [1, Huawei] | Observation 7: For 480 kHz and 960 kHz, bundling DMRS in one slot per multi-slot outperforms the legacy DMRS pattern mapped per slot.  Proposal 13: Support DMRS mapped on symbol l0 to symbol l0+S\*L-1 within the first PDSCH slot for the multi-slot scheduling, when only front-loaded DMRS is configured, where L is the length and l0 the starting symbol of legacy front-loaded DMRS. |
| [3, vivo] | Observation 6:   * Comparing with legacy pattern (type-1 with FD-OCC), ‘type-1 no FD-OCC’ has obvious performance gain for DS >= 20ns; * ‘DMRS on every RE with FD-OCC’ has better performance than ‘Type-1 with FD-OCC’ and ‘Type-1 no FD-OCC’, and the performance between DMRS on every RE with/without FD-OCC is very close; * ‘Type-1 no FD-OCC’ and ‘DMRS on every RE with FD-OCC’ still support 2-port transmission, which can be used for MU-MIMO or 2-layer transmission for single UE; * ‘Type-1 no FD-OCC’ still supports data multiplexing in DMRS symbols, while ‘DMRS on every RE’ can’t support this. * ‘Type-2 no FD-OCC’ has better performance than ‘Type-2 with FD-OCC’, and the gain on SCS-960KHz is higher than the gain on SCS-480KHz; * The performance of ‘Type-2 no FD-OCC’ is a little worse than that of ‘Type-1 no FD-OCC’.   Proposal 5: Support ‘type-1 no FD-OCC’ for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS in Rel-17.  Proposal 6: Do no introduce new DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS in Rel-17. |
| [5, InterDigital] | Observation 1: Type-2 DM-RS shows performance loss due to insufficient RS density in low SNR.  Observation 2: Type-1 DM-RS shows performance loss due to FD-CDM in nonconsecutive REs.  Observation 3: Dynamic switching between the existing pattern and DM-RS with enhanced density provides best performance.  Proposal 1: Support proposed DM-RS pattern with dynamic switching for PDSCH and PUSCH with larger SCSs.  Observation 4: Dynamic switching can be achieved by utilizing reserved values for antenna port(s) indication table in DCI.  Proposal 2: Support the updated antenna port(s) indication table for enhanced density DM-RS. |
| [7, Lenovo] | Observation 1: For higher SCS values such as 480kHz and 960kHz, BLER performance difference between the ideal channel estimation and real channel estimation varies for different SCS values, where, as the subcarrier spacing is increasing, the performance degradation with real channel estimation also increases which could be attributed to the performance of DM-RS configuration with different SCS values  Proposal 10: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, new DM-RS configurations should be supported with following criterion:   * High frequency density of the DM-RS for high SCS for better channel estimation when channel coherence bandwidth is less than the configured SCS * Reduced number of DM-RS ports as the performance gain of high rank MIMO channels is expected to be limited in this FR   Proposal 11: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, it should be agreed to not support FD-OCC for DMRS type 1 and type 2 configuration and maximum number of orthogonal DMRS ports are reduced   * DMRS type 1:   + 1-symbol: No FD-OCC, maximum # of DMRS ports is 2   + 2-symbol: No FD-OCC, maximum # of DMRS ports is 4 * DMRS type 2:   + 1-symbol: No FD-OCC, maximum # of DMRS ports is 3   + 2-symbol: No FD-OCC, maximum # of DMRS ports is 6 |
| [8, Samsung] | Proposal 5: Support FD-OCC disable applicable to certain DMRS indication value by RRC configuration.  Proposal 6: Support DMRS overhead reduction in time domain and DMRS bundling across multiple PDSCH/PUSCHs. |
| [9, CATT] | Proposal 16: Use existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz; new DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density is not supported.  Proposal 17: Additional potential DMRS enhancement for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling is not supported.  Proposal 18: The reserved states in the "Antenna port(s)" field can be used to indicate the FD-OCC off state for rank -1. |
| [10, ZTE] | Observation 5: With the same total RS power, Rel-15 DMRS Type 1 pattern and the new DMRS pattern that fully occupied in frequency domain show comparable performance.  Proposal 13: Reuse the Rel-15 legacy DMRS pattern for 52.6GHz~71GHz.  Proposal 14: Support to use the reserved bit to indicate whether FD-OCC is applied. |
| [13, Ericsson] | Proposal 29 For DMRS-Type 1 for 480 and 960 kHz SCS, support a method for rank-1 transmission that enables the UE to assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports within a CDM group are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE. Further discuss whether or not an RRC parameter is needed to enable this. |
| [15, Nokia] | Observation 11: Existing RAN1 specification provides support for flexible configuration of different DMRS antenna ports belonging into same or different CDM groups for rank-1 and rank-2.  Observation 12: For rank-1, type-1 and new type (“comb-1”) w/o OCC-2 can achieve better BLER performance of PDSCH compared with the type-2 DMRS w/o OCC-2 with SCSs =480 and 960 kHz.  Observation 13: For rank-2, both type-1 and type-2 DMRS w/o OCC-2 outperfom other DMRS types in BLER performance with SCSs=480 and 960 kHz.  Observation 14: Type-1 w/o OCC-2 outperforms in BLER performance other DMRS types in the most of the considered cases.  Observation 15: It is reasonable to provide a specification support for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH to be optimized only up to rank-2 in Rel-17 for at higher carrier frequencies (>52.6 GHz).  Observation 16: New DMRS type (irrespective of rank 1 or rank 2) does not provide any possibility for multiplexing of it with any other type of signal/RS/channel into same OFDM symbol.  Observation 17: Due to additional RS overhead associated with the new DMRS type, the usage of new DMRS type leads to reduced achievable PUSCH/PDSCH throughput in comparison with type-1 DMRS w/o OCC.  Observation 18: New DMRS type approximately doubles the computational complexity of the channel estimation associated with PUSCH/PDSCH.  Observation 19: It is not feasible to introduce new DMRS type for PUSCH/PDSCH in Rel-17 for above 52.6 GHz.  Proposal 21: No additional DMRS pattern is supported in Rel-17 for above 52.6 GHz.  Proposal 22: Support one of following alternatives for enhancement of the rank 1 PDSCH DM-RS reception.   * Alt 1: UE assumes no MU-pairing is applied when scheduled with 1 DM-RS port * Alt 2: Introduce new antenna port mapping of rank 1 scheduling and no MU-pairing. |
| [18, Qualcomm] | Observation 9: For rank 1, with SCS 960kHz, for channels with larger DS, the main reason of performance degradation with the larger SCS is the loss of orthogonality, and the gain from increasing the frequency density of the DMRS tones is limited, i.e., the performances of Config.1 with no CDMing and the new configuration with no CDMing are very close to each other.  Observation 10: For rank 1, with SCS 480kHz, even for channels with larger DS, the different DMRS patterns have very comparable performances, and the best performance is obtained Config.1 with no CDMing.  Observation 11: For rank 2, with SCS 960kHz, with DS 20ns all DMRS patterns perform the same, while with DS 50ns, there is a significant performance loss when FD-OCC is ON, and the best performance is obtained with config type 1 with ports from different CDM groups.  Observation 12: For rank 2, with SCS 480kHz, all DMRS patterns perform the same.  Proposal 5: Do not introduce a new pattern with DMRS tones sent over every RE, for the higher band.  Proposal 6: For DMRS enhancement for high SCSs, while communicating over channels with large DS and using high MCS, for rank 1, a single port should be used from one CDM group and the remaining ports from the same group should not be assigned to other UEs.  Proposal 7: Consider the following options to signal the information of FD-OCC OFF/ON   * Option 1: RRC configuration tied to an MCS threshold * Option 2: DCI indication by introducing new entries to the DMRS antenna ports tables, e.g., reuse the reserved entries |
| [19, LG] | Proposal #18: DM-RS configuration without FD-OCC should be supported for high SCS.  Proposal #19: Further study on how to indicate implicitly that FD-OCC is not applied to DM-RS port is required. |
| [21, Intel] | Proposal 15:   * For DMRS enhancement in NR extension up to 71 GHz support either indication to UE that CDM groups, signaled in scheduling DCI, do not contain potential co-scheduled DMRS ports (aka DMRS without OCC de-spreading) or full-density DMRS (without any OCC de-spreading restrictions). |
| [22, Apple] | Proposal 4: Conclude that no new DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS in Rel-17.  Proposal 5: To account for transmission with large SCSs in low coherence BW channels,   * turn on or off the FD-OCC based on the scenario the channel is in * configure the UE with a DMRS port pattern based on the new SCSs and the coherence bandwidth of the channel * This should be applicable to DMRS type-1 and DMRS type-2.   Proposal 6: Deprioritize the study of DMRS bundling and DMRS overhead reduction for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz operation. |
| [24, NTT DOCOMO] | Proposal 1: Support DMRS configuration, in which FD-OCC is not applied for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS, for Type1 and/or Type 2 DMRS  Proposal 2: Support new DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density than the existing DMRS patterns for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS. |

