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# Introduction

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

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Study, and if justified, specify larger number of orthogonal DMRS ports for downlink and uplink MU-MIMO (without increasing the DM-RS overhead), only for CP-OFDM,
* Striving for a common design between DL and UL DMRS
* Up to 24 orthogonal DM-RS ports, where for each applicable DMRS type, the maximum number of orthogonal ports is doubled for both single- and double-symbol DMRS

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

This document contains summary of the company’s proposal and FL proposals.

# Objective #3 (increasing DMRS ports)

## Confirm WA

In RAN1#110 meeting, the following working assumption was made.

|  |
| --- |
| Working Assumption* To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, support at least Opt.1 (introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6)).
	+ FFS: FD-OCC length for Rel.18 DMRS type 1 and type 2.
	+ FFS: Whether it is needed to handle potential performance issues of Opt 1. For example, study if there is performance loss in case of large delay spread scenario. If needed, how (e.g. additionally support other options).
 |

18 companies propose to confirm the WA. Based on tdoc reviewing, there is no critical concern to confirm the WA. Hence, FL proposal is to confirm the WA. FFS for FD-OCC length can be removed, because it is covered in other agreement.

FL notes:

* Ericsson shows evaluation result that Opt.5 outperforms Opt.1 in case of the large delay spread.
* ZTE, NTT DOCOMO propose to consider TD-OCC enhancement across non-consecutive symbols as an additional option. While, Intel, NEC, Samsung, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB propose to consider Opt.1 only.
* Huawei/HiSilicon propose to enhance TD-OCC between double symbols in Opt.1. From FL perspective, Opt.1 does not preclude possibility of such enhancement in future.

**FL proposal#3.1 (Round-1):**

* **Confirm the WA in RAN1#110 with the following update:**
	+ ***To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, support at least Opt.1 (introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6)).***
		- ***~~FFS: FD-OCC length for Rel.18 DMRS type 1 and type 2.~~***
		- ***FFS: Whether it is needed to handle potential performance issues of Opt 1. For example, study if there is performance loss in case of large delay spread scenario. If needed, how (e.g. additionally support other options).***

**Support/fine (26): Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Spreadtrum (remove FFS), vivo, OPPO, Google, CATT, Intel (Only Opt.1), NEC (Opt.1 only), Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Samsung (Opt.1 only), NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm (Opt.1 only), Nokia/NSB (Opt.1 only), Apple, InterDigital, Futurewei, Lenovo, MediaTek, CMCC, LGE, Sharp**

**No (1?): Ericsson?**

Please provide your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Apple | We are fine. But does the modification help anything. We anyhow need to discuss whether FD-OCC 4 and/or FD-OCC 6 should be supported.  |
| InterDigital  | Support FL proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Google | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| Ericsson | We need to acknowledge the performance issue with FD-OCC 4/6 first. Several companies have shown in their simulation with 300ns/1000ns delay spread there’s certain level of performance degradation being observed with FD-OCC 4/6 compare with FD-OCC 2. Ericsson, HW, Intel, Lenovo, InterDigital, ZTE … Once we acknowledge the performance issue, we can further discuss if there’s need to resolve the issue in Rel-18 DMRS design, either support enhancement on top of Opt1(e.g. FAT-OCC) or other options (e.g. TD-OCC) or dynamic switching between Rel15/Rel-18 DMRS type.Proposal 1:***RAN1 acknowledge that for large delay spread scenario there is performance degradation with FD-OCC4/6 (compare with Rel-15 FD-OCC2)***Proposal 2:* + ***To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, support at least Opt.1 (introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6)).***
		- ***FFS: FD-OCC length4/6 combined with TD-OCC length 2 on additional DMRS symbols (FAT-OCC)***
		- ***FFS: other options***

Note: FAT-OCC or dynamic switching between Rel18/Rel-15 DMRS can mitigate the observed performance issue with large delay spread for Opt1. |
| ZTE | Support in principle.Regarding the FFS part, simulation results provided by several companies have already shown that FD-OCC-M (M>2) will cause sever performance loss in case of large delay spread. For MU-MIMO scenario, this case should also be enhanced with increase DMRS ports anyways. Ericsson’s proposals can be used to capture the above.**FL proposal#3.1:*** **Confirm the WA in RAN1#110 with the following update:**
	+ ***To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, support at least Opt.1 (introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6)).***
	+ ***RAN1 acknowledge that for large delay spread scenario there is performance degradation with FD-OCC4/6 (compare with Rel-15 FD-OCC2), and RAN1 shall strive to further study the solution (e.g., TD-OCC) to increase the number of orthogonal DMRS ports in this scenario.***
		- ***~~FFS: FD-OCC length for Rel.18 DMRS type 1 and type 2.~~***
 |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. In addition to Opt.1, we also prefer to Opt.3 since it can provide performance gain relative to Opt.1 in case of large delay spread scenario, especially in high SNR region. Furthermore, the scheduling is more flexible for multiplexing more users on account of introducing more CDM groups.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| NEC | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support FL proposal#3. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support. Considering the potential work load and UE complexity. We don’t prefer additional schemes other than Opt.1. |
| Ericsson | FD-OCC combined with TD-OCC on additional DMRS symbols (FAT-OCC) is based on FD-OCC length 4 or 6, only if additional DMRS symbol is configured, you swap the sign on additional symbols, i.e. apply TD-OCC length 2. When additional symbol is not configured, only FD-OCC is applied. Please also note that TD-OCC on additional DMRS symbol is not new, it is **already used in LTE** uplink.The receiver side can decide whether to utilize FD-OCC or TD-OCC to decode based on the channel knowledge from receiver side. Considering the complexity for UE, if the **UE** side receiver chooses to **always use FD-OCC**, it works fine too.More important is that **gNB can utilized FAT-OCC**. We think FAT-OCC is very useful for improving uplink performance. In our simulation we’ve shown that the performance of FAT-OCC is on par with FD-OCC length 2, i.e. the Rel-15 DMRS when there’s large delay spread.We still believe FAT-OCC is a simple and effective design for Rel-18 DMRS, and it can be considered as an extension based on option1. **FL proposal#3.1:*** **Confirm the WA in RAN1#110 with the following update:**
	+ ***To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, support ~~at least~~ Opt.1 (introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6)).***
	+ ***RAN1 acknowledge that for large delay spread scenario there is performance degradation with FD-OCC4/6 (compare with Rel-15 FD-OCC2), ~~and RAN1 shall strive to further study the solution (e.g., TD-OCC) to increase the number of orthogonal DMRS ports in this scenario.~~***
		- ***~~FFS: FD-OCC length for Rel.18 DMRS type 1 and type 2.~~***
 |
| vivo | Support the proposal, and fine with removing ‘at least’. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal to confirm the working assumption, and we are fine with removing “at least” to have Opt. 1 only for supporting Rel-18 DMRS. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal. Also, we propose to remove ‘at least’.Though we proposed to remove FFS, it is still fine to keep it.  |
| LGE | Support. We also don’t prefer additional schemes other than Opt.1 |
| QC | We support FL proposal. In addition, we think the second FFS can be removed as well. We studied Opt1 in high Delay spread channel and did not observe performance degradation.  |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| Intel | Support the proposal. We do not think we need to bring up performance degradation due to FD-OCC 4/6 in large delay spread since we have shown in our paper that receiver implementation can help alleviate the channel estimation error in large delay spread by performing the channel dispreading after the MMSE filtering which can avoid the error floor in large delay spread case.  |
| Sharp | Support |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support the FL proposal. And, supporting just option 1 is fine. Additional schemes are not necessary. The FFS can be removed as well. |
| **Mod** | **No update on FL proposal#3.1. Ericsson/ZTE’s proposal seems not agreeable, because at least Qualcomm has different view.** |

### **ROUND-2**

In the Round 1, FL proposal#3.1 was made. There is no update on FL proposal#3.1. For the Proposed conclusion#3.1a from Ericsson, let’s hear other companies views.

**FL proposal#3.1 (No update from Round1):**

* **Confirm the WA in RAN1#110 with the following update:**
	+ ***To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, support at least Opt.1 (introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6)).***
		- ***~~FFS: FD-OCC length for Rel.18 DMRS type 1 and type 2.~~***
		- ***FFS: Whether it is needed to handle potential performance issues of Opt 1. For example, study if there is performance loss in case of large delay spread scenario. If needed, how (e.g. additionally support other options).***

**Support/fine (26): Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Spreadtrum (remove FFS), vivo (Opt.1 only), OPPO, Google, CATT, Intel (Only Opt.1), NEC (Opt.1 only), Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Samsung (Opt.1 only), NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm (Opt.1 only), Nokia/NSB (Opt.1 only), Apple, InterDigital, Futurewei, Lenovo, MediaTek, CMCC, LGE, Sharp**

**No (1?): Ericsson?**

**Proposed conclusion#3.1a (from Ericsson):**

**Several companies showed evaluation results that for large delay spread scenario there is performance degradation with FD-OCC4/6 compared with Rel-15 FD-OCC2.**

**Support/fine (2): Ericsson, ZTE**

**No (12): Qualcomm, Apple, Futurewei, New H3C, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Lenovo, Samsung, MediaTek, vivo, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI**

For FL proposal#3.1, if you don’t change your position, you don’t need to input your views again. Please provide your views for Proposed conclusion#3.1a from Ericsson.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | When we debate FD-OCC4 and FD-OCC6 during GTW, there were more than 1 company commented that with advanced channel estimation, i.e., MMSE before OCC despreading, the performance loss under high-frequency-selective channel is minimum or none. Even though we doubt that, given this discussion, the proposed conclusion seems to be unnecessary.  |
| Futurewei | Regarding Proposed Conclusion #3.1a, it is unclear to us what purpose this conclusion tries to serve. Therefore the proposed conclusion seems unnecessary.  |
| New H3C | We support proposal 3.1. For proposal 3.1a, intention of this proposal isn’t clear to us we suggest proponent to clarify it in detail. |
| Spreadtrum | The proposed conclusion doesn’t make any decision. It look more like an observation. So further clarification on the purpose is needed. |
| OPPO | Firstly, based on our evaluation, there is negligible loss for FD-OCC4 compared to FD-OCC2 in 300ns delay spread as shown in our contribution. Secondly, we don’t think the conclusion would help to make any progress on this issue.  |
| Lenovo | It is observed the MSE performance degradation of FD-OCC 4 compared with FD-OCC 2 in our simulation for channel with 300ns/1000ns delay spread. However, we think the issue can be resolved by 2.3. |
| Samsung | We don’t think that the conclusion is necessary. |
| ZTE | At least, simulation results from companies include us have already proved the considerable performance degradation of FD-OCC length 4/6 exists when large delay spread (300ns and1000ns as assumed in EVM). We think Conclusion#3.1a is required to echo the FFS part in proposal#3.1 for progress. |
| Xiaomi | Support FL proposal#3.1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support in principle.Under large or mixed delay spread scenario, there indeed exists performance degradation incurred by the despreading operation utilizing larger FD-OCC length and higher interference among multiplexed DMRS ports as shown in [2], which can be addressed by adopting different FD-OCC length for different CDM groups (multiplexing less DMRS ports experiencing large channel delay spread within one CDM group with shorter-length FD-OCC, while multiplexing more DMRS ports experiencing small channel delay spread within one CDM group with longer-length FD-OCC) as illustrated in the FFS below Proposal#2.2.1.Furthermore, considering the orthogonality between DMRS ports is more easier to be broken under larger FD-OCC length, reusing Walsh-based FD-OCC may cause severe performance degradation for DMRS ports utilizing the same inner code when the orthogonality between DMRS ports cannot maintain, which will bring unexpected performance imbalance.The performance degradation will bring greater challenge to channel estimation and/or DMRS ports allocation algorithm and encumber the overall system performance, which is not friendly to both gNB and/or UE vendors. |
| Ericsson | This conclusion is to echo the FFS part and to progress with the working assumption. We could at least acknowledge companies have done such effort in the evaluation and there is certain degradation being observe. How about change the wording like this to reflect the observation we captured from contributions.**~~RAN1 acknowledge~~ Several companies showed evaluation results that for large delay spread scenario there is performance degradation with FD-OCC4/6 compared with Rel-15 FD-OCC2.****Mod: Thank you, updated.** |
| MediaTek | We are not sure what is the intention of conclusion 3.1a. We don’t support this conclusion. |
| vivo | Regarding FL proposal#3.1, we prefer to remove ‘at least’. Many companies have given the simulation results that show opt 1 (FD-OCC) outperforms opt 3 (FDM) and opt 2/5 with TD-OCC on additional symbols in the case of large delay spread.**FL proposal#3.1:*** **Confirm the WA in RAN1#110 with the following update:**
	+ ***To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, support ~~at least~~ Opt.1 (introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6)).***
		- ***~~FFS: FD-OCC length for Rel.18 DMRS type 1 and type 2.~~***
		- ***~~FFS: Whether it is needed to handle potential performance issues of Opt 1. For example, study if there is performance loss in case of large delay spread scenario. If needed, how (e.g. additionally support other options).~~***

Regarding Proposed conclusion#3.1a, we are not sure the motivation of this conclusion. If it is used to introduce TD-OCC enhancement, we think it is unnecessary. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | In our simulations, we observed very negligible difference between Rel. 15 2-FD-OCC and Rel. 18 4/6 FD-OCC for any given delay spread if the number of ports per CDM group is constant. Even to progress with the working assumption, we don’t think this conclusion is necessary. |
| QC | This is not a study item which needs to capture simulation results/observation in TR. Even if it is, a TR would capture simulation results/observations from both sides. There are companies’ results show no loss in large delay spread channel.  |
| **Mod** | **FL proposal#3.1: some companies prefer to limit Opt.1 only, but it would be not acceptable for other some companies. Hence, no update is made.** **Ericsson’s proposal#3.1a: Many companies have concern to take this conclusion.** |
| **Mod** | **FL proposal#3.1 is moved to EMAIL ENDORSMENT 1.** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Details on Opt.1 (FD-OCC)

### 2.2.1 FD-OCC length.

### **ROUND-2**

On 10/11 (Mon.) GTW session, following agreement was made.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement:****For enhanced FD-OCC length for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH for Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS, support*** + **Opt.1-2: Length 4 FD-OCC is applied to 4 REs of DMRS within a PRB or across consecutive PRBs within an CDM group**
 |

At the end of the GTW, Huawei/HiSilicon commented to add FFS to the agreement, and Mr. Chairman suggest to discuss in email. Let’s discuss it in this section instead of email.

**Proposal#2.2.1 from Huawei/HiSilicon:**

**Add the following FFS into the agreement.**

* **For enhanced FD-OCC length for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH for Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS, support**
	+ **Opt.1-2: Length 4 FD-OCC is applied to 4 REs of DMRS within a PRB or across consecutive PRBs within an CDM group**
	+ **FFS: Additionally support option that length 2 and length 6 FD-OCC are applied to 2 and 6 REs of DMRS within a PRB for different CDM groups respectively under large or mixed delay spread scenario.**

Please provide your views on adding the FFS to the agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (Round1) | Under mix or large delay spread scenario, either advanced sequence design for length-4 FD-OCC (e.g., DFT-vector like FD-OCC) or adopting different FD-OCC length for different CDM groups (multiplexing less DMRS ports experiencing large channel delay spread within one CDM group with shorter-length FD-OCC, while multiplexing more DMRS ports experiencing small channel delay spread within one CDM group with longer-length FD-OCC) should be considered.[…] |
| CMCC (Round1) | We prefer length-6 and support opt.2 proposed by HW. As discussed in our contribution [16], when supporting MU-MIMO between Rel-15 ports and Rel-18 ports, length-6 FD-OCC can achieve better multiplexing capability. For example, two ports in CDM group 0 can be used for Rel-15 UE and six ports in CDM group 1 can be used for Rel-18 UE. |
| QC2 (Round1) | @Huawei, Thank Huawei for providing an interesting option 2. But if I understand it correctly, with one CDM group support FD-OCC 2, while another CDM group support FD-OCC6, when a rank >1 PDSCH is scheduled on both CDM group, this will require UE to run two different channel estimation algorithm for two different CDM groups, which would double UE complexity. Furthermore, the channel estimation quality on the two CDM group will be likely different. Therefore, we don’t support this option. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Not support the proposal. We don’t prefer to support multiple FD-OCC length, which complicates specification.For MU-MIMO between different CDM groups, it was already agreed in the following agreement. So, the use-case of different FD-OCC length in different CDM groups is not clear to us.Agreement (in RAN1#110)* Support MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports.
	+ For MU-MIMO by different CDM groups, no MU-MIMO scheduling restriction of PUSCH/PDSCH (i.e. MU-MIMO between Rel.15 UE and Rel.18 UE is allowed).
	+ For MU-MIMO within a CDM group, study whether and how to support MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports for PDSCH.
		- Note: the study includes MU-MIMO between Rel.15 UE and Rel.18 UE, and between Rel.18 UEs.

