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# Background

In RAN plenary #94, the WID for Rel-18 MIMO enhancements was finalized [1]. According to the WID, some enhancements for SRI/TPMI are necessary to enable 8 TX UE transmission.

|  |
| --- |
| *Objective 5: Study, and if justified, specify UL DMRS, SRS, SRI, and TPMI (including codebook) enhancements to enable 8 Tx UL operation to support 4 and more layers per UE in UL targeting CPE/FWA/vehicle/Industrial devices*  *- Note: Potential restrictions on the scope of this objective (including coherence assumption, full/non-full power modes) will be identified as part of the study.* |

To accomplish the objective, the scope of this agenda item centers on codebook design for 8TX, CW to layer mapping, SRS enhancements to support 8 ports, impacts resulted from coherency characteristics of such UEs as well as UE operation with full power.

# High Priority Topics

In the last meeting, RAN1 agreed on EVM assumptions as well as some basic assumptions to further clarify the scope of the work under this agenda item in Rel-18 [2]. Based on the agreements made in the last meeting, and the provided discussion in companies’ contributions [3-26], following topics are recognized as high priority topics to be discussed for decision in WG1 #110.

# Codebook Design for UL Transmission for 8TX UE

In the last meeting, five alternatives were identified for down-selection. The main difference between the alternatives lies in whether/how NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks or NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks to be applied for a given UE coherence capability.

Based on the agreed alternatives, Table 1 captures companies’ preferences for the codebook design for UL 8TX UE. To aid the decision on this topic, 8 companies have provided their results and observations using LLS (1) and SLS (7) simulations.

* Based on the simulation results, 5 companies have argued in favour of **Alt1b** (**Qualcomm**, **OPPO**, **Intel**(2), **ZTE** and **MT**).
* **Huawei** shows simulation results in support of superiority of **Alt2a**. **Intel** reports a better performance can be achieved by Alt1b, however due to simplicity and less overhead, it flags **Alt2a** as their first choice.
* According to **Ericsson** evaluations, there is no clear performance gap among the agreed alternatives as the size of the codebook is quite large. **Ericsson** proposes to study solutions for reducing the codebook resolution.

Table 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| For 8TX UE codebook-based uplink transmission, down-select one of   * Alt1-a:   + Study NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) as the starting point for design of the codebook for non-coherent UEs   + Study NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of the codebook for fully/partially-coherent UEs * Alt1-b:   + Study NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) as the starting point for design of the codebook for partially/non-coherent UEs   + Study NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of the codebook for fully-coherent UEs * Alt2-a:   + Study NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) as the starting point for design of codebook for fully/partially/non-coherent UEs * Alt2-b:   + Study NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) in combination with those based on NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebooks as the starting point for design of codebook for fully/partially/non-coherent UEs * Alt3:   + Study NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of codebook for fully/partially/non-coherent UEs * Transmission using one or multiple precoders corresponding to one or multiple SRS resources can be studied as part of the above alternatives. | * **Alt1-a:** Samsung, Sharp (2) * **Alt1-b:** ZTE, Spreadtrum (1), vivo, Lenovo, OPPO, CATT, NEC, Intel (2), CMCC, MediaTek, Qualcomm, IDC(1), Apple NTT(1), Sharp (1)      * **Alt2-a:** Huawei/HiSlicon, Spreadtrum (1), Google, IDC(2), Lenovo, Intel (1) * **Alt2-b:** LG, NTT(2) * **Alt3:** Nokia |

**FL Proposal 2.1a: RAN1 further studies Alt1b and Alt2a for down-selection in RAN1 meeting #110b-e.**

**FL Proposal 2.1b: For evaluation purpose of codebook alternatives when Rel-15 DL Type I is used, following oversampling ratios are assumed**

* **(O1, O2) = (1,1), (2.1)**
* **Note: Other values may be used and reported by companies**

In the last meeting, four main categories of antenna layouts were agreed for codebook design and evaluation. To have further alignment among companies, as suggested by **Xiaomi**, **Samsung**, **Apple**, **NTT**, **CMCC**, it would be helpful to clarify antenna layout for each category of UE coherency.

**FL Proposal 2.1c: For evaluation of codebook alternatives for full-coherent and partial-coherent 8TX UE, the followings are assumed**

* **Full coherent: Antenna layout 1a (Ng=1, M=2, N=2, P=2), 1b (Ng=1, M=1, N=4, P=2)**
* **Partial coherent:** 
  + **Antenna layout 2a, 2b (Ng=2, M=1, N=2, P=2)**
  + **Antenna layout 3a, 3b (Ng=4, M=1, N=1, P=2)**

