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# Background

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

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

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

Based on the progress and agreements made in the last meeting [2-3], the following topics are the focal point of the discussion in this meeting.

**High Priority Topics**

* **Partially/Non-coherent precoding:**
  + Codebook structure for Ng=2
  + Decision for supported cases of layer to antenna group mapping for Ng=4
  + Discuss precoding indication
* **Fully-coherent precoding:**
  + Decision on applicability of oversampling values (2,1) and (2,2) per agreed (N1, N2)
  + Discuss precoding indication
    - Based on UL legacy indication by using an index
    - Based on DL indication by using i1, i2, … etc.
* **Remaining details for specification support of dual CW transmission:**
  + Down-selection between the two alternatives as the target CW for UCI multiplexing
  + Enabling/Disabling the second CW
  + Discuss other aspects; CBG, configured grant operation, etc.

**Other Topics**

* **Others:**
  + Down-selection between the two options for NCB SRI indication

# Codebook Design for Coherent 8TX UE

Void

# Codebook Design for Partially/Non-Coherent UE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agreement**  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook,   * When Ng=2   + Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook,     - Full-coherent precoders are used       * FFS whether partial-coherent precoders are needed * When Ng=4, down-select from,   + Alt1:     - Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook,       * Full-coherent precoders are used   + Alt2:     - Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook,       * Partial-coherent precoders are used   **Agreement**  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=2,   * Following rank and layer splitting cases are supported  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | | 1 | (1,0), (0,1) |  | | 8 |  | (4,4) |  * Select from the following cases based on the performance and overall DCI overhead  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | | 2 | (2,0), (0,2) |  | | 2 |  | (1,1) | | 3 | (3,0), (0,3) |  | | 3 |  | (2,1), (1,2) | | 4 | (4,0), (0,4) |  | | 4 |  | (2,2), (3,1), (1,3) | | 5 |  | (4,1), (1,4), (2,3), (3,2) | | 6 |  | (4,2), (2,4), (3,3) | | 7 |  | (4,3), (3,4) |   Note: Above is not relevant to how precoders are indicated. |

Based on the discussion in the last meeting, it was agreed to use full-coherent precoders from Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook for when Ng=2. Therefore, the precoder indication can be simply based on indication of two full-coherent 4TX precoders. Furthermore, different options of layer splitting were identified for discussion and down-selection in this meeting.

According to the agreement, for Ng=2, full-coherent precoders from Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook are used to construct the 8TX codebook. Based on the Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook, as shown in Table 1, there are a total of 30 fully coherent precoders that can be indicated by 5 bits. Therefore, to indicate an 8TX precoder for a partially coherent UE with Ng=2, 10 bits can be used to maintain flexibility and support all possible cases of layer splitting.

**Table 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **Number of fully coherent precoders** |
| 1 | 16 |
| 2 | 8 |
| 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 |

***~~Proposal 3.1: For partially coherent 8TX UE with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of two full-coherent 4TX precoders.~~***

***~~Proposal 3.2:~~* ~~For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=2,~~**

* **~~TPMI indication is based on using 2 TPMI each with a length of 5 bits~~**
* **~~Down-select from one the followings~~**
  + **~~Alt1 - Following combinations of layer splitting are supported~~**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **~~Rank~~** | **~~All layers in one Antenna Group~~** | **~~Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups~~** |
| ~~2~~ | ~~(2,0), (0,2)~~ |  |
| ~~2~~ |  | ~~(1,1)~~ |
| ~~3~~ | ~~(3,0), (0,3)~~ |  |
| ~~3~~ |  | ~~(2,1), (1,2)~~ |
| ~~4~~ | ~~(4,0), (0,4)~~ |  |
| ~~4~~ |  | ~~(2,2), (3,1), (1,3)~~ |
| ~~5~~ |  | ~~(4,1), (1,4), (2,3), (3,2)~~ |
| ~~6~~ |  | ~~(4,2), (2,4), (3,3)~~ |
| ~~7~~ |  | ~~(4,3), (3,4)~~ |

* + **~~Alt2 - Following combinations of layer splitting are supported, where for rank>4, e~~*~~ach CW is mapped to only one antenna group.~~***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **~~Rank~~** | **~~All layers in one Antenna Group~~** | **~~Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups~~** |
| ~~2~~ | ~~(2,0), (0,2)~~ |  |
| ~~2~~ |  | ~~(1,1)~~ |
| ~~3~~ | ~~(3,0), (0,3)~~ |  |
| ~~3~~ |  | ~~(2,1), (1,2)~~ |
| ~~4~~ | ~~(4,0), (0,4)~~ |  |
| ~~4~~ |  | ~~(2,2), (3,1), (1,3)~~ |
| ~~5~~ |  | ~~(2,3), (3,2)~~ |
| ~~6~~ |  | ~~(3,3)~~ |
| ~~7~~ |  | ~~(4,3), (3,4)~~ |
|  |  |  |

Based on the comments from the preparation phase, companies have indicated the following points for proposals 3.1 and 3.2,

* Further discuss other options for precoder indication,
* The TPMI indication can be done with less overhead than the FL proposed 10 bits,
* For layer splitting, only cases based on an almost balanced layer splitting should be supported.

Therefore, proposals 3.1 and 3.2 are updated as follows,

***Proposal 3.1: For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.***

***Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,***

* ***Option 1 – A single TPMI is indicated and applied on both antenna groups***
* ***Option 2 – A single TPMI is indicated, from which a second precoder is derived for the second antenna group***
* ***Option 3 - Two TPMIs are indicated, where the first is applied on the first antenna group, and the second is applied on the second antenna group***

***Proposal 3.2:* For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, Ng=2,**

* **Following combinations of layer splitting are supported, where for rank>4, each CW is mapped to only one antenna group.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** |
| 2 | (2,0), (0,2) |  |
| 2 |  | (1,1) |
| 3 | (3,0), (0,3) |  |
| 3 |  | (2,1), (1,2) |
| 4 | (4,0), (0,4) |  |
| 4 |  | (2,2) |
| 5 |  | (2,3), (3,2) |
| 6 |  | (3,3) |
| 7 |  | (4,3), (3,4) |

Another aspect of partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE is related to the case with Ng=4. In the last RAN1 meeting, two alternatives were identified for down-selection. The main difference between the two alternatives can be captured as follows,

* Alt1 offers a cleaner design that could benefit from having a same framework for TPMI indication as the case with Ng=2
* Alt2 could offer a better performance due to having a larger selection of 2TX precoder, however that comes with a large overhead and more challenging path for down-selection and specifications.

Based on the review of companies’ contributions and comments received during the preparation phase, there is a strong majority for support of Version A.

***Proposal 3.3:***

***Version A -* For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4, Alt1 is supported where**

* **Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook,** 
  + **Full-coherent precoders are used**

***~~Version B -~~* ~~For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4, Alt2 is supported where~~**

* **~~Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook,~~**
  + **~~Partial-coherent precoders are used~~**

Following the same principle as the case with Ng=2, proposal 3.4 is prepared for the partial coherent UEs with Ng=4 antenna groups.

***Proposal 3.4:***

**For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,**

* **Following rank and layer splitting cases are supported**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across ~~2~~ 4 Antenna Groups** |
| 1 | (1,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0), (0,0,0,1) |  |
| 2 | (2,0,0,0), (0,2,0,0), (0,0,2,0), (0,0,0,2) |  |
| 8 |  | (2, 2, 2, 2) |

* **Select from the following cases based on the performance and overall DCI overhead**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across ~~2~~ 4 Antenna Groups** |
| 2 |  | (1,1,0,0), (1,0,1,0), (1,0,0,1)  (0,1,1,0), (0,1,0,1)  (0,0,1,1) |
| 3 |  | (2,1,0,0), (2,0,1,0), (2,0,0,1)  (1,2,0,0), (0,2,1,0), (0,2,0,1)  (1,0,2,0), (0,1,2,0), (0,0,2,1)  (1,0,0,2), (0,1,0,2), (0,0,1,2) |
| 4 |  | (2,2,0,0), (2,0,2,0), (2,0,0,2)  (0,2,2,0), (0,2,0,2),  (0,0,2,2) |
| 5 |  | (2,2,1,0), (2,2,0,1), (2,1,2,0), (2,1,0,2), (2,0,1,2), (2,0,2,1)  (0,2,2,1), (0,2,1,2), (1,2,2,0), (1,2,0,2)  (0,1,2,2), (1,0,2,2) |
| 6 |  | (2,2,2,0), (2,2,0,2), (2,0,2,2),(0,2,2,2) |
| 7 |  | (2,2,2,1), (2,2,1,2), (2,1,2,2), (1,2,2,2) |