Note: PUSCH above is CP-OFDM waveform. |
| Apple | We do not support FFS.The whole purpose of DMRS enhancement is to allow more flexible MU-MIMO scheduling. If we keep FD-OCC 2, how can MU-MIMO scheduling be improved?This may also cause uneven DMRS pattern that may impact UE implementation.  |
| Futurewei | We are open to the FFS as it seems it is trying to address potential severe technical issue of FD-OCC length 4 only case.  |
| New H3C | We are fine with FFS. |
| Spreadtrum | According to the agreement below, only Opt.1-1 and Opt.1-2 are valid options for down selection in this meeting. The FFS doesn’t belong to any of the 2 options. So we don’t think the FFS should be considered.Agreement* For enhanced FD-OCC length for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH, support the following FD-OCC length:
	+ For Rel.18 DMRS type 1, down select from the following in RAN1#110bis-e:
		- Opt.1-1: Length 6 FD-OCC is applied to 6 REs of DMRS within a PRB within an CDM group
		- Opt.1-2: Length 4 FD-OCC is applied to 4 REs of DMRS within a PRB or across consecutive PRBs within an CDM group
	+ For Rel.18 DMRS type 2:
		- Length 4 FD-OCC is applied to 4 REs of DMRS within a PRB within an CDM group

FFS: Support of length 6 FD-OCC |
| OPPO | RAN1 agreed to down select between FD-OCC4 and FD-OCC6 in this meeting. Then we don’t think the FFS part is needed. Does it mean that we need to further decide it in next meeting?  |
| Sharp | Not support. We prefer common design for Rel-18 eType 1 and eType 2. |
| Lenovo | We are open for discussion but we think additional complexity needs being considered if supporting multiple FD-OCC length.  |
| Samsung | Not support. We think one length for Rel-18 DMRS is enough. |
| ZTE | RAN1 shall strive to a unified design as WID states. |
| Xiaomi | About Proposal#2.2.1, we agree with QC. If there is too much performance loss caused by large channel delay spread, other solution can be used, for example, the DMRS type can be changed back to legacy DMRS.For the length of OCC, we still have concern on the orphan REs problem. For now, we can support length 4 OCC. But if we cannot reach an agreement in section 2.2.3, then length 6 OCC should be taken in consideration again. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support.Thanks companies for providing valuable question.@QC, since different CDM groups are mainly for UEs experiencing different delay spread, the gNB should strive to allocate one CDM group for rank >1 PDSCH of a UE, which will not force two different channel estimation algorithm to be conducted simultaneously and not suffer from different channel estimation quality.@NTT DOCOMO, as we described, considering that the delay spreads in real scenario are not equal, adopting different FD-OCC length for different CDM groups (multiplexing less DMRS ports experiencing large channel delay spread within one CDM group with shorter-length FD-OCC, while multiplexing more DMRS ports experiencing small channel delay spread within one CDM group with longer-length FD-OCC) will bring performance benefit as shown in [2].@Spreadtrum, the agreement you pasted doesn't preclude using different FD-OCC length for different CDM groups. |
| Ericsson | We appreciate HW’s proposal to bring back the FD-OCC length 6. We can see the situation is the same as before, but we are open for discussion. |
| MediaTek | We don’t support this proposal, as pointed out by many other companies we should strive to have a single solution. We prefer to have a single FD-OCC length, which is length 4. |
| **Mod** | **Thank companies for your feedbacks.** **From procedure perspective, Spreadtrum/OPPO’s comments are valid. The new added FFS does not belongs to any of the 2 options in RAN1#110 agreement. It means the new added FFS reverts the agreement. We had discussion for FD-OCC length, and finally agreed FD-OCC length 4. We should not re-open a door for FD-OCC length 6 again, unless all companies support to revert the previous agreements.** |
| vivo | Share the same view with Mod. |
| Apple | The FFS, i.e. FD-OCC2 + FD-OCC6, is even worse than FD-OCC6. It makes MU-MIMO scheduling even worse which defeats the purpose of supporting larger number of DMRS ports. This agreement, i.e., FD-OCC4 is important to progress this topic. We do not need to overly spend time on FFS and we should make agreement as clear and clean as possible |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Having multiple FD-OCC lengths across CDM groups only complicates the specification and UE implementation. We prefer to not include the FFS. |
| CATT | We do not support FFS.Length-2 FD-OCC can be implemented by dynamic switching between Rel.18 and Rel.15 DMRS ports. Length-6 FD-OCC is not helpful for co-scheduling of Rel.15 and Rel.18 UEs within one CDM group and it has already been precluded. |
| Nokia/NSB | We don’t want to increase the ambiguity. We don’t support the FFS.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.2 FD-OCC design

For the details of FD-OCC code, following FD-OCC codes are proposed for length 4 and 6.

**For length 4:**

* **Opt.1-1: Walsh matrix (Hadamard code):**

$$W\_{Hadamard}^{4}=\left[\begin{matrix}\begin{matrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{matrix}\\\begin{matrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}-1&-1\\-1&1\end{matrix}\end{matrix}\right]$$

Supported by: Lenovo, OPPO, CATT, NTT DOCOMO (1st pref), MediaTek?, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Qualcomm (robust to TLL residual timing error)

* **Opt.1-2: Cyclic shift** **with {0, π, π/2, 3π/2}**

$$W\_{Cyclic shift}^{4}=\left[\begin{matrix}\begin{matrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{matrix}\\\begin{matrix}1&+j\\1&-j\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}-1&-j\\-1&+j\end{matrix}\end{matrix}\right]$$

Supported by: Ericsson (FFT based decoding), DOCOMO (2nd pref)

* **Opt.1-3: Inner cover codes + outer cover codes**

Supported by: HW

**For length 6:**

* **Opt.2-1: size 6 DFT-based sequence**:

$$W\_{DFT}^{6}=\left[\begin{matrix}\begin{matrix}1&1\\1&e^{-jπ/3}\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}1&1\\e^{-j2π/3}&-1\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}1&1\\e^{j2π/3}&e^{jπ/3}\end{matrix}\\\begin{matrix}1&e^{-j2π/3}\\1&-1\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}e^{-j2π/3}&1\\1&-1\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}e^{j4π/3}&e^{j2π/3}\\1&-1\end{matrix}\\\begin{matrix}1&e^{-j4π/3}\\1&e^{-j5π/3}\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}e^{-j8π/3}&1\\e^{-j10π/3}&-1\end{matrix}&\begin{matrix}e^{j8π/3}&e^{j4π/3}\\e^{j10π/3}&e^{j5π/3}\end{matrix}\end{matrix}\right]$$

Supported by: Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Intel.

Since FD-OCC length 4 is already agreed for DMRS type 2, we can discuss FD-OCC length 4 at least for DMRS type 2. FL proposal is to propose Opt.1-1, because it is the majority views based on reviewing tdocs.

**FL proposal#2.2.2:**

* **For FD-OCC length 4 for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH for Rel.18 eType 2 DMRS and for Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS (if supported), support one from the following FD-OCCs:**
	+ **Opt.1-1: Walsh matrix (Hadamard code):**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OCC index** | **wf(0)** | **wf(1)** | **wf(2)** | **wf(3)** |
| 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 2 | +1 | +1 | -1 | -1 |
| 3 | +1 | -1 | -1 | +1 |

* + **Opt.1-2: Cyclic shift with {0, π, π/2, 3π/2}:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OCC index** | **wf(0)** | **wf(1)** | **wf(2)** | **wf(3)** |
| 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 2 | +1 | +j | -1 | -j |
| 3 | +1 | -j | -1 | +j |

Please provide your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Support. |
| Apple | Support |
| InterDigital  | Support FL proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Google | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| Ericsson | Do not support. We support cyclic code with FD-OCC length 6. For length 4, we only support cyclic code. It is essential for us that the FFT based decoding can be used. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not Support.We support DFT-based sequence (i.e., Opt.1-2 for length-4 and option.2-1 for length-6), which is more friendly to the DFT-based channel estimation. Opt.1-3 itself is only a framework of Rel.18 DMRS design, it does not imply the detailed sequence design and can be deleted.Moreover, as FL claimed in section 2.1, **TD-OCC design of 2-symbol DMRS is not precluded**. Candidate designs can be:**For TD-OCC of 2-symbol DMRS:*** + **Alt.1:** $W\_{t}^{2}=\left[\begin{matrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{matrix}\right]$
	+ **Alt.2:** $W\_{t}^{2}=\left[\begin{matrix}1&j\\1&-j\end{matrix}\right]$

As discussed in our contribution, the combination of FD-OCC Opt.1-2 and TD-OCC Alt.2 can ensure fixed cross-correlation between the inner cover code (formed by the Kronecker product of the length-2 subsequence of the length-4 FD-OCC and the length-2 TD-OCC) of Rel.18 expanded DMRS ports and that of Rel.15 DMRS ports, which can achieve balanced performance when the orthogonality between DMRS ports is destroyed due to large delay spread or compatibility issue. |
| NEC | Further discuss after section 2.2.1 is settled. |
| Xiaomi | If length 6 OCC is not precluded, Opt.2-1 should be included in this proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support.  |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Support Opt.2-1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| QC | Support FL proposal.  |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | Don’t support. We support length-6 FD-OCC without scheduling restrictions.  |
| Sharp | Support |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Open to discuss this depending on the outcome of 2.2.1. |
| **Mod** | **Based on Ericsson and Huawei’s inputs, I bring backed Opt.1-2.****For the comment of TD-OCC of 2-symbol DMRS from Huawei, I think it is separate issue.** |

### **ROUND-2**

* FL observation in the 1st round.
	+ Majority companies prefer Opt.1-1. In QC[24], it says Opt.1-1 is robust to TLL residual timing error.
	+ Ericsson/Huawei has concern on Opt.1-1 for UL, because Opt.1-2 can use DFT based decoding at receiver.

In Qualcomm [24]

|  |
| --- |
| Furthermore, it is expected that size-4 DFT matrix would perform worse than size-4 Hadamard matrix with TTL residual timing error. The reason is because DFT code is essentially a phase ramp in frequency domain, where each DFT vector is just an all 1 vector with a certain phase ramp. A timing error could make a DFT vector look like another DFT vector to receiver, because timing error translates into a phase ramp in frequency domain. However, the columns of Hadamard matrix does not have this phase ramp property, which makes it more robust to phase ramping due to TLL residual timing error.  |

In Ericsson,

|  |
| --- |
| It is essential for us that the FFT based decoding can be used. |

In Huawei,

|  |
| --- |
| We support DFT-based sequence (i.e., Opt.1-2 for length-4 and option.2-1 for length-6), which is more friendly to the DFT-based channel estimation.  |

**FL proposal#2.2.2:**

* **For FD-OCC length 4 for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH for Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS, support one from the following FD-OCCs (to be down-selected in RAN1#111):**
	+ **Opt.1-1: Walsh matrix (Hadamard code):**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OCC index** | **wf(0)** | **wf(1)** | **wf(2)** | **wf(3)** |
| 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 2 | +1 | +1 | -1 | -1 |
| 3 | +1 | -1 | -1 | +1 |

* + **Opt.1-2: Cyclic shift with {0, π, π/2, 3π/2}:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OCC index** | **wf(0)** | **wf(1)** | **wf(2)** | **wf(3)** |
| 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 2 | +1 | +j | -1 | -j |
| 3 | +1 | -j | -1 | +j |

**Support Opt.1-1 (14): DOCOMO, Apple, Futurewei, New H3C, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Sharp, Lenovo, Samsung, ZTE, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI**

**Support Opt.1-2 (10): DOCOMO (2nd pref.), Ericsson, Futurewei, New H3C, Sharp (2nd pref) , Xiaomi, Huawei/HiSilicon, , Fraunhofer IIS/HHI**

Please provide your views. Hopefully, we can down select one from Opt.1-1/1-2 in this meeting.

Please also check comments from Qualcomm/Ericsson/Huawei.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | We slightly prefer Opt.1-1, but we are also fine with Opt.1-2.We prefer to have the same option for both PDSCH and PUSCH. |
| Ericsson | We only support Opt.1-2. What mentioned above about performance loss is not true. Dependent on implementation, with DFT matrix that gives a phase ramp, one can extract the time response of each layer perfectly by filtering out each time window. The Hadamard code on the contrary doesn’t have pure phase ramp and the layers become mixed with each other.UE side complexity for implementing the cyclic code, sign flip and IQ swap for Cyclic code, is completely insignificant compared to total complexity at gNB side to support Hadamard code.We also prefer to have the same option for PDSCH and PUSCH, however our first priority is to make sure the Rel-18 DMRS is affordable for us. |
| Apple | We support Option.1-1DL CSI-RS has OCC4 and it is based on Hadamard.  |
| Futurewei | We are open to both options.  |
| New H3C | We are open to both options |
| Spreadtrum | We support Option.1-1.Similar view as Apple. We prefer to have the same OCC code design among all kinds of reference signals. |
| OPPO | We support option 1-1. With option 1-1, the Rel-15 UE with FD-OCC2 can be multiplexed with Rel-18 UE with FD-OCC4 in the same CDM group, which provide additional scheduling flexibility.  |
| Sharp | We have the similar view with DOCOMO |
| Lenovo | We support Option.1-1. We have similar view as Apple, Spreadtrum with reusing legacy length 4 OCC for CSI-RS. Also, the alphabet set (i.e. {+1, -1}) is not increased for option.1-1 relative to length 2 FD-OCC and this is beneficial to realization.  |
| Samsung | Support Option.1-1. |
| ZTE | Support option 1-1 only. As we mentioned in section 2.2.1, a unified design should be reached. |
| Xiaomi | From our understanding, the DFT based channel estimation relies on the channel estimated by LS or MMSE method, denoted as $\hat{H}$. In DFT based channel estimation, we need to get the channel $\hat{H}$ first, then the coefficients that only corresponds to the noise can be removed to improve the performance channel estimation. There is no much performance difference of $\hat{H}$ for these two OCC and the further processing on $\hat{H}$ is the same no matter what OCC is applied. Therefore, we do not think Opt.1-2 is more friendly to the DFT-based channel estimation.Well, our understanding might not be correct. Welcome to point out our misunderstanding and further discuss about this. |
| Xiaomi(2) | Sorry, after double check on this issue, we got the intention of Huawei and Ericsson and there is a little mistake on our understanding above. We are fine with both Opt.1-1 and Opt.1-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As we described in Round-1, FL has claimed in section 2.1 that **TD-OCC design of 2-symbol DMRS is not precluded**. Thus we suggest the following proposal to be discussed by companies after the FD-OCC is decided:**FL proposal#2.2.2A:*** **For TD-OCC length 2 for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH for Rel.18 eType 1/2 DMRS (if supported), support one from the following TD-OCCs:**
	+ **Opt.1:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **OCC index** | **Wt(0)** | **Wt(1)** |
| 0 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | +1 | -1 |

* + **Opt.2:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **OCC index** | **Wt(0)** | **Wt(1)** |
| 0 | +1 | +j |
| 1 | +1 | -j |

**Mod: let’s discuss TD-OCC later.**In terms of **FL proposal#2.2.2**, we support Opt.1-2.Besides the benefit extracted by FL from our and Ericsson’s Tdoc, which is the higher friendliness to the DFT-based channel estimation, another important benefit of Opt.1-2 that should be emphasized is that it can achieve balanced performance when the orthogonality between DMRS ports cannot maintain as shown in [2].For example, if the orthogonality between the length-4 FD-OCC of legacy and expanded DMRS ports is destroyed due to large delay spread or compatibility issue and Opt.1-1 is used, DMRS ports P1 and P12 can still approximately keep mutual orthogonality thanks to their orthogonal inner cover codes (formed by the Kronecker product of the length-2 subsequence of the length-4 FD-OCC and the length-2 TD-OCC) and nearly flat channel on two adjacent subcarriers. However, for DMRS ports P0 and P12 using the same inner cover code, the interference between them can be significant and great performance gap between DMRS ports will appear, which will bring greater challenge to channel estimation and/or DMRS ports allocation algorithm and may encumber the overall system performance.The unbalanced performance of DMRS ports under Opt.1-1 has been proved adequately in [2]. Considering that companies may neglect the unbalance phenomenon described above, further evaluation and careful selection is strongly recommended.Regarding the argument of some companies that DL CSI-RS has Walsh-based OCC4, we think it's not that convincible since UL SRS has Cyclic shift-based OCC. Now that reusing the common design for DMRS (which applies to both UL and DL) and other RS is already impossible, what we really need to pay attention to is the potential performance influence as illustrated above. |
| Ericsson | @OPPO, for multiplexing Rel-18 DMRS with legacy DMRS, with cyclic code, in the DL you can use one legacy code with one new code, in the UL you can mix one legacy with 3 new code, or 2 legacy code with 2 new code. |
| MediaTek | We support Hadamard matrix solution only, i.e., Opt 1-1. This is in line with legacy design, furthermore, as pointed out by QC, Hadamard codes are more robust to timing error. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Fine with both options. |
| **Mod** | **So far, the number of companies support Opt.1-1 and Opt.1-2 is even. My suggestion is to agree FL proposal#2.2.2 and down select in RAN1#111.** |
| CATT | We support option 1-1, which can be used to facilitate co-scheduling of Rel.15 and Rel.18 UEs within one CDM group. |
| **Mod** | **FL proposal#2.2.2 is moved to EMAIL ENDORSMENT 1.** |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with both options.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.3 Orphan REs in length 4 FD-OCC in DMRS type 1

If FD-OCC length 4 is supported in sect. 2.2.1, FD-OCC length 4 can be applied across consecutive PRBs. If the number of PRBs is odd, there is orphan REs. How to deal with the orphan REs should be discussed.