Table 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Google | Proposal 2.1a: Support  Proposal 2.1b: We think the assumption should be the same overhead for precoder indication for both alternatives.  Proposal 2.1c: Is it correct understanding that coherent transmission within a panel should be assumed? If yes, maybe we can add a sub-bullet to clarify that. |
| Lenovo | Support **Proposal 2.1a** and **2.1b.**  On **Proposal 2.1c**: we think antenna layout 2a, 2b, 3a and 3b can also used for full coherent transmission if different antennas across different antenna groups are coherent. We propose the following change:  **FL Proposal 2.1c: For evaluation of codebook alternatives for full-coherent and partial-coherent 8TX UE, the followings are assumed**   * **Full coherent:**    + **Antenna layout 1a (Ng=1, M=2, N=2, P=2), 1b (Ng=1, M=1, N=4, P=2)**   + **Antenna layout 2a, 2b (Ng=2, M=1, N=2, P=2)**   + **Antenna layout 3a, 3b (Ng=4, M=1, N=1, P=2)** * **Partial coherent:**    + **Antenna layout 2a, 2b (Ng=2, M=1, N=2, P=2)**   + **Antenna layout 3a, 3b (Ng=4, M=1, N=1, P=2)** |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.1a: We have concern with Alt2-a since it requires co-phase design (across 2Tx/4Tx precoders) to obtain for full-coherent precoders. Such co-phasing is already present in DL Type I codebook, hence can be used, which will save codebook design efforts. Also, several companies have shown results in which DL Type I CB based full coherent precoders outperform R15 2Tx/4Tx based 8Tx FC precoder design. We therefore suggest to focus on DL Type I CB for full coherent precoders, i.e., either Alt1-a or Alt1-b for further study.  Proposal 2.1b: we are supportive of lower oversampling factor, since it can be one way to reduce TPMI payload. We however suggest to add one more candidate (2,2), which can be beneficial for layout 1a, i.e., (M,N)=(2,2), especially for low rank (e.g. rank 1-2).  Proposal 2.1c: support |
| MediaTek | We support Alt1-b for proposal 2.1a. Since DL codebook design is already mature with proven performance, we believe is a better choice compared to starting a new codebook design by concatenating legacy R15 codewords at least for full coherent mode.  We support proposal 2.1b, based on our simulation results reducing oversampling delivers a good overhead-performance tradeoff.  We support proposal 2.1c. We do not agree with Lenovo’s modification (additional multi-panel scenarios) for full coherent layout, as we believe only single panel should be considered for full coherent mode. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.1a: OK, even though we share similar concern as SS on co-phase design for fully-coherent precoders.  Proposal 2.1b: support.  Proposal 2.1c: support. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.1a: If codebook subset is discussed separately, we are ok with this proposal, and have preference on Alt 1b. We think that non/partial coherent TPMIs should be available for full coherent UE similar to Rel-15 codebook subset.  Proposal 2.1b: Support of lower oversampling value. We have preference on Oversampling factor of 1 due to its lower overhead.  Proposal 2.1c: support |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.1a: We think Alt.1b has majority support and can be agreed. However, we are fine with the proposal as the first step.  Proposal 2.1b: We agree with Samsung that (2,2) should be included, which would outperform (1,1) for (M,N)=(2,2) and at least rank 1. Further evaluation is needed for the values.  Proposal 2.1c: support. |
| NEC | Proposal 2.1a: Support the proposal. And prefer Alt 1b.  Proposal 2.1b: Support the proposal. And we also think oversampling (2,2) can be added.  Proposal 2.1c: Support |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.1a: support;  Proposal 2.1b: support, but there is a typo, it is should be (1,1), (2,1) instead of (1,1), (2.1)  Proposal 2.1c: support; |
| ZTE | We can support proposal 2.1a, and prefer Alt1-b, with following reasons considered:   1. DL codebook based scheme outperforms extended codebook based on UL 2Tx/4Tx codebook scheme as shown in our tdoc R1-2205924, as well as other evaluation from other companies. 2. Regarding spec effort, we think that the spec efforts on introducing 8-Tx codebook based on DL 8Tx may be limited due to the fact that the DL 8-Tx codebook is mature scheme. 3. DL codebook scheme is a structured design, which means higher flexibility for determining number of precoding candidates in the codebook, considering the trade-off between overhead of precoder indication and transmission performance.   Regarding Proposal 2.1b, we believe lower O1/O2 is necessary for UL codebook design, e,g., O1, O2 with value of 1 can be baseline. From our evaluation, higher value of O1/O2 for some lower ranks, such as rank =2, 3, is beneficial for cell-edge UE, and potentially for MU-MIMO UE. We may consider rank specific oversampling factor, like value of i2 (phase offset, phi) in DL codebook design, or i1,3 are rank specific. Therefore, we suggest the following changes:  **FL Proposal 2.1b: For evaluation purpose of codebook alternatives when Rel-15 DL Type I is used, following oversampling ratios are assumed**   * **(O1, O2) = (1,1), (2,~~.~~1)** * **Note: Other values may be used and reported by companies** * **Rank specific oversampling ratios can be considered.**   Proposal 2.1c: support |
| InterDigital | Proposal 2.1a: Support.  Proposal 2.1b: Support, for lower values of oversampling values. ZTE’s update is also fine.  Proposal 2.1c: Support. |
| Intel | Generally fine with FL Proposal 2.1a, 2.1b and 2.1c. |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2-1a:** Since we now just have results and some analysis of the alternatives, we prefer to discuss more before downselecting. For example, companies’ results seem to be pointing in opposite directions in some cases. Also, can the FL clarify that the last bullet on multiple precoders or SRS resources is unaffected by this proposal?  **Proposal 2-1b:** To clarify our view: our results so far do show limited benefit of higher oversampling rates, but we would like to study a bit more before concluding. Our understanding is that this is the spirit of this proposal, since other values may be used and reported. Since the entire DL Type 1 codebook is not necessarily used, but rather precoders based on the DL Type I CB, we suggest that be clarified. Also, as commented by other companies, (O1,O2)=(2,2) can be useful in e.g. (M,N)=(2,2) (i.e. UPA) layouts.  **FL Proposal 2.1b: For evaluation purpose of codebook alternatives when a precoder based on Rel-15 DL Type I is used, following oversampling ratios are assumed**   * **(O1, O2) = (1,1), (2.1), (2,2)** * **Note: Other values may be used and reported by companies**   **Proposal 2-1c:** Companies are already providing results, and so we see no need to further restrict the configurations at this stage. Limiting the scenarios and UE antenna configurations now may miss important use cases for the codebook designs. |
| Nokia, NSB | We shall focus on 8Tx CB design for the fully coherent UE, because this is key point to support uplink 8Tx. Once full coherent 8Tx CB design is completed, we can further discuss about partial/non-coherent CB support. We can also support the 2nd point of Alt1-b. The selection decision shall be based on system-level simulation results.  For Proposal 2.1b: we also support to include (O1, O2)=(2, 2)  In Proposal 2.1c, these antenna layouts have been agreed in last meeting. What’s new here? |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.1a: We also have concern with Alt2-a for full-coherent UEs. The R15 UL 4Tx full-coherent codewords are selected from R15 DL Type I 4Tx codewords with reduced oversampling factors. The co-phasing is already present in R15 DL Type I codebook to denote the physical characteristics of antennas with different polarizations. For R18 UL 8Tx full-coherent codewords, when using Alt2-a, the physical characteristics of the introduced co-phasing (to guarantee orthogonality between layers) should be clarified. Our preference is Alt1-b.  Proposal 2.1b: The reduced oversampling factor (O1, O2) = (2,1) seems correspond to (N1, N2, O1, O2) =(4,1,4,1). If (Ng=1, M=2, N=2, P=2) is supported, we prefer that (O1, O2) = (2,2) can also be supported for (N1, N2, O1, O2) =(2,2,4,4) configuration when R15 DL Type I is used.  Proposal 2.1c: If coherent transmission can be operated between panels, antenna layout 2a and 3a can also be supported for full-coherent UEs. |
| QC | We support the three proposals in general.  For FL Proposal 2.1a, we’d like to point out an issue that might be overlooked the group. When using Rel-15 SP type 1 DL codebook for fully coherent UE, due to the DFT structure, the phase of precoder entries on 4 Tx on one polarization has to satisfy a linear phase ramp, which actually impose a new requirement on UE to calibrate the phase difference cross TXs, besides the legacy fully coherency requirement. Please notice that the legacy fully coherent requirement is about keeping the same phase difference across TX from SRS transmission to PUSCH transmission. It is not about keeping a linear phase ramp across the Tx. A simple example to illustrate the difference: A UE has 8 Tx, while one Tx has an 100ns constant Tx time delay due to hardware not calibrated, which would create a phase difference on this Tx comparing to other Tx. This phase difference does not impact UE to meet the fully coherence requirement, because the same phase different on this Tx occurs on both SRS Tx and PUSCH Tx. However, This phase different on this particular Tx would fail the DFT precoder’s linear phase ramp requirement. To compensate this phase difference due to Tx timing error, UE has to calibrate all Tx to make sure Tx time is aligned.  In summary, using DL type 1 (DFT based) precoder will create a new type of UE: calibrated fully coherent UEs, which has more stringent requirements than legacy fully coherent UE. We are not saying we don’t support Alt 1b. But we’d like to point out this issue and we are open to discuss how to solve the calibration issue.  For proposal 2.1 b, we just have a point to emphasize on O1 and O2, Rel-15 UL codebook entries are QPSK constellation. From UE implementation point of view, we would like to keep the QPSK constellation. Thus the precoding can be implemented by sign flip and I/Q swap, without complex number multiplications. Going beyond QPSK constellation would increase UE implementation complexity.  With the above, can FL please clarify if the (2,1) or even (2,2) proposed by some companies apply which antenna layout. With certain antenna layout, it might create 8PSK constellation points for precoder, which we don’t support. |
| CMCC | Support FL Proposal 2.1a.  For FL Proposal 2.1b, some companies show that there is almost no difference between different oversampling ratios, so for evaluation purpose, only (O1, O2) = (1,1) can be assumed as the baseline or with high priority, and other values may be used and reported by companies.  For FL Proposal 2.1c, it seems that the assumption of coherence within and across the antenna groups is not align among companies, maybe further clarification is needed. |
| Huawei/HiSlicon | For proposal 2.1a, we are fine with the proposal to narrow down the alternatives. Compared to Alt1-b, we prefer Alt2-a. Firstly, Alt2-a can achieve a unified codebook for three coherence types. Secondly, for fully coherent precoders, DL type 1 codebook has larger indication overhead. If we consider reduced oversampling factor for DL type 1 codebook to reduce overhead, we need to further study the performan loss of DL type 1 codebook.  For proposal 2.1b: We think that different codebook alternatives should have same number of codewords to achieve a fair comparison.  For proposal 2.1c: Support |
| CATT | Proposal 2.1a: Support  Proposal 2.1b: Support in principle. We also think (O1, O2) = (2,2) should be included. We are fine to study whether rank-specific oversampling ratios are used.  Proposal 2.1c: Seems not necessary. Companies can report antenna layouts that they used. |
| Samsung | @QCM: re the linear phase for FC UEs, in our view, if a UE reports being capable of FC UL transmission, then the UE, e.g. by some implementation, can achieve (or can ensure with high probability) the linear phase requirements across Tx antennae. Note that the UE can always report PC or NC as capability if it can’t meet the linear phase requirement. |
| Apple | We are generally supportive of the 3 proposals. For P2.1b, we also think (2, 2) can be further considered. |
| Sharp | Proposal 2.1a: Support.  Proposal 2.1b: Support, (O1, O2) = (2,2) also can be included.  Proposal 2.1c: Support. |
| vivo | On proposal 2.1b, we would like to add additional values for O1, O2 for evalulations  **FL Proposal 2.1b: For evaluation purpose of codebook alternatives when Rel-15 DL Type I is used, following oversampling ratios are assumed**   * **(O1, O2) = (1,1), (2.1), (2,2), (4,4)** * **Note: Other values may be used and reported by companies** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Number of Layers for UL Transmission

In NR Rel-17, uplink transmission is restricted to a maximum of 4 layers for transmission. However, for 8TX UEs, some companies have proposed to increase the number of layers. Table 3 shows the overall state of views expressed by companies.

On this topic, 9 companies have provided SLS simulation results and some observation in support of their preferred proposals as captured below.

* Support up to 8 layers
  + According to their evaluation, **Lenovo** shows that 25% of channel conditions exhibits a higher rank than 4.
  + Based on the evaluation results provided by **Huawei**, **ZTE**, **Ericsson**, **NTT** and **Nokia**, a rank 8 transmission results in a higher throughput, regardless of the max modulation order, i.e., 64QAM or 256QAM. **Huawei** has also demonstrated that their observation holds up for both P0 values of -50dBm and -80 dBm.
* Prioritize 4 layers
  + **Vivo** and **MediaTek** argue that a 4-layer transmission with 256QAM gives a similar or only slightly better performance than an 8-layer with 64QAM.
  + According to **Qualcomm**’s evaluations, in terms of mean and cell-center throughput, an 8-layer transmission with 64QAM has a marginal gain over a 4-layer transmission with 256QAM, but it has a marginal loss for the cell-edge throughput. Hence, the benefit of supporting more than 4 layers is insignificant.