***Note: Above is not relevant to how precoders are indicated.***

Table 2 - Companies’ views

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Perspective** |
| Google | 3.1: We think we should discuss TPMI indication after we finalize the codebook design. Option 1 and option 2 depend on the codebook design. We cannot see any benefit from option 3. Usually, 2 TPMI indication (separate indication) would require larger overhead than 1 TPMI indication (joint indication).  3.2/3.3/3.4: Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | 3.1: Agree with Google to discuss TPMI discussion after we finalize the CB design. And we donot understand Option 2. Some clarification on Option 2 is appreciated.  3.2: Support  3.3: Support  3.4: Not support. First, there should be ‘4 Antenna Groups’ instead of ‘2 Antenna Groups’ in the table. Second, not sure the reason to preclude some layer splitting cases, e.g., (1,1,1,0) and its permutations for rank=3, (1,1,1,1) and its permutations for rank=4, (2,2,1,1) and its permutations for rank=6, etc. |
| NEC | 3.1: In our understanding, TPMI is just an index corresponding to a precoder. No matter how the precoder is designed. If we really need an agreement, we support single TPMI.  3.2/3.3: Support. |
| OPPO | 3.1: The difference between Option 1 and Option 2 is unclear to us.  3.2: We think there would be performance loss for (3,0), (0,3) and (4,0), (0,4) compared to mapping the layers to both antenna groups. We prefer FFS for (3,0), (0,3) and (4,0), (0,4).  3.3: We prefer version B. As shown in proposal 3.4, there are too many layer splitting cases for version A. The overhead of version A would be significantly lager than that of version B.  3.4: agree on 3.3 first. |
| Lenovo | Proposal 3.1: Agree with Google. Such details should be discussed after we make some progress in the codebook design.  Proposal 3.2: We think it is important to balance the power between the two groups, so the layer split like (2,0),(0,2),(3,0),(0,3),(4,0),(0,4) should not be included. Splitting the layers across two groups can also provide higher performance, since there are more precoder to select from in the lower ranks. So we think only the right column (layer split between 2 antenna groups with (almost) the same number of layers) should be specified.  Proposal 3.3: Do not support. More study is needed to compare the two alternatives, including the signalling overhead and performance. Basing the Ng=4 design on 2TX precoder offers better performance than 4TX. The TPMI overhead can be mitigated by limiting the 2TX precoder combinations, such as only allow different 2TX precoders to be used in different antenna groups.  Proposal 3.4: Do not support. This decision should be made after an agreement is reached on the issue of Proposal 3 (2TX or 4TX codebook). |
| CATT | **Proposal 3.1**:  The proposal is not clear for us. Does a single TPMI in option 2 means a single 8Tx TPMI or a single 4Tx TPMI? As we explained in last round, we prefer to indicate a single 8Tx TPMI to the UE.  Besides, we have concern on indicating two full-coherent 4TX precoders. As shown in our contribution (R1-2302686), for rank = 3, 8Tx precoders generated with full-coherent 4Tx precoder + partial-coherent 4Tx precoder slightly outperforms 8Tx precoders generated with two full-coherent 4Tx precoders, and can keep the constant modulus property. We prefer to consider 8Tx precoders generated with full-coherent 4Tx precoder + partial-coherent 4Tx precoder, partial-coherent 4Tx precoder + partial-coherent 4Tx precoder, and partial-coherent 4Tx precoder + non-coherent 4Tx precoder for rank 3, 5 and 7 respectively.  **Proposal 3.2**:  We believe that one layers split is sufficient regardless of ranks. Thus, following modifications are suggested:    **Following combinations of layer splitting are supported, where for rank>4, each CW is mapped to only one antenna group.**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | | 1 | (1,0), (0,1) |  | | 2 | (2,0), (0,2) |  | | 2 |  | (1,1) | | 3 | (3,0), (0,3) |  | | 3 |  | ~~(2,1),~~ (1,2) | | 4 | (4,0), (0,4) |  | | 4 |  | (2,2) | | 5 |  | (2,3)~~, (3,2)~~ | | 6 |  | (3,3) | | 7 |  | ~~(4,3),~~ (3,4) | | 8 |  | (4,4) |   **Proposal 3.3**:  Support in principle with following modifications:  ***Proposal 3.3:***  ***Version A -* For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4, Alt1 is supported where**   * **Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook, at least:**   + **Full-coherent precoders are used**   **Proposal 3.4**:  We believe that we should make decisions on proposal 3.3 firstly and then turn to designing the combinations of layer splits for the partial coherent UEs with Ng=4 antenna groups. |
| ZTE | 3.1: Support option 3.  Option 1 and option 2 need more clarification. Single TPMI should be joint TPMI which can indicate two 4 Tx TPMIs. It seems only one 4Tx TPMI is used for 2 port groups in Option 1.  3.2: We can support the table for rank 2-4, but have concern on (3, 2) and (4, 3). If following legacy UL codebook scheme, permutation is not needed for higher rank.  3.3: Support.  3.4: The format of layer splitting cases for rank=1 seems not correct, which is for Ng=2. It should be modified as (1/0/0/0), (0/1/0/0), (0/0/1/0), (0/0/0/1) for rank 1.   * We agree with the candidates for rank 2, 7, 8 in above table. * For rank 3 and rank 4, group balanced candidates should be added. E.g, 1/1/1/0, 1/1/0/1, 1/0/1/1, 0/1/1/1 for rank 3, and 1/1/1/1 for rank 4. * For rank 6, group balanced splitting such as 2/1/2/1, 1/2/1/2, 2/2/1/1, 1/1/2/2/ should be added for discussion. * For rank 5, group balanced splitting such as combinations of one 2 and three 1 should also be added for discussion.   Some considerations:   1. For higher rank, permutation can be either not supported or partially supported. 2. We need to determine the relation among four 2Tx port groups, whether first two 2Tx port groups correspond to one 4Tx port group or the 1st and the 3rd 2Tx port groups correspond to one 4Tx port group, because Ng=2 UE can support Ng=4 codebook. This issue is relevant to port indexing for 8Tx. The former means [0, 1, 4, 5] and [2, 3, 6, 7], the latter means [0, 2, 4, 6] and [1, 3, 5, 7] assuming 2Tx ports of [0, 4], [1, 5], [2, 6] and [3, 7]. After this is determined, we can choose [2/1/2/1] or [2/2/1/1/], instead of both. Note that such port indexing splitting is also discussing for 8Tx SRS in AI 9.1.3.2. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 3.1:** We prefer to have this discussion after finalizing precoder design, but in general we prefer single TPMI.  **Proposal 3.2:** We believe the entries in the table can be further reduced, i.e.,  **Following combinations of layer splitting are supported, where for rank>4, each CW is mapped to only one antenna group.**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | | 1 | (1,0), (0,1) |  | | 2 | (2,0), (0,2) |  | | 2 |  | (1,1) | | 3 | (3,0), (0,3) |  | | 3 |  | (2,1), ~~(1,2)~~ | | 4 | (4,0), (0,4) |  | | 4 |  | (2,2) | | 5 |  | ~~(2,3),~~ (3,2) | | 6 |  | (3,3) | | 7 |  | (4,3), ~~(3,4)~~ | | 8 |  | (4,4) |   **Proposal 3.3:** Support  **Proposal 3.4:** We would like to prioritize finishing the codebook design for Ng =2 and then move to Ng=4. |
| QC | Proposal 3.1: Support option 3, which is the most straightforward solution. Option 1 has a restriction that the two antenna groups have to use same precoder. We don’t support option 2, before it is clarified how to derive the precoder for the second antenna group.  Proposal 3.2: Support the spirit of the proposal. But we think overhead can be further reduced by only keep “1,2” out of “(2,1), (1,2)”, “2,3” out of “(2,3), (3,2)”, “3,4” out of “(3,4), (4,3)”. There seems no strong motivation to keep both.  Proposal 3.3: support  Proposal 3.4: Need more discussion. For example, for layer 4, why not support (1,1,1,1)? |
| Intel | *Proposal 3.1*  We also think the details of TPMI indication could be the next step. We are fine with the main bullet.  Regarding the options, more discussions are required. For single TPMI/two TPMI, does it mean single TPMI field or two TPMI fields?  We think we can firstly focus on the main bullet and suggest the following change.  ***Proposal 3.1: For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.***  ***~~Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,~~***   * ***~~Option 1 – A single TPMI is indicated and applied on both antenna groups~~*** * ***~~Option 2 – A single TPMI is indicated, from which a second precoder is derived for the second antenna group~~*** * ***~~Option 3 - Two TPMIs are indicated, where the first is applied on the first antenna group, and the second is applied on the second antenna group~~***   *Proposal 3.2*  What’s the motivation to have the CW mapping to antenna group, i.e., “**where for rank>4, each CW is mapped to only one antenna group.**”?  *Proposal 3.3*  OK with Version A.  *Proposal 3.4*  Generally fine. |