**Figure 12. Example of orphan RB/REs of Type1 DMRS [26]**

Following options can be considered.

* **If FD-OCC length 4 is supported in DMRS type 1, down select from the following to handle orphan REs:**
	+ **Alt.1: Introduce scheduling restriction (e.g. gNB always schedules PDSCH/PUSCH with even number of PRBs).**
		- **FFS: details.**
	+ **Alt.2: Not introducing scheduling restriction (i.e. gNB can schedules PDSCH/PUSCH with any number of PRBs).**
		- **Alt.2-1: FD-OCC length 4 can be decoded per a PRB at a receiver.**
		- **Alt 2-2: DMRS is not transmitted in the last 2 REs corresponding to the DMRS port in the orphan RB.**

Alt.2-1 is illustrated in figure below, RE#4 and RE#6 are used twice for FD-OCC decoding on CE window 1 and 2.

 

Alt.1: Channel estimation across two RBs[7]  Alt.2-1: Two channel estimations based on FD-OCC=4 in one RB [7]

ZTE shows evaluations result to compare performance between Alt.2-1 (purple), and Alt.2-2 (red). Based on the result, Alt.2-2 has slightly better performance than Alt.2-1.

Mod: due to the large size of FL summary, the figures are deleted.

|  |
| --- |
| ZTE [4]**Figure 1** Performance comparison of different schemes of frequency domain multiplexing***Observation 1:*** *For DMRS type 1, DMRS with PRB bundling without mapping the last two REs in the last PRBs performs a little better than two CE windows when the number of scheduled DMRS port in one PRG is odd.* |

Vivo shows evaluations result to compare performance between Alt.1 (red with square), and Alt.2-1 (red with circle). Based on the result, both performances are almost the same.

|  |
| --- |
| In vivo [6]d) 64QAM, DS=3001. For DMRS type 1, FD-OCC=4 with two channel estimations in one RB has a similar performance to FD-OCC=4 with 2RB as scheduling granularity.
 |

Multiple companies mention the scheduling restriction of Alt.1 is not preferred. For Alt.2, Alt.2-1 requires additional receiver complexity. Some companies mention Alt.2-2 would degrade performance significantly, however, based on ZTE’s evaluation result, the performance degradation is not observed. Hence, FL proposal is to select Alt.2-2, which neither introduce additional scheduling restriction nor increase large receiver complexity.

**FL proposal#2.2.3: (Round1)**

* **If FD-OCC length 4 is supported in DMRS type 1, select the following to handle orphan REs:**
	+ **Alt.2: Not introducing scheduling restriction (i.e. gNB can schedules PDSCH/PUSCH with any number of PRBs).**
		- **Alt 2-2: DMRS is not transmitted in the last 2 REs corresponding to the DMRS port in the orphan RB.**

Apple [21] makes a good point that it is important to align CDM group index from common freq. resource (e.g. Point A). MU-MIMO is also not possible in case of figure 2.2.3. Also, Apple shows assessment that only limited scenario, the orphan RE issue happens.

|  |
| --- |
| Next, we need to handle the orphan CDM group issue for DRMS Type I for both the FDRA type 0 and FDRA type 1. The following facts of the current NR specification need to be taken into considering when designing the restriction* PRG (Precoding Resource Block Group) is configured with reference to Point A (common resource block 0)
	+ PRG can be configured to contain 2 PRB, or 4 PRB, or wideband
* For FDRA type 0,
	+ The frequency resource allocation is bitmap with unit of RBG (Resource Block Group)
	+ RBG is counted with reference to Point A (common resource block 0)
	+ RBG is always even number
* For FDRA type 1,
	+ The frequency resource allocation is a set of contiguously allocated PRB indicated by the starting PRB, and a number of contiguously allocated PRBs

To avoid orphan CDM group across PRG boundary, one principle is to start CDM group from Point A (common resource 0) which aligns with the PRG. Since PRG is always even number of PRBs, i.e., 2 or 4, this ensure that there is no orphan CDM group issue for almost all the PDSCH PRBs, except under certain condition, the first and the last PRB of the scheduled PDSCH***Proposal 1.2, When FD-OCC length 4 is used to double the number of DMRS port for CP-OFDM, for DMRS Type 1, to avoid orphan CDM group issue, start CDM group operation from Point A (common resource block 0)**** ***Consider the restriction, e.g., no DMRS, only for the following cases***
	+ ***For FDRA type 0***
		- ***The first PRB of the scheduled PDSCH, when the first indicated RBG contains odd number of PRBs***
		- ***The last PRB of the scheduled PDSCH, when the last indicated RBG contains odd number of PRBs***
	+ ***For FDRA type 1***
		- ***The first PRB of the scheduled PDSCH, when it is located at odd number of PRBs from Point A***
		- ***The last PRB of the scheduled PDSCH, when it is located at odd number of PRBs from Point A***
 |



**Figure 2.2.3. MU-MIMO is impossible if different starting PRB of FD-OCC for Type1 DMRS with length 4 FD-OCC for different UEs.**

Please provide your views for FL proposal 2.2.3 and Apple’s proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support FL proposal 2.2.3. We think it is good to start PRB index of FD-OCC for Type1 DMRS with length 4 FD-OCC from Point A. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.2.3 may still have some issue.The true issue is CDM group cross PRG boundary. In the current specification, PRG starts from point A and PRG is either wideband or always even (2 or 4). So if we start the CDM group also from point A, we remove almost all the issue since CDM will advance synchronously with PRG. The only issue is that for the first and last PRB of the FDRA, it might have problem, which is only for the first few RE for the first PRB and last few RE for the last PRB. We can discuss this further.  |
| InterDigital  | Support Alt 2, but for the sub-bullet we prefer DMRS to be still transmitted in the scheduled RB, but it would be left to UE as how to use it.  |
| Futurewei | Support FL proposal 2.2.3. We are ok that for supporting MU-MIMO with Type 1 DMRS, the starting PRB of length-4 FD-OCC of different UEs should be aligned.  |
| Google | Support proposal 2.2.3, but we think it is better to have a clear definition on orphan RE, as this could have spec impact.We are also open to study Apple’s proposal.  |
| OPPO | Support Alt 2. For the sub-bullet, we prefer no restriction on the transmission of DMRS in the last two REs at least for PUSCH. For example, if MU-MIMO is not scheduled for uplink, the two REs can still be used for channel estimation at gNB. |
| Ericsson | We support length 6 FD-OCC. We can consider support length 4 only if there’s no scheduling restriction and it’s assumed that the UE utilize the DMRS at scheduling edge for an extra raw channel estimate. |
| ZTE | Support FL proposal#2.2.3Regarding case of figure 2.2.3, it seems as long as the CDM group index of UE#2 starting from PRB#1 or PRB#3, inter-UE orthogonality can be guaranteed for MU-MIMO scenario. Apparently, it can be up to gNB implementation. |
| Lenovo | Support FL proposal 2.2.3. We are open for more discussion on orphan CDM group issue. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Alt.2. How to perform channel estimation can be left for implementation. |
| NEC | We support Apple’s proposal in general. While only starting from point A seems not enough, common RB index should be applied for FD-OCC mapping. Or in other words, if common RB index (point A already applied) is applied for FD-OCC mapping, we don’t need to say point A again. |
| Xiaomi | We are not sure whether the simulation results of vivo where the performance of length 4 OCC is better than length 6 OCC is still valid when Alt 2-2 is supported. If this is how we solve the Orphan REs problem, we would rather support length 6 OCC than length 4 OCC. |
| Spreadtrum | Our first preference is Alt.1. We are fine with FL proposal 2.2.3 if there’s majority view.  |
| vivo | Support Alt 2-1, which doesn’t require any spec effort. We would like to mention that 1. It is up to receiver implementation whether to perform two channel estimations for FD-OCC=4 decoding in each RB or just in the orphan RB. When only performing two channel estimations in the orphan RB, its performance would be almost the same as FD-OCC=4 with 2RB granularity as shown below.
2. After two FD-OCC=4 decoding, only one MMSE filtering operation would be performed to complete the channel estimation in each PRG (2/4/wideband). Therefore, the receiver complexity is acceptable, just with more additive operations when performing the FD-OCC=4 decoding.

Regarding Alt 2-2, if DMRS is not transmitted in the last 2 REs, there are three key points should be noticed.1. It changes the pattern of DMRS, which would lead to many additional issues, such as power boosting, channel estimation accuracy
2. The last 2 REs can be still transmitted, UE can determine whether to use them for eatimation.
3. Additional MMSE filtering matrix should be calculated for the last PRG containing the orphan RB due to the different number of REs occupied by DMRS from other PRGs, which would increase the UE complexity

Moreover, regarding Alt 1, we would like to clarify that it is not enough to just introduce the restriction on the number of scheduled RB as even. For FD-OCC=4 decoding, it is also necessary to align the offset of the start RB of each UE in MU-MIMO as even. As shown in the figure below, if two UEs in MU-MIMO don’t align the offset of the start RB as even (offset=1 RB in the figure below), FD-OCC=4 decoding in the red box can’t be performed correctly for UE 1. Therefore, Alt 2 is a better way without any restriction.Regarding Apple’s proposal, in the current TS 38.211, it has been specified that the reference point for DMRS mapping is subcarrier 0 in common resource block 0 (Point A). That implies that FD-OCC=4 would be mapped from point A. Based on this principle, we find there is a mistake of FD-OCC mapping for UE#2 from PRB#2 in Figure 2.2.3, where the OCC value of one port should be the same on the same subcarrier for all UEs. Therefore, we think it’s unnecessary to discuss starting CDM group operation from Point A again.According the above analysis, we prefer to modify the proposal as follow.**FL proposal#2.2.3:*** **If FD-OCC length 4 is supported in DMRS type 1, select the following to handle orphan REs:**
	+ **Alt.2: Not introducing scheduling restriction (i.e. gNB can schedules PDSCH/PUSCH with any number of PRBs).**
		- **Up to the receiver how to implement DMRS channel estimation.**
 |
| Samsung | Support original Alt.1 which can be the simplest solution. Actually scheduling restriction on even number of RBs is not a big restriction, since the smallest unit of FDRA type 0 and PRG is 2 PRBs. If Alt2-2 (DMRS is not transmitted in the last 2 REs) is adopted, then channel estimation on the last RB may be degraded, and power boosting for the DMRS symbol would be complicated. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support Alt.1 at least on the perspective to OCC code mapping. We prefer to distinguish the discussions about OCC-code mapping and orphan RE handling.  |
| QC | We object this proposal. Among the three alternatives, Alt 2-2 is the worst solution. From performance point of view, it should yield worst performance, because of losing 2 DMRS tones per comb on the edge RB. We appreciate ZTE provide simulation result. But the result is counter intuitive. It is very unlikely that why a DMRS pattern with less DMRS tones can yield better performance than a DMRS pattern with more DMRS tones. From spec/implementation impact point of view, Alt 2-2 introduced a new DMRS pattern in freq domain, which would impact DMRS sequence generation, channel estimation interpolation, PDSCH/PUSCH rate matching, and DMRS/PDSCH power ratio. With the above reasoning, we cannot accept Alt 2-2. The most reasonable scheme to solve the orphan RB issue is Alt 1. Based on multiple companies’ input, RA type 0 does not have orphan RB issue (unless at BWP boundary). RA type 1 may have orphan RB issue. But how difficult it is for gNB to schedule even RB for Rel-18 UE by add or subtract 1 RB? We fail to see it is a critical issue for gNB scheduling. Maybe we missed some point on gNB scheduling. But can opponents of Alt 1 please provide a few examples/cases to help us understand why a gNB can (actually has to) schedule even RBs with RA type 0 but then suddenly think schedule even RB is a “mission impossible” in RA type 1? |
| CATT | Support FL proposal#2.2.3. |
| Intel | Do not support this proposal.  |
| Sharp | Support Alt 2 and we have similar view with OPPO. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support Alt 1. Agree with QC’s views. |

### **ROUND-2**

In the 1st round discussion, following if FL observation.

* Alt.1 does not have big issue at least for PDSCH.
	+ For PUSCH, it may impact on coverage.
* It is better to clarify “orphan REs”. (Text suggestion will be appreciated)
* Alt.2-2 is objected by Qualcomm/Intel/ Fraunhofer IIS/HHI.
* For starting the CDM group from point A, Apple/NEC/vivo shows views. More views are needed.

Let’s generally discuss whether we need gNB scheduling restriction or not. Starting CDM group from point A can be discuss separately.

**FL proposal#2.2.3a (scheduling restriction):**

* **For FD-OCC length 4 in Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS for PDSCH, select the following to handle orphan REs (i.e. if the total number of REs of DMRS in a CDM group is not multiples of 4, how to handle the remainder of REs):**
	+ **Alt.1: Introduce scheduling restriction (e.g. gNB always schedules PDSCH with even number of PRBs).**
		- **FFS: details.**
	+ **Alt.2: Not introducing scheduling restriction (i.e. gNB can schedules PDSCH with any number of PRBs).**
		- **Alt.2-1: FD-OCC length 4 can be decoded per a PRB at a receiver.**
			* **Up to the receiver how to implement DMRS channel estimation.**
* **Note: For FD-OCC length 4 in Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS for PUSCH, there is no orphan RE issue, because gNB (receiver) can decide whether to schedule with restriction (e.g. even number of PRBs) or not.**

**FL proposal#2.2.3b (start CDM group from point A):**

* **For FD-OCC length 4 in Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS, to avoid orphan CDM group issue (i.e. CDM group cross PRG boundary), start CDM group operation from Point A (common resource block 0)**

Please provide your views to the above two proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple (ROUND1) | The true issue is CDM group cross PRG boundary. In the current specification, PRG starts from point A and PRG is either wideband or always even (2 or 4). So if we start the CDM group also from point A, we remove almost all the issue since CDM will advance synchronously with PRG. The only issue is that for the first and last PRB of the FDRA, it might have problem, which is only for the first few RE for the first PRB and last few RE for the last PRB. We can discuss this further. |
| NEC (ROUND1) | We support Apple’s proposal in general. While only starting from point A seems not enough, common RB index should be applied for FD-OCC mapping. Or in other words, if common RB index (point A already applied) is applied for FD-OCC mapping, we don’t need to say point A again. |
| Vivo (ROUND1) | Regarding Apple’s proposal, in the current TS 38.211, it has been specified that the reference point for DMRS mapping is subcarrier 0 in common resource block 0 (Point A). That implies that FD-OCC=4 would be mapped from point A. Based on this principle, we find there is a mistake of FD-OCC mapping for UE#2 from PRB#2 in Figure 2.2.3, where the OCC value of one port should be the same on the same subcarrier for all UEs. Therefore, we think it’s unnecessary to discuss starting CDM group operation from Point A again. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Our preference is Alt.2, But we don’t see any big issue on Alt.1. Alt.1 will disable gNB to schedule PUSCH with 1 PRB, which may limit coverage. However, Rel.18 DMRS would be configured for MU-MIMO or SU-MIMO scenario, which is not coverage limited scenario. |
| Ericsson | Alt.2 is our preference. We can leave the performance discussion to RAN4. |
| Apple | We support Proposal 2.2.3bOur second preference is Alt1. in proposal 2.2.3aAlt2 is problematic. For example, for DL, if PRG is 2PRB and a contiguous PDSCH in frequency domain starts from the middle of a PRG (second PRB). Then we may have issue of orphan RE every other PRB depending on how we start the CDM group, if we do not have any further restriction. Orphan RE can be avoided with minimum impact to gNB scheduling flexibility. But gNB needs to schedule to accommodate UE channel estimation concern, instead of ignoring the orphan RE problem. |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt. 2 in FL proposal#2.2.3a. |
| New H3C | We support Alt.2 in proposal 2.2.3a |
| Spreadtrum | The orphan RE issue may happen in both DL and UL. Without scheduling restriction, both gNB and UE will have to handle it with additional implementation complexity. Therefore, we think having scheduling restriction is simpler not only for UE implementation, but also for gNB implementation. Also, with scheduling restriction, the performance issue cause by orphan RE can be avoided and further discussion on potential enhancements are not needed.  |
| OPPO | For proposal 2.2.3a, we are fine with either Alt.1 or Alt.2. With Alt.2, we think some restriction on channel estimation is needed at least for PDSCH DMRS. For example, UE cannot assume that there is no co-scheduled UEs in the same CDM group for channel estimation in orphan REs.For in proposal 2.2.3b, we are fine with it.  |
| Sharp | We support Proposal 2.2.3b.We are fine with the Alt 2 in FL proposal#2.2.3a, but don’t support Alt 2-1. In our view, spec effort is needed at least for wf(k’). Furthermore, we prefer a common design for eType1 and eType2. |
| Lenovo | For the discussion of FL proposal#2.2.3a, we support original FL proposal#2.2.3 in round 1 or Alt.1 on account that the complexity is larger for Alt.2-1. For FL proposal#2.2.3, it is simple and has no restriction for scheduling. For the BLER performance, we think the performance between Alt.1 and Alt.2-2 (FL proposal#2.2.3) is similar in case of large PRB number.  |
| Samsung | We support Alt.1 in proposal 2.2.3a, which seems not a big restriction on scheduling, and can easily solve orphan RE problem. We are fine with proposal 2.2.3b. |
| ZTE | Ok to take proposal#2.2.3b as a conclusion. We tend to agree with vivo’s assessment that reference starting point of DMRS mapping has already captured by specification. Besides, this depends on gNB scheduling only when MU-MIMO, which can be handled by gNB implementation when any issue exists.Either Alt 2-2 in original proposal#2.2.3 or Alt 2 in proposal#2.2.3a is fine to us. Alt 1 in proposal#2.2.3a will strict gNB schedule flexible especially when MU-MIMO.@QC, tanks to your question about our simulation result of FD-OOC 4 w/o 2 orphan REs vs FD-OCC 4 w/ 2 CE windows, basically, BLER gap is quite closed (~0.1dB) which far below common imagination. For FD-OCC 4 w/ 2 CE windows, it is proceed per PRB and where the estimation of the overlapped part is comes from the second CE window. Besides, the number of allocated PRBs in total is set to 25 in our simulation, the impact caused by the last 2 REs without DMRS is super marginal, which is actually closed to DMRS transmitted in all REs, i.e., the case of FD-OCC 4 with 2RB bundling. For your reference, simulation results provided by vivo can also prove this point. |
| Xiaomi | For FL proposal#2.2.3a, we support Alt.1.Fine with FL proposal#2.2.3b. |
| Ericsson | We want to clarify that the restriction is only needed for PDSCH, for PUSCH there should be no restriction because gNB can decide if to schedule and handle the orphan RB. I hope removing the “PUSCH” shall be acceptable for the group.**FL proposal#2.2.3a (scheduling restriction):*** **For FD-OCC length 4 in Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS, select the following to handle orphan REs (i.e. if the total number of REs of DMRS in a CDM group is not multiples of 4, how to handle the remainder of REs):**
	+ **Alt.1: Introduce scheduling restriction (e.g. gNB always schedules PDSCH~~/PUSCH~~ with even number of PRBs).**
		- **FFS: details.**
	+ **Alt.2: Not introducing scheduling restriction (i.e. gNB can schedules PDSCH~~/PUSCH~~ with any number of PRBs).**
		- **Alt.2-1: FD-OCC length 4 can be decoded per a PRB at a receiver.**
			* **Up to the receiver how to implement DMRS channel estimation.**