Table 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of layers for codebook and non-codebook UL transmission for 8TX UE,   * **Alt1**: Support up to 8-layer UL transmission for 8TX UE * **Alt2**: Prioritize up to 4-layer UL transmission for 8TX UE | * **Alt1**: Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Sony, Lenovo, CATT, Xiaomi, CMCC, Ericsson, NTT, Nokia * **Alt2:** Intel, vivo, Samsung, Qualcomm, MediaTek(?) |

**FL Proposal 2.2: Support up to 8 layers for codebook and non-codebook UL transmission for 8TX UE.**

Table 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Google | Support Alt1. |
| Lenovo | Support Proposal 2.2. |
| Samsung | In our view, between up to 4 and >4 layers UL transmission, the former (up to 4 layers) is more important since it is more likely in practice. We therefore prefer to prioritize up to 4 layers. This will save discussion time and efforts, and also simply the specification work. |
| MediaTek | We support Alt. 2. We believe 4-layer design need to be prioritized. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support.  We can consider up to 4-layer and up to 8-layer as different UE capabilities, and discuss the two cases in parallel. But we do not agree to prioritize up to 4-layer. |
| LG Electronics | Support. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| ZTE | Support Proposal 2.2.  We should point out that scheme of up to rank 8 outperforms scheme of up to rank 4 based on simulation results from majority of companies. We notice clear performance gains even from results of proponents of up to 4 layers, MediaTek and Qualcomm, which are Avg gains ~10% - ~20% in some cases, such as low RU, outdoor, higher P0, or better gains for cell-center UE. For instance, from MediaTek’s result, 8-Tx RANK-8 transmission can bring a significant performance gains for outdoor.  In a word, up to 8 layer transmission is an essential enhancement for 8Tx, and should be done in Rel-18 (also for commercial promotion). We guess that we may not be so luxurious to have opportunities for enhancing UL codebook for each release. |
| InterDigital | Support Proposal 2.2. |
| Intel | We slightly prefer to prioritize up to 4-layers and we are open for discussion. |
| MediaTek | **@ ZTE**, we greatly appreciate for checking our contribution, we wanted to highlight that as shown in our contribution the gains from utilizing 8 layers on UL are not consistent throughout different cases, i.e., even though it may help in some scenarios, we don’t observe it uniform performance improvement. Hence, we urge to prioritize 4 layers UL transmission first. Given that the WID for this agenda item is tailored towards CPE and FWA, we believe indoor UEs use cases playing and important role in effectiveness of this feature where we fail to see meaningful gain from moving to 8 UL layers. |
| Ericsson | **Support.** We find substantial gains, especially in high SNR scenarios. We suspect that companies that do not find the gains have different simulation assumptions and/or scenarios. For example, full buffer simulations could increase interference and degrade the benefit of higher ranks, building penetration for indoor UEs will reduce SNR, while pointing a CPE UE toward the serving cell will increase SNR. We suggest further discussion of such aspects if concerns remain on up to 8 layers. |
| Nokia, NSB | We have simulation results to demonstrate the gain of using 8-layer UL transmission with 8Tx. Based on sim results, 8-layer UL Tx shall be supported.  Since our sim results are based on CB-based transmission, suggest modify Proposal 2.2 as:  **Proposal 2.2: Support up to 8 layers for codebook ~~and non-codebook~~ UL transmission for 8TX UE.** |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| QC | We don’t support this proposal. We support Alt 2. Based on QC (and MTK, VIVO) simulation results, the gain of 8 layer over 4 layer is not significant. Given the large spec impact of 8 layer PUSCH, we have the same view as Samsung to prioritize the specification for up to 4 layers and deprioritize the specification for up to 8 layers. |
| CMCC | Support Alt1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support FL’s proposal.  We observed that companies showing marginal benefits of max 8L all focus on indoor FWA cases. However, outdoor FWA is also a very important scenario for UE types such as CPE. For outdoor FWA, our results and also some other simulation results have shown there’s obvious gain by using max 8L compared to max 4L. Therefore, we support max 8L. |
| CATT | Support the proposal. For the evaluation, same QAM type for 4-layer and 8-layer is preferred. It is not reasonable to derive conclusion based on comparing the performance of an 8-layer transmission with 64QAM and a 4-layer transmission with 256QAM, since many UEs cannot support 256 QAM. |
| Samsung | As mentioned earlier, we don’t see a strong reason to warrant the support for >4 layers, given the current situation, however, we can be OK if the support for >4 layers is optional (subject to separate UE capability). This perhaps is a good middle ground. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have similar observation with HW that companies showing marginal benefits of max 8-layer Tx all focus on indoor FWA scenario, which has smaller UL SINR range compared with outdoor FWA based on the EVM. But outdoor FWA is also a very important scenario for us. And the companies evaluating outdoor FWA have shown significant performance gain of max 8-layer Tx.  Some companies compare 8-layer-64QAM with 4-layer-256QAM to show marginal performance benefits. However, such comparison is not necessary, and the reason is not clear to us as we do not intend to replace 256QAM with 8Tx. What we observe is that even after 256QAM is used, the additional usage of 8Tx can still provide significant performance gain (comparing 8-layer-256QAM with 4-layer-256QAM).  Up to 8-layer is important for commercial NW. It would be regretful if we spend the 2nd meeting to get stuck in this issue again.  As SS and we proposed, separate UE capabilities for up to 4-layer and up to 8-layer for an 8TX UE could be a middle ground, and we hope it could be acceptable. |
| Apple | We do not have strong view on this, but supporting separate UE capabilities may be a good way to move forward. |
| Sony | We support FL’s proposal 2.2. |
| Sharp | Support the FL Proposal 2.2. |
| vivo | We would like to see the evaluations results before making decision, we don’t see strong motivation to support more than 4 layers which leads to lots of standardization work. |
| KDDI | We support FL's proposal.  Simulation results from the companies have confirmed the performance gain of 8 layers.  We think that enabling 8 layers will maximize the effect of 8TX. |

# Number of Codewords for UL Transmission

In NR Rel-17, uplink transmission is restricted to single codeword. For 8TX UEs, some companies have proposed to enhance uplink transmission by increasing the number of codewords for 8TX UE.

Several companies (9) are in favor of adoption of dual codeword for uplink transmission, from the list of supporting companies, 3 companies state that the usage of more than one codeword should be conditioned/linked to other operational characteristics or system parameters. On the other hand, 3 companies have stated their preference for continued usage of single codewords due to significant increase in the specification process. Based on **vivo** evaluation results, the performance gain of dual codeword compared to single codeword is negligible.

Table 5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of codewords with >4 layers for codebook and non-codebook UL transmission for 8TX UE,   * **Alt1**: Single codewords * **Alt2**: Dual codewords | * **Alt1**: Intel, vivo, IDC(1) * **Alt2**:   + Supported by: Xiaomi, Qualcomm, NTT, Nokia   + Conditionally supported by: ZTE, IDC(2), Sony, CMCC     - Condition: To link its usage based on other operational parameters, e.g., panel, coherency, CSI, etc. |

**FL Proposal 2.3: Support dual codeword** **for codebook and non-codebook UL transmission for 8TX UE** **conditioned/linked to other operational characteristics or system parameters.**

* **FFS conditions to enable dual codeword, i.e., number layers, panels, antenna group, etc.**

Table 6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Google | For Alt2, we would like to understand whether new codeword to layer mapping scheme needs to be introduced. It seems new codeword to layer mapping can be out of scope. |
| Lenovo | Propose the following wording change:  **FL Proposal 2.3: Support dual codeword** **for codebook and non-codebook UL transmission for 8TX UE** **conditioned/linked to other operational characteristics or system parameters.**   * **FFS conditions to enable dual codeword, i.e., number layers, panels, antenna group, codeword-to-layer mapping, etc.** |
| Samsung | This proposal can be discussed if >4 layers is supported. Without an agreement on >4 layers, it is premature to discuss it. |
| MediaTek | Agree with Samsungs’ comment. We can postpone this decision until max number of layers is agreed on. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support.  For codework-to-layer mapping, just reusing DL scheme would be okay. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Samsung. But, if agreed to support >4 layers, reusing DL CW2Layer mapping can be a starting point of discussion. |
| OPPO | We agree with the proposal only for >4 layer transmission and when the current CW to layer mapping is reused. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal |
| ZTE | Support.  Most companies believe it is necessary to support 2CWs for >4 layers.  Besides >4 layers case, we also suggest to support 2CWs for STxMP UE and 2-4 layers case. For STxMP, it is natural to have 2CWs, each CW corresponding to a panel and a TRP. For 2-4 layers case, 2CWs provide more flexibility for imbalance channel quality of different layers, which was identified by our real-field test in the product team. More details can be found in our tdoc R1-2205924. |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal. |
| Intel | Same view as Samsung. This proposal depends on the discussion on the number of layers. |
| Ericsson | **This needs further study in our view, especially given the spec impacts for both L1 and higher layers.** Two codeword transmission is also being studied for STxMP, and care should be taken to not have conflicting design outcomes. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support in general. It’s okay to postpone with more study as well. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| QC | Same view as Samsung. |
| CMCC | Support the usage of more than one codeword is conditioned to number of layers. Same as DL transmission, when UL layers are less than or equal to 4, one CW is enabled, and when UL layers are larger than 4, dual CWs are enabled. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support to enable dual codewords according to the number of layers and reuse DL codeword to layer mapping to save spec effort. |
| CATT | The proposal is acceptable. Since the majority prefer to support 2 CW for >4 layers. For process, we prefer to update the proposal as follows:  **FL Proposal 2.3: Support dual codeword** **for codebook and non-codebook UL transmission for 8TX UE** **~~conditioned/linked to other operational characteristics or system parameters~~at least for >4 layers.**   * **FFS other conditions to enable dual codeword, i.e., other number of layers,panels, antenna group, etc.** |
| Apple | If 8 layers are supported, 2 CWs can be supported. CATT’s modification looks good. |
| Sony | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Discuss this proposal after we have resolution on proposal 2.2 |
|  |  |