| ZTE | Proposal 3.4: Thanks for considering our suggestion. We are fine now. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 3.1: We also prefer to have this discussion after finalizing precoder design  Proposal 3.2: Support.  Proposal 3.3: Support. More layer splitting flexibility can be obtained by using 2Tx precoder.  Proposal 3.4: We can deprioritize it before we have an agreement on Proposal 3.3. |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 3.1: There is no much difference between Option 1 and Option 2. Option 3 provides most flexibility. However, it is still not quite clear about the payload size of various options. We can keep these options open to check the TPMI payload size to determine the performance of these options.  Proposal 3.2: The key issue related to the layer splitting is to identify overall the payload size for the precoder indication. However, given various types of layer splitting, it is still not clear how much payload each selection would be and how much impact on the payload size. We probably need a complete design on precoder indication. Simply picking some layer splitting won’t help much. Do not support.  Proposal 3.3: Okay with this design.  Proposal 3.4: Similar to 3.2, the payload size of such layer splitting among groups is still missing. We can further discuss on the details of the design. |
| QC2 | We have an additional comment on proposal 3.2. Similar to Intel, we are not sure what’s the motivation to have the CW mapping to antenna group, i.e., “**where for rank>4, each CW is mapped to only one antenna group.**”? So we don’t support this part in the proposal as well.  By the way, isn’t this discussion already happening in DMRS FL summary? We are not sure we need duplicate the discussion here. |
| LG | Proposal 3.1: Option 3 is preferred. We don’t understand how Option 2 works. Can proponent explain more?  Proposal 3.2: Agree with Intel, CW mapping text should be removed.  Proposal 3.3: Support  Proposal 3.4: Agree with QC, (1,1,1,1) is one of the balanced option. |
| Sharp | 3.1: It is not clear what each option means. We support option 3 if it means to indicate two TPMI indexes.  3.2: There is no reason to limit the rank combinations if the number of required bits remains the same: the number of PMI candidates corresponding to all rank combinations for Ng=2 is 960, and the number of PMI candidates corresponding to rank combinations for Proposal 3.2 is 736.  If the number of bits is reduced by eliminating certain PMI candidates, the PMI candidates to be removed should be clearly stated.  3.3/4: Agree with OPPO. |
| Apple | P3.1: we support Option 3.  Option 1 and 2 need clarification.  For Option 1, it is not clear whether the single TPMI is a 4Tx TPMI or a 8Tx TPMI for the joint indication of two 4Tx precoders.  For Option 2, it is not clear how the second precoder is derived.  P3.2: it is not clear to us why only the combinations with balanced layer splitting should be supported. When the antenna configurations were discussed earlier, companies mentioned that different antenna groups may be located in different places on the UE and/or face different directions. This means the number of layers that can be supported by each group can be quite different, which justifies the support of all the combinations, including the unbalanced one. E.g. one antenna group may have very weak signal.  From overhead perspective, even with the restricted layer splitting, still 10 bits are required, and we do not see the benefit of overhead reduction either.  In addition, it is not clear to us why each CW is mapped to only one antenna group. (1) For rank <=4, only 1 codeword is supported, and layers may be split between two antenna groups already. So why the restriction for rank > 4? (2) we think the proposal also contradicts the previous agreement to reuse DL Rel-15 codeword to layer mapping. For example, for rank = 5, the 1st codeword is mapped to the first 2 layers, and the 2nd codeword is mapped to the remaining 3 layers. It is not possible to support both (2, 3) and (3, 2) split.  P3.3: we support the proposal.  P3.4: it is not clear to us how the rationale behind the proposed layer combinations. We should also put it in the context of DCI overhead, because the whole purpose of the restriction is overhead reduction. So far we do not know whether/how much overhead this can save. |
| CMCC | Proposal 3.1: Support Option 2. Option 1 has strong restriction that two antenna groups will use the same precoders. Option 3 will increase the TPMI indication overhead. One way for Option 2 is that one 4TX full-coherent precoding matrix and an additional phase offset are indicated to UE for generating 8 TX codebook .  Proposal 3.2: Support. It is possible that one of the antenna groups is blocked or with worse channel condition, then the left column to support all layers in one antenna group could be supported.  Proposal 3.3: Support.  Proposal 3.4: Not support. For rank 3-7, both group selection candidates and group balanced candidates should be considered. |
| Samsung | Proposal 3.1: support. Assuming a TPMI in these options means a Rel.15 4Tx FC TPMI, we also think Option 1 is too restrictive, if it means the same precoding is applied to both groups. Our understanding about Option 2 is as follows. For rank 2, suppose rank 2 TPMI 14, i.e, is indicated, then   * (0,2), (2,0) case: the indicated precoder us applied to the group with 2 layers * (1,1): a layer for each group is selected from the indicated two layers. If x1 and x2 denote layer indices selected from the indicated 2 layers for group 1 and 2 respectively, then (x1,x2) can be (1,1), (1,2), (2,1), (2,2).   Re Option 3: based on our simulation results, we don’t need to support all possible combinations of 8Tx precoders constructed based on 4Tx FC precoders. We can achieve similar performance with a much smaller codebook (e.g. 4-5 times less codebook size).  Proposal 3.2:   * Support, but “**where for rank>4, each CW is mapped to only one antenna group.**” Is not needed and should be removed, * Re (2,3) vs (3,2), there is no reason only support (2,3) and not (3,2). We think both should be supported. The comment for other similar combinations. * Similar to Nokia, we also think we don’t to consider all layer combinations for TPMI indication. Otherwise, the overhead can be too much. A possible simplification can be as described below. * In our view, we can design the codebook using a dummy notation (Lx,Ly), where (x,y) = (1,2) or (2,1) is the order according to which the layers are formed and applied at the two groups. For example: if (Lx,Ly)=(1,2), and (x,y)=(1,2), then 1 layer is applied to group 1 and 2 layers to group 2; else, 2 layers are applied to group 1 and 1 layer to group 2. * So, we can delete the following 6 highlighted combinations. * Finally, whether (x,y) needs indication can be discussed.   ***Proposal 3.2:* For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, Ng=2,**   * **Following combinations of layer splitting (Lx,Ly) are supported~~, where for rank>4, each CW is mapped to only one antenna group.~~** * **(x,y) = (1,2) or (2,1)**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | | 2 | (2,0)~~, (0,2)~~ |  | | 2 |  | (1,1) | | 3 | (3,0)~~, (0,3)~~ |  | | 3 |  | (2,1)~~, (1,2)~~ | | 4 | (4,0)~~, (0,4)~~ |  | | 4 |  | (2,2) | | 5 |  | ~~(2,3),~~ (3,2) | | 6 |  | (3,3) | | 7 |  | (4,3)~~, (3,4)~~ |   Proposal 3.3   * Do not support, there are too many possible layer combinations if 2Tx CB is used. Implying the codebook size will be too large, and codebook pruning will be necessary. * Rel. 15 4Tx PC precoder based design can a way to prune the codebook since 4Tx PC precoders are based on 2Tx precoders, and also, the TPMI indication can be the same as Ng=2 case, hence we can avoid two separate TPMI indication mechanisms for Ng=2 and 4.   Proposal 3.4: same comment as Ng=2 case. We can focus on the following layer combinations, and the ordering, e.g., (x,y,u,v) (1,2,3,4), (1,2,4,3), and so on (24 possible orderings) can be discussed separately.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | **Layers split across 3 Antenna Groups** | **Layers split across 4 Antenna Groups** | | 1 | (1,0,0,0) |  |  |  | | 2 | (2,0,0,0) | (1,1,0,0) |  |  | | 3 |  | (2,1,0,0) | (1,1,1,0) |  | | 4 |  | (2,2,0,0) | (2,1,1,0) | (1,1,1,1) | | 5 |  |  | (2,2,1,0) | (1,1,1,1) | | 6 |  |  | (2,2,2,0) | (2,2,1,1) | | 7 |  |  |  | (2,2,2,1) | | 8 |  |  |  | (2,2,2,2) | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For Proposal 3.1, we support option 3. Option 1 will need to generate a new precoding matrix tables with large number of candidates for different layers, leading to heavy spec effort. By contrast, option 3 reuse legacy precoding matrix tables, and it can be expected to have the same performance and overhead with option 1. For option 2, how to derive the second TPMI is not clear to us, if directly use the first precoder to second antenna group, then there may be performance loss.  