**Mod: this is reasonable suggestion.** |
| MediaTek | We propose Alt. 1 for Proposal 2.2.3a. |
| vivo | **Regarding FL proposal#2.2.3a,** we support Alt 2.As for Alt 1, we have mentioned that it is not enough to restrict the number of scheduled RB as even. There are three restrictions should be introduced as follows.1. The number of scheduled RB as even.
2. The RB offset of scheduled PDSCH from point A as even
3. The RB offset between scheduled PDSCH of different UEs in MU-MIMO as even

Therefore, Alt 2 is a simpler solution to handle the orphan RE issue with limited increase of UE complexity, without any additional spec effort.**Regarding FL proposal#2.2.3b**, we think it is unnecessary.As we have mentioned in Round-1, it has been specified that the reference point for DMRS mapping is subcarrier 0 in common resource block 0 (Point A) in the current TS 38.211. That implies that FD-OCC=4 would be mapped from point A. Besides, the current spec TS 38.214 has specified that precoding is applied per PRG, and UE should perform channel estimation in each PRG separately. In other words, UE would not perform FD-OCC de-spreading in the CDM group across PRG. Therefore, according to two points mentioned above, there is no need to discuss FL proposal#2.2.3b. |
| Apple | Regarding Proposal 2.2.3.b, we need to discuss how to start CDM group with respect to PRB considering the orphan RE issue. Based on vivo’s explanation, Proposal 2.2.3.b is already supported by the current specification. If all the other companies agree, we can just draw a conclusion, and clarify that this may not mean any specification change. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | We prefer Alt. 1 in proposal 2.2.3a. We believe the scheduling of even number of RBs for a gNB is not a critical issue and this simplifies UE implementation as well. |
| QC | For proposal 2.2.3a, we only support Alt. 1, based on the following reason.1. So far, we did not hear any technical concern why gNB cannot schedule even number of RBs for a PDSCH and has to allocation odd number of RB for it. VIVO raised three points. But isn’t that automatically satisfied for type 0 RA? Then for type 1 RA, why gNB cannot move/change RB allocation by just a single RB to make everything even? We still fail to see what is the critical technical issue which stop gNB to do so.
2. On the other hand, if orphan RB on PDSCH is allowed by spec, which would require UE to implement special channel estimation algorithm to handle the orphan RB. UE can implement a change to enhancement something. But benefit/motivation of this “something” has to be justified. In this case, we don’t see the justification, based on the reasoning in 1).
3. This is a secondary point: The suggested special channel estimation algorithm from VIVO is a smart algorithm. But it only works with an assumption that UE does de-spreading first to separate 4 ports. But not all UE receivers do de-spreading first.
 |
| CATT | Support Proposal 2.2.3a.With regard to Proposal 2.2.3b, we wonder whether RA type 1 have orphan RB/RE issue. If RA type 1 does have orphan RB/RE issue, Proposal 2.2.3b is not enough. |
| Nokia/NSB | For Proposal 2.2.3a, we support Alt.1. We don’t expect very small PRB allocation with Rel-18 DMRS, and the added 1 PRB if any, should not be high overhead . 1 RB increase/decrease can be handled by scheduling, MCS selection. We don’t support Proposal 2.2.3b. Preserving orthogonality among UEs scheduling is upto NW. So, we don’t need any further proposal.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.2.4 DMRS port index for Rel.18 DMRS ports

### **ROUND-2**

In the 1st round, multiple companies discuss using DMRS port indexes. To avoid confusion, definition of DMRS port indexes should be clarified. In TS38.211, DMRS port indexes for PUSCH and PDSCH are specified as following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 6.4.1.1.3-1: Parameters for PUSCH DM-RS configuration type 1.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDM group$$λ$$ | $$Δ$$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |

Table 6.4.1.1.3-2: Parameters for PUSCH DM-RS configuration type 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | CDM group $$λ$$ | $$Δ$$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 3 | 1 | 2 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 8 | 1 | 2 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 9 | 1 | 2 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 10 | 2 | 4 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 11 | 2 | 4 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |

 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 7.4.1.1.2-1: Parameters for PDSCH DM-RS configuration type 1.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $$p$$ | CDM group  | $$Δ$$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1000 | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1001 | 0 | 0 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1002 | 1 | 1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1003 | 1 | 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1004 | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 1005 | 0 | 0 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 1006 | 1 | 1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 1007 | 1 | 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |

Table 7.4.1.1.2-2: Parameters for PDSCH DM-RS configuration type 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $$p$$ | CDM group  | $$Δ$$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1000 | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1001 | 0 | 0 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1002 | 1 | 2 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1003 | 1 | 2 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1004 | 2 | 4 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1005 | 2 | 4 | +1 | -1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1006 | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 1007 | 0 | 0 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 1008 | 1 | 2 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 1009 | 1 | 2 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 1010 | 2 | 4 | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 |
| 1011 | 2 | 4 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |

 |

Note that *w*f(*k*’) corresponds to FD-OCC and *w*t(*l*’) corresponds to TD-OCC. Instead of exact FD-OCC/TD-OCC, we can use the following parameters to define DMRS port indexes for PUSCH and PDSCH.

* FD-OCC index = {0,1,2,3}
* TD-OCC index = {0,1}
* CDM group index = {0,1} for eType1 and = {0,1,2} for eType2.

**FL proposal#2.2.4:**

* **For Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS ports of PDSCH/PUSCH with FD-OCC length 4, association between DMRS port indexes, CDM group index, FD-OCC index, and TD-OCC index (across consecutive DMRS symbols, if any) are determined by the following table 1 and table 2.**
	+ **The *p* in table 1 and table 2 corresponds to DMRS port index for PUSCH.**
	+ **DMRS port index for PDSCH is determined by *p* +1000 in table 1 and table 2.**
	+ **FD-OCC is determined by the following table 3. (some values are FFS):**
	+ **TD-OCC (across consecutive DMRS symbols, if any) is determined by the following table 4. (some values are FFS):**

**Table 1. Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS ports for PUSCH**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *p* | CDM group index | FD-OCC index | TD-OCC index |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 10 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 11 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 13 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| 14 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 15 | 1 | 3 | 1 |

**Table 2. Rel.18 eType 2 DMRS ports for PUSCH**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *p* | CDM group index | FD-OCC index | TD-OCC index |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 13 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 14 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 15 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 16 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 17 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 19 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| 20 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 21 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 22 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 23 | 2 | 3 | 1 |

**Table 3. FD-OCC for Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS ports**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD-OCC index** | **wf(0)** | **wf(1)** | **wf(2)** | **wf(3)** |
| 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 2 | +1 | FFS | -1 | FFS |
| 3 | +1 | FFS | -1 | FFS |

**Table 4. TD-OCC (across consecutive DMRS symbols, if any) for Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS ports**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TD-OCC index** | **wt(0)** | **wt(1)** |
| 0 | +1 | FFS |
| 1 | +1 | FFS |

Please provide your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. |
| ZTE | Generally fine with this proposal if it assumes for FD-OCC 4. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with this proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with this proposal if its assuming FD-OCC 4 only |
| **Mod** | **Clarified that the proposal assumes FD-OCC length 4.** |
| vivo | Support. |
| Apple | In general, we are fine.To make the proposal complete, it would also be good to clarify the table for TD-OCC and FD-OCC index |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | OK |
| Futurewei | Support. |
| QC | Similar view as apple. It is better to add the table to list the TD-OCC and FD-OCC codes. But we also understand the FD-OCC codes design is still pending.  |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. |
| **Mod** | **Table 3/4 are added per Apple/Qualcomm’s request. The detail of FD-OCC is still pending, and Huawei propose new TD-OCC, so some parts of the tables are FFS.** |
| CATT | Support in principle. |
| **Mod** | **FL proposal#2.2.4 is moved to EMAIL ENDORSMENT 1.** |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer to use indexing as symbol-first. Or, we can discuss it later since this is not urgent.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## DCI-based dynamic switching between FD-OCC length 2 and 4/6

15 companies (FUTUREWEI, Huawei/HiSilicon, InterDigital, Spreadtrum, vivo, Lenovo, CATT, NEC, Sharp, Samsung?, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia/NSB) mentioned it is beneficial to support dynamic switching between FD-OCC length 2 and M (M = 4 or 6) due to the following reasons:

* It enables to MU-MIMO with Rel.15-17 UEs within a CDM group.
* If the large MU-MIMO capacity is not required, gNB can dynamically indicate DMRS with FD-OCC length 2 because it has better performance than FD OCC length4/6 in case of large delay spread.

On the other hand, 8 companies (OPPO, Google, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Apple, Qualcomm) think the dynamic switching is not needed due to the following reasons:

* It increases UE complexity
* Performance difference between FD-OCC length 2 and 4/6 is not significant.

Regarding to the UE complexity,

* Ericsson [25] says: Dynamic fallback is already supported by using different DL DCI format (DCI format 1\_0 is Rel.15 DMRS, and DCI format 1\_1 can be configured with Rel.18 DMRS).
* Samsung [22] says: In current specification, dynamic switching between DMRS type 1 and type 2 can be done by TDRA field in DCI. To be specific, different DMRS type can be configured with different PDSCH/PUSCH mapping type, and each TDRA entry can indicate different PDSCH/PUSCH mapping type. Similarly, switching between current DMRS type 1 (or 2) and new DMRS type 1 (or 2) can be studied and supported if justified.

Regarding to the performance difference between FD-OCC length 2 and 4/6, multiple companies show the results.

Mod: due to the large size of FL summary, the figures are deleted.

d) 64QAM, DS=300

The BLER performance of R18 DMRS type 2 in MU-MIMO with 2 UEs [7]

Fig.3 Comparison of MSE performance of enhanced DMRS pattern and R15 legacy DMRS pattern for type 1 DMRS [8].

**Fig 13: Performance comparison between assuming FD-OCC 2 vs FD-OCC 4 with joint MMSE channel estimation [24]**

Considering that majority companies think it is beneficial to support the dynamic switching, FL suggestion is to agree the dynamic switching, but this feature can be optional UE capability. Also, the intention of the proposal is to support the dynamic switching within/using a DCI format. Nokia/NSB and vivo mention detail on how to enable the dynamic switching (e.g. new DCI field, use existing TDRA field, etc.), which can be discussed later.

**FL proposal#2.3 (round1):**

* **For increased DMRS ports for enhanced FD-OCC, support DCI based dynamic switching between DMRS port(s) associated with length 2 FD-OCC and DMRS port(s) associated with length M FD-OCC (where M > 2), within a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2/0\_1/0\_2.**
	+ **This feature is optional UE feature of Rel.18 DMRS port(s).**

**Support/fine (14): DOCOMO, InterDigital, Futurewei, Ericsson, ZTE, Lenovo, NEC, vivo, Samsung, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Sharp**

**No (11): Apple, Google, OPPO, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Spreadtrum, LGE, Qualcomm, Intel, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI**

**Discuss later (2): Huawei/HiSilicon**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Support. |
| Apple | We still have concern on this proposal  |
| InterDigital | Support FL proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support in principle. We suggest removing the term “within a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2/0\_1/0\_2” from the proposal as this term may imply that the existing DCI is to be used without introducing a new DCI field, which is still to be discussed.  |
| Google | We would like to clarify the DMRS ports associated with FD-OCC-2 and FD-OCC-M, does it mean to use different FD-OCC sequence or just to provide some reference for the UE to identify the FD-OCC despreading length? In our view, it is sufficient to keep the same FD-OCC-M sequence, but the gNB only needs to tell UE some co-scheduled UE info to identify the FD-OCC despreading length. |
| OPPO | We think the dynamic switching is not needed. No matter the switching is implemented via a new DCI field or a current field, it would lead to larger DCI overhead and/or loss of flexibility. The benefit doesn’t deserve the cost. |
| Ericsson | This can be one of the solutions to mitigate the performance issue with FD-OCC 4/6. We are open for discussion.  |
| ZTE | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Can be postponed after 2.2 is decided. |
| NEC | Support  |
| Xiaomi | From our understanding, this is actually a DMRS type switching problem about how to support the switching of R18 DMRS type and legacy DMRS type. FD-OCC length 2 is legacy DMRS type and length 4/6 is R18 DMRS type. We are OK to discuss how to support the switching between R18 DMRS and legacy DMRS. While, we don’t see any convincing reason that the switching has to be dynamic yet. More discussion is needed and we think RRC based switching can be the base line because the DMRS type is indicated/updated by RRC signalling in current specification. |
| MediaTek | Not support. As mentioned by OPPO and Xiaomi we don’t believe such dynamic switching is needed.  |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. Besides, as mentioned by FL in section 2.5, this feature can avoid the need of MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports. |
| vivo | Support in principle.Regarding the sub-bullet, i.e., as an optional feature, we wonder why UE can’t support the dynamic switching. In our understanding, R18 UE would prepare for FD-OCC=2 decoding for fallback DCI format, while preparing for FD-OCC=4 or 6 decoding for DCI format 1\_1/1\_2/0\_1/0\_2. In other words, anyway R18 UE would prepare two FD-OCC decoding process for different FD-OCC length, so why can not support dynamic switching in the same DCI format? |
| Samsung | Support in principle and similar view with vivo. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support in principle.  |
| LGE | We also believe that the dynamic switching is not needed, as mentioned by OPPO and Xiaomi. |
| QC | We thank FL’s effort to settle down the issue. But we still cannot accept this proposal in its formulation. We might be able to accept the proposal if it can be reformulated in the direction of use DCI to indicate some information of co-schedule MU. The reasons we don’t accept this proposal are the following. * It does not help allowing MU scheduling between Rel-15 and Rel-18 UE at all. A rank 1 Rel-15 UE and a rank 1 Rel-18 UE can always be co-scheduled with code [1,1,1,1] and [1,-1,1,-1], even without this bit. Rel-15 UE just treat the Rel-18 UE as a Rel-15 UE. While the Rel-18 UE can treat the Rel-15 UE as a Rel-18 UE.
* If this bit has any benefit, the benefit is for the following scenario. A Rel-18 UE is scheduled with rank 2 on port 0/1, with this bit to tell OCC-2, the Rel-18 UE can run channel estimation assuming OCC-2, which “might” improve channel estimation. We have run simulation for this scenario in R1-2209970. However, the gain is only very small. With almost zero performance gain, consider the complexity it brings to UE implementation, we do not support this proposal.