### Summary on DMRS

#### FD density

The following was agreed in RAN1#104-e meeting.

* Existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 120 kHz SCS.
* At least existing DMRS patterns are supported for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Further study on whether to introduce different DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density (in number of subcarriers) than the existing DMRS patterns for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS
* Further study on whether and how to restrict DMRS port configuration (e.g., the number of DMRS ports) as in FR2 for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS

On the need of DMRS enhancement for 480 and 960 kHz SCS, the following contributions submitted to this meeting evaluated and compared BLER performance using the existing comb DMRS pattern against some new DMRS patterns.

[3, vivo] compared performance of Rel-15 Type-1 DMRS and DMRS on every RE for high MCS with different DS. It is observed that ‘DMRS on every RE with FD-OCC’ has better performance than ‘Type-1 with FD-OCC’. It also observed that ‘Type-1 no FD-OCC’ still supports data multiplexing in DMRS symbols, while ‘DMRS on every RE’ cannot support that.

[5, InterDigital] compared BLER and throughput performances of Rank 1 and Rank 2 for 480 and 960 kHz SCS. It observed performance gain of an enhanced DMRS pattern with increased density for low SNR UEs. It proposed to support new DMRS pattern and dynamic switching of existing and new patterns.

[7, Lenovo] evaluated BLER performance of DMRS mapped to each RE in frequency domain and showed about 1 dB gain for 960 kHz SCS compared to existing type-1 DMRS. It also proposed to reduce number of DM-RS ports as the performance gain of high rank MIMO channels is expected to be limited in this FR.

[10, ZTE] observed that with the same total RS power, Rel-15 DMRS Type 1 pattern and the new DMRS pattern that fully occupied in frequency domain show comparable performance.

[15, Nokia] compared BLER performance of rank-1 and rank-2 PDSCH for different DMRS configuration options w/ and w/o OCC-2 (i.e. Rel-15 type-1, Rel-15 type-2 and new type (“comb-1”) ) without any phase noise impairments for 480 and 960 kHz SCS. It is observed that new type DMRS (i.e. comb-1 or increased frequency density) does not outperform Type-1 w/o OCC-2.

[18, Qualcomm] compared PDSCH performance of a new DMRS pattern featured by high frequency density (i.e., every RE) and 2-FD-OCC across adjacent REs with existing type-1 and type-2 DMRS patterns with 480 and 960kHz SCS. It is observed that the gain from increasing the frequency density of the DMRS tones is limited (e.g., < 0.2 dB when CDM is off for MCS22).

[21, Intel] evaluated PDSCH performance with and without frequency domain OCC being enabled as well as full density DMRS. For higher order modulation such as 64QAM (MCS 22), it observed the performance gain for both without FD-OCC and full density DMRS. It then proposed to support either FD-OCC off or full density DMRS.