# Numeration of Antenna groups

In the last meeting, the notion of antenna group for full-coherent or partial-coherent 8TX UE was discussed and agreed [1]. As such, for a fully/partially-coherent 8TX UE, Ng>=1 antenna groups can be considered where each group comprises coherent antennas, and across groups, antennas can be non-coherent/coherent depending on device types.

An important remaining aspect related to antenna group that may be also relevant to the design of the codebook is the range of Ng. On this issue, 9 companies have provided their recommendations as captured in Table 7.

Table 7

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * For a full-coherent or partial-coherent 8TX UE, antenna ports can be divided into one or two or four antenna port groups, the antenna ports within an antenna port group are fully-coherent and the antenna ports in different antenna port groups are non-coherent. | * Xiaomi, Google, Lenovo, OPPO, ZTE(?), CATT, IDC, LG, Nokia |

**FL Proposal 2.4: For a full-coherent or partial-coherent 8TX UE, support Ng=1, 2, 4.**

Table 8

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Google | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Samsung | support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| OPPO | Support. |
| NEC | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Intel | Just to clarify, for partial coherent UE, the value of Ng should be 2 or 4, correct?  If Ng=1, then it should be full coherent UE. |
| Ericsson | **We are OK with supporting Ng=1,2,4, but would like to clarify the proposal.** A partial coherent UE will not support Ng=1 in my understanding, while a fully coherent UE can support Ng=1, 2, & 4. Suggest the following:  **FL Proposal 2.4: 8 Tx coherent precoders can be applied within Ng=1, 2, 4 groups of elements** |
| Nokia, NSB | Ng=1, 2, 4 can be supported. However, the number of antenna groups (coherent antenna groups) is also related to UE implementation. We cannot restrict the support of Ng only for {1, 2, 4}. Other numbers shall not be excluded. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| QC | We support the proposal. We also think a UE capability is needed to let UE report Ng. |
| CMCC | One thing for clarification, Ng=1, 2, 4 can be supported for full-coherent UE, and the antennas are coherent across groups, Ng=2, 4 can be supported for partial-coherent UE, and the antennas are non-coherent across groups. If this is common understanding, it may be better to add a note in the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| CATT | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Sharp | Support |
| vivo | In our view for we don’t need Ng larger than 1 for full-coherent, Ng=2, 4 for partial coherent for evaluation purpose for time being. We need more discussion on codebook design whether Ng=2 is sufficient. |
|  |  |

# Medium Priority Topics

# SRI/TPMI Indication for Codebook UL Transmission

For SRI and TPMI indication, companies have provided their high-level views about their preferred indication mechanism. In codebook-based UL transmission, TPMI and SRI are used for indication of rank, precoder and antenna ports for PUSCH transmission.

To support codebook-based transmission, SRI/TPMI indication for an 8TX UE can require significant specification work, and also can become costly in terms of overhead. Table 9 shows companies views on this topic. Based on companies’ perspectives, two main solutions can be considered for SRI/TPMI indication,

* Use a single field to indicate rank and precoder: This may be more efficient from overhead perspective; however, it requires some specification work that involved some new additions, e.g., tables, fields, etc.
* Use separate fields to indicate rank/precoder per port group: This solution may require more overhead as the first solution; however the specification impact is less as existing indicator can be reused.

Table 9

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TPMI/SRI indication for Codebook-based | * **Alt1:** Single field to indicate rank and precoder   + Supported by: ZTE, Samsung, IDC (partial update), NTT, * **Alt1:** Separate fields to indicate rank/precoder per port group   + Supported by: ZTE, OPPO, Samsung, Ericsson, |

**FL Proposal 3.1: Study low overhead solutions for SRI/TPMI indication for codebook and non-codebook transmission by an 8TX UE.**

* **FFS using single or separate fields**
* **FFS DCI-based, DCI+RRC, DCI+MAC CE, etc.**

Table 10

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Google | Support. |
| Lenovo | Support the main bullet without FFS.  It’s hard to discuss the detail solutions without agreed codebook at the early stage. |
| Samsung | Support |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Lenovo that it seems difficult to discuss detailed design w/o UL codebook. But, fine to study on this issue. |
| OPPO | This issue can be further discussed when the codebook is stable. At this stage, we are fine with the proposal. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| ZTE | Support.  Although details can be determined after codebook design, SRI/TPMI indication scheme can affect codebook design to some extent. We believe FFS parts are meaningful. |
| InterDigital | Support. |
| Intel | Fine with FL proposal |
| Ericsson | We do think that codebooks should not be too large, but DCI size is not too big a concern in 8 Tx operation in our view. We think 8 Tx is more for throughput than coverage, and so scenarios where PDCCH coverage are not a primary concern. Also, ~6 extra bits TPMI/SRI compared is not a bit impact compared to other parts of DCI, especially if we end up with multi-codeword operation. For us, scheduler complexity is the larger concern, since gNB should evaluate all the precoders in the codebook.  Using higher layers to convey precoding information may be redundant with respect to beam management mechanisms that already handle the slower changing components of precoding. Also, such mechanisms require much higher protocol overhead than L1 mechanisms, and so the net benefit should be carefully analyzed.  We’d like to understand what ‘low overhead’ means for non-codebook. The Rel-15 spec already saves DCI overhead by taking into account the maximum rank for non-codebook based operation. So, we think Rel-15 mechanisms are low overhead schemes that should be studied.  **We propose the following revision:**  **FL Proposal 3.1: Study low overhead solutions for SRI/TPMI indication for codebook and non-codebook transmission by an 8TX UE.**  **• FFS using single or separate fields**  **~~• FFS DCI-based, DCI+RRC, DCI+MAC CE, etc.~~**  **Note: Low overhead schemes for study include those using Rel-15 SRI/TPMI indication mechanisms** |
| Nokia, NSB | The proposal is in general fine. However, we would prefer to prioritize the discussion of CB-based transmission first. Non-CB based Tx can be further discussed once we have a clear picture for CB-based design. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| QC | We think the proposal is fine. But we have same view as Nokia that this proposal can be discussed after the CBs are settled. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. We think both one field or two fields are used for TPMI. Because the indication of SRI and TPMI are different, they may need to be discussed separately. 2. We prefer single field to jointly indicate rank and precoder as legacy TPMI. 3. We prefer to consider beamformed CSI based precoder indication as another option to save overhead. Any way to reduce overhead will have negative impact on the accuracy of codebooks. One way to resolve this issue is that we can use beamformed CSI to indicate precoder with low overhead and high resolution. Specifically, TRP transmits a beamformed CSI-RS with precoder *WDL,* then UE can receive the CSI-RS as a vector of *PUL* as   By choosing the precoder WDL of CSI-RS, the selected codeword PUL can be indicated to UE with high precision. Because the CSI-RS overhead is not related to the number of codewords, we can design a high-resolution codebook with large codebook size. Even we can use beamformed CSI-RS to indicate optimal precoder without quantification.  As for the indication overhead, 8 CSI-RS ports are required for 8TX UL transmission with up to 8 layers, which occupies 8 resource elements. If we use the 8 resource elements to transmit DCI in PDCCH with QPSK modulation, the number of bits to be transmitted is typically 8\*2\*0.2=3.2, where 0.2 is a typical value of coderate in PDCCH. Compared to the DCI indication overhead in the candidate UL 8TX codebook, the overhead of beamformed CSI-RS based UL precoder indication is greatly reduced. |
| CATT | We think this issue can be discussed after the design of codebook is stable. But we are fine with this proposal at this stage. |
| Apple | This highly depends on the codebook design, and should be discussed after that. |
| Sharp | Generally support. This can be discussed after done of codebook design. |
| vivo | The proposal is generally fine, details depend on codebook design |
|  |  |

# SRS Configuration for non-CodeBook UL Transmission

Table 11 captures main proposals for SRS configuration for non-codebook UL transmission for an 8TX UE. For codebook transmission, the enhancement for configuration seems more straightforward, hence most companies have discussed configuration for non-codebook transmission.