For Proposal 3.2, we don’t support. We prefer to support all layer splitting cases to accommodate various channel qualities. It is strongly possible that two antenna port groups have different channel qualities. When they have similar channel quality, balanced layer splitting is most likely preferred. When the channel quality of one antenna group is better than another antenna group, unbalanced layer splitting is most likely preferred. When the channel quality of one antenna group is extremely bad, group selected layer splitting is most likely preferred.  In addition, from our calculation, there’s no DCI bit saved from current proposal. With full flexibility on layer splitting, about 10 bits are needed. And with the layer splitting in proposal 3.2, we still need 10 bits, although a lot of reserved states are there.  For Proposal 3.3, not support. Based our simulation, Alt2 based on UL Rel-15 2TX fully coherent codebook has very marginal performance gain than Alt 1 based on UL Rel-15 4TX partially coherent codebook, but leads to 3 bits more indication overhead. In addition, there are too many layer splitting cases to be considered, which may lead to heavy spec effort. We suggest to discuss Ng =2 firstly, and then reuse it to Ng=4 as much as possible to speed up 8TX process.  For Proposal 3.4, we suggest to delay the discussion of it. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 3.1: Prefer option3 and suggest to consider a unified solution for TPMI after the codebook design.  Proposal 3.2: Support.  Proposal 3.3: Support.  Proposal 3.4: this proposal misses some candidates and requires more discussion after proposal 3.3. |
| Ericsson | **P3.1**: Support, prefer Option 1.  **P3.2:** A good direction, but the number of layer combinations seems too high. We think a single rank split is enough for ranks 5 & 7, as this will save 40 precoders and maintain the same performance.  **P3.3**: Support. Again, our findings are that basing the design on 2 Tx performs better than basing it on 4 Tx.  **P3.4**: Would like clarification on the performance and on the notation of the proposal:   * Sorry, but I don’t understand the notation here. For us, the notation means: , where is the rank of the 2 Tx precoder that applies to 2 of the 8 ports. So for example the rank 8 case with (2, 2, 2, 2) corresponds to ‘Layers split across 4 antenna groups’, not 2 antenna groups. Another possibility would be to say ‘Layers per antenna group’, rather than ‘Layers split across 4 antenna groups’ for clarity. * Regarding the design principle for the layer split, rank 3 with one layer per group is excluded. While we understand that concentrating layers in a group (e.g. for rank 3 using (2,1,0,0) instead of (1,1,1,0)) can be beneficial, e.g. to reduce interference in the case of directional antennas, having more groups can allow more power from more Tx chains and more coherent combining gain (within a group). So we prefer to also have cases with more than two groups active for ranks > 2. Overall our proposal for Ng=4 is:  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | **Layers split across 3 Antenna Groups** | **Layers split across 4 Antenna Groups** | | 1 | (1,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0), (0,0,1,0), (0,0,0,1) |  |  |  | | 2 | (2,0,0,0), (0,2,0,0), (0,0,2,0), (0,0,0,2) |  |  |  | | 2 |  | (1,1,0,0), (1,0,1,0), (1,0,0,1), (0,1,1,0),  (0,1,0,1), (0,0,1,1) |  |  | | 3 |  | (2,1,0,0), (2,0,1,0), (2,0,0,1), (0,2,1,0), (0,2,0,1), (0,0,2,1), (1,2,0,0), (1,0,2,0), (1,0,0,2), (0,1,2,0), (0,1,0,2), (0,0,1,2) |  |  | | 3 |  |  | (1,1,1,0), (1,1,0,1), (1,0,1,1), (0,1,1,1) |  | | 4 |  | (2,2,0,0), (2,0,2,0), (2,0,0,2), (0,2,2,0), (0,2,0,2), (0,0,2,2) |  |  | | 4 |  |  |  | (1,1,1,1) | | 5 |  |  | (2,0,2,1), (0,2,1,2) |  | | 5 |  |  |  | (1,1,2,1), (1,1,1,2) | | 6 |  |  |  | (2,1,2,1), (1,2,1,2) | | 7 |  |  |  | (2,1,2,2), (1,2,2,2) | | 8 |  |  |  | (2,2,2,2) | |
| IDC | Proposal 3.1: Based on looking at comments from CMCC and Samsung, we tend to agree that Option 2 may be superior than Option 1, as Option 1 is just forcing to use the same 4Tx FC precoder for both antenna groups. So, it would be good that we may further discuss over Options 2 and 3.  Proposal 3.2/3.3/3.4: OK |
| **FL:**  **Updated proposals for Round2** | ***Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.*  *Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *Option 1 – A single TPMI is indicated and applied on both antenna groups* * *Option 2 – A single TPMI is indicated, from which a second precoder is derived for the second antenna group* * *Option 3 – Up to two TPMIs are indicated, where the first is applied on the first antenna group, and the second is applied on the second antenna group*   ***Proposal 3.3:***  ***Version A -*** For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4, Alt1 is supported where   * Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook,   + Full-coherent precoders are used   ***~~Version B -~~*** ~~For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4, Alt2 is supported where~~   * ~~Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook,~~   + ~~Partial-coherent precoders are used~~   **2TX-based:** Google, NTT, NEC, CATT, ZTE, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Intel, Xiaomi, Nokia, LG, Apple, CMCC, Ericsson, IDC  **4TX-based:** OPPO, Sharp, Samsung, Huawei  ***Proposal 3.4a:***  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,   * Following rank and layer splitting cases are supported, * FFS whether all permutations are needed  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Rank | All layers in one Antenna Group | Layers split across 4 Antenna Groups | | 1 | (1,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0), (0,0,0,1) |  | | 2 | (2,0,0,0), (0,2,0,0), (0,0,2,0), (0,0,0,2) |  | | 4 |  | (1,1,1,1) | | 7 |  | (2,2,2,1), (2,2,1,2), (2,1,2,2), (1,2,2,2) | | 8 |  | (2, 2, 2, 2) |   *Note: Above is not relevant to how precoders are indicated.*  ***Proposal 3.4b:***  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,   * Select from the following cases based on the performance and overall DCI overhead * FFS whether all permutations are needed  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Rank | All layers in one Antenna Group | Layers split across 4 Antenna Groups | | 2 |  | Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:  (1,1,0,0), (1,0,1,0), (1,0,0,1)  (0,1,1,0), (0,1,0,1), (0,0,1,1) | | 3 |  | Transmission by 2 of the 4  antenna groups:  (2,1,0,0), (2,0,1,0), (2,0,0,1)  (1,2,0,0), (0,2,1,0), (0,2,0,1)  (1,0,2,0), (0,1,2,0), (0,0,2,1)  (1,0,0,2), (0,1,0,2), (0,0,1,2)  Transmission by 3 of the 4  antenna groups:  (1,1,1,0), (1,1,0,1), (1,0,1,1), (0,1,1,1) | | 4 |  | Transmission by 2 of  the 4  antenna groups:  (2,2,0,0), (2,0,2,0), (2,0,0,2)  (0,2,2,0), (0,2,0,2), (0,0,2,2) | | 5 |  | Transmission by 3 of the antenna groups:  (2,2,1,0), (2,2,0,1), (2,1,2,0), (2,1,0,2), (2,0,1,2), (2,0,2,1), (0,2,2,1), (0,2,1,2), (1,2,2,0), (1,2,0,2)  (0,1,2,2), (1,0,2,2)  Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:  (1,1,2,1), (1,1,1,2) | | 6 |  | Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:  (2,2,2,0), (2,2,0,2), (2,0,2,2), (0,2,2,2)  Transmission by four antenna groups:  (2,1,2,1), (1,2,1,2) |   *Note: Above is not relevant to how precoders are indicated.*  ***Proposal 3.5:***  For non-coherent uplink precoding with rank≤8 by an 8TX UE,  Alt1. – All 255 combinations of non-coherent rank1 precoders are supported  Alt2. – Only a subset of Alt1. is supported |
| Apple | P3.1: the same comment as in the previous round, that Option 1 and 2 need clarification. We are not against listing the options, but we need to be clear what each option means.  For Option 1, it is not clear whether the single TPMI is a 4Tx TPMI or a 8Tx TPMI for the joint indication of two 4Tx precoders. It seems that companies have different interpretation based on the comments.  For Option 2, it is not clear how the second precoder is derived. If it is the same precoder, it is too restrictive, as commented by many other companies. If it is like what CMCC suggested, it should not really make a difference whether to have a phase offset or not. The two antenna groups are non-coherent, and applying a phase offset to a precoder does not change anything.  Maybe some suggestion to see if we can clarify it further:  ***Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.*  *Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *Option 1A – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated and applied on both antenna groups* * *Option 1B – A single TPMI is indicated, which is mapped to two 4TX TPMI, applied to two antenna groups respectively.* * *Option 2 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated, which is used for the first antenna group, and a second precoder is derived for the second antenna group based on the indicated TPMI.*   + *FFS: how to derive the second precoder [From Apple perspective, we would like to know the possible options before agreeing to such an option. It would be great if proponents can clarify.]* * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated, where the first is applied on the first antenna group, and the second is applied on the second antenna group*   P3.3: OK  P3.4a: we think this should be a working assumption, similar to what we have for Ng=2.  Regarding “*FFS whether all permutations are needed*”, does it refer to the entries in the table? If yes, it is a bit confusing. I would suggest we put the permutations to be discussed further in brackets to be clear.  For rank 2, I wonder why we do not have layer split of (1, .., 1, ..) at all. I thought we are trying to support balanced split, and this is deviating from that principle. I feel we are not being consistent.  P3.4b: at this stage, we should include all the permutations in the table. We will do down-selection anyway. As commented above, we think the entries for rank 2 should be moved to P3.4a.  P3.5: is there a typo in Alt 1? Should it say “non-coherent precoders up to rank 8” instead of “non-coherent rank1 precoders”? If this is the intention, we are fine with the proposal in principle. |