[22, Apple] compared the performance of new pattern (increased density) for the 960 kHz SCS with different channel delay spreads at 5 usec, 10 usecs, and 20 usec for MSCS 22. It observed a small improvement (0.5 dB at 10-1 for DS = 20) in BLER performance and proposed that new pattern should not be adopted.

[24, NTT DOCOMO] have evaluated PDSCH BLERs with 480 and 960 kHz SCS for different DMRS patterns with 2-port configuration, i.e., Rel-15 DMRS type 1 with comb and non-comb (i.e., FD-OCC) based 2-port configuration, Rel-15 DMRS type 2 with comb and non-comb (i.e., FD-OCC) based 2-port configuration, and 2-port DMRS with DMRS on every RE in the symbol containing DMRS. It observed performance gain of full-density DMRS.

In addition to BLER performance, other aspects of block DMRS including the possibility for multiplexing of it with any other type of signal/RS/channel into same OFDM symbol, extra overhead and computational complexity of channel estimation are discussed in [15, Nokia].

Companies’ results showing notable performance gain of increased DMRS frequency density are summarized below.

Yes: [3, vivo], [5, InterDigital], [7, Lenovo], [21, Intel], [24, NTT DOCOMO]

No: [10, ZTE], [15, Nokia], [18, Qualcomm], [22, Apple]

Companies’ view to support increased DMRS frequency density are summarized below.

Yes: [5, InterDigital], [7, Lenovo], [21, Intel], [24, NTT DOCOMO]

No: [3, vivo], [9, CATT], [10, ZTE], [15, Nokia], [18, Qualcomm], [22, Apple]

Moderator’s comment:

It has been three meetings for companies to consider, evaluate and debate on the increased DMRS frequency density. Although more evaluation results are submitted, there has not been a shift in company positions to form a clear majority to support it.

Unless the proponent companies can convince other companies in this meeting, moderator suggest conclude and close the discussion point considering limited time of this WI and in light of the potential support of FD-OCC off (as in section 2.4.2.2), which achieves similar performance improvement compared to legacy DMRS with increased density (full RE).

##### Discussion point 4-1:

Companies are encouraged to provide comments and/or potential agreeable proposal if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, increased DMRS frequency density and/or FD-OCC are essential for the channel estimation performance with higher SCS. Therefore, at least one of these enhancements should be supported. If we can agree to support FD-OCC off, then we are ok with this proposed conclusion. |
| Qualcomm | We do not support introducing new pattern with full RE density as it does not provide a significant performance gain compared with legacy pattern with FD-OCC OFF |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the moderator’s comment that if no consensus can be reached by end of this meeting, then this discussion should be closed.  We do not support the new pattern with full RE density because the new pattern shows only a marginal performance gain compared to the legacy pattern, and also prevents data multiplexing. |
| Futurewei | Since the DMRS frequency density issue has been studied for three meetings and no clear gain is shown by companies to increase the density, it is recommended to reuse the legacy DMRS frequency density and close the discussion. |
| Intel | We support the full density DMRS as it provides improvement of PDSCH performance via better channel estimation according to our evaluation results. |
| Samsung | We agree with moderator’s assessment. |
| Ericsson | We agree with the moderator's assessment and do not support increased density for DMRS. |
| DOCOMO | According to the evaluation results from multiple companies, DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density show better performance. We would see it important feature in this FR, even though its gain is argued as “small”, as UEs in severe environment in terms of SNR is assumed. In addition, we assume limited number of layers could be available in higher FR, which implies less data multiplexing is possible in practice. So we still prefer to have this functionality. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with moderator’s assessment. We do not support introducing new pattern with full density since it cannot provide notable gain. |
| Apple | We agree with the moderator’s assessment. |
| vivo | Agree with the moderator’s comment. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with the moderator’s comment.  When comparing rank1 all-RE pattern vs rank2 without FD-OCC, rank 2 without FD-OCC outperform rank1 all RE pattern. We don’t see any usecase for rank1 all RE pattern. |
| InterDigital | We believe that increased DMRS frequency density should be supported considering performance gain with dynamic density switching. |
| CATT | Agree with the moderator’s comment. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Summary of company positions based on comments/contributions:  Support increased DMRS density regardless whether support FD-OCC off or not: DOCOMO, InterDigital  Support increased DMRS density or FD-OCC off: Lenovo, Intel, vivo  Do not support increased DMRS density: Qualcomm, LG, Futurewei, Samsung, Ericsson, ZTE, Apple, Nokia, CATT |
| Moderator2 | Considering RAN1 agreed to support a configuration of DMRS where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied in section 2.4.2.2, the following conclusion is proposed to conclude the discussion of increased frequency density for existing DMRS pattern. |

##### Conclusion 4-1:

* In Rel-17, for NR operation with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, conclude that new DMRS pattern with increased frequency domain density is not supported.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments especially if they cannot accept this conclusion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the conclusion |
| InterDigital | We are not fine with the conclusion and prefer to further consider new DMRS pattern. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the conclusion |
| Apple | We are fine with the conclusion |
| Moderator | Question to InterDigital:  What aspects and/or issues should be considered for further study with new DMRS pattern? |
| Ericsson | We support the conclusion |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the conclusion. |
| DOCOMO | We can live with the conclusion for the sake of progress. Thanks Moderator for your coordination. |

#### FD OCC

The following was agreed in RAN1#104-e meeting.

Further study on at least the following aspects of potential DMRS enhancement with respect to FD-OCC:

* whether to support a configuration of DMRS in which FD-OCC is not applied for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS
  + Applicability to Type-1 and/or Type-2 DMRS
  + Details on whether and how to indicate that FD-OCC is not applied to DMRS port
  + Impact to UE multiplexing capacity and inter-UE interference in MU-MIMO

The following contributions studied and evaluated performance with respect to FD-OCC.