* If the group want to introduce a field to dynamic to dynamically indicate OCC size in DCI, we think a more appropriate usage of such a field is to indicate co-scheduled MU existence/port information, rather than telling the target UE how to interpret the OCC size. As a matter of fact, if we use 1 bit to indicate MU exist or not, it is equivalent to indicate the OCC size. Take the above figure as an example, if the rank 2 target UE is scheduled on port 0/1, and 1 bit in DCI tells the target UE there is MU on port 8/9, then target UE knows that it must assume OCC-4 for channel estimation. If the bit tells target UE there is NO MU on port 8/9, then target UE knows that it can assume OCC-2 (or OCC-4) for channel estimation. Assuming OCC-2 or OCC-4 for the latter case is up to UE implementation, why gNB has to force UE to assume OCC-2 with 1 bit (as in the FL proposal). Again, a more reasonable proposal is that gNB use 1 bit tell UE whether MU exist or not on port 8/9, whether UE assume OCC-2 or OCC-4 is up to UE.
* Following the above, if we formulate the proposal to use one field in DCI to indicate co-scheduled MU information, we can further discuss whether use >1 bits to indicate a little more information, such as 2 whether only port 8 has MU, or only port 9 has MU, or both port 8/9 has MU, which can benefit UE’s channel and noise estimation.

In summary, we cannot accept current FL proposal. We suggest reformulating the proposal in the direction of indicating co-scheduled MU information, such as the following: **Proposal: In Rel-18, study whether/how to introduce a new field in DCI scheduling PDSCH to indicate the information of co-scheduled MU.*** **FFS: number of bits and detail of indicated information, e.g., existence and/or ports of MU.**

**If supported, this feature is an optional UE feature of Rel.18 DMRS enhancements** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | Before agreeing on dynamic switching, we need to clarify how we differentiate between Rel-18 and Rel-15 ports. Are they assigned the same port numbers and different OCC lengths? We also fail to see how this facilitates better MU-MIMO pairing. For length 2 OCCs which are sub-length orthogonal to length 4/6 OCCs, pairing is already possible within the same DM-RS CDM group with no impact to UEs using length-2 OCC.  |
| Sharp | Support |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Prefer to have the FD-OCC length (i.e., DMRS configuration) configured via RRC. Considering that dynamic switching is proposed mostly to enable MU-MIMO scheduling in the same CDM group by falling back to Rel. 15-17 configuration, the resulting increase in UE complexity and possibly, DCI overhead, may outweigh the aforementioned narrow advantage. Moreover, in our simulations, we observed negligible or no difference in performance between different FD-OCC lengths for any given delay spread if the number of ports per CDM group is kept constant. Therefore, dynamic switching between different FD-OCC lengths may be unnecessary. |

### **ROUND-2**

In the 1st round, whether to support the dynamic switching of FD-OCC length between 2 and 4 were discussed. Since the FL proposal#2.3 seems not acceptable, let’s try Qualcomm’s proposal. From FL perspective, for UE with Rel.18 DMRS ports, if the information of co-scheduled MU in the same CDM group is indicated, UE can decide whether to de-spread with length 2 or 4. Hence, the performance benefit of the dynamic switching can be also obtained with FL proposal#2.3a. For the details, please check Qualcomm’s comment in the 1st round.

**FL proposal#2.3a:**

* **For Rel-18 UE, introduce a new field in DCI scheduling PDSCH to indicate the information of co-scheduled MU in the same CDM group.**
	+ **FFS: number of bits and detail of indicated information, e.g., existence and/or ports of MU.**
	+ **This feature is an optional UE feature of Rel.18 DMRS enhancements.**

**Support/fine ():**

**No ():**

Please provide your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Our 1st preference is to support the dynamic switching, But, we are open to support FL proposal#2.3a. If the new bit is 1-bit, we think it is almost equivalent to support FD-OCC length switching. |
| ZTE | Support the original FL proposal#2.3 in round-1.Regarding QC’s comment above, we have the similar feeling to DOCOMO that proposal#2.3a is the same to FD-OCC length switching. In our view, the original FL proposal#2.3 in round-1 is more friendly to further study how to indicate dynamic switching between FD-OCC 2 and FD-OCC M. |
| Xiaomi | We do not really get the difference between FL proposal#2.3a and FL proposal#2.3 (round1). Does FL proposal#2.3a mean that it is UE that decide whether to switch, while, for FL proposal#2.3 (round1), it is the network that decide whether to switch?**Mod: For both proposals, it may be up to UE to decide which size of FD-OCC length UE actually use for de-spreading, because it would be not testable. FL proposal#2.3 (round 1) explicitly indicate FD-OCC length, which implies UE is expected to use the indicated FD-OCC for de-spreading. In FL proposal#2.3a, how to use the indicated FD-OCC length of MU is up to UE. Most probably, UE would use the information to decide FD-OCC length for de-spreading to improve the performance.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support FL proposal#2.3. Regarding QC’s comment in round-1 that “gNB has to force UE to assume OCC-2”, we think the detailed behavior UE conducts is not explicitly limited in the current Spec., i.e., length-4 despreading can also be adopted for Rel-15 DMRS ports although not preferred. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with this proposal. |
| vivo | Don’t support FL proposal#2.3a, prefer the FL proposal#2.3(Round-1). It’s unreasonable that when the network has sent the additional DCI signalling, it still depends on UE to decide the FD-OCC length for de-spreading. In other words, costing the same even more overhead (if DCI size is based on ports of MU), FL proposal#2.3a can’t achieve the same effect as FL proposal#2.3. If UE don’t support dynamic switching, RRC-based switching is a better choice than FL proposal#2.3a. If UE supports dynamic switching, it should be ready for dynamic switching.  |
| Apple | Proposal 2.3a probably needs more discussion. In the current form, the new filed is to indicate the co-scheduled MU in the same CDM group. It is still unclear what kind of information about the co-scheduled MU is provided by this field, the number of layer? The DMRS type? The DMRS ports? FDRA? TDRA? Etc? |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Prefer determining FD-OCC length via RRC configuration instead of UE implementation or dynamic indication. |
| Futurewei | We support the original FL proposal#2.3 (round1), but not FL proposal#2.3a. Regarding FL proposal#2.3a, to our understanding, depending on the exact DMRS ports allocated to the UE, in some cases, even if it is indicated that there is no co-scheduled MU in the same CDM group, the UE still needs to use FD-OCC length M>2. So in these cases the indication of information of co-scheduled MU in the same CDM group is redundant and FL proposal#2.3a can’t achieve the same effect as FL proposal#2.3 (round1).  |
| QC | Reading comments from companies, I think almost all companies (except VIVO) agree that even FL proposal#2.3(Round-1) is adopted, it is up to UE to assume OCC-2 or OCC-4 for channel estimation, because NW cannot mandate UE to use OCC-2 or OCC-4. If so, what is the point to add this field in DCI? To VIVO: channel estimation is UE implementation. Why gNB would force UE to use OCC-2 or OCC-4 to do channel estimation. As long as UE can meet PDSCH decoding requirements defined in RAN4 spec, why should NW care UE used OCC-2 or OCC-4 in channel estimation?To Apple, and all: if RAN1 want to introduce a field in DCI to help UE improve channel estimation, we think use this field to indicate co-scheduled MU information rather than the OCC length is the right way to go. As for what information should be indicated, we think the starting point could be use 2 bits to indicate the MU ports information, which can help UE to do channel and noise estimation, to avoid UE to do MU detection on port 8/9.   |
| Samsung | We support original FL proposal#2.3 (dynamic switching between FD-OCC 2 and 4). we think the purpose of the FL proposal#2.3 is not only for indicating different length of OCC and performance compensation by using shorter OCC (although it seems marginal gain based on companies’ inputs), but also for having more number of SU-MIMO layers. Our understanding is that Rel-18 DMRS is for enhancing MU-MIMO scheduling, so it does not make sense to support larger number of SU-MIMO layers, e.g., 2CW with more than 4 layers. Hence, in order to have larger number of layers by SU-MIMO scheduling, we think dynamic switching between Rel-15 DMRS and Rel-18 DMRS should be supported. Regarding FL proposal#2.3a, now it requires 2 bits based on QC’s example, so it requires more DCI overhead than FL proposal#2.3, and this cannot realize larger number of layers for SU-MIMO scheduling by switching into from Rel-18 DMRS to Rel-15 DMRS. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support original proposal #2.3. We have a fundamental question to the proponent objecting dynamic switching. The new proposal 2.3a by QC is the same functionality with dynamic switching by implicit signaling. The proponent is mentioning UE complexity from dynamic switching, but I think even the companies are also considering for applying the different channel estimation parameter according to the scheduling condition in DCI such as existence of co-scheduled UE or not. We think this is also dynamic switching. Companies to propose unified table for both FD-OCC2 and FD-OCC4, is also supporting dynamic switching. If we don’t support dynamic switching for UE complexity, UE shall use the same channel estimation algorithm for any case. Regarding to the overhead, we proposed an option to use TDRA table. This may be useful not to increase the DCI overhead, and this is already supported in Rel-15 for mapping Type change. (DMRS type is configured per mapping type.) So, we propose the same framework as used in REl-15.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Definition of Rel.18 DMRS ports (viod)

## MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports

4 companies (e.g. ZTE, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Sharp) support MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports. Note that FL proposal#2.4 is assumed as definition of Rel.18 DMRS ports, that is

* + **Rel.15 DMRS ports: All DMRS ports with FD-OCC length =2.**
	+ **Rel.18 DMRS ports: All DMRS ports with FD-OCC length >2.**

Spreadtrum [6] mentioned spec. enhancement is not needed to multiplex Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports if gNB indicates only FD-OCC sequence of either [+1 +1 +1 +1] or [+1 -1 +1 -1] for Rel.18 DMRS ports, gNB can also indicate FD-OCC of [+1 +1] or [+1 -1] for Rel.15 DMRS ports for another UE.

FUTUREWEI mention that if DCI-level dynamic switching of FD-OCC length is supported, MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports is not needed. Huawei/HiSilicon mentions that this can be discussed later.

**From FL perspective, if dynamic switching is supported in sect. 2.3, MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports are not needed. Hence, I suggest to discuss this later.**

|  |
| --- |
| FL proposal#3.5 (may be discussed later):* Support MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports within a CDM group for PDSCH.
	+ - Note: the study includes MU-MIMO between Rel.15 UE and Rel.18 UE, and between Rel.18 UEs.

Companies views based on tdocs:Support/fine ():ZTE, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Sharp (only between Rel.18 or later UEs)No (): FUTUREWEI, vivo (up to gNB implementation), Xiaomi (there is no solution), MediaTek, Nokia/NSB,Discuss later: HW |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Agree with FUTUREWEI. Whether MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports is needed or not depends on whether DCI-level dynamic switching of FD-OCC length is supported. |
| Apple | Do not fully understand this. The issue is more from the UE interference cancellation perspective in case UE may need to assume what DMRS is used for the co-scheduled UE. In this case, irrespective of whether dynamic switch is supported, the problem is that a UE might be co-scheduled with legacy or Rel-18 UE. |
| InterDigital | We have a similar view as Spreadtrum that this could be potentially done without any enhancement. But we need to wait for the outcome of the FL Proposal #2.2.2. |
| Futurewei | As pointed out by FL, our view is that MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports is not needed if dynamic switching between FD-OCC length 2 and M is supported. So we are fine to discuss and make decision on dynamic switching in Section 2.3 first and then come back to this topic.  |
| Google | OK to postpone the discussion. |
| OPPO | We think the multiplexing is beneficial without specification impact. |
| Ericsson | We are OK to postpone the discussion.  |
| ZTE | Our understanding is different from FL’s assessment. Support of dynamic switching between FD-OCC-2 and FD-OCC-M does not mean MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports is not needed. Even though Rel-18 UE could dynamically switch to Rel-15 FD-OCC sequence to keep the orthogonality, however, it results in fewer DMRS ports available. For example, Rel-18 UE with FD-OCC [+1 -1 +1 -1] switch to [+1 -1] when co-scheduled with Rel-15 UE with FD-OCC [+1 +1], the available DMRS ports of Rel-18 UE will be halved in this case. It deviates from the WID that strive to larger number of orthogonal DMRS ports for DL and UL MU-MIMO. In terms of supporting MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports, it should specify the principle that the OCC sequence of Rel-18 DMRS ports should be orthogonal with Rel-15 DMRS ports. |
| Lenovo | We also think the discussion is related with conclusion of whether DCI-based dynamic switching between FD-OCC length 2 and 4/6 is supported and FD-OCC design (e.g. OCC sequence). So we prefer to discuss this issue later.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK to postpone. |
| NEC | OK to postpone. |
| Xiaomi | For clarification, all we said in our contribution is that there is no such a length 4/6 OCC can be orthogonal to length 2 OCC used in legacy DMRS as shown below.

|  |
| --- |
| Let’s assume that one of the length 4 OCC is $[A,B,C,D]^{T}$, like $[+1,-1,+1,-1]^{T}$or $[+1,-1,-1,+1]^{T}$ when the length 4 OCC is Walsh sequence. In order to support the multiplexing of R18 DMRS and legacy DMRS, $[A,B]^{T}$ is supposed to be orthogonal to $[+1,+1]^{T}$ and $[+1,-1]^{T}$. Then we have the following equation:Apparently, there is no non-zero solution for this equation. Hence, there is no such a length 4/6 OCC which is used in frequency to support larger number of DMRS ports can be orthogonal to length 2 OCC used in legacy DMRS.***Observation 1:*** ***There is no such a length 4/6 OCC which is used in frequency to support larger number of DMRS ports can be orthogonal to length 2 OCC used in legacy DMRS*** |

We do not know whether there is solution to support the multiplexing between legacy DMRS and R18 DMRS in MU-MIMO. And if there is way to support the multiplexing, we will support it. |
| MediaTek | We believe MU-MIMO scheduling of R15 and R18 is independent to whether DCI based switching of R15 and R18 is supported. As pointed out by Apple scheduling R15 and R18 in the same CDM group impact the interference cancellation performed at the UE. Nevertheless, we do not support scheduling of R15 and R18 ports within the same CDM group. |
| Spreadtrum | We are OK to postpone the discussion. |
| vivo | Support MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports within a CDM group for PDSCH. However, we think it is unnecessary to introduce any specification for it, since there is no any restriction on indicated DMRS port in one CDM group for MU-MIMO in the current TS 38.214.It is up to the network to ensure the DMRS ports indicated to UEs are orthogonal as much as possible in MU-MIMO. Due to the limited number of orthogonal DMRS port, the network can even configure different *scramblingID* of DMRS to UEs in MU-MIMO, which would lead to non-orthogonal MU-MIMIO scheduling in the current network. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal, and it can be discussed later after finalizing which option, length, and OCC are utilized. |
| CMCC | We share similar view with ZTE/MediaTek that MU-MIMO scheduling of R15 ports and R18 ports is independent to the dynamic switching of R15 and R18 ports. From our side, we should strive to double the number of orthogonal DMRS ports even when co-scheduling the R15 and R18 ports. |
| Nokia/NSB | We don’t need to agree this. Up to moderator to coordination.But, we don’t believe two issues are dependent. Though we use the same sequence, whether to apply FD-OCC2 or FD-OCC4 should be signalled, and they are different ports. For example, total number of DMRS ports to indicate for type 1 single symbol is 12 (4 Rel-15 + 8 Rel-18).  |
| LGE | Ok to postpone. |
| QC | We disagree with Futurewei. We think the 1 bit indication of OCC size does not help allowing MU scheduling between Rel-15 and Rel-18 UE at all. A rank 1 Rel-15 UE and a rank 1 Rel-18 UE can always be co-scheduled with code [1,1,1,1] and [1,-1,1,-1], even without this bit. Rel-15 UE can just treat the Rel-18 UE as a Rel-15 UE. While the Rel-18 UE can treat the Rel-15 UE as a Rel-18 UE.  |
| CATT | OK to postpone the discussion. However, we think that MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports (within one CDM group) needs to be discussed even if dynamic switching is supported in sect. 2.3. Dynamic switching is related to one UE, but MU-MIMO is related to more than one UEs. Therefore, both issues should be discussed. |
| Intel | OK to postpone. But like other companies, we think two issues are being mixed here. Dynamic switching between FD-OCC lengths should not impact MU-MIMO pairing and vice-versa.  |
| Sharp | Agree with the FL’s suggestion.Additionally, we don’t support MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports. Our interpretation was that Rel-18 DMRS ports have length 2 or M FD OCC. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Postpone discussion after 2.3 is finalized |

## Rel.18 DMRS Ports Indication and Signaling

In TS38.212, antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2 indicates DMRS port index(es) of PDSCH/PUSCH. The current antenna port(s) table only captures DMRS port indexes of Rel.15 DMRS port(s) (p=#1000~1007 for type1 and p=#1000~1011 for type2), multiple companies mention it is necessary to add at least 1-bit in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2 to indicate Rel.18 DMRS ports in Rel.18, because total number of DMRS ports is doubled in Rel.18.