For SRS configuration in non-codebook transmission mode, two main alternatives have been proposed by companies,

* Configuring a single SRS resource set that is configured with up to 8 single-port SRS resources. Hence a single SRI indication can be used for indication of a preferred spatial filter. However, the SRI field needs to be enhanced to support the additional SRS port combination introduced by an 8TX UE.
* Configuring two SRS resource sets that each is configured with 4 single-port SRS resources. As such, two SRI indications should be used for indication of preferred spatial filter. Therefore, there should not be any need to redesign/enhance the existing SRI field, how two SRI indication may be needed.

**Table 11**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SRS configuration for non-CB | * **Alt1:** A single SRS resource set configured with up to 8 single-port SRS resources (Single SRI indication)   + Supported by: ZTE, Lenovo, Apple, LG, Samsung, Xiaomi, Intel, OPPO, CMCC, CATT * **Alt2:** Two SRS resource sets, each configured with 4 single-port SRS resources (Two SRI indications)   + Supported by: vivo, Samsung, Xiaomi |

**FL Proposal 3.2: For SRS configuration for non-codebook UL transmission for an 8TX UE, down-select from**

* **Alt1: A single SRS resource set configured with up to 8 single-port SRS resources**
* **Alt2: Two SRS resource sets, each configured with 4 single-port SRS resources**

Table 12

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Google | Support Alt1. |
| Lenovo | According to chair arrangement, SRS related issue should be discussed in AI 9.1.3.2. |
| Samsung | Support both alternatives |
| NTT DOCOMO | We’re okay to discuss SRS related issues either here or in AI 9.1.3.2, but a common understanding is needed.  We’re okay to study both alts but it may be too early to say ‘down-select’. Supporting both alts is another possibility. |
| LG Electronics | Support proposal 3.2, and we have preference on Alt1. |
| OPPO | This issue can be discussed in AI9.1.3.2. |
| NEC | Support the proposal, and Alt 2 preferred. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal |
| ZTE | We also agree that Alt1 and Alt2 can be both supported as one possibility. Alt1 is straightforward enhancement, and should be supported. We are also open to Alt 2. |
| InterDigital | Support in principle. We can add Alt3 for supporting both Alt1 and Alt2, or down-select/merge later. |
| Intel | Fine with FL proposal. Alt1 is slightly preferred, and we are open for discussion. |
| Ericsson | Support in principle. Alt 2 seems to require 8 SRS resources to always be configured, but this is probably not the intention. Also, it seems to make sense to allow one SRS resource to be configured. Suggest:   * **Alt2: Up to two SRS resource sets, each configured with up to 4 single-port SRS resources** |
| Nokia, NSB | This needs further study. Non-CB based SRI design shall follow CB-based design, particularly related to the max layers. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| QC | We don’t have strong preference between the two alternatives. Do we have to down select between these two Alternatives? Supporting both of them seems fine to us as well. |
| CMCC | Support Alt1.  This issue is also discussed in agenda 9.1.3.2, it may be better to determine which agenda will handle this issue. |
| Huawei/HiSlicon | Support Alt 1, we failed to see the benefits of multiple SRS resource sets. |
| CATT | Support Alt 1. |
| Apple | Support Alt 1. We also would like to understand the benefit of Alt 2. |
| Sharp | Support Alt 1. |
| vivo | For non-codebook alt 2 is preferable, revision from Ericsson is fine. |
|  |  |

# Full Power Operation

Many companies have expressed the importance of full power transmission for 8TX UE. In Rel-16, full power transmission for codebook transmission is supported by Mode 0, Mode 1 and Mode 2. Several companies have stated that to support full power transmission for 8 TX UE, Rel-16 full power transmission schemes can be re-used with necessary enhancements.

Table 13

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Full power operation for 8TX UE | * Reusing Rel-16 full power transmission schemes with necessary enhancements   + Supported by: Qualcomm, Nokia, NTT, Ericsson, IDC, CMCC |

**FL Proposal 3.3: Extend Rel-16 full power Mode 0, Mode 1 and Mode 2 to support to 8TX UE.**

Table 14

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Google | We are not sure whether UL FP mode 1 and mode 2 are needed. This 8Tx enhancement is for CPE. If all UEs can support mode 0, maybe we can support mode 0 only to reduce the work load. |
| Lenovo | Fine to study this feature when the 8TX codebook is ready. |
| Samsung | In our view, we should design the 8Tx codebook first, then discuss full power modes. Without the codebook, we are not sure what this proposal mean. |
| MediaTek | In our view this issue can be addressed after codebook design is agreed on. |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK, even though we think it should be discussed after codebook design is determined. |
| LG | As agreed in the previous meeting and mentioned by MediaTek, it can be discussed after codebook design. |
| OPPO | Agree with Samsung. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | We agree to postpone full power design. If we need to support all of three modes later, it should not be a big burden considering reusing R16 full power scheme as much as possible.  By the way, 8Tx UE should not be supposed as a low-cost UE, and then whether mode 1 (i.e., one TX PA only supports up to 1/8 max power) is needed can be further justified. |
| InterDigital | Support in principle. And, we’re fine to study this after more progress on codebook design issues. |
| Intel | Fine with FL proposal. |
| Ericsson | **We think this needs further study.** RAN1 should not preclude practical UE implementations that trade off cost/complexity vs. performance, and so support the spirit of the proposal. However, we prefer to have more detailed proposals for the different modes before agreeing to specify each one of them now. Full power modes depend on the codebook designs, and these are still being considered. Companies are already investigating full power operation in their contributions, and that is enough in our view for the moment. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Samsung. |
| QC | Same view as Samsung |
| CMCC | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support to support the full power modes to accommodate different UE implementations. |
| CATT | Fine to study this issue later. |
| Apple | Prefer to discuss in a later stage. |
| Sharp | Agree with Samsung. |
| vivo | Full power mode0 and 1 are straight forward, we can discuss mode 2 once we have codebook design ready |
|  |  |

# Low Priority Topics

Following topics have been brought up by companies as the next step issues for support of 8TX UE. Please provide your additional inputs for each topic.

# PTRS-related Enhancements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Companies’ views** |
| Aspects for PTRS-DMRS association,   * Definition and indication of mapping between PTRS and PUSCH ports | Supported by: vivo, Lenovo, Qualcomm, DOCOMO, LG Electronics, ZTE,CATT |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Codebook Configuration

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Companies’ views** |
| Aspect related to codebook configuration and power mode,   * For a full-coherent or partial coherent UE, UE further reports other information   + FFS other information, e.g., antenna layout, virtualization capability across antenna ports, etc. | Supported by: Apple, IDC  QC comment: We are supportive the general discussion on UE capability report. But we prefer UE to report a preferred codebook among all codebooks defined in spec, rather than antenna layout or virtualization, which are UE implementation details.  vivo: this can discussed later after we have codebook design in place. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Feature-lead Proposals for Approval