[3, vivo] compared PDSCH BLER performance of type-1 DMRS with and without FD-OCC for 480KHz and 960 KHz SCS with 64QAM, while the phase noise is compensated with CPE only approach. It observed some gain of both type-1 and type-2 DMRS without OCC for high MCS especially at large delay spread (e.g., TDL-A DS >= 20 ns).

[7, Lenovo] argued that for NR operation beyond 52.6 GHz, the performance gain of high rank is limited. Therefore, it proposed to support FD-OCC off for this FR, at least with high SCS values of 480kHz and 960kHz and consequently reduce the number of orthogonal ports.

[13, Ericsson] proposed to support FD-OCC off for rank-1 UE and argued that such a method is most beneficial for Type-1 DMRS, since this DMRS type is well-suited for the 52.6 – 71 GHz band due to it's low PAPR/CM properties, and the fact that large DMRS port-multiplexing capacity is not needed.

[15, Nokia] compared BLER performance of rank-1 and rank-2 PDSCH for different DMRS configuration options w/ and w/o OCC-2 (i.e. Rel-15 type-1, Rel-15 type-2 and new type (“comb-1”) ) without any phase noise impairments. It is observed that Type-1 w/o OCC-2 outperforms other DMRS configurations. It proposed to support either UE assumes no MU-pairing is applied when scheduled with 1 DM-RS port or introduce new antenna port mapping of rank 1 scheduling and no MU-pairing.

[18, Qualcomm] compared PDSCH performance of a new DMRS pattern featured by high frequency density (i.e., every RE) and 2-FD-OCC across adjacent REs with existing type-1 and type-2 DMRS patterns with 480 and 960kHz SCS. It is observed that for channels with larger DS, the main reason of performance degradation with the larger SCS is the loss of orthogonality. It showed performance gain without CDM for MCS22/26.

[21, Intel] evaluated PDSCH performance with and without frequency domain OCC being enabled for DMRS. For higher order modulation such as 64QAM (MCS 22), it observed the performance drop when OCC is enabled.

[22, Apple] evaluated PDSCH performance of type-1 DMRS with and without FD-OCC for 960 kHz SCS. It observed that at high frequency selectivity (low coherence bandwidth for large delay spread) there is a benefit in turning off the FD-OCC. It also observed that the FD-OCC adaptation can be used by a UE with DMRS type-2 without any increase in signaling/complexity especially if explicit signaling is used and as such should be applicable for DMRS type-2.

[24, NTT DOCOMO] have evaluated PDSCH BLERs with 480 and 960 kHz SCS for different DMRS patterns with 2-port configuration, i.e., Rel-15 DMRS type 1 with comb and non-comb (i.e., FD-OCC) based 2-port configuration, Rel-15 DMRS type 2 with comb and non-comb (i.e., FD-OCC) based 2-port configuration, and 2-port DMRS with DMRS on every RE in the symbol containing DMRS. It observed performance gain when FD-OCC is off for both type 1 and type 2 DMRS.

Companies’ results showing notable performance gain of turn off FD-OCC are summarized below.

Yes: [3, vivo], [15, Nokia], [18, Qualcomm], [21, Intel], [22, Apple], [24, NTT DOCOMO]

Companies’ view to support FD-OCC off are summarized below.

Yes: [3, vivo], [7, Lenovo], [13, Ericsson], [15, Nokia], [18, Qualcomm], [19, LG], [21, Intel], [22, Apple], [24, NTT DOCOMO]

No:

Companies views on whether support FD-OCC off for type-1 and/or type-2 DMRS are summarized below.

Type-1 only: [8, Samsung], [13, Ericsson],

Type-1 and type-2: [3, vivo], [7, Lenovo], [22, Apple], [24, NTT DOCOMO]

Companies views on how to indicate FD-OCC off to UE are summarized below.

RRC: [8, Samsung]

DCI (e.g., use the reserved states in the "Antenna port(s)" field): [9, CATT]

FFS: [13, Ericsson], [15, Nokia], [18, Qualcomm], [19, LG]

Moderator’s comment:

Seems no company object to support a DMRS configuration where UE can assume FD-OCC is off. Note that based on the discussion in RAN1#104b-e, formulate the following alternative proposals and one of them should be chosen.

##### Proposal 4-2

Alt1:

* For NR operation in FR2-2 with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied.
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + FFS details on whether and how to indicate that FD-OCC is not applied to DMRS port

Alt2:

* For NR operation in FR2-2 with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH with DMRS type-1, support a RRC configuration which indicates FD-OCC is not applied to an DMRS port indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH.
  + FFS which or all DMRS port(s)

Alt3:

* For NR operation in FR2-2 with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH with DMRS type-1, support a DMRS configuration where UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied to the DMRS port(s) indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH.
  + FFS which reserved state(s) in antenna port(s) field

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support proposal 4-2 Alt 1.  In our view, FD-OCC should be applied to both DMRS type-1 and type-2 and it seems to be considered only with Alt 1. |
| Qualcomm | We do not see much progress with Alt 1 compared with the last agreement.  We support Alt 3, with the addition of considering DMRS type-2 as well for this enhancement  Alt 2 will limit the flexibility of scheduling by losing multiplexing opportunities specially with low MCS where FD-OCC does not cause a significant performance loss |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt 1 or Alt 3. For Alt 2, we share the view as Qualcomm. |
| Futurewei | Support Proposal 4-2.Alt1 that includes further study for type-2 DMRS FD-OCC. |
| Moderator | Wording update below to address comments to DMRS type-2. |
|  |  |

##### Proposal 4-2a

Alt1:

* For NR operation in FR2-2 with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied.
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + FFS details on whether and how to indicate that FD-OCC is not applied to DMRS port

Alt2:

* For NR operation in FR2-2 with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a RRC configuration which indicates FD-OCC is not applied to an DMRS port indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH.
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + FFS which or all DMRS port(s)