| vivo | Proposal 3.1: support option 3,  Proposal 3.3: do not support, using 4Tx partialcoherent precoders for Ng=4 is simple solution, can be commonly designed, codebook subset restriction can be considered for further overhead reduction.  Proposal 3.4b could be starting point for discussion. If we can agree on 4Tx partial coherent precoders for Ng=4, we don’t need to discuss this issue.  Proposal 3.5: support alt1 |
| FL | @Apple: Thanks for your questions.  Proposal 3.1: In the first sentence, it is already says “… *full-coherent 4TX precoders”*, therefore, there was no need to say “4TX TPMI”. I can add this for further clarification, but it really doesn’t need it.  Proposal 3.4a: The case of your interest for rank2 is in Proposal 3.4b. For 3.4a, I only included the “super obvious” cases, it doesn’t mean that cases in 3.4b are less important.  Proposal 3.5: No, it is not a typo. In the last meeting, we agreed on NC rank1 precoders, here I am just referring to them that how they can be used to construct precoders for other ranks.  ***Updated Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.*  *Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *Option 1 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated and applied on both antenna groups* * *Option 2 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated, which is used for the first antenna group, and a second precoder is derived for the second antenna group based on the indicated TPMI.*   + *FFS: how to derive the second precoder* * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated, where the first is applied on the first antenna group, and the second is applied on the second antenna group* |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 3.1: As commented by some companies, a single 8TX TPMI indication should be one of the options. And before codebook design is finished, we’re not sure if there is other simple and clear indication method. Thus, we also suggest adding: other options are not precluded. The suggested update is as follows.   * *Option 4 – A single 8TX TPMI is indicated* * *Other options are not precluded*   Proposal 3.3: support  Proposal 3.4a/b: generally we agree with Apple’s comment on ‘include all the permutations in the table, put the permutations to be discussed further in brackets’. Then it is clear which permutations are agreeable and which are to be further determined.  Proposal 3.5: we have similar question as Apple and we see the reply from FL. Then we suggest following revision on Alt1. And we support Alt1 if non-nested codebook subset configuration is supported.  Alt1. – All 255 non-coherent precoders up to rank 8 are supported, where the precoders for rank 2~8 are combinations of non-coherent rank1 precoders |
| Google | Proposal 3.1: We think this still needs more discussion. It depends on the codebook design. If we define the codebook with precoders to cover all the functionalities of option 2 and 3, we only need option 1. Maybe one way is to list all possible options for codebook designs and the TPMI indications. Based on the existing agreement for non-coherent and full-coherent precoders, it seems option 1 is the only way.  Proposal 3.3: Support version A.  Proposal 3.4a: Support.  Proposal 3.4b: Why is there no precoders with all layers in one antenna group for rank 2 case?  Proposal 3.5: OK with Docomo’s revision. |
| Sharp | P3.1: Support option 3.  P3.3/4: We prefer Version B for the reduction of TPMI overhead. On the other hand, we can accept Version A for the sake of progress in the discussion, as we understand that 2TX-based shows higher performance when each antenna group is composed of directional antennas. However, if Version A is adopted, we support to determine the layer splitting based on the assumption that the performance will not be degraded.  P3.5: Support Alt1. |
| FGI | Proposal 3.1: Option 3 is generally supported. We also agree with NTT DOCOMO’s comment for this proposal. Two TPMIs associated with full-coherent 4TX precoders may be indicated according to option 3, but how to indicate these two TPMIs to the 8TX UE still has more discussion.  Proposal 3.3: Support.  Proposal 3.5: Support. |
| QC | Proposal 3.1: Proposal 3.1: Support option 3, which is the most straightforward solution. Option 1 is not clear. Does it mean single TPMI indicate an 8 Tx precoder or a single TPMI indicate a 4 Tx precoder and the same precoder is applied to both antenna groups? We don’t support option 2 neither, before it is clarified how to derive the precoder for the second antenna group.  Proposal 3.3: support.  Proposal 3.4a: support.  Proposal 3.4b: we are fine with it in general. But it might need more discussion whether all combinations are supported.  Proposal 3.5: we support Alt 1. |
| Samsung | Updated Proposal 3.1   * For Option2: we are not sure the indicated 4Tx TPMI needs to be applied to 1st group always. For instance, for (1,1) layer split, a rank 2 4Tx TPMI is indicated and a layer for each group is selected from the indicated two layers. If x1 and x2 denote layer indices selected from the indicated 2 layers for group 1 and 2 respectively, then (x1,x2) can be (1,1), (1,2), (2,1), (2,2). So, we suggest to add this option also (Option2A below). * Option 3: Since up to 2 means 1 or 2, for the case 1 TPMI, the TPMI can be applied to first or the second, which one needs to be indicated.   ***Updated Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.*  *Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *Option 1 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated and applied on both antenna groups* * *Option 2 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated, which is used for the first antenna group, and a second precoder is derived for the second antenna group based on the indicated TPMI.*   + *FFS: how to derive the second precoder* * *Option 2A – For rank r > 1, A single rank r 4TX TPMI is indicated, and out of layers are used for the -th group, when , the layers are orthogonal.* * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated, where when two 4Tx TPMIs are indicated, the first is applied on the first antenna group, and the second is applied on the second antenna group; and when one TPMI is indicated, the TPMI is applied to one of the two groups, which one group is indicated.*   Proposal 3.3 Version A: what is the TPMI overhead if we used 2Tx FC precoders? We can be OK for progress, but we need to limit the TPMI payload to 7 bits at most.  Proposal 3.4a: we prefer to consider the layer splitting case together, in order to ensure that the TPMI payload is not too much; hence can support the following for now.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 1 | (1,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0), (0,0,0,1) | | 2 | (2,0,0,0), (0,2,0,0), (0,0,2,0), (0,0,0,2) |   Proposal 3.4b: Ok, but we have far too many combinations, not sure, we will be able to provide simulation results comparing all of them in <3 weeks (next meeting). Our suggestion is to de-prioritize “Transmission by 3 of the 4  antenna groups:” Also, some of the combinations for rank 5-6 are missing, added then in below.  ***Proposal 3.4b:***  *For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,*   * *Select from the following cases based on the performance and overall DCI overhead* * *FFS whether all permutations are needed*  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Rank | All layers in one Antenna Group | Layers split across 4 Antenna Groups | | 2 |  | Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:  (1,1,0,0), (1,0,1,0), (1,0,0,1)  (0,1,1,0), (0,1,0,1), (0,0,1,1) | | 3 |  | Transmission by 2 of the 4  antenna groups:  (2,1,0,0), (2,0,1,0), (2,0,0,1)  (1,2,0,0), (0,2,1,0), (0,2,0,1)  (1,0,2,0), (0,1,2,0), (0,0,2,1)  (1,0,0,2), (0,1,0,2), (0,0,1,2)    Lower priority: Transmission by 3 of the 4  antenna groups:  (1,1,1,0), (1,1,0,1), (1,0,1,1), (0,1,1,1) | | 4 |  | Transmission by 2 of  the 4  antenna groups:  (2,2,0,0), (2,0,2,0), (2,0,0,2)  (0,2,2,0), (0,2,0,2), (0,0,2,2) | | 5 |  | Lower priority: Transmission by 3 of the antenna groups:  (2,2,1,0), (2,2,0,1), (2,1,2,0), (2,1,0,2), (2,0,1,2), (2,0,2,1), (0,2,2,1), (0,2,1,2), (1,2,2,0), (1,2,0,2)  (0,1,2,2), (1,0,2,2)    Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:  (1,1,2,1), (1,1,1,2), (2,1,1,1),(1,2,1,1) | | 6 |  | Lower priority: Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:  (2,2,2,0), (2,2,0,2), (2,0,2,2), (0,2,2,2)    Transmission by four antenna groups:  (2,1,2,1), (1,2,1,2), (2,2,1,1), (1,2,2,1),(1,1,2,2),(2,1,1,2) | |