# Round1

# List of Companies’ Proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **InterDigital** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For enabling 8 Tx UL for UEs with many antennas, it should be discussed how/when to use single or dual codeword based on considered scenarios, UE types, coherency types, and so forth.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Consider UE to report its capabilities on a supported type of antenna/panel structure or virtualization capability across UE antenna ports such as SRS antenna ports, enabling up to 8 Tx UL.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Support antenna grouping with further studies on how to associate parameters between the group, and consider enhancements on precoding design at least based on Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks (Alt1-b, Alt2-a) to enable up to 8 Tx UL.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *To reduce signaling overhead associated to SRI/TPMI indication for a 8TX UE, RAN1 studies partial update of TPMI/SRI information for 8TX UE.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Support to retain the full power transmission mode of operation with necessary enhancements to be also applicable for the new enhanced UL-MIMO transmission case supporting up to 8-Tx UL.* |
| **Huawei** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support maximal 8 layers for 8TX UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *SRI enhancement with overhead reduction to enable 8TX NCB based UL transmission should be supported.*  ***Proposal 3****：Block-wise codebook based on legacy 2TX and 4TX UL codebook should be supported for UL 8TX.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *The beamformed CSI-RS should be considered to indicate UL precoders to UE.* |
| **ZTE** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Regarding 8 Tx-UL operation in Rel-18, support 8-Tx and up to 8 layers for UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Regarding codebook design for 8-Tx, Alt 1-a is preferred.*   * *Full-coherent codebook can be based on NR Rel-15 DL type I;*   + *Some parameters can be optimized per rank, e.g., oversampling value can be lower for lower rank(s).* * *Partial-coherent codebook can be based on NR Rel-15 UL 4-Tx/2-Tx UL codebooks*   + *FFS: only full coherent UL 4-Tx/2-Tx UL codebooks vs. Full+partial+non coherent UL 4-Tx/2-Tx UL codebooks* * *For non-coherent codebook,*   + *FFS: full flexibility vs. partial flexibility*   + *FFS: whether to be supported by some of partial coherent codebooks*   ***Proposal 3:*** *Regarding codebook indication for 8-Tx, consider one of the following options:*   * *Option A: One table, each entry indicating one or more ranks + one or more TPMIs for one or more port groups.* * *Option B: Indication for # of port groups, and separate fields each indicating rank+TPMI for a port group* * *Option C: One field for rank combination indication, and zero or more fields for a shared TPMI or multiple TPMIs (each TPMI corresponding to one port group).*   ***Proposal 4:*** *Regarding non codebook based transmission design for 8-Tx,*   * *The number of SRS resources in an SRS set can be up to 8* * *Potential optimization for SRI re-design considering DCI overhead, e.g., 8 bits or less*   ***Proposal 5:*** *On 8-Tx UL transmission enhancement, 2 CWs for UL transmission should be supported for more than 4 layers UL 8-Tx transmission, for multiple panel simultaneous transmission, and for 2~4 layers.*   * *Condition of enabling >1 CWs for UL transmission can be further studied in RAN1, e.g., if the number of Tx(s) and the number of UL layers exceeds threshold(s).* |
| **Spreadtrum Communications** | ***Proposal 1***：*For 8TX UE codebook-based uplink transmission, Alt2-a is preferred and Alt1-b is second preferred.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Further study the potential methods to reduce DCI overhead for SRI indication.* |
| **vivo** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support both codebook and non-codebook based schemes for 8Tx UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Support fully-coherent, partially-coherent and non-coherent UEs for 8Tx UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Two SRI fields corresponding to two SRS resource sets for non-codebook transmission can be considered to simplify the SRI indication.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Codebook constructed by two 4Tx precoders indicated by two TPMI fields can be considered for partial and none coherent antenna assumption.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *DL type1 codebook can be considered for fully coherent antenna assumption.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *First, focus on transmission rank<=4, further discussed number of supported codewords if transmission rank>4 is supported.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Following issues should be further discussed:*   * *PTRS-DMRS association indication when rank>4, if supported* * *Impact on full power modes* |
| **Sony** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Up to 8 layers UL transmission can be supported for 8Tx UE.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Two CWs can be supported for in UL 8Tx transmission.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Panel-specific CW to layer mapping can be considered for multi-panel UE UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Channel state-based CW to layer mapping can be considered for 8 Tx UE UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Dynamic CW to layer mapping indication scheme can be considered 8 Tx UE UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Enhanced TPMI indication with finer precoding information can be considered for UE UL transmission enhancements.* |
| **Google** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support to prioritize the codebook design for antenna layout 3-a and 3-b.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *The enhancement of 8Tx transmission supports both coherent and partial coherent transmission, where the partial coherent transmission assumes coherent transmission within a panel.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Support to define the 8Tx UL codebook based on Rel-15 DL Type1 multi-panel codebook, where additional precoders with panel selection can be introduced.* |
| **Lenovo** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Prioritize full coherence and partial coherent UE capability for 8Tx UL operation*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Use antenna grouping to represent different UL Tx coherence assumptions, with the following conditions*   * *Antenna configurations of different antenna groups are identical* * *Coherence assumptions of two antennas within an antenna group are the same* * *Coherence assumptions of two antennas across two antenna groups are the same*   ***Proposal 3:*** *Support Alt1-b and Alt2-a for further study of codebook design*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Study the performance benefits, signaling overhead and specification impact of supporting frequency-selective precoding for 8Tx UE*  ***Proposal 5:*** *TPMI signaling overhead is considered as a performance metric when studying different alternatives for 8Tx UL codebook design*  ***Proposal 6:*** *More than 4 layers PUSCH transmission should be supported for 8TX PUSCH transmission with 2 codewords.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Study codeword-to-layer mapping for 8TX UL PUSCH transmission with more than 4 layers scheduling.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *Study UCI multiplexing in PUSCH scheduled with 2 codewords.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *Study mapping beteen PTRS ports and PUSCH antenna ports, as well as the indication of associated DMRS port for each PTRS for 8TX PUSCH transmission.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *To support 8Tx UL transmission, on the SRS configuration,*   * *One or two SRS resources with 8 SRS ports can be configured in the SRS resource set for CB when codebook based UL transmission is configured, and* * *Up to 8 SRS resources with single port can be configured in the SRS resource set for nCB when non-codebook based UL transmission is configured.* |
| **OPPO** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Strive for a unified codebook design applicable to all considered antenna layouts.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For full-coherent codebook with uniform linear antenna array of 8 ports,*   * *Prioritize linear array of cross-polarized antenna configuration* * *NR DL 8Tx Type 1 CB (wideband beam and co-phasing) is used as baseline with less beams.*   ***Proposal 3:*** *For partial-coherent 8 ports codebook,*   * *Prioritize linear array of cross-polarized antenna configuration* * *Support codebook design based on Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks* * *Each group of cross-polarized antennae is assumed to be coherent, and two groups of cross-polarized antennae can be coherent or non-coherent.*   ***Proposal 4:*** *For non-coherent 8 ports codebook,*   * *Prioritize linear array of single-polarized antenna configuration* * *Support 8x1 antenna selection vector for each layer with restricted codebook size*   ***Proposal 5:*** *Consider separate indication of TRI and TPMI if two-stage codebook is agreed for 8 Tx uplink.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Introduce SRI enhancement to indicate up to 8 SRS resources for non-codebook uplink transmission, considering signaling overhead and standardization complexity.* |
| **CATT** | ***Proposal 1:*** *UL 8Tx with up to 8 layers is supported in Rel-18.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For UL 8Tx with DFT-s-OFDM, precoding matrices in Table 1 are adopted for non-coherent codebook.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For UL 8Tx with CP-OFDM, whether all or a subset of port selection precoding matrices are supported for non-coherent codebook shall be considered.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For UL 8Tx operation, all or a subset of precoding matrices in non-coherent codebook included in partial-coherent codebook and full-coherent codebook is considered.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *On codebook design for partial-coherent UE with UL 8Tx, two coherent groups with four coherent antennas per group, and four coherent groups with two coherent antennas per group are considered.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *On codebook design for partial-coherent UE with UL 8Tx,*   * *If two coherent groups are supported, the two coherent ports groups are {0,2,4,6} and {1,3,5,7}, respectively;* * *If four coherent groups are supported, the four coherent port groups are {0,4}, {1,5}, {2,6}, and {3,7}, respectively.*   ***Proposal 7:*** *On codebook design for partial-coherent UE with UL 8Tx, Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebook is selected as the starting point.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For UL 8Tx operation, all or a subset of precoding matrices of partial-coherent codebook included in full-coherent codebook is considered.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *On codebook design for full-coherent UE with UL 8Tx in DFT-S-OFDM, searching precoding matrices by computer can be considered.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *On codebook design for full-coherent UE with UL 8Tx in CP-OFDM, NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook can be considered as the starting point.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *For UL 8Tx for codebook based PUSCH, TPMI/SRI indication is designed after the codebook and SRS design are available.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *For UL 8Tx for non-codebook based PUSCH, one SRI field is used to indicate SRS resource(s).* |