Alt3:

* For NR operation in FR2-2 with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a DMRS configuration where UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied to the DMRS port(s) indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH.
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + FFS which reserved state(s) in antenna port(s) field
  + FFS which reserved state(s) in antenna port(s) field

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Intel | Among the alternatives 1/2/3, we support Proposal 4-2.Alt3. |
| Samsung | We would like to first clarify the wording “FD-OCC is not applied” in all the proposals. This wording can be interpreted as “w\_f(k’)={+1,+1}”, but we don’t think that’s the intention of the proposal. The observation of the benefit comes from the assumption that no other UE is using port(s) associated with FD-OCC different from the FD-OCC applied to the target UE. So, in our understanding, we are aiming to support similar UE behavior as in Rel-15/16, i.e., “the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE”, wherein the orthogonal antenna ports are restricted to using different FD-OCC only in this context. If this is the intention of the proposal, we hope the wording can be clarified, and better to use the spec language to avoid confusion. For example, adding a sub-bullet for all the alternatives:   * “FD-OCC is not applied” refers to the UE may assume that a set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE, wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports have the same RE mapping and different FD-OCC.   Based on above clarification, we support Alt 2a. If RRC based approach cannot be agreed, we are with Alt 1a as well. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal, and prefer Alt-3 since it aligns with the current method in the spec for for rank-2.  Similar to Samsung, we think that some updated language could be used to align with existing language in 38.214 Section 5.1.6.2. For example, the wording for all alternatives could be like this:  For ~~NR operation in FR2-2 with~~ 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS where the UE ~~is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied~~ may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE … |
| DOCOMO | We support Proposal 4-2a Alt 3. Ok with Ericsson’s update |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer Alt3. RRC based configuration seems too restrictive since when lower MCS is applied, there is no need to turn off the FD-OCC. Also OK with Ericsson’s updates. |
| Apple | We are fine with Alt-3. |
| vivo | Support proposal 4-2a.Alt3 because:   1. The overhead of DCI is not increased; 2. The control by gNB can be dynamic.   Agree with Samsung and Ericsson about the clarification on the wording “FD-OCC is not applied”. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support either Alt 1 (first preference) or Alt 3.  For Alt 1, it can be applied to DMRS type 2. When UE is indicated with rank1, UE always assume FD-OCC is not applied. (Please clarify the second FFS)  Regarding to alt 3, if two UEs are assigned port 0 and port 2 respectively, we can support MU-pairing. So, Alt 3 seems too much limitation. Limiting FD-OCC itself is simpler. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our preference would be Alt2 (RRC configuration). MU pairing does not depend on MCS but on spatial information, and then MCS is determined for each of the paired UEs. The gNB will not decide whether to pair UEs based on the MCS that each UE supports, and then decide whether to use FD-OCC or not based on MCS. So we think RRC configuration of FD-OCC on/off for rank-1 transmission of type-1 DMRS is sufficient. Alt1 presumably would increase DCI overhead. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt 2 with Samsung’s update. |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt 3. |
| CATT | We support Alt 3. |
|  |  |
| Moderator | Summary of company positions expressed so far:  Alt1: Lenovo, LG, Futurewei, Nokia,  Alt2: Samsung, Huawei, InterDigital  Alt3: Qualcomm, LG, Intel, Ericsson, DOCOMO, ZTE, Apple, vivo, Nokia, CATT  Wording updated below to address comments. |

##### Proposal 4-2b

Alt1:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS where the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE.
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + Down select between the following options for the indication to UE
    - RRC configuration
    - antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH

Alt2:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS, indicated by a RRC configuration, where the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE.
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + FFS which or all DMRS port(s)

Alt3:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS, indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH, where the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE.
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Samsung | [Moderator copied below comment from email reflector]  The current wording from updated proposals “where the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE” is like turning off all the remaining antenna ports instead of antenna ports with different FD-OCC only. For example, by this wording, antenna ports with different TD-OCC and RE-multiplexing are also turned off, and we believe this is not aligned with the original intention “FD-OCC is not applied”. I guess our suggested wording is more aligned with the intention for your reference (of course any equivalent wording is ok to us) “the UE may assume that a set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE, wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports have the same RE mapping and different FD-OCC”. |
| Moderator | [Moderator copied below comment from email reflector]  About the wording “where the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE” used in the proposal 4-2b referring to FD-OCC off, I took the suggestion from Ericsson’s comment, which I believe is an exact copy from TS 38.214, section 5.1.6.2 on this matter. I’m not sure that could be interpreted as different TD-OCC and RE-multiplexing off. Do you think the description in TS 38.214 is not accurate?  I’d like to hear other companies’ view as well to make sure that we have the same understanding on what we intend to agree on this proposal. |
| Intel | [Moderator copied below comment from email reflector]  I think I understand Hongbo’s comments and share the same concern.  When the specification refers to “all remaining orthogonal antenna ports”, it could be understood as any orthogonality, e.g. time/freq/code. So even FDM DMRS for type 1 or TDM code multiplexed ports need to be disabled. From my understanding this was to enable pure SU-MIMO operation (if you forget about quasi-orthogonal MU multiplexing when there is good spatial separation using beamforming).  The problematic cases for 60GHz is only from FD-OCC and not due to MU-MIMO aspects. Therefore, only FD-OCC dispreading functionality should be turned off and possibility to perform MU-MIMO should be preserved. Otherwise, DMRS orthogonal multiplexing capacity will take a significant hit as all orthogonal ports are unusable.  So use of the 214 text as is quite problematic. |
| LG | [Moderator copied below comment from email reflector]  Thanks for discussion. I think the wording “all remaining orthogonal antenna ports” may or may not be a problem in some cases.  First of all, I have the same understanding as Samsung/Intel. Since the wording could be interpreted as any orthogonal port in time/freq, which in some cases may cause TD-OCC to turn off unintentionally. However, I do not think the current spec description is incorrect. This is because the 'antenna port table' specifies the DMRS port index for each codepoint, so it is very clear whether TD-OCC or FD-OCC should be turned off. Therefore, unintended operation does not occur.  On the other hand, in the current specification below (38.214), I understand that PTRS and TD-OCC multiplexed DMRS ports (e.g., ports 1004-1007 for type1) cannot be used at the same time. Therefore, when PTRS is configured to UE in FR2-2, the wording may not be a problem because MU-MIMO is not applicable to the TD-OCC multiplexed port.  the UE may assume that the following configurations are not occurring simultaneously for the received PDSCH:   * any DM-RS ports among 1004-1007 or 1006-1011 for DM-RS configurations type 1 and type 2, respectively are scheduled for the UE and the other UE(s) sharing the DM-RS REs on the same CDM group(s), and * PT-RS is transmitted to the UE. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | AS commented on the reflector:  On the updated proposal 4-2b (for all three alternatives), we do not think that the updated wording captures the original intention of just turning off the FD-OCC. This updated wording is basically a super-set according to which none of the orthogonal ports (regardless of which multiplexing) can be used. Basically, we share similar concerns as Samsung.  We would prefer to keep the original wording “where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied”  If the intention is to avoid using “FD-OCC”, then maybe more general wording could be “where the UE may assume that all the remaining antenna ports on the same REs of a symbol are not configured” |
| DOCOMO | Support 4-2b.Alt3. We share similar concern with Samsung and Lenovo. |
|  |  |
| Moderator2 | Appreciate all the constructive comments to refine the wording for precise/specification language.  One more attempt on wording update into proposal 4-2c.  Summary of company positions expressed so far:  Alt1: Lenovo, LG, Futurewei, Nokia,  Alt2: Samsung, Huawei, InterDigital  Alt3: Qualcomm, LG, Intel, Ericsson, DOCOMO, ZTE, Apple, vivo, Nokia, CATT |