FUTUREWEI [1] proposes two possible options:

|  |
| --- |
| * Scheme A: Generate new tables similar to Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in [4]. To accommodate larger number of orthogonal DMRS ports, these new tables will in general have more entries/rows than its legacy counterparts. Therefore, it requires larger size of Antenna port(s) field in DCI to indicate one of the entries in the table. For example, the size of the Antenna port(s) field is increased from 4, 5, or 6 bits to 5, 6, or 7 bits, respectively.
* Scheme B: Reuse the existing Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in [4] and keep the size of the Antenna port(s) field in DCI unchanged. To accommodate larger number of orthogonal DMRS ports, introduce a new bit to the existing DCI message to indicate the DMRS port indexing offset. For example, if this bit is set to “0”, the Antenna port(s) field in DCI refer to one row in the existing tables to indicate the number of CDM groups without data, DMRS port(s), and number of front-load symbols. In this case, the operation is similar to that in legacy mode. On the other hand, if this bit is set to “1”, the Antenna port(s) field in DCI refers to one row in the legacy tables to indicate the number of CDM groups without data and the number of front-load symbols, while the real DMRS port(s) indexes is the ones read from the existing table plus an offset value, which is 8 for DMRS Type 1 and 12 for DMRS Type 2, respectively.
 |

Following illustrates examples of extension of Table 7.3.1.2.2-1 in TS38.212.



a) Scheme A b) Scheme B

Figure 2.6. Examples of extension of Table 7.3.1.2.2-1 in TS38.212.

From FL perspective, both Scheme A/B have not much difference. One thing we should carefully consider is that it seems Scheme B cannot indicate 3 or 4 DMRS ports within a CDM group (e.g. DMRS port index = 0,1,8,9 in DMRS type 1). This may be problem especially for >4 ranks, because in the current spec., in case of two CWs, all remaining DMRS ports are not used to other UEs. If UE#1 cannot use all of 4 DMRS ports within a CDM group, some of DMRS ports are wasted, which cannot not increase the max number of DMRS ports in MU-MIMO.

**FL proposal#2.6:**

* **If Rel.18 DMRS is configured, increase/add at least 1-bit in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2 to indicate Rel.18 DMRS port(s).**
* **Down select one of the following on how to enhance TS38.212.**
	+ **Scheme A: Specify new antenna port(s) tables similar to Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212. The size of the Antenna port(s) field is increased from 4, 5, or 6 bits to 5, 6, or 7 bits, respectively.**
		- **Existing rows in Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 are copied to the new tables except for “Reserved” row.**
			* **FFS for other rows in the new tables.**
	+ **Scheme B: Reuse the existing Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 and keep the size of the Antenna port(s) field in DCI unchanged. Introduce new 1-bit DCI field of “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” to indicate Rel.18 DMRS ports.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “0”, DMRS port(s) are the same as indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “1”, DMRS port(s) are incremented with X from the indicated DMRS port(s) by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
			* **Value of X is 8 for DMRS type 1 and 12 for DMRS type 2.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support in principle. We believe it is important to enable to indicate 3 or 4 DMRS ports within a CDM group to a UE to minimize DMRS overhead (e.g. DMRS port index = 0,1,8,9 in DMRS type 1). However, Scheme B seems not possible such operation. If we add new DMRS port combination in reserved bit, it may be possible. |
| Apple | The issue of Scheme B is that it will limit the DMRS port selection, i.e., either all selected from the first half of DMRS ports or the second half of DMRS ports.Maybe we first agree on OCC length, finalized the DMRS port pattern table similar as Table 7.4.1.1.2-1/2 in 38.211, and then discuss the antenna port indication table since we may also need to discuss for UL which is even harder since we need to discuss more than 4 layers  |
| InterDigital | Don’t agree with the first bullet that requires addition of a new bit. We could simply use one of the reserved codepoint to indicate whether the indicated DMRS ports are for Rel-18 DMRS.We are OK with scheme B, if the first bullet is corrected. |
| Futurewei | Support FL’s proposal. We are open to both schemes with a slight preference on Scheme B as it requires less specification effort. Our understanding is that the main goal for increased DMRS ports in this WI is to support pairing more users in MU-MIMO. In this case, supporting rank up to 2 per user within a CDM group is sufficient. In the case that it is really needed to support higher rank (e.g., 3 or 4) for a UE within a CDM group, the tables with maxLength = 2 can be used.  |
| Google | We think new table should be needed (Scheme A), but the first main bullet seems unnecessary. |
| OPPO | For the first bullet, we don’t think it is needed. RRC based table switching is sufficient. With Scheme A, Rel-15 and Rel-18 DMRS can use different tables with different size. Furthermore, more antenna port combinations should be supported for Rel-18 DMRS, e.g. 4 ports within one CDM group with only one CDM group without data, which is not supported in Rel-15. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | First things first, RAN shall clarify whether the first half of Rel-18 DMRS ports and the second half of Rel-18 DMRS ports can be allocated in one CDM group, e,g,. port 0, port 1, port 8 and port 9 are allocated in CDM group 0 when DMRS type 1 with single-symbol. The above can be supported by Scheme A in principle, but Scheme B seems to completely preclude this point. Besides, the first main bullet is not needed in the current phase and should be removed.**FL proposal#2.6:*** **Down select one of the following on how to enhance TS38.212.**
	+ **Scheme A: Specify new antenna port(s) tables similar to Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212.**
		- **Existing rows in Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 can be copied to the new tables except for “Reserved” row at least.**
			* **FFS for other rows in the new tables.**
	+ **Scheme B: Reuse the existing Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 and keep the size of the Antenna port(s) field in DCI unchanged. Introduce new 1-bit DCI field of “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” to indicate Rel.18 DMRS ports.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “0”, DMRS port(s) are the same as indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “1”, DMRS port(s) are incremented with X from the indicated DMRS port(s) by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
			* **Value of X is 8 for DMRS type 1 and 12 for DMRS type 2.**
 |
| Lenovo | Support FL’s proposal. We are open for more discussion on scheme A and scheme B. In general, scheme B reuses existed DMRS port indication table as much as possible and the standard effort is lower although some flexibility may be lost such as supporting DMRS port index = 0,1,8,9 in DMRS type 1. For scheme A, it need clarify on details and have more discussion on necessity for new entries/rows different from legacy antenna port table.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Current version precludes some candidate options and further study is needed. Suggest to postpone after 2.2 is decided.  |
| NEC | We also think the first bullet is not needed. And we prefer scheme A in principle. While we think it’s not needed to copy each exiting row for Rel-18 DMRS ports. For example, the row “number of CDM group without data = 1, DMRS port = 8”, what’s the use case? Taking “DMRS type 1” “maxlength =1” for example, with number of CDM group without data =1, the maximum number of DMRS ports available is 4 (with doubled DMRS ports), while legacy Rel-15 configuration can support this already.So in our understanding, the additional DMRS ports (8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15) is only needed when legacy DMRS ports (0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7) are all allocated. In this case, the number of CDM group without data =2 for DMRS port 8 is sufficient.**FL proposal#2.6:*** **Down select one of the following on how to enhance TS38.212.**
	+ **Scheme A: Specify new antenna port(s) tables similar to Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212.**
		- **At least some existing rows in Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 are copied to the new tables except for “Reserved” row.**
			* **FFS for the copied rows. For example, whether all existing rows are needed to be copied.**
			* **FFS for other rows in the new tables.**
	+ **Scheme B: Reuse the existing Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 and keep the size of the Antenna port(s) field in DCI unchanged. Introduce new 1-bit DCI field of “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” to indicate Rel.18 DMRS ports.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “0”, DMRS port(s) are the same as indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “1”, DMRS port(s) are incremented with X from the indicated DMRS port(s) by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
			* **Value of X is 8 for DMRS type 1 and 12 for DMRS type 2.**
 |
| Xiaomi | Support FL proposal#2.6 with less details. **FL proposal#2.6:*** **Down select one of the following on how to enhance TS38.212.**
	+ **Scheme A: Specify new antenna port(s) tables similar to Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212.**
	+ **Scheme B: Reuse the existing Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 and keep the size of the Antenna port(s) field in DCI unchanged.**

The details of DMRS ports indication can be discussed later. |
| MediaTek | Fine. We are open to discussing both Scheme A and B further.  |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. Specifying new antenna port(s) tables is a more clear solution, and the additional port combinations can be further discussed. |
| vivo | In additional to scheme A and B, another potential solution could also be considered, i.e., specifying a new antenna port table only containing the rows for new DMRS port index, e.g., 8/9/10/11… for type 1.**FL proposal#2.6:*** **Down select one of the following on how to enhance TS38.212.**
	+ **Scheme A: Specify new antenna port(s) tables similar to Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212.**
		- **Alt 1: Existing rows in Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 are copied to the new tables except for “Reserved” row.**
			* **Existing other rows for new DMRS port index in the new tables.**
		- **Alt 2: Not existing rows in Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 are copied to the new tables except for “Reserved” row.**
			* + **Existing other rows for new DMRS port index in the new tables.**
	+ **Scheme B: Reuse the existing Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 and keep the size of the Antenna port(s) field in DCI unchanged. Introduce new 1-bit DCI field of “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” to indicate Rel.18 DMRS ports.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “0”, DMRS port(s) are the same as indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “1”, DMRS port(s) are incremented with X from the indicated DMRS port(s) by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
			* **Value of X is 8 for DMRS type 1 and 12 for DMRS type 2.**
 |
| Samsung | Support in principle. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. The details can be discussed later. |
| Nokia/NSB | We don’t support the proposal. Using 1-bt DCI indication is similar to Scheme A, which is doubling the table size. We proposed a scheme without DCI bit increase. The tables provided cannot fully distinguish FD-OCC2 and FD-OCC4 for port#0-3 if they are FD-OCC2 or FD-OCC4. Frankly, we have 12 ports (4 FD-OCC2, and 8 FD-OCC4 ports). The above is only supporting 8 FD-OCC4 ports only. It is clear to explicitly indicate what port is used. We proposed DMRS indication into TDRA table similar to mapping type A/B clarification. At least, we prefer to study the proposed schemes and discuss the further down-scoping. Added Scheme C.**FL proposal#2.6:*** **~~If Rel.18 DMRS is configured, increase/add at least 1-bit in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2 to indicate Rel.18 DMRS port(s).~~**
* **Down select one of the following on how to enhance TS38.212.**
	+ **Scheme A: Specify new antenna port(s) tables similar to Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212. The size of the Antenna port(s) field is increased from 4, 5, or 6 bits to 5, 6, or 7 bits, respectively.**
		- **Existing rows in Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 are copied to the new tables except for “Reserved” row.**
			* **FFS for other rows in the new tables.**
	+ **Scheme B: Reuse the existing Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 and keep the size of the Antenna port(s) field in DCI unchanged. Introduce new 1-bit DCI field of “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” to indicate Rel.18 DMRS ports.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “0”, DMRS port(s) are the same as indicated by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
		- **If “DMRS port(s) offset indicator” field is set “1”, DMRS port(s) are incremented with X from the indicated DMRS port(s) by antenna port(s) field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2.**
			* **Value of X is 8 for DMRS type 1 and 12 for DMRS type 2.**
	+ **Scheme C: Reuse the existing Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1/2/3/4 and Tables 7.3.1.2.2-1A/2A/3A/4A in TS38.212 and keep the size of the Antenna port(s) field in DCI unchanged. Introduce new table to indicate Rel.18 DMRS ports including full 8/16 or 12/24 ports.**
		- * **TDRA entry configured includes a entry indicate what DRMS ports is used for scheduling.**
 |
| LGE | Support FL's proposal. We prefer scheme B because it requires less specification effort. |
| QC | Similar view as Apple, Option B seems unnecessarily restrictive. We prefer option A in general. But we suggest to defer the discussion on the details of filling the entries of the expanded table, as this should be discussed together with MU scheduling restriction in section 2.7. We suggest to combing the discussion of section 2.6 and 2.7 together. They can be discussed after we more important topics in previous sessions are settled.  |
| CATT | Support the proposal and Scheme A is preferred. |
| Intel | Ok with proposal. Scheme B seems strange in that it may limit MU-MIMO pairing options. We are also OK with suggestion from QC on combining discussions 2.6/7.  |
| Sharp | Support NEC’s proposal. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Open to discuss both schemes further. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## MU-MIMO scheduling restriction within a CDM group

In section 5.1.6 in TS38.214, MU-MIMO scheduling restriction is specified as following.

|  |
| --- |
| For DM-RS configuration type 1, - if a UE is scheduled with one codeword and assigned with the antenna port mapping with indices of {2, 9, 10, 11 or 30} in Table 7.3.1.2.2-1 and Table 7.3.1.2.2-2 of Subclause 7.3.1.2 of [5, TS 38.212], or- if a UE is scheduled with two codewords, the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE.For DM-RS configuration type 2, - if a UE is scheduled with one codeword and assigned with the antenna port mapping with indices of {2, 10 or 23} in Table 7.3.1.2.2-3 and Table 7.3.1.2.2-4 of Subclause 7.3.1.2 of [5, TS38.212], or- if a UE is scheduled with two codewords, the UE may assume that all the remaining orthogonal antenna ports are not associated with transmission of PDSCH to another UE. |

In Qualcomm [24], following was proposed.

|  |
| --- |
| **Observation 4: To avoid co-scheduled SU+MU DMRS ports exceeding the total number of DMRS ports that a UE can support, certain restrictions are needed on co-scheduled MU ports.** **Proposal 6: Adopt Option 1 (for both type-1 and type-2 DMRS) to increase number of orthogonal DMRS ports for PDSCH and PUSCH, with restrictions as listed below** * **For single symbol DMRS, if the DMRS ports of a UE are in two or more CDM groups, the UE does not expect DMRS ports from a co-scheduled UE in a same CDM group as the UE.**
* **For double symbol DMRS, a UE does not expect DMRS ports from a co-scheduled UE in a same CDM group as the UE, unless the UE and the co-scheduled UE each associated with a distinct TD-OCC for their DMRS ports respectively.**
 |

Considering that MU-MIMO scheduling restriction is specified in Rel.15, Rel.18 DMRS ports also needs the scheduling restriction of MU-MIMO.

**FL proposal#2.7:**

* **For Rel.18 DMRS ports associated with FD-OCC length 4/6 for PDSCH/PUSCH, following MU-MIMO scheduling restriction is specified.**
	+ **For single symbol DMRS, if the DMRS ports of a UE are in two or more CDM groups, the UE does not expect DMRS ports from a co-scheduled UE in a same CDM group as the UE.**
	+ **For double symbol DMRS, a UE does not expect DMRS ports from a co-scheduled UE in a same CDM group as the UE, unless the UE and the co-scheduled UE each associated with a distinct TD-OCC for their DMRS ports respectively.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We’d like to postpone the discussion until antenna port(s) indication in sect. 2.6. Firstly, we’d like to see whether 4 DMRS ports within a CDM group can be allocated to a UE in R18. If not, we would have concern on the proposal, because some DMRS ports cannot be allocated for anybody, especially for > 4 ranks (i.e. two CWs). |
| Apple | We are open to discuss the restriction. But we also prefer to delay it since the DMRS port design is clearer.  |
| InterDigital | Same view as Apple; this can be discussed later. |
| Futurewei | This proposal can be discussed later. |
| Google | We think it can be decided after a DMRS ports indication table is agreed.  |
| OPPO | Support to discuss later. |
| Ericsson | In principle fine with the proposal.  |
| ZTE | Share the view with companies to discuss this later. |
| Lenovo | Same view and this proposal can be discussed later. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Can be postponed after 2.2 is decided. |
| NEC | Open to discuss later. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with NTT DOCOMO. |
| MediaTek | We also like to postpone this discussion to later. |
| Spreadtrum | Share the view with companies to discuss this later. |
| vivo | Discuss it later. |
| Samsung | We are fine with discussion what is needed for MU-MIMO within CDM group, which can be discussed later. |
| CMCC | Support to discuss later. |
| Nokia/NSB | We need further check on the proposal, but it is beneficial to discuss about the restrictions which determines the total number of DMRS ports to signal (Table size).  |
| LGE | We also agree with NTT DOCOMO. |
| QC | We thank other companies for agreeing to discuss the restrictions. We think these restrictions should be discussed together with the antenna ports indication table in section 2.6, because certain new entries might be labelled as “not allowed with co-scheduled MU if this entry is used”. To DCM: regarding “4 DMRS ports within a CDM group”, we think it should be allowed. We don’t see any problem to allow it, given we are doubling # DMRS ports. As a matter of fact, putting a SU with rank 4 in a CDM group (so that NW can FDM another user to another group) seems better than putting 4 ports into two CDM group (so that NW have to CDM another user which might create larger interference in large delay spread channels).  |
| CATT | Support to discuss later. |
| Intel | We should discuss this once antenna port definitions are settled.  |
| Sharp | Support to discuss later. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Other proposals

Following proposals are also proposed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposals** | **Companies**  |
| 1. **PTRS-DMRS association for Rel.18 DMRS ports**
 | Lenovo |
| 1. **Study how to support dynamic switching between different number of additional DMRS symbols in Rel-18**
 | Ericsson |
| 1. **Sequence mapping equation needs to be modified to ensure that Rel.18 DMRS and Rel.15 DMRS have the same DMRS pattern**
 | Lenovo |
| 1. **Study on OCC disabling scheme for new DMRS type (Rel.17 feature in above 52.6GHz).**
 | Samsung |

Please provide your views on the above proposals, or other aspects which are not included in the summary, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Google | We think new PT-RS RE offset table is needed, since there are more DMRS ports.  |
| Ericsson | We hope companies can consider to discuss Proposal 2). |
| Lenovo | For proposal 1, we have similar view as Google.For proposal 3, we agree to discuss sequence mapping equation for R18 DMRS pattern. But we prefer to discuss it later after the details on R18 DMRS pattern are agreed. |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 1: We can discuss it later.Proposal 2: We see the benefit, and fine to discuss.Proposal 3: We think the same DMRS sequence can be applied. Proposal 4: We don’t think DL single port DMRS usage should be prioritized in other than FR2-2.  |

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

## Rel.15/18 DMRS ports for >4 layers PUSCH (void)

## PTRS-DMRS association

Multiple companies (e.g. Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo?, LGE, CATT, Sharp?, Apple, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, etc.) propose to increase the size of PTRS-DMRS association filed in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to 4-bit for PUSCH > 4 ranks.