| **NEC** | ***Proposal 1:*** *From UE perspective, reporting capability of full, partial and non coherent is sufficient. And considering the partial coherent layouts, more than one type of partial coherent for different number of antennas within a group can be introduced.*  ***Proposal 2****: For codebook based uplink transmission, support Alt 1-b for codebook design.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Overhead reduction for partial and non coherent codebook should be studied, for example, based on antenna groups.* |
| **Intel** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For 8Tx UL codebook design, if RAN1 strives for unified solution for different coherence, then Alt2-a is preferred, i.e., the full coherent/partial coherent/non-coherent precoders could be based on Rel-15 2Tx/4Tx codebook.*   * *Otherwise, the codebook design could be based on Alt1-b, i.e.,*   + *The non-coherent precoders are antenna selection vectors or based on Rel-15 2Tx/4Tx codebook*   + *The partial coherent precoders could be based on Rel-15 2Tx/4Tx codebook*   + *The full coherent precoders could be based on Rel-15 Type I codebook*   ***Proposal 2:*** *For 8Tx UL codebook design, RAN1 to take the overhead into account.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For 8Tx UL transmission, the maximum of 4 layers could be prioritized.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For 8Tx UL transmission, single codeword is preferred.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For codebook based transmission with 8Tx, one SRS resource set could be configured. The number of SRS resources and number of ports for SRS resources could be discussed together with full power operation.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *RAN1 to discuss the UE PA architectures to be considered for full power operation with 8Tx in Rel-18.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *For non-codebook based transmission, one SRS resource set could be configured, and joint encoding of SRI and RI is preferred.* |
| **Xiaomi** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support 8Tx with more than 4 transmission layers for the UL.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For the PUSCH, the number of antenna ports should be extended to 8 accordingly.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Support both codebook based UL transmission and non-codebook based UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *2 codewords should be supported for up to 8 layers of uplink transmission.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *The supported 2 codeword transmission scheme can be enabled when more than X transmission layers is configured, X is up to UE capability.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Support the extension of the maximum number of SRS resources in a SRS resource set to 8.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Support the configuration of the SRS resources in one or two SRS resource sets;*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For non-codebook based PUSCH transmission with 8Tx, SRI indicated by the bitmap of the SRS resources of the SRS resource configured in either one or two SRS resource set(s) is preferred for the simplicity without any effort on the design of new SRI tables.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *The following cross-polarized antenna layout configurations can be considered as a starting point, i.e., (N1,N2,Ng)=(4,1,1), (N1,N2,Ng)=(2,2,1), (N1,N2,Ng)=(2,1,2), and (N1,N2,Ng)=(1,1,4) with d=0.5λ.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *The subset of Rel-15 DL Type I 8Tx codebook with reduced oversampling factors (N1,N2,O1,O2) = (4,1,2,1) and (2,2,2,2) can be used for Rel-18 UL 8Tx fully-coherent codebook. The subset selection principle can be based on CSI estimation, distance from the optimal codeword obtained by SVD, BLER or throughput performance, and so on. A group of codewords with the same beam (i1) or co-phasing (i2) can be selected with high priority.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *Concentrating two or four (same or different) Rel-15 UL 4Tx fully-coherent codewords with a co-phasing factor (e.g., +1, -1,+j, -j) can be adopted for Rel-18 UL 8Tx fully-coherent codebook, e.g.,*  *,**,**or**.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *The antenna ports can be divided into two or four antenna port groups, the antenna ports within an antenna port group are fully-coherent and the antenna ports in different antenna port groups are non-coherent.*  ***Proposal 13:*** *For partially-coherent codewords, the Rel-15 DL Type I 8Tx codebook based Rel-18 UL fully-coherent codewords can be Hadamard multiplied by a sparse matrix which should guarantee the orthogonality between layers. The elements can be exchanged in a column-wised manner so that the Xth group of layers can be transmitted on the Xth antenna port group.*  ***Proposal 14:*** *For partially-coherent codewords, four or two Rel-18 UL 4Tx fully-coherent codewords are concentrated for two or four antenna port groups, respectively, i.e.,*  ***or*** *for two antenna port groups, and**for four antenna port groups. Each layer of 4Tx codewords should be set as the corresponding antenna ports, when different antenna ports partition schemes are used.*  ***Proposal 15:*** *A unified codebook design principle is recommend for Rel-18 UL 8Tx fully/partially-coherent codebook.*  ***Proposal 16:*** *Antenna selection vector(s) can be used to construct the non-coherent codewords. Considering the TPMI overhead, 8 non-coherent codewords when rank=1 and 1 non-coherent codeword when rank>1 can be adopted.*  ***Proposal 17:*** *Considering the TPMI overhead, the bit width of TPMI for 8Tx codebook can be set as 6, 7, or at most 8 bits.*  ***Proposal 18:*** *The scaling factor can be set as sqrt(1⁄K) where K denotes the number of non-zero elements in the codeword.* |
| **Samsung** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Regarding the transmission scheme for 8Tx UL operations,*   * *Support both CB and NCB based UL transmission* * *For RAN1 work, adopt a serialized approach and prioritize CB-based discussions next 1-2 meetings*   ***Proposal 2:*** *consider the following aspects of 8Tx antenna layout,*   * *Polarization: cross-polarized* * *Antenna groups: 𝑁𝑔≥1 groups* * *Antenna panels and coherence types:*   + *Single panel: one antenna group (𝑁𝑔=1) and full-coherence*   + *Multi-panel: multiple antenna groups (𝑁𝑔>1) and partial-/non-coherence*   ***Proposal 3:*** *support a single unified 8Tx codebook structure for different coherence types (i.e. FC, PC, and NC) based on antenna groups*   * *Antennae within a group are coherent* * *Antennae across multiple groups are non-coherent*   ***Proposal 4:*** *regarding the 8Tx UL codebook,*   * *support Alt1-a* * *reuse DL Type I codebook parameters (𝑁𝑔,𝑁1,𝑁2,𝑂1,𝑂2,𝐿)*   + *FC: (𝑁𝑔,𝑁1,𝑁2,𝑃)=(1,4,1,2),(1,2,2,2)*   + *PC: (𝑁𝑔,𝑁1,𝑁2,𝑃)=(2,2,1,2),(4,1,1,2)*   + *NC: (𝑁𝑔,𝑁1,𝑁2,𝑃)=(8,−,−,−)*   + *Study mechanisms to reduce TPMI payload, e.g. 𝐿=1, lower oversampling factors*   ***Proposal 5:*** *study the following examples for the indication of (A) antenna group(s), and (B) UL precoding matrix,*   * *Ex1: two separate indicators, e.g. SRI for (A) and TPMI for (B)* * *Ex2: a joint indicator, e.g. TPMI*   ***Proposal 6:*** *Discussion on full power modes can be start after the 8Tx codebook is designed*  ***Proposal 7:*** *regarding 8Tx NCB based UL transmission,*   * *Support number of SRS resources (𝑁𝑆𝑅𝑆) up to 8* * *Support both one SRS resource set and two SRS resource sets* * *When 𝑁𝑆𝑅𝑆≤4, the SRI indication follows legacy (Rel.15) scheme, and* * *When 𝑁𝑆𝑅𝑆>4,*   + *Study the need for 𝐿𝑚𝑎𝑥>4*   + *study the following SRI indication schemes*     - *Alt1: combinatorial index scheme*     - *Alt2: bitmap based scheme*   ***Proposal 8:*** *for STx2P, support both*   * *Case 1 (1 PUSCH): one SRI indicating a pair of SRS resources (e.g. STx2P to sTRP)* * *Case 2 (2 PUSCHs): two SRIs, each indicating a SRS resource for a TRP (e.g. STx2P to mTRP)*   ***Proposal 9:*** *regarding max number of layers*   * *prioritize the RAN1 work for max 4 layers* * *>4 layers can be discussed, if its need and use cases can be identified* |
| **LG** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support both codebook and non-codebook based 8Tx UL transmission in Rel-18 MIMO.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Support Alt2-b for 8Tx codebook design.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Support fully-coherent, partial-coherent and non-coherent UEs for 8Tx uplink transmission.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Support two-level partial coherency for codebook based 8Tx UL transmission.*   * *Level-1: 4-group 2Tx coherency* * *Level-2: 2-group 4Tx coherency*   ***Proposal 5:*** *For 8Tx UL codebook cons t ruction, consider the following two options*   * *Option 1. Common UL codebook for all potential antenna layouts* * *Option 2. Multiple UL codebooks*   ***Proposal 6:*** *Consider Table 4 for rank 1 8Tx codebook for CP-OFDM.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Consider Table 5 for rank 1 8Tx codebook for DFT-s-OFDM.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *Consider following alternatives for enabling 8Tx non-codebook based UL transmission.*   * *Alt1. Increase # of SRS resource from 4 to 8.* * *Alt2. Allow max 2 SRS ports per SRS resource* * *Alt3. Reuse Rel-17 S-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH mechanism* |
| **CMCC** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support maximal 8 layers UL transmission for 8 TX UE.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *SRI field in Rel-15 can be reused for codebook based 8 TX UL transmission, when only one SRS resource is configured, the SRI field in DCI is absent, when two SRS resources are configured, 1 bit of SRI field in DCI is reused to indicate the selected SRS resource.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *How to indicate up to 8 transmission rank and corresponding PUSCH precoder without increasing the SRI overhead for non-codebook UL transmission can be further studied.*  ***Proposal 4****: Support Alt1-b: NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of the codebook for 8TX fully-coherent UE.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *The supported configurations of (N1, N2) for 8 TX UE can be N1=N2=2 or N1=4, N2=1 with the consideration of dual polarization, and the supported configurations of over sampling factor (O1, O2) can be further discussed for the codebook design of 8 TX fully-coherent UE.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Support Alt1-b: NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks as the starting point for design of the codebook for partially-coherent UE.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *If same spatial vector can be assumed among different antenna groups, the common spatial vector and phase offset design should support to indicate both partial-coherent and non-coherent codebooks for partially-coherent UE, and indicate {1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8} layers codebook.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *If different spatial vectors are assumed for different antenna groups, multiple TPMIs should be indicated to UE for each antenna groups for partially-coherent UE.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *Support Alt1-b: 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) as the starting point for design of the codebook for non-coherent UE.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *Enable 2 CWs with individual MCS, RV and NDI for 8 TX UL transmission can be studied.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *Full power transmission for 8 TX UE with full rated PAs on each Tx chain can be discussed firstly, which is independent of codebook design.* |