##### Proposal 4-2c

Alt1:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied.
  + Note: “FD-OCC is not applied” refers to the UE may assume that a set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE, wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports have the same RE mapping and different FD-OCC
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + Down select between the following options for the indication to UE
    - RRC configuration
    - antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH

Alt2:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS, indicated by a RRC configuration, where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied
  + Note: “FD-OCC is not applied” refers to the UE may assume that a set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE, wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports have the same RE mapping and different FD-OCC
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + FFS which or all DMRS port(s)

Alt3:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS, indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH, where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied.
  + Note: “FD-OCC is not applied” refers to the UE may assume that a set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE, wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports have the same RE mapping and different FD-OCC
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + FFS which reserved state(s) in antenna port(s) field

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Ericsson | Is the following:  " wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports have the same RE mapping and different FD-OCC "  equivalent to  " wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are within the same CDM group and have different FD-OCC "  If so, I think the latter would be a better description for Type-1 DMRS  We prefer Alt-1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, the wording from Ericsson is more in line with the specification and the proposal can be updated accordingly for all the alternatives.  We can support the proposal with proposed update from Ericsson. |
| LG Electronics | We still prefer Alt1 and Alt3. |
| DOCOMO | Since configuration approach seems still controversial, we support Alt 1. Also fine with Ericsson’s update. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer Alt-3, Alt-1 is also acceptable. Also fine with Ericsson’s update. |
| vivo | We prefer Alt-3 and Alt.1 is acceptable. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt-3 and are fine with Ericsson’s update. |
| Samsung | We prefer Alt-2, and ok with Alt 1. Ericsson’s update is ok to us. |
| Intel | The formulation in 4-2c is better and 4-2b. We may need to work on further on how to best capture this into the specification.  Among the three, our preference is Alt 3 as mentioned before. |
| Moderator | Again, thanks for all the comments trying to improve the language of the note here. I believe we are on the same page and agree that we may need to work further on how to capture that into the specification later when the proposal itself can be agreed and FFS details are decided.  I’ll let companies check and refine the wording of notes here before I jumped into another round of revision.  Summary of company positions expressed so far:  Alt1: Lenovo, LG, Futurewei, Nokia, Ericsson, DOCOMO, ZTE (2nd preference), vivo (2nd preference), Samsung (2nd preference),  Alt2: Samsung, Huawei, InterDigital  Alt3: Qualcomm, LG, Intel, ZTE, Apple, vivo, Nokia (2nd preference), CATT  It seems Alt1 should be okay for everyone given FFS between indication methods. Please continue discussion and see if we can agree on Alt 2 or Alt 3 for a bit more progress than Alt 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 1 is our first preference, but we will also be okay to support Alt 2 for progress on this issue. |
| Moderator2 | Did not see any comment on the wording suggestion from Ericsson, so I assume it’s okay for everyone. One more try to refine the wording in 4-2d.  Summary of company positions expressed so far:  Alt1: Lenovo, LG, Futurewei, Nokia, Ericsson, DOCOMO, ZTE (2nd preference), vivo (2nd preference), Samsung (2nd preference),  Alt2: Samsung, Huawei, InterDigital, Lenovo (2nd preference)  Alt3: Qualcomm, LG, Intel, ZTE, Apple, vivo, Nokia (2nd preference), CATT |

##### Proposal 4-2d (closed)

Alt1:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied.
  + Note: “FD-OCC is not applied” refers to the UE may assume that a set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE, wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are within the same CDM group and have different FD-OCC
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + Down select between the following options for the indication to UE
    - RRC configuration
    - antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH

Alt2:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS, indicated by a RRC configuration, where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied
  + Note: “FD-OCC is not applied” refers to the UE may assume that a set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE, wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are within the same CDM group and have different FD-OCC
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + FFS which or all DMRS port(s)

Alt3:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS, indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH, where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied.
  + Note: “FD-OCC is not applied” refers to the UE may assume that a set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE, wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are within the same CDM group and have different FD-OCC
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + FFS which reserved state(s) in antenna port(s) field