In ZTE [4]

|  |
| --- |
| One issue is when up to 8 DMRS ports are supported for UL transmission, the association between DMRS ports and PTRS ports should also be enhanced, where the PTRS-DMRS association indication field should be increased. More precisely, for the case of 8 DMRS ports share one PTRS port, 3 bits in total are needed. For case of 4 DMRS ports share one PTRS port, 4 bits (2bits + 2bits) in total are needed. For case of 2 DMRS ports share one PTRS port, 4 bits (1bit + 1bit + 1bit + 1bit) in total are needed. ***Proposal 7:*** *More than 2 bits should be used for the DMRS port and PTRS port association indication for UL transmission with more than 4 layers.* * *Support 3 or 4 bits of the PTRS-DMRS association field in DCI.*
* *Support 2 PTRS ports for up to 8 layers transmission.*
 |

**FL proposal#3.2:**

* **For more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH with up to 2 ports UL PTRS, support up to 4 bits of PTRS-DMRS association field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.**
	+ **For 1 port UL PTRS, 3bits are used for the indication of PT-RS and DMRS ports association for UL PTRS port 0.**
	+ **For 2 ports UL PTRS, 4bits are used for the indication of PTRS and DMRS association when 2 PTRS ports are used, 2bits MSB are for the indication of PTRS port 0, and 2 bits LSB are for the indication of PTRS port 1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. |
| Apple | We need to separate discussion of (1) full-coherent (2) partial-coherent (3) non-coherent, instead of the current formulation. For partial-coherent, we now have more than 1 antenna architecture agreed in 8 Tx agenda  |
| InterDigital | First we need to discuss the multiplicity of the PTRS port which as Apple mentioned, for an 8TX UE, should be related to the number of antenna groups. |
| Google | We are not sure whether 2 PT-RS ports are needed or not. PT-RS port indication also depends on whether two codewords are supported. |
| OPPO | We can first agree on the number of UL PTRS ports.  |
| ZTE | Support.Basically, no matter antenna port coherency or antenna groups number of 8 Tx UE, the case of PTRS-DMRS association indication can be classified as *x* PTRS ports shared by *y* DMRS ports (where *x*=1 or 2, *y*=2 or 4 or 8, *x*<*y*). Consequently, 3 or 4 bits of the indication field are needed as elaborated in our contribution [4]. |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. The overhead should strive to be minimized. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal targeting for 2-port PT-RS, in our view whether it is needed to support 4-port or not can be discussed further. |
| MediaTek | Agree with Oppo. We still haven’t agreed on supporting 2 ports UL PTRS ports yet.  |
| Spreadtrum | We suggest to decide the maximum number of PTRS ports first. |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Support the proposal, and also fine with discussion after determining the maximum number of PTRS ports. |
| CMCC | We need to discuss the max number of PTRS ports firstly. For the discussion of PT-RS and DMRS ports association, it may be clearly to separate the discussion based on the antenna architecture agreed in 8 Tx agenda as Apple mentioned. In Rel-15, the max number of PTRS ports and PT-RS and DMRS ports association are also separately specified base on UE antenna architecture. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share view with OPPO, MTK and others. We don’t support increase of DCI indication.  |
| LGE | Support |
| QC | Similar as Apple’s and InterDigitial, we suggest to discuss the relationship between antenna groups and # PTRS ports first. We think one PTRS port for each antenna group is needed.  |
| CATT | Support. |
| Sharp | Support |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Max number of PTRS ports

In RAN1#110 meeting, in AI 9.1.4.2 (SRI/TPMI for 8Tx UL), antenna assumption of for full/partial coherent UE was agreed that the number of Ng (antenna coherent groups) is 1, 2, 4 where each group comprises coherent antennas, and antennas can be non-coherent/coherent across groups, depending on device types. From technically speaking, if different antenna groups do not share the same PA (Power Amplifier), different phase noise would be observed for different antenna groups.

Multiple companies (Lenovo, LGE, CATT, Xiaomi, Apple, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm) mention the max number of PTRS should be enhanced to up to 4 ports. On the other hand, some other companies ( Samsung, Nokia/NSB) think the enhancement is not needed.



**Fig 15:** **Examples 8 Tx PUSCH transmission requires 4 PTRS ports [24]**

**FL proposal#3.2:**

* **For 8Tx PUSCH, support up to 4 ports PTRS for CP-OFDM.**

**Support/fine (12): NTT DOCOMO, Apple, InterDigital, ZTE, Lenovo, Huawei/HiSilicon, Xiaomi, CMCC, LGE, Qualcomm, CATT**

**No, i.e. up to 2 PTRS ports (8): Google, OPPO, NEC, vivo, Samsung, MediaTek, Nokia/NSB**

**Postpone (1): Sharp**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. |
| Apple | We think it is for 8 Tx UL operation * **For 8 TX UL operation ~~more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH~~, support up to 4 ports PTRS for CP-OFDM.**
 |
| InterDigital  | We are fine with Apple’s revision. |
| Google | We think 1 PT-RS port is sufficient. There seems to be no multi-panel transmission for 8Tx based on current agreement.  |
| OPPO | We think two PTRS ports are sufficient. If the number of PTRS ports should be the same as the number of antenna groups, does it mean that we need 8 ports for non-coherent antenna layout? |
| ZTE | Support. In our view, Apple’s update is the same to FL proposal#3.2. |
| Lenovo | Suggest the following update:* **For ~~more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH~~ 8Tx PUSCH, support up to 4 ports PTRS for CP-OFDM.**
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| NEC | We also think up to 2 PTRS ports are sufficient. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| MediaTek | We don’t believe number of PTRS ports need to scale with number of panels. |
| vivo | Don’t support 4 PTRS ports. Up to 2 PTRS ports are sufficient, since each pair of antenna groups can be linked to the same oscillator among 4 antenna groups.  |
| Samsung | Not support, we think up to 2 PTRS is enough. |
| CMCC | Support.Up to 4 antenna coherent groups have been agreed in 8 Tx agenda, which may require up to 4 PTRS ports.In Rel-15, the max number of PTRS ports for non-coherent is same as partial-coherent antenna architecture, this principle can be reused that up to 4 ports PTRS is enough. |
| Nokia/NSB | As long as 3GPP support upto two UL panels (or two TRPs), up to 2 PTRS ports is enough.  |
| LGE | Support |
| QC | Support FL proposal. We are also fine with Apple revision.  |
| CATT | Support. |
| Sharp | We suggest waiting progress of AI 9.1.4.2 because Ng is not defined yet. It is unclear that different antenna groups do not share the same PA. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Antenna port(s) table for >4 layers PUSCH

Multiple companies mentioned enhancement of antenna port(s) table for rank 5/6/7/8 is needed to support >4 layers PUSCH. Some companies (e.g. Huawei/HiSilicon, vivo, OPPO, CMCC, etc) think the baseline is to reuse the same or a subset of DMRS port combination for rank 5/6/7/8 for PDSCH. On the other hand, Note/CATT pointed out that DMRS port indication mechanism is different between PUSCH and PDSCH:

* For PUSCH, DMRS is indicated from ports combinations with total ports number equals to the number of layers indicated by TPMI/SRI.
* For PDSCH, DMRS is indicated from all ports combinations.

In RAN1#110, following was proposed. However, some companies commented that it is not possible to reuse DMRS port combinations of PDSCH.

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal#4.3:*** **For > 4 layers PUSCH, support new antenna port indication table for rank = 5,6,7,8 for both DMRS type 1/2, and for both single-symbol/double-symbol DMRS.**
	+ **For Rel.15 DMRS ports (if supported), following options can be considered**
		- **Alt.1: same DMRS port combinations as that for rank = 5,6,7,8 for PDSCH are reused.**
		- **Alt.2: new DMRS port combinations are used for rank = 5,6,7,8 (FFS: details).**
	+ **For Rel.18 DMRS ports (if supported), following options can be considered**
		- **Alt.1: same DMRS port combinations as that for rank = 5,6,7,8 for PDSCH are reused.**
		- **Alt.2: new DMRS port combinations are used for rank = 5,6,7,8 (FFS: details).**
			* **Note: whether the DMRS port combination allows to use single symbol DMRS for rank = 5,6,7,8 should be checked.**
 |

From FL perspective, it is clear that we need to define new antenna port(s) table for rank = 5,6,7,8 for PUSCH. Question is either/both of Rel.15 DMRS ports or Rel.18 DMRS ports should be assumed. This will be solved after FL proposal#3.1 is agreed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal  |
| InterDigital | Support FL proposal. For Alt2., we even believe that support of every combination may not be necessary, but we can discuss it later. |
| Google | Support in principle |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| ZTE | Support |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. The details on new DMRS port combination can be clarified and discussed later. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| NEC | Fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal in principle.First, in our view the “Note” mentioned the issue for the single symbol DMRS should be under the bullet for Rel-15 DMRS.Second, we think whether the DMRS table defined for RANK 5/6/7/8 separately or jointly for all RANKs similar as DL also needs to be clarified, or we agree that the details can be discussed later. |
| MediaTek | Fine |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal in principle. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think Rel-15 DL port combinations can be used for full-coherent case only, and also for rank>4, we don’t need DCI filed of “Antenna port(s)”. For partial coherent with 2 or 4 groups of ports, we have to consider the option to distribute the port group into the different DMRS CDM group.  |
| LGE | In our view is to support only one port combination for each of UL rank 5/6/7/8 and it can be one of supported DL DMRS port combinations. Specifically, in the DL DMRS table, rank 5 can be indicated by one of two port combinations and if the same UL DMRS port combinations as DL DMRS port combination are introduced for rank 5, 1 bit in the UL DMRS port indication field needs to be used. In the same way, 1bit is needed for UL rank 6 DMRS port indication if the same port combinations are supported as DL. Thus we’d like the following version:**FL proposal#4.3:*** **For > 4 layers PUSCH, support new antenna port indication table for rank = 5,6,7,8 for both DMRS type 1/2, and for both single-symbol/double-symbol DMRS.**
	+ **For Rel.15 DMRS ports (if supported), following options can be considered**
		- **Alt.1: same DMRS port combinations as that for rank = 5,6,7,8 for PDSCH are reused.**
		- **Alt.2: new DMRS port combinations are used for rank = 5,6,7,8 (FFS: details).**
		- **Alt.3: only one port combination for each of rank=5,6,7,8 for PDSCH are reused.**
	+ **For Rel.18 DMRS ports (if supported), following options can be considered**
		- **Alt.1: same DMRS port combinations as that for rank = 5,6,7,8 for PDSCH are reused.**
		- **Alt.2: new DMRS port combinations are used for rank = 5,6,7,8 (FFS: details).**
		- **Alt.3: only one port combination for each of rank=5,6,7,8 for PDSCH are reused.**

**Note: whether the DMRS port combination allows to use single symbol DMRS for rank = 5,6,7,8 should be checked.** |
| QC | Can FL please clarify what is the relationship between this proposal and the proposal in section 2.6? They seem targeting the same issue? Are we duplicate the discussion? Mod: Thank you for the question. Yes, both sect. 2.6 and sect. 3.4 tries to specify new antenna port(s) table for Rel.18 DMRS ports. But, in sect. 3.4, we will define two new tables for PUSCH with rank = 5,6,7,8 for Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports. In sect. 2.6, we will define new tables for PUSCH with rank = 1,2,3,4 with Rel.18 DMRS ports only, and new tables for PDSCH with Rel.18 DMRS ports only. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | OK with FL’s proposal |
| Sharp | Support |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Other proposals

Following proposals are also proposed. Note that discussion of two CW or one CW, and CW to layer mapping is not listed because it is not related to DMRS enhancement. These proposals can be discussed in AI 9.1.4.2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposals** | **Companies**  |
| 1. **Study power boosting of PTRS for up to 8-layer PDSCH and PUSCH transmission**
 | Lenovo, OPPO |
|  |  |

Please provide your views on the above proposals, or other aspects which are not included in the summary, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | We think PTRS power boosting needs to be discussed anyway, now or later.  |
| Lenovo | We have similar view as OPPO. |
| Nokia/NSB | We can discuss it according to the decision of the other issue.  |
| QC | PTRS power boosting is a valid issue. Agree with Lenovo/OPPO to discuss it.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion

Based on the email discussion, following FL proposals are proposed.

 **FL proposal#3.1:**

* **Confirm the WA in RAN1#110 with the following update:**
	+ ***To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, support at least Opt.1 (introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6)).***
		- ***~~FFS: FD-OCC length for Rel.18 DMRS type 1 and type 2.~~***
		- ***FFS: Whether it is needed to handle potential performance issues of Opt 1. For example, study if there is performance loss in case of large delay spread scenario. If needed, how (e.g. additionally support other options).***

**Support/fine (26): Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Spreadtrum (remove FFS), vivo, OPPO, Google, CATT, Intel (Only Opt.1), NEC (Opt.1 only), Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Samsung (Opt.1 only), NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm (Opt.1 only), Nokia/NSB (Opt.1 only), Apple, InterDigital, Futurewei, Lenovo, MediaTek, CMCC, LGE, Sharp**

**No (1?): Ericsson?**

|  |
| --- |
| In the last meeting, we agreed to down select FD-OCC length for R18 eType 1 from 4 or 6. Based on the companies tdocs, FD-OCC length 4 would have better performance in case of large delay spread. However, FD-OCC length 4 needs to apply 4 REs across PRBs, which makes an issue of orphan REs if gNB schedules odd PRBs. So, some companies still prefer FD-OCC length 6. So, we have pros. and cons. Length 4 would have better performance, but length 6 simplify the specification.Also, HW proposes new proposal that length 3 and length 6 are applied to different CDM group, but, QC has concern on it.**Opt.2: Length 2 and length 6 FD-OCC are applied to 2 and 6 REs of DMRS within a PRB for different CDM groups, respectively** |

**FL proposal#2.2.1:**

* **For enhanced FD-OCC length for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH for Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS, support**
	+ **Opt.1-2: Length 4 FD-OCC is applied to 4 REs of DMRS within a PRB or across consecutive PRBs within an CDM group**

**Support/fine (22): FUTUREWEI, ZTE, New H3C, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, OPPO, Google, CATT, Xiaomi (either 4/6), Sharp, MediaTek, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Apple, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB (either 4/6), NEC, InterDigital, vivo**

**No (6): Ericsson (concern of orphan REs), LGE (concern of orphan REs), Intel (concern of orphan REs), Huawei/HiSilicon (add new Opt.2), CMCC (add new Opt.2)**

**FL proposal#2.2.2:**

* **For FD-OCC length 4 for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH for Rel.18 eType 2 DMRS and for Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS (if supported), support one from the following FD-OCCs:**
	+ **Opt.1-1: Walsh matrix (Hadamard code):**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OCC index** | **wf(0)** | **wf(1)** | **wf(2)** | **wf(3)** |
| 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 2 | +1 | +1 | -1 | -1 |
| 3 | +1 | -1 | -1 | +1 |

* + **Opt.1-2: Cyclic shift with {0, π, π/2, 3π/2}:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OCC index** | **wf(0)** | **wf(1)** | **wf(2)** | **wf(3)** |
| 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| 1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 |
| 2 | +1 | +j | -1 | -j |
| 3 | +1 | -j | -1 | +j |

|  |
| --- |
| In the last meeting, different companies had different interpretation of Rel.15 DMRS ports. To avoid confusion, this proposal clarify the term of Rel.15 is DMRS with FD-OCC length = 2 in R15. QC commented that figure should be included in the proposal, so my proposal is to capture the proposal with the figure. |

**FL proposal#2.4:**

* **For discussion purpose, definition of Rel.15 DMRS ports and 18 DMRS ports are:**
	+ **Rel.15 Type 1/Type 2 DMRS ports: DMRS ports with FD-OCC length =2.**
	+ **Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS ports: DMRS ports with FD-OCC length >2.**
* **Following figure shows difference between Rel.15 Type 1 DMRS ports and Rel.18 eType 1 DMRS ports.**

****

**Support/fine (27): DOCOMO, Apple, InterDigital, Futurewei, Google, OPPO, Ericsson, ZTE, Lenovo, Huawei/HiSilicon, NEC, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Spreadtrum, Vivo, Samsung, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, LGE, QC, CATT, Intel, Sharp, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI**

**No (0):**

|  |
| --- |
| This proposal is for more than 4 layers PUSCH, both Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports are supported, and gNB can select which one to be used. We can remove the last note, because it was already agreed now. |

**FL proposal#3.1:**

* **For more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH, support**
	+ **Both Rel.15 Type 1/Type 2 DMRS ports and Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS ports.**
		- **For UE supporting Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS ports, UE can be indicated with either of Rel.15 Type 1/Type 2 DMRS ports or Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS ports.**
			* **RRC based indication is supported as the baseline. FFS whether DCI based indication is further needed.**
		- **For UE not supporting Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS ports, UE can be indicated with Rel.15 Type 1/Type 2 DMRS ports only.**
	+ **Note: definition of Rel.15/18 DMRS ports is**
		- **Rel.15 Type 1/Type 2 DMRS ports: DMRS ports with FD-OCC length =2.**
		- **Rel.18 eType 1/eType 2 DMRS ports: DMRS ports with FD-OCC length >2.**

**Support/fine (26): NTT DOCOMO, Apple, InterDigital, Google, OPPO, Ericsson, ZTE, Lenovo, Huawei/HiSilicon, NEC, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Spreadtrum, vivo, Samsung, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, LGE, QC, CATT, Intel, Sharp, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI**

**No (0):**
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# **Appendix**

## **RAN1#109e agreements:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EVM**Agreement* LLS is used for objective #3 (increasing DMRS ports for MU-MIMO) in Rel.18 MIMO, while SLS can be used optionally.