| **MediaTek** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support up to 4-layer transmission with 8TX UL operation.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Down select Alt 1-b for the CB design*   * *Alt1-b:*   + *Study NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) as the starting point for design of the codebook for partially/non-coherent UEs*   + *Study NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of the codebook for fully coherent UEs*   ***Proposal 3:*** *Type I CB can be reduced for UL 8TX through the following techniques:*   * *Reduced DFT oversampling factors.* * *Further quantize the beam co-phasing possibilities.* * *FFS: Other techniques*   ***Proposal 4:*** *Prioritize dual polarization over single polarization for full-coherent/partially coherent UEs.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Prioritize the CB design for partially coherent UE with two group and four group coherent antennas.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Study and support if justified, the additional co-phasing and amplitude compensation factors as a part of CB design across the panels of full coherent UEs.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *SRS and SRI enhancement to support non-codebook based PUSCH with 8 Tx.*   * *FFS details on SRS and SRI enhancement for 8 TX via multiple SRS resource sets up to 8 ports.* |
| **Ericsson** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support up to 8 layers for both codebook- and non-codebook-based transmission.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Support non-coherent precoders in 8 Tx codebook-based operation.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Consider restricting codebooks for 8 TX UEs such that elements of the precoding matrices are limited to the set {+1, +j, -1, -j}.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Study techniques to reduce/restrict the number of precoder candidates for 8 Tx codebook designs.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Focus the study of Rel-15 NCB-based operation with up to 8 layers on using Rel-15 principles, allowing any combination of SRS resources for a given maximum number of layers and SRS resources.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Study indicating multiple Rel-15/16 TPMIs, each corresponding to an SRS resource, where precoders do not combine coherently across SRS resources.* |
| ***Qualcomm*** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Rel-18 prioritize the specification for 8 Tx PUSCH with up to 4 layers, while deprioritize the specification for 8 Tx PUSCH with more than 4 layers.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *NR Rel-18 reuse and concatenate existing Rel-15 2 Tx and/or 4 Tx PUSCH precoders to support 8 Tx PUSCH precoders with partial coherent or noncoherent 8 Tx (i.e., Alt 1-b).*   * *Prioritize the specification of the following two cases.*   + *Concatenate two 4 Tx precoders to build an 8 Tx precoder.*   + *Concatenate four 2 Tx precoders to build an 8 Tx precoder.* * *FFS details on signalling to reuse and concatenate existing Rel-15 precoders.* * *FFS how to reduce the size of the codebook.*   ***Proposal 3:*** *As a starting point, Rel-18 study the new precoder codebook for PUSCH with fully coherent 8 Tx based on DFT matrix (i.e., Alt 1-b).*  ***Proposal 4:*** *8 Tx UL codebooks reuse entries from QPSK constellation, without introducing constellation higher than QPSK.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For codebook based 8 Tx PUSCH in Rel-18, prioritize the specification for non-coherent and partial coherent 8 Tx precoders.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Rel-18 specify SRS and SRI enhancement to support non-codebook based PUSCH with 8 Tx.*   * *FFS details on SRI enhancement for 8 SRS ports sounding via a single SRS resource set.* * *FFS details on SRI enhancement for 8 SRS ports sounding via multiple SRS resource set, each sounding less than 8 ports.*   ***Proposal 7:*** *Increase # UL PTRS ports from up to 2 (in Rel-15/16/17) to up to 4, for both noncodebook based PUSCH and codebook based PUSCH.*   * *FFS: enhancements to support up to 4 PTRS ports.*   ***Proposal 8:*** *Specify a new UE capability to indicate the number of PTRS ports, X, required by the UE, where X≤4.*   * *FFS: PTRS to DMRS association enhancements.*   ***Proposal 9:*** *For 2 CWs PUSCH with 8 layers in Rel-18, reuse Rel-15 2 CWs PDSCH CW to layer mapping procedure.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *Study, and if necessary, specify HARQ enhancement to support two codewords PUSCH with 8 Tx including at least the following aspects*   * *NDI, RV, MCS signaling for the second CW* * *CBG based PUSCH with 2 CWs* * *Dynamic switch between 2 CW and single CW PUSCH*   ***Proposal 11:*** *Study, if necessary, specify the UCI-multiplexing enhancement to support UCI multiplexing on two codewords PUSCH with 8 Tx including at least the following aspects*   * *Multiplex UCI only on one of the CWs or both CWs* * *Whether allowing different beta offset values for the two CWs*   ***Proposal 12:*** *Study, if necessary, specify the signaling on DMRS port indication in DCI to support PUSCH with more than 4 layers.*  ***Proposal 13:*** *Support reusing Rel-16 full power transmission schemes with necessary enhancements for PUSCH with 8 Tx.* |
| **Apple** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For the support of 8 Tx UL with codebook based transmission scheme, UE reports:*   * *Whether it supports full coherency, partial coherency, or non-coherency in antenna configuration.* * *For a full-coherent or partial coherent UE, it further reports the antenna layout.*   + *For a full-coherent UE, it reports whether it supports (2, 2, 2) or (4, 1, 2) layout.*     - *Note that whether the layout is considered as (4, 1, 2) or (1, 4, 2) is not critical for the UE, because the UE may rotate the direction.*   + *For a partial-coherent UE, it reports whether it supports 2 or 4 antenna groups.*   ***Proposal 2****: For codebook based transmission scheme with 8Tx UL, support 1 SRS resource with up to 8 ports.*  ***Proposal 3****: For codebook based transmission scheme with 8Tx full coherent antenna configuration, reuse the Rel-15 DL Type I codebook design for 8 Tx with small oversampling factor (e.g. O=2).*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For codebook based transmission scheme with 8Tx partial coherent antenna configuration, use the Rel-15 UL 2Tx/4Tx codebooks for the per-antenna-group precoding.*   * *FFS how the layers are split among the groups*   ***Proposal 5:*** *For codebook based transmission scheme with 8Tx non-coherent antenna configuration, a mechanism that provides full flexibility for the antenna port selection is considered as the starting point for the design.*   * *FFS overhead reduction*   ***Proposal 6:*** *For full power transmission, advanced UEs similar to a UE that supports ul-FullPwrMode-r16 in Rel-16 (with all full-rated PAs) should be assumed to simplify the design.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *For non-codebook based transmission scheme with 8Tx UL, support 1 SRS resource set with up to 8 SRS resources, each with a single port.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For non-codebook based transmission scheme with 8Tx UL, a mechanism that provides full flexibility for the SRI indication is considered as the starting point for the design.*   * *FFS overhead reduction* |
| **NTT DOCOMO** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support 8TX UL transmission with up to 8 layers per UE.*  ***Proposal 2:***   * *Support a unified TPMI/RI indication method for fully-/partially/non-coherent UEs.*   + *Support single precoder indication for new 8TX precoder for fully/partially/non-coherent UEs.*   + *Joint indication of layer and TPMI index is the starting point.* * *The number of supported precoders for 8TX should be carefully considered to reduce the DCI indication overhead.* * *For 8TX UL codebook design, support Alt1-b or Alt2-b.*   + *For partially/non-coherent precoders, NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebook is the starting point. New 8TX precoder (each with a new TPMI index) is designed based on existing 2TX/4TX precoders.*   + *For fully-coherent precoders, NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook is the starting point. New 8TX precoder (each with a new TPMI index) is designed based on existing DL Type I precoders.*     - *Study the candidate value of N1, N2, O1, O2 to be supported.*   ***Proposal 3:***   * *Support two codewords for PUSCH transmission for more than 4 layers. Following enhancements can be further discussed.*   + *codeword-to-layer mapping for more than 4 layers for spatial multiplexing (reuse DL codeword-to-layer mapping)*   + *DCI enhancement with codeword-specific indications of MCS, NDI, and RV*   + *UCI multiplexing on two codewords PUSCH* * *Support two codewords for simultaneous multi-panel UL transmission for less than 4 layers. The design on support of two codewords PUSCH should be common and can be discussed jointly for 8TX UL transmission and multi-panel UE transmission.* |
| **Sharp** | ***Proposal 1:*** *We should first study rectangular arrangement but no other layout is precluded. Also, the three layouts summarized in the table should be discussed with the same priority*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Support different codebooks for each coherent capability that is Alt1-a or Alt1-b.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *We should use different codebooks for each coherent type as a starting point for design and believe Alt1-b reduce the standardization efforts.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *We should discuss how to reduce overhead with TPMI indication.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *RRC configuration should be separated according to the number of antenna ports for 8Tx transmission.* |
| **Nokia** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Study NR DL (Type-I) 8Tx codebooks for uplink transmission, with consideration of uplink antenna implementations for CPE/FWA/vehicle/Industrial devices.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *RAN1 shall discuss on whether DL 8Tx multi-panel codebook (Type-I codebook) should be studied in Rel-18.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Support 8TX for UL transmission and support up to 8 transmission layers on UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Consider reusing Rel-15 uplink codebook design principle for 8Tx partial coherent codebooks with 𝑵𝒈=𝟐 and 𝑵𝒈=𝟒.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Extend Rel-16 full power mode 1 and mode 2 support to 8Tx.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *If two codewords are supported for uplink Tx, consider to support rank combinations of 2+3, 3+3, 3+4, and 4+4.* |
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