Companies are encouraged to provide comments if any.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views | |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt 3 as first preference, and we are okay with Alt 1 and postponing the decision to the next meeting | |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal. Fine with the updated wording. | |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Alt 2. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The current language looks good to us. Alt 3 is preferred since FD-OCC should not be turned off for some cases such as low MCS and low frequency range. Compared with RRC configuration, indication of reserved antenna port field is more flexible and it does not require additional signalling overhead. If no consensus can be achieved, we can accept Alt 1 as well for sake of progress. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our preference is still Alt2, but of course we can also accept Alt1. | |
| Moderator | Discussion is closed. Refer to Chair’s notes for the agreement. |

#### DMRS for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling

[1, Huawei] compared two DMRS patterns in time domain: Rel-15 DMRS pattern (with individual channel estimation per slot), and a bundling DMRS pattern (with joint channel estimation based on all the DMRS symbols across slots). It observed about 0.2dB~0.6dB gain of the bundling DMRS pattern. [1, Huawei] then proposed that DMRS mapped on symbol l0 to symbol l0+S\*L-1 within the first PDSCH slot for the multi-slot scheduling, when only front-loaded DMRS is configured, where L is the length and l0 the starting symbol of legacy front-loaded DMRS.

[9, CATT] argued that given the channel estimation filter at the UE is usually optimized with fixed filter length based on current DMRS pattern, DMRS bundling will increase the UE implementation complexity since the enhancement depends on the receiver algorithm in UE implementation. With that, it proposed not to support potential DMRS enhancement for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

[8, Samsung] proposed for multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs with contiguous time domain resource, DMRS time domain density can be lower than one DMRS per PUSCH/PDSCH to reduce DMRS overhead and DMRS bundling of multiple PUSCHs/PDSCHs can be applied to improve channel estimation performance.

On the same topic, [15, Nokia] argued that the decoding of each slot in a period is up to implementation, and new (bundled DMRS) pattern increase the complexity and proposed to use the existing DMRS time-domain pattern for multi-slot scheduling unless any critical performance degradation is identified.

[22, Apple] also argued that given there is current work on joint channel estimation for PUSCH in the Rel-17 coverage enhancement Work Item, to avoid duplication of effort between work items, the discussion on these enhancements (especially DMRS bundling) should be de-prioritized.

Companies’ view to support DMRS enhancement for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling are summarized below.

Yes: [1, Huawei], [8, Samsung]

No: [9, CATT], [15, Nokia], [22, Apple] (deprioritize)

Moderator’s comment:

With limited input and diverse views on this topic, suggest companies to study further.

##### Discussion point 4-3:

Companies are encouraged to provide comments and/or suggestions on agreeable proposals if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Similar work is on-going in the CE WI and considering that this is a low-priority area for this WI, we propose to conclude that no further discussion on DMRS enhancements for multiple PDSC/PUSCH is done in this WI. |
| Qualcomm | For Multi-PUSCH grant, the DMRS bundling is considered in coverage enhancement WI and no need to duplicate the discussion.  We do not support DMRS bundling for multi-PDSCH as is will increase the UE complexity and may affect the UE processing timeline. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For clarity, we do not propose DMRS bundling across slots, as this is being discussed in the Coverage Enhancements WI and there is no need repeating the discussion here. The two comments above don’t apply to our proposal described below for better clarity.  Our proposal for above 52.6 GHz with multi-slot scheduling is to have DMRS only in the first scheduled slot, in order to avoid the delay incurred for PDSCH decoding in the last slot(s) of 480/960 kHz SCS, which would otherwise delay the HARQ feedback unevenly for different values of SCS. Additionally the DMRS that is only present in the first slot it may benefit from occupying more OFDM symbols for better channel estimation accuracy. Therefore our proposal:  DMRS mapped on symbol l0 to symbol l0+S\*L-1 within the first PDSCH slot for the multi-slot scheduling, when only front-loaded DMRS is configured, where L is the length and l0 the starting symbol of legacy front-loaded DMRS. |
| Futurewei | Given that the channel fluctuation across multiple slots is expected to be small for higher subcarrier spacing, we support new DMRS patterns for multiple PxSCH, for example, allocation more DMRS symbols to the earlier slots of a multi-slots, such that demodulation latency is reduced without affecting much of the performance. |
| Samsung | As evaluated by some companies, the performance gain by joint CE is achieved. We think it is an important feature to support.  Regarding the concern on duplicated discussion, we think joint CE for DMRS for 60GHz is different from Rel-17 coverage enhancement, because different TBs and different SLIVs for multi-PDSCH/PUSCHs for 60GHz while single TB with same SLIV (type-A PUSCH repetition) is assumed for coverage. |
| Ericsson | We think that further enhancement of DMRS should be de-prioritized. Proper assessment will take many rounds of simulation and discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer to de-prioritize the discussion on DMRS bundling for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling because the existing DMRS pattern performs well and DMRS bundling requires the increasing implementation complexity. |
| Apple | We have some clarification questions on the scheme. (1) what happens if there are gaps between the PxSCH (2) Do we have to address phase continuity issues similar to those being handled in coverage enhancement with attendant LSs to RAN4 to clarify what is possible and what is not ? (3) what are the rules on the size of the DMRS based on the # of PxSCH transmissions (4) given that in your paper you use the term “the DMRS symbols can be concentrated at the beginning of the scheduled multi-slot PDSCHs/PUSCHs, referred to as bundling DMRS”, could you clearly explain the different between this bundling and the DMRS bundling in coverage enhancement ? From the statement by Samsung, it is not clear how the transmitted information being different TBs vs a same TB results in a different behavior by the UE. |
| vivo | We prefer to de-prioritize this discussion.  Actually, a clarification question to Huawei:  For figure 5 in your T-doc (R1-2106446),    **Figure 5. DMRS location impact on PDSCH processing delay**  If a single slot PDSCH with k0=7 can be processed to conform N1 timeline with the absolute time of 120 kHz SCS, the issue you mentioned in figure 5 should not be a problem, right? |
| Nokia/NSB | New time pattern increases the complexity of channel estimator. For high subcarrier spacing, we don’t expect high mobility. Time-domain bundling is enough for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To answer Apple’s question, it is true that there could be a phase discontinuity between the multiple PDSCHs transmitted in different slots (even if there is no channel estimation across slots). If this can be addressed by implementation, as possibly concluded in the Coverage Enhancements WI discussion, then such conclusion should also be applicable here. With transmission of DMRS only in the first slot, it should be obvious to the UE that the network should ensure phase continuity across slots. In this sense the problem is easier to address from specification perspective than joint channel estimation across slots (which leaves the choice to the UE between separate or joint channel estimation, thus requires explicit signaling from the network about the phase continuity assumption). For the second question, our assumption was that the number of OFDM symbols used for DMRS in the first slot would only depend on the SCS (based on our performance evaluations), not on the number of scheduled slots, but we are open for discussion.  We are not sure we understand vivo’s question. Could you clarify your question? |
| InterDigital | We agree with Nokia that time domain bundling is enough for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| CATT | We agree to de-prioritize this discussion. |
| vivo | To Huawei: According to your Tdoc, you think there is certain timeline issue for the last PDSCH if one DCI schedules 8 PDSCHs as shown in the lower part of Figure 5, due to late DM-RS position. This is the motivation to put DM-RS in the first slot. However, for the case that one DCI schedules single PDSCH with k0=7 (i.e. only the last PDSCH in the figure), do you think it will not meet the timeline either? I think in this case, you can’t put DM-RS in the first since it is no longer scheduled by the DCI. |
| Futurewei | We are not sure if enough input has been provided to conclude that DM-RS time-domain bundling is enough or not for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH. Given that for FR2-2, multi-PDSCH/PUSCH seems to be a key feature, we do not recommend rush to close the discussion of DM-RS enhancement by this meeting. Suggest FFS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thank you for the clarification from vivo, we now understand your example. In the example where a single PDSCH is scheduled with k0=7, then the HARQ feedback would have to come later compared to scheduling 8 PDSCHs where the DMRS is placed in the first scheduled slot. We agree that in that case the DMRS enhancements would not help in reducing the HARQ feedback delay since a single slot is scheduled. This would also be true when scheduling a single PDSCH with any value of k0. But when multiple PDSCHs are scheduled, then placing DMRS only in the first slot can still help reduce the minimum HARQ feedback delay for this case, which should be a typical case of multi-slot scheduling with a single DCI. |
| Moderator | Summary of company positions:  Support DMRS enhancement for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in this WI  Yes: Samsung, Huawei, Futurewei  No or de-prioritize: Lenovo, Qualcomm, ZTE, Ericsson, vivo, Nokia, Apple, InterDigital, CATT  Suggest to de-prioritize this discussion. |
| Futurewei | Support de-prioritize the discussion. |