| Lenovo | Proposal 3.1: We like some clarifications on the updated proposal:   * Option 1: After the update, we do not think Option 1 works. It seems a same 4TX precoder is applied to both antenna groups. It cannot cover layer splitting scheme such as (2,0) and (0,2). If the intention is to cover (1,1), using the identical precoder in the two groups to send different data stream is not a good idea, at least it is to restrictive for the gNB to choose the proper precoder. * Option 2: Does it mean only the TPMI for the first antenna group is signalled, and the second TPMI for the second antenna group is implicitly derived from the first TPMI? If the second TPMI is not signalled at all, we do not think it is sufficient. It is more reasonable to signal the first TPMI in full, and how the second TPMI is signalled/interpreted depends on the first TPMI. We suggest to a rewording of Option 2:   *Option 2: A first 4TX TPMI is indicated, which is used for the first antenna group, and a second precoder is indicated for the second antenna group and interpreted based on the first TPMI.*  *FFS: how to interpret the second precoder.*   * Option 3: We understand this one. * We agree with DOCOMO that an option 4 should be added, and other options are not precluded.   Proposal 3.3: Support Version A.  Proposal 3.4a/3.4b: We think more evaluation is needed. Preferably some down selection can be done to reduce the TPMI overhead to less than 10 bits.  Proposal 3.5: We support Alt 1. |
| ZTE | **Proposal 3.1**: Prefer option 3. Option 1 is too restrictive. Option 2 is not clear on how to derive the second precoder.  **Proposal 3.3**: Support.  **Proposal 3.4a**: We can support 3.4a, and we also agree with Apple that the group balanced splitting in 3.4b for rank 2 should be moved to 3.4a.  **Proposal 3.4b**: for rank 5, the following combination should be added in the case of Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:  (1,1,2,1), (1,1,1,2), (2,1,1,1), (1,2,1,1)  We are generally fine with the proposal.  **Proposal 3.5**: Support Alt 2 in principle. We don’t think we need to support all 255 port selection combinations for non coherent codebook for 8Tx.  Considering UE antenna layout, some ports are more relevant than with other ports. E.g., port 0 and port 4 are more relevant if we assume (0,4), (1,5), (2,6), (3,7) are cross polarization pairs, or ports (0,4) and ports (1,5) (or ports (0,4) and ports (2,6) ) are more relevant if we assume they are close in physical distance.  For instance, we can reduce the candidates by using the above assumptions as follows:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | rank | Ports selection | | 1 | **8**: (0), (4), (1), (5), (2), (6), (3), (7) | | 2 | **7**: (0,4), (1,5), (2,6), (3,7), (4,1), (5,2), (6,3) | | 3 | **6**: (0,4,1), (1,5,2) (2,6,3), (4,1,5), (5,2,6), (6,3,7) | | 4 | **5**: (0,4,1,5), (1,5,2,6), (2,6,3,7), (4,1,5,2), (5,2,6,3) | | 5 | **4**: (0,4,1,5,2), (1,5,2,6,3), (4,1,5,2,6), (5,2,6,3,7) | | 6 | **3**: (0,4,1,5,2,6), (1,5,2,6,3,7), (4,1,5,2,6,3) | | 7 | **2**: (0,4,1,5,2,6,3), (4,1,5,2,6,3,7) | | 8 | **1**: (0,4,1,5,2,6,3,7) | | total | 8+7+...+1 = **36** | |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 3.1: Support option3.  Proposal 3.3: Support version A.  Proposal 3.4: Maybe a complete set containing all candidates for each rank can be a starting point for further discussion and down-selection.  Proposal 3.5: Support |
| LG Electronics | P3.1: Support option 3.  P3.3: Support version A.  P3.4a: Support.  P3.4b: Support.  P3.5: Support. Alt 1 is preferred which requires 8bits for indication. Btw, we are fine with DCM’s version. |
| CATT | **Proposal 3.1:**  As per the clarifications by FL, we do not support the proposal.  We prefer to delete the limitation of using full-coherent precoders only. The reason is the same as in the last round: As shown in our contribution (R1-2302686), for rank = 3, 8Tx precoders generated with full-coherent 4Tx precoder + partial-coherent 4Tx precoder slightly outperforms 8Tx precoders generated with two full-coherent 4Tx precoders, and can keep the constant modulus property. We prefer to consider 8Tx precoders generated with full-coherent 4Tx precoder + partial-coherent 4Tx precoder, partial-coherent 4Tx precoder + partial-coherent 4Tx precoder, and partial-coherent 4Tx precoder + non-coherent 4Tx precoder for rank 3, 5 and 7 respectively.  We agree with DOCOMO and Google that all options should be listed for more discussion. We prefer to the option 4 in DOCOMO’s suggestions.  Based on the above statements, following modified proposal is suggested:  ***Updated Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two ~~full-coherent~~ 4TX precoders.*  *Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *Option 1 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated and applied on both antenna groups* * *Option 2 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated, which is used for the first antenna group, and a second precoder is derived for the second antenna group based on the indicated TPMI.*   + *FFS: how to derive the second precoder* * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated, where the first is applied on the first antenna group, and the second is applied on the second antenna group* * *Option 4 – A single 8TX TPMI is indicated* * *Other options are not precluded*   **Proposal 3.3:** Same view as in the last round:  Support in principle with following modifications:  ***Proposal 3.3:***  ***Version A -* For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4, Alt1 is supported where**   * **Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook, at least:**   + **Full-coherent precoders are used**   It is our view that full-coherent precoders is essential and can be the baseline with Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook supported, while other precoders should not be excluded at this stage.  **Proposal 3.5:** Support. |
| Intel | *Proposal 3.1*  Option 1: Not sure whether it is correct option. For example, for rank-1, only one antenna group is used. But in Option 1, looks both antenna groups are always used. In addition, even for rank larger than 1, it is possible that all the layers are transmitted over one antenna group. For the layer splitting over both antenna groups, we don’t know how option 1 works. For example, for rank-3, it requires one 4Tx precoder with rank-1 and one 4Tx precoder with rank-2. Obviously, two 4Tx TPMIs are required.  Option 2: It’s confusing and require more clarification on how it works. With the explanation from Samsung, looks the layer splitting should be additionally signalled to the UE. Therefore, it is not preferred.  Option 3: Generally fine, but we think the number of TPMI fields should be discussed. It could be one TPMI field or two TPMI fields. If two TPMI fields are used, then each TPMI field could indicate one 4Tx precoder. If only one TPMI field is used, it could be split into two parts, each part indicates one 4Tx precoder, or the 4Tx precoder(s) could be jointly encoded.  We suggest the following update on Option 3:   * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated, where the first is applied on the first antenna group, and the second is applied on the second antenna group*   + *FFS: the number of TPMI fields, e.g., single TPMI field or two TPMI fields*   *Proposal 3.3*  Ok with Version A.  *Proposal 3.4*  We think the rows for Rank-2 and Rank-4 from Proposal 3.4a could be removed and put into the table of Proposal 3.4b for further discussion, similar with what have been done for the case of Ng=2.  In addition, in Proposal 3.4b, for Rank-4, we think it’s possible that 3 antenna groups are used, e.g., (2,1,1,0).  *Proposal 3.5*  Do not support at this stage.  In previous meeting, we only agreed the rank-1 precoders for non-coherent case. And there was no agreement yet regarding the non-coherent precoder structure for rank>1, i.e., whether it is based on antenna selection vector or it is based on Rel-15 4Tx non-coherent precoders.  We should reach agreement on the non-coherent precoder structure firstly before discussing Proposal 3.5.  In addition, the codebook subset configuration should be considered. If the non-coherent precoders could be included in the partial coherent codebook subset, then a unified design is better, i.e., based on Rel-15 4Tx non-coherent precoders. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 3.1:** we believe TPMI can be discussed after finalizing codebook design. We are ok with modified proposal by CATT as it does not preclude any possibility. But the final down-selection needs to be done after codebook design completion.  **Proposal 3.3:** Support.  **Proposal 3.4a:** Support.  **Proposal 3.4b:** Support  **Proposal 3.5:** Support, we prefer Alt 1. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 3.1: For Option 1, there is no need to restrict the precoder for the second antenna group. For Option 3, we think indication of two TPMIs result in high signalling overhead. We support the Option 4 proposed by DOCOMO, i.e., joint indication of TRI and TPMI for 8Tx codebook.  Proposal 3.3: Support Version A.  Proposal 3.4a and 3.4b: OK to discuss.  Proposal 3.5: We prefer Alt2. |