Agreement* No EVM discussion is needed for objective #5 (>4 layers PUSCH DMRS) in AI 9.1.3.1 (DMRS) in Rel.18.

Agreement* LLS for increasing DMRS ports in AI 9.1.3.1 in Rel.18:
	+ Evaluated channel: PDSCH as baseline (Companies can additionally submit evaluation results of PUSCH).
	+ Evaluation metric:
		- BLER for fixed MCS and rank as baseline
		- User throughput for adaptive MCS and rank as optional
		- MSE or NMSE of DMRS as optional
	+ Evaluation baseline (i.e. compared with):
		- For evaluation of enhanced single-symbol DMRS, baseline refers to Rel.15 single-symbol DMRS or Rel.15 double-symbol DMRS.
		- For evaluation of enhanced double-symbol DMRS, baseline refers to Rel.15 double-symbol DMRS.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| Duplex, Waveform  | TDD, OFDM Note: FDD, OFDM is not precluded  |
| Carrier Frequency  | 4 GHz  |
| Subcarrier spacing   | 30kHz  |
| Channel Model  | CDL-B or CDL-C in TR 38.901 with 30ns or 300ns delay spread as baseline for MU-MIMO and SU-MIMO Note: Other delay spread is not precluded.  Note: Simulation using TDL-A with 30ns or 300ns for MU-MIMO is not precluded.   |
| Delay spread  | Baseline: 30ns, 300ns Optional: 1000ns  |
| UE velocity  | Baseline: 3km/h, 30km/h Optional: 60km/h, 120km/h  |
| Allocation bandwidth  | 20MHz Note: Other bandwidth smaller than 20MHz is not precluded  |
| MIMO scheme  | Baseline: MU-MIMO Optional: SU-MIMO  |
| BS antenna configuration  | Companies can select and need to report which option(s) are used between - 32 ports: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng, Mp, Np) = (8,8,2,1,1,2,8), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.8)λ - 16 ports: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng, Mp, Np) = (8,4,2,1,1,2,4), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.8)λ Other configurations are not precluded.  |
| UE antenna configuration  | Companies can select and need to report which option(s) are used between 4RX: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng, Mp, Np) = (1,2,2,1,1,1,2), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ for rank > 2 2RX: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng, Mp, Np) = (1,1,2,1,1,1,1), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ for (rank 1,2) Other configuration is not precluded.  |
| MIMO Rank  | 1, 2, or 4 per UE (rank fixed or rank adaptation)  |
| UE number for MU-MIMO  | 1, 2, 4, 8, or 12  |
| Precoding and precoding granularity  | For PDSCH: Companies can select and need to report which option(s) are used between * [ZF or SVD] based sub-band precoding (with 4PRB precoding granularity) on ideal channel knowledge
* CSI codebook based sub-band precoding (with 4PRB precoding granularity) on ideal CSI feedback.

For PUSCH: Companies can select and need to report which option(s) are used between * [ZF or SVD] based wide-band precoding on ideal channel knowledge
* Codebook based wide-band precoding on ideal CSI feedback.
 |
| Feedback delay for precoding  | 5ms  |
| DMRS type  | Type 1E and/or Type 2E, which are enhanced DMRS that are based on the legacy RE mappings of DMRS Type 1/2, where the enhanced DMRS support larger DMRS ports. Note: The terminology of Type 1E and/or Type 2E is for discussion purpose.  |
| DMRS configurations  | Baseline:  * Single symbol DMRS without additional DMRS symbols and 1 additional DMRS symbol
* Double symbol DMRS without additional DMRS symbols.

Note: evaluation of other additional DMRS symbol(s) are not precluded.  |
| DMRS mapping type  | Mapping type A (slot based) for PDSCH. Mapping type A (slot based) for PUSCH.  |
| Link adaptation  | * Fixed modulation, coding and rank for BLER evaluation as baseline.
* Adaptation of both MCS and rank for throughput evaluation as optional.
 |
| HARQ  | Baseline: Off Optional: On (HARQ with max. 4 re-transmissions) for throughput evaluation  |
| Channel estimation  | Realistic channel estimation with ideal info of frequency sync, SNR, doppler and delay spread  |
| Receiver type  | MMSE as baseline  |
| EVM  | No radio impairments   |

Agreement* For LLS assumptions for increasing DMRS ports in AI 9.1.3.1 in Rel.18:
	+ Precoding assumption of PUSCH, “[ZF or SVD]” in RAN1#109e agreement is updated by
		- Alt.2-2: SVD

AgreementFor LLS assumptions for increasing DMRS ports in AI 9.1.3.1 in Rel.18: * Precoding assumption of PDSCH, “[ZF or SVD]” in RAN1#109e agreement is updated by SVD.

Agreement* For MU-MIMO LLS of PDSCH, for evaluation of SVD/CSI-codebook based sub-band precoding, companies shall report the pre-coding assumption of interference of co-scheduled UEs from the following:
	+ Alt.1: calculated by pre-coder of channel of each co-scheduled UE.
		- For precoding assumption of PDSCH, precoder of target UE and precoder of co-scheduled UE are generated independently.
		- Companies can report a set of azimuth and zenith angle offset used for evaluation (For example, azimuth angle offsets from [30o, 60o, 90o] and zenith angle offset from [3o, 6o] can be considered).
	+ Alt.2: calculated by random pre-coder (i.e. precoder selected randomly from a predefined set of precoders) which is different from the pre-coder of target UE.
		- For precoding assumption of PDSCH, only the channel of one target UE, i.e. *Hd*, needs to be modelled. Precoder is generated based on *Hd* to obtain the precoder for this UE only. The interference from co-scheduled UEs can be modelled as, cid:image002.png@01D86C43.8E5DA4E0, wherein *Wi* can be randomly selected from a predefined set of precoders
			* Companies shall report how to generate the predefined set of precoders for simulation.
	+ Alt.3: the same pre-coder as scheduled UE.
		- PDSCH interference and interfering DMRS ports are emulated using the same pre-coder as for the scheduled UE.
		- Power offset of the co-scheduled UE is one value from {0dB, -3dB, -6dB} as fixed evaluation parameter. Other values are not precluded.
		- For precoding assumption of PDSCH, only the channel of one target UE, i.e. *Hd*, needs to be modelled. Precoder for the target UE (denoted as *Wd*) is generated based on *Hd* only. Denote the precoding matrix/vector of the ith co-scheduled UEs as *Wi*, and *Wi*=*Wd* (*Wi* for all th co-scheduled UEs are same). Then the interference from co-scheduled UEs can be modelled as cid:image003.png@01D86C43.8E5DA4E0.​

For the above Alt.1-3, only PDSCH performance of the target UE is evaluated, while interference of both PDSCH and DMRS of co-scheduled UE(s) is simulated.Agreement* For SLS assumption for increasing DMRS ports in AI 9.1.3.1 in Rel.18,
	+ Scenario: Dense Urban (Macro only) at 4GHz is a baseline. Other scenarios (e.g. Umi, Uma) are not precluded.
	+ Following evaluation assumptions are used for SLS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter**  | **Value**  |
| Scenario  | Dense Urban (macro only)  |
| Carrier frequency  | 4GHz  |
| Duplex, Waveform   | TDD, OFDM Note: FDD, OFDM is not precluded  |
| Multiple access   | OFDMA   |
| Frequency Range  | FR1 only.  |
| Inter-BS distance  | 200 m   |
| Channel model  | According to the TR 38.901   |
| Antenna setup and port layouts at gNB  | Companies need to report which option(s) are used between * 32 ports: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng, Mp, Np) = (8,8,2,1,1,2,8), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.8)λ
* 16 ports: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng, Mp, Np) = (8,4,2,1,1,2,4), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.8)λ Other configurations are not precluded.
 |
| Antenna setup and port layouts at UE  | 4RX: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng, Mp, Np) = (1,2,2,1,1,1,2), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ for rank > 2 2RX: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng, Mp, Np) = (1,1,2,1,1,1,1), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ for (rank 1,2)  Other configurations are not precluded.  |
| BS Tx power   | 41 dBm for 10MHz, 44dBm for 20MHz, 47dBm for 40MHz  |
| BS antenna height   | 25 m   |
| BS noise figure  | 5 dB  |
| UE noise figure  | 9 dB  |
| UE antenna height & gain  | Follow TR36.873   |
| Modulation   | Up to 256 QAM  |
| Coding on PDSCH  | LDPC Max code-block size=8448bit  |
| Numerology  | Slot/non-slot   | 14 OFDM symbols per slot  |
| SCS   | 30 kHz   |
| Simulation bandwidth   | 20 MHz  |
| Number of RBs  | 52 for 30 kHz SCS  |
| Frame structure   | Slot Format 0 (all downlink) for all slots  |
| MIMO scheme  | SU/MU-MIMO with rank adaptation is a baseline  For low RU, SU-MIMO or SU/MU-MIMO with rank adaptation are assumed  For medium/high RU, SU/MU-MIMO with rank adaptation is assumed  |
| MIMO layers  | For all evaluation, companies to provide the assumption on the maximum MU layers (e.g. 8 or 12)  |
| CSI feedback  | Feedback assumption at least for baseline scheme CSI feedback periodicity (full CSI feedback): 5 ms,  Scheduling delay (from CSI feedback to time to apply in scheduling): 4 ms  |
| Overhead  | Companies shall provide the downlink overhead assumption  |
| Traffic model  | Baseline: FTP1 with 50% Resource Utilization Optional: Full buffer  |
| UE distribution  | [80%] indoor (3km/h),  [20%] outdoor (30km/h)  |
| UE receiver  | MMSE-IRC as the baseline receiver  |
| Feedback assumption    | Realistic  |
| Channel estimation       | Realistic  |

**For increasing orthogonal DMRS ports**Agreement* Specify to increase the max. number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH larger than Rel.15 for CP-OFDM without increasing the DMRS overhead.
	+ Strive to have common design of DMRS enhancement for PDSCH and PUSCH for a given DMRS Type.

Agreement* The maximum number of enhanced DMRS ports in Rel.18 is doubled from Rel.15 DMRS ports:
	+ For DMRS type 1, the max. number of enhanced DMRS ports in Rel.18 for PDSCH/PUSCH is
		- Single symbol DMRS: 8 DMRS ports.
		- Double symbol DMRS: 16 DMRS ports.
	+ For DMRS type 2, the max. number of enhanced DMRS ports in Rel.18 for PDSCH/PUSCH is
		- Single symbol DMRS: 12 DMRS ports.
		- Double symbol DMRS: 24 DMRS ports.

Agreement* To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, evaluate and, if needed, specify one or more from the following options:
	+ Opt.1 (enhance FD-OCC): Introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6).
		- Study aspect includes potential performance degradation in large delay spread, potential scheduling restriction, backward compatibility.
	+ Opt.2 (enhance TD-OCC): Utilize TD-OCC over non-contiguous DMRS symbols (e.g. TD-OCC across front/additional DMRS symbols)
		- Study aspect includes potential performance degradation in high UE velocity, potential scheduling restriction (e.g. how to apply freq. hopping), potential DMRS configuration restriction (e.g. restriction of the number of additional DMRS), backward compatibility.
	+ Opt.3 (Sparser frequency allocation): increase the number of CDM groups (e.g. larger number of comb/FDM).
		- Study aspect includes potential performance degradation in large delay spread, backward compatibility.
	+ Opt.4 (using TDMed DMRS symbol): reusing additional DMRS symbols to increase orthogonal DMRS ports
		- Study aspect includes potential performance degradation in high UE velocity, potential DMRS configuration restriction (e.g. restriction of the number of additional DMRS), backward compatibility.
	+ Opt.5 TD-OCC over non-contiguous DMRS symbols combined with FD-OCC or FDM: reusing additional DMRS symbol(s) to improve channel estimation performance.
		- Study aspect includes potential performance degradation in high UE velocity, potential scheduling restriction (e.g. how to apply freq. hopping), potential DMRS configuration restriction (e.g. restriction of the number of additional DMRS), backward compatibility.
	+ The same option can be applied to both single symbol DMRS and double symbol DMRS.

Agreement* To increase the max. number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH compared to Rel.15 DMRS for CP-OFDM without increasing the DMRS overhead,
	+ Study whether/how to enable MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports, as well as whether/how to enable MU-MIMO among Rel.18 DMRS ports, in the same or different CDM group.

Agreement* To increase the max. number of orthogonal DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH larger than Rel.15
	+ Study whether/how to support DCI-based dynamic antenna ports indication of Rel.18 DMRS ports and/or Rel.15 DMRS ports.
	+ Study whether/how to reuse the antenna port indication table in 38.212 as much as possible for both PDSCH and PUSCH
	+ Study the potential need for MU scheduling restrictions in the design of the enhanced antenna port indication table in 38.212 for DL PDSCH.

**For 8 Tx UL SU-MIMO**Agreement* Study the following potential DMRS enhancement for potential support of more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH.
	+ Extend DMRS port allocation table for rank 5~8
		- Note: DL DMRS table can be a reference
	+ Enhancement for DMRS to PTRS mapping
* Study whether to utilize Rel.18 DMRS ports for more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH.
* Note: the above study does not imply more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH is supported.
* Note: other study for potential DMRS enhancement for potential support of more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH is not precluded.
 |

## **RAN1#110bis-e agreements:**

|  |
| --- |
| **For increasing orthogonal DMRS ports**Working Assumption* To increase the number of DMRS ports for PDSCH/PUSCH, support at least Opt.1 (introduce larger FD-OCC length than Rel.15 (e.g. 4 or 6)).
	+ FFS: FD-OCC length for Rel.18 DMRS type 1 and type 2.
	+ FFS: Whether it is needed to handle potential performance issues of Opt 1. For example, study if there is performance loss in case of large delay spread scenario. If needed, how (e.g. additionally support other options).

Agreement* For enhanced FD-OCC length for DMRS of PDSCH/PUSCH, support the following FD-OCC length:
	+ For Rel.18 DMRS type 1, down select from the following in RAN1#110bis-e:
		- Opt.1-1: Length 6 FD-OCC is applied to 6 REs of DMRS within a PRB within an CDM group
		- Opt.1-2: Length 4 FD-OCC is applied to 4 REs of DMRS within a PRB or across consecutive PRBs within an CDM group
	+ For Rel.18 DMRS type 2:
		- Length 4 FD-OCC is applied to 4 REs of DMRS within a PRB within an CDM group
		- FFS: Support of length 6 FD-OCC

Agreement* Support MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports.
	+ For MU-MIMO by different CDM groups, no MU-MIMO scheduling restriction of PUSCH/PDSCH (i.e. MU-MIMO between Rel.15 UE and Rel.18 UE is allowed).
	+ For MU-MIMO within a CDM group, study whether and how to support MU-MIMO between Rel.15 DMRS ports and Rel.18 DMRS ports for PDSCH.
		- Note: the study includes MU-MIMO between Rel.15 UE and Rel.18 UE, and between Rel.18 UEs.
	+ Note: PUSCH above is CP-OFDM waveform.

AgreementFor increased DMRS ports for enhanced FD-OCC, study whether/how to support DCI based switching between DMRS port(s) associated with length 2 FD-OCC and DMRS port(s) associated with length M FD-OCC (where M > 2).**For 8 Tx UL SU-MIMO**Agreement* For support of more than 4 layers SU-MIMO PUSCH, study the following potential enhancements for PTRS-DMRS association.
	+ Whether to support more than 2-port UL PTRS.
	+ Whether to increase the DCI size of PTRS-DMRS association field in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.

AgreementFor > 4 layers PUSCH, support rank = 5,6,7,8 for both DMRS type 1/2, and for both single-symbol/double-symbol DMRS. |