# Conclusion

The following agreements were made in RAN1#106-e.

Agreement:

For NR operation with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, value(s) for PDSCH processing time (N1) for PDSCH processing capability 1 and PUSCH preparation time (N2) are to be defined for PDSCH/PUSCH timing capability 1 only.

Agreement:

For NR operation with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, only value(s) for CSI computation delay requirement 2 are to be defined.

* FFS: The specific values

Agreement:

When defining value ranges and/or default values for k0/k1/k2 for NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, RAN1 assumes the following definitions (this agreement does not define the following and these definitions may be updated later)

* The value of k0 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PDSCH in number of slots
* The value of k1 indicates the slot offset between the slot of the last PDSCH scheduled by the DCI and the slot carrying the HARQ-ACK information corresponding to the scheduled PDSCHs in number of slots
* The value of k2 indicates the slot offset between DCI and its scheduled PUSCH in number of slots
* Note: Default values are indicated by DCI format 1\_0 and 0\_0

Agreement:

* For 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, for rank 1 PDSCH at least with DMRS type-1, support a configuration of DMRS where the UE is able to assume that FD-OCC is not applied.
  + Note: “FD-OCC is not applied” refers to the UE may assume that a set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with the PDSCH to another UE, wherein the set of remaining orthogonal antenna ports are within the same CDM group and have different FD-OCC
  + FFS whether applies to DMRS type-2
  + Down select between the following options for the indication to UE
    - RRC configuration
    - antenna port(s) field in DCI scheduling the rank 1 PDSCH

Agreement:

For NR operation with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, adopt at least the values of N1, N2 and N3 as in the following tables for single and multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.

* Note: N1/N2 applies to any PDSCH/PUSCH for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
* RAN1 to study (until RAN1#106b-e) and possibly introduce smaller values considering at least the following factors
  + PDCCH monitoring capability
  + Mix numerology scheduling
  + Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
  + Cross-carrier scheduling
* Note: The decision for the number of HARQ processes should take this agreement into account.

Table 2-2.1 PDSCH processing time arrange for PDSCH processing capability 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | PDSCH decoding time *N1* [symbols] | |
| *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* = pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in both of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB* | *dmrs-AdditionalPosition* ≠ pos0 in  *DMRS-DownlinkConfig* in either of  *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeA*, *dmrs-DownlinkForPDSCH-MappingTypeB*  *or if the higher layer parameter is not configured* |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 | 24 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 | 96 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 | 192 |

Table 2-2.2 PUSCH preparation time for PUSCH timing capability 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | PUSCH preparation time *N2* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 36 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 144 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 288 |

Table 2-2.3 Minimum gap between the second detected DCI and the beginning of the first PUCCH resources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline *N3* [symbols] |
| 3 (120 kHz) | 20 |
| 5 (480 kHz) | 80 |
| 6 (960 kHz) | 160 |
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