| CMCC | Proposal 3.1: Support Option 2. Option 1 is not applicable to antenna group selection transmission, such as the layer splitting of {2,0}. The TPMI overhead of Option 3 may be large than Option 2.  Proposal 3.3: Support Version A.  Proposal 3.4a: Support.  Proposal 3.4b: Further discussion is needed.  Proposal 3.5: Support Alt2. |
| IDC | Proposal 3.1: Option 1 is too restrictive. We suggest Option 2 and Option 3 for further discussions. Regarding Option 2, Lenovo’s update sounds also okay to us.  Proposal 3.3: Support Version A  Proposal 3.4a: Support  Proposal 3.4b: Support  Proposal 3.5: Support Alt2. |
| Ericsson | **Updated P3.1**: Prefer DOCOMO’s option 4 (A single 8TX TPMI is indicated); also OK to have ‘others not precluded’, since we really should discuss TPMI after the codebook design is done. For the revised (and original?) option 1, it seems that an identical precoder is applied to both groups; as others have commented this may not have good performance. Similarly, for option 2, limiting the indication to one 4 TX TPMI constrains the number of precoders and this should impact performance. For option 3, the overhead is double that of 4 Tx. Also, it’s unclear how e.g. rank 1 works : if a single 4 Tx precoder is applied, are only half the Tx chains active?  **P3.3**: Support, for the reasons given earlier.  **P3.4**: P3.4a is almost OK. But we wonder why rank 7 is included here. This includes all possibilities, which is unneeded in our view (we think [(2,1,2,2), (1,2,2,2)] is enough). We suggest that rank 7 be moved to the table in P3.4b. Given that change we can support.  **P3.5:** Support, prefer Alt 2. We find that e.g. 32 precoders performs as well as 255, and so there is quite some potential for DCI overhead savings. |
| OPPO | Proposal 3.1: We also think Option 1 is too restrictive and would degrade the performance.  Proposal 3.3: Support Version B  Proposal 3.4a: Fine.  Proposal 3.4b: There are too many candidate combinations in this proposal and the overhead should be considered. We should restrict the signaling overhead to be no more than that of Version B in proposal 3.3, otherwise 4Tx partial coherent codebook should be a better choice.  Proposal 3.5: Support Alt2. We think full set cannot provide better performance. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 3.1：support option 3. The option 1 and option 2 are too restrictive.  Proposal 3.3：not support. As we commented in the first round, Alt2 based on 2TX requires 3 bits more indication overhead, but has very marginal gains than Alt 1 based on 4TX. We think solid comparison of performance and overhead is needed before making decision.  Proposal 3.4a and 3.4b: not support at this stage. We agree with Lenovo and Spreadtrum that more evaluation is needed on the saved DCI size and performance, and a complete set can be a starting point.  Proposal 3.5：support Alt 2. We think it is not essential to support all precoders for non-coherent UE. |
| Samsung | Proposal 3.1: sorry the previous wording was incorrect; the main goal here is to reduce overhead based on orthogonal 4Tx TPMIs, and achieve good UPT performance. Please see the table, and the corresponding Option2A.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Rank (r) | Orthogonal 4Tx rank r FC TPMIs | 8Tx layers split | | 2 | (14,18), (15,19), (16,20), (17,21) 🡪 each pair corresponds to 4 orthogonal 4Tx precoders | (1,1):   * 4 choose 1 (same) * 4 choose 2 (different) | | 3 | (3,5), (4,6) 🡪 each pair corresponds to 4 orthogonal 4Tx precoders | (2,1), (1,2)   * 2 layers: 4 choose 2 * 1 layer: remaining 2 choose 1 | | 4 | 3,4 🡪 each corresponds to 4 orthogonal 4Tx precoders | (2,2)   * 4 choose 2 * Remaining 2 choose 2, or 1 of corresponding rank 2 TPMIs | | 5-8 | Based on rank 4 TPMI  3,4 🡪 each corresponds to 4 orthogonal 4Tx precoders | Similar as above |  * *Option 2A – For rank r > 1, rank r 4TX FC TPMIs, providing 4 orthogonal layers, are used*    + *(: 4 choose 1 (same precoder) + 4 choose 2 (different precoders)*   + *: (assuming ), choose layers for group 1*      - *Ex1: remaining (4-) choose for group 2*     - *Ex2: 1 of the corresponding orthogonal rank 4Tx TPMIs*   Proposal 3.5: we also support Alt2 since full flexibility is not needed (they don’t bring much gain) for higher rank. Similar to E///, we also think a total of 32 should be sufficient. Re ZTE’s proposal, it seems that the basis design principle is “for rank >1, the selected ports are uniformly space, e.g. , where is the spacing”. This can be one good candidate for Alt2. So, suggest to include it as an example  ***Proposal 3.5:***  For non-coherent uplink precoding with rank≤8 by an 8TX UE,  Alt1. – All 255 combinations of non-coherent rank1 precoders are supported  Alt2. – Only a subset of Alt1. is supported   * Ex: for rank , uniformly spaced ports ( |
| vivo | On proposal 3.3, our concern is related the proposal 3.4 where discussion on layer split is complicated already. If we take higher rank, say rank=7, combination of layer split is one thing to agree and then further discuss is needed whether subset or all of FC 2Tx rank=1 and rank=2 precoders are supported. This will explode the possible combinations and codebook size. In general number of precoders are less of higher rank, for example rank>4 where 2nd CW is enabled not many precoders are needed. If we use 4Tx partial coherent rank=2,3 and 4 precoders to construct 8Tx precoders for rank=5,6,7,8, we already know how many precoder are there.  On proposal 3.4, a and b, discussion is just getting complicated. We don’t see how we can converge on a set of combination at this point.  On proposal 3.5, revision of alt1 by DOCOMO is not needed.f |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 3.1: Support Option 3 because of its flexibility. For arguments of the overhead cost, please provide details of overhead, in terms of the number of bits to facilitate the discussion.  Proposal 3.3: Either A or B is good for us.  Proposal 3.4a/3.4b: Either proposal is not a complete design. However, we may start with 3.4a with “at least Following rank and layer splitting cases are supported,.. ”, as a working assumption. More rows with split can be added later when overall design becomes agreeable.  Proposal 3.5: Support Alt2 to simplify the design. |
| NEC | Proposal 3.1: We share similar view with some companies, and we also support to add option 4 by DoCoMo.  Proposal 3.3: Support |
| FL | **Please provide your inputs for the following updated proposals:**  ***Updated Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.*  *Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *~~Option 1 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated and applied on both antenna groups~~* * *~~Option 2 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated, which is used for the first antenna group, and a second precoder is derived for the second antenna group based on the indicated TPMI.~~*   + *~~FFS: how to derive the second precoder~~* * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated,*    + *When two TMPIs are indicated, the first is applied on one of antenna group, and the second is applied on the other antenna group,*   + *When one TPMI is indicated, the TPMI is applied to one of the two groups; which one group is indicated* * *Option 4 – A single 8TX TPMI is indicated* * *Other options are not precluded*   ***Updated Proposal 3.5:*** *For non-coherent uplink precoding with rank≤8 by an 8TX UE,*   * Alt1. – All 255 combinations of non-coherent rank1 precoders are supported * Alt2. – Only a subset of Alt1. is supported   + Example (ZTE, Samsung): For the shown antenna set up, NC precoders can be defined as follows,      |  |  | | --- | --- | | *rank* | *Ports selection* | | *1* | ***8****: (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h)* | | *2* | ***7****: (a, b), (c, d), (e, f), (g, h), (b, c), (d, e), (f, g)* | | *3* | ***6****: (a, b, c), (c, d, e) (e, f, g), (b, c, d), (d, e, f), (f, g, h)* | | *4* | ***5****: (a, b, c, d), (c, d, e, f), (e, f, g, h), (b, c, d, e), (d, e, f, g)* | | *5* | ***4****: (a, b, c, d, e), (c, d, e, f, g), (b, c, d, e, f), (d, e, f, g, h)* | | *6* | ***3****: (a, b, c, d, e, f), (c, d, e, f, g, h), (b, c, d, e, f, g)* | | *7* | ***2****: (a, b, c, d, e, f, g), (b, c, d, e, f, g, h)* | | *8* | ***1****: (a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h)* | | *total* | *8+7+...+1 =* ***36*** | |
| Samsung | Updated P 3.1:   * if this proposal is only about TPMI indication, we are OK, but then it should be discussed in Section 6, not here. * If we are discussing codebook design (precoders for rank 1-8), then we can’t support this since it implies all of Rel.15 4Tx FC precoders are included in the codebook design for Ng=2. Based on our simulations, we don’t see any need for supporting all.   Updated P3.5: OK  **@Samsung: Yes, Proposal 3.1 is only for TPMI indication.** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 3.1:   * One thing we agree with SS is that we do not need to include all the R15 4TX FC precoders for Ng=2. For example, for layer split case of (1,1), if all the 16 4TX FC precoders are considered without any restriction, there will be 16\*16=256 precoders for this specific case, which we think is not needed. Some further restriction on R15 4TX FC precoders selection can be considered.   Proposal 3.1:   * We are not objecting Alt2 to select a subset of precoders. But on how to do down-selection, it should be FFS. We’re not sure if the specific example is a good candidate. |
| Apple | P3.1:  We are generally supportive of the updated proposal, but we are a little bit concerned about the added bullet under Alt 3. This is about the actual signaling field in the DCI, “*which one group is indicated*” seems to imply that we may have an additional bit to indicate the group. Can we replace this bullet with “FFS: details for indicating the TPMI when only one antenna group is used”.  I also wonder if we have “down-select” in main bullet now, does it still make sense to have “other options are not precluded”? These two are contradictory to each other in some sense, and we should be clear which way we want to go.  P3.5:  We are fine with listing two alternatives, but we prefer to remove the examples. |
| LG | Proposal 3.1: We are generally fine with the proposal. We also fine with Apple’s suggestion on the case where only one antenna group is used.  Proposal 3.5: We are fine with the proposal and have preference on Alt 1. For examples of Alt 2, what is the rationale of selecting particular port combination for rank = 2,3,4,5,6,7 ?, Therefore, we also prefer to remove the examples. |
| QC | P3.1: same comment as Apple. The meaning of “*When one TPMI is indicated, the TPMI is applied to one of the two groups; which one group is indicated*” is not clear. We suggest the following   * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated,*    + *When two TMPIs are indicated, the first is applied on one of antenna group, and the second is applied on the other antenna group,*   + *FFS: details of TPMI indicating when one TPMI is indicated.*   + *~~When one TPMI is indicated, the TPMI is applied to one of the two groups; which one group is indicated~~*   P3.5: we are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Proposal 3.1: We are generally fine with the updated proposal, but it should be discussed under section 6.  Proposal 3.5: Some questions for clarification: 1). Are both alternatives to be supported, or there will be a down selection in the following meetings; 2). The codeword combinations under Alt 2 are just example, (the exact combinations will be FFS), or are they being finalized in this proposal? |
| CATT | **Proposal 3.1:**  We do not support the current proposal. Same view as in the last round. As per the discussion reviewed, we fail to see the necessity to use full-coherent precoders only. Suggest the following modifications:  ***Updated Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two ~~full-coherent~~ 4TX precoders.*  *Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *~~Option 1 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated and applied on both antenna groups~~* * *~~Option 2 – A single 4TX TPMI is indicated, which is used for the first antenna group, and a second precoder is derived for the second antenna group based on the indicated TPMI.~~*   + *~~FFS: how to derive the second precoder~~* * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated,*    + *When two TMPIs are indicated, the first is applied on one of antenna group, and the second is applied on the other antenna group,*   + *When one TPMI is indicated, the TPMI is applied to one of the two groups; which one group is indicated* * *Option 4 – A single 8TX TPMI is indicated* * *Other options are not precluded*   **Proposal 3.5:**  Fine in principle. Further study is needed on which precoders are supported if only a subset of Alt1. is supported |
| vivo | P3.1, generally fine, also agree that further pruning of 4Tx precoders can be considered  P3.5, we don’t understand alt2, for non-codebook based PUSCH we have agreed to support all combinations. Non-coherent and non-codebook based operation is basically same. |
| ZTE | P3.1: In our views, when a single TPMI is indicated, the controversial part is how to disable another TPMI, where the mapping between one TPMI and respective antenna group should be fixed. We prefer to have general description for the “FFS” as mentioned by QC and Apple:   * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated,*    + *When two TMPIs are indicated, the first is applied on one of antenna group, and the second is applied on the other antenna group,*   + *FFS: details of how to disable another TPMI when a single TPMI is indicated.*   + *~~When one TPMI is indicated, the TPMI is applied to one of the two groups; which one group is indicated~~*   Proposal 3.5: Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Updated proposal 3.1: in general we are fine with it. Just when one TPMI is indicated, not sure whether the indication of which group is needed. E.g., there are reserved entries for each TPMI, when reserved entry is indicated, it means there’s no TPMI for this antenna group. Then no indication is needed.  Updated proposal 3.5, for alt 2, we don’t understand the principle in selecting the combinations. In our understanding, a simpler way is just to use 4T/2T combinations there, which has been selected among all combinations. No further effort is needed. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 3.1: We have similar view as Apple and QC. For option 3, when one TPMI is indicated, one more field should be introduced to indicate which antenna group is activated. To solve this issue, we propose to include the empty matrix in 4Tx TPMI and always using two 4TX TPMIs. gNB can avoid the case that two precoders indicated by the two 4Tx TPMIs are all empty matrices. And we suggest the following.   * *Option 3 – Two 4TX TPMIs (including empty matrix) are indicated,*    + *~~When two TMPIs are indicated, t~~The first is applied on one of antenna group, and the second is applied on the other antenna group,*   + *~~When one TPMI is indicated, the TPMI is applied to one of the two groups; which one group is indicated~~* * *Option 4 – A single 8TX TPMI is indicated* * *Other options are not precluded* |
| Intel | *Updated Proposal 3.1:*  For Option 3, regarding the indication when only one TPMI is used, fine with the version from ZTE. One question for Option 3, how many TPMI fields are used? One TPMI field or two TPMI fields?  *Updated Proposal 3.5:*  Same view as Huawei. |
| Samsung | Re P3.1   * We prefer the original wording, as clearly, two 4Tx TPMIs are not indicated always. There are two alts for TPMI indication.   + Alt1: indication of 1 or 2 is included in the precoder (inserting all zero sub-matrix when 1 4Tx precoder needs to be indicated).     - This alt is actually Option4, since a single 8Tx TPMI needs reporting.   + Alt2: separate indication of the groups index, e.g. indicating 1 or 2 or both. |
| Nokia, NSB | Updated Proposal 3.1: Support. The updated Option 3 includes certain support for original Option 1 and Option 2. This is a good way forward. We are okay with QC’s modification.  Updated Proposal 3.5: We are okay with this proposal 3.5. There is no need to show the example. Beside, the x-pol antenna setup might be misleading, because all antennas are non-coherent. |
| Ericsson | New P3.1: Support in principal; need to clarify the first part since either 4 Tx or 8 Tx will be downselected: “Updated Proposal 3.1: For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on ~~indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.~~” Note that we have already agreed to use fully coherent precoding for Ng=2, so we don’t need to repeat that here. Ok with QC’s change as well.  New P3.2: Also support in principle. Similar comment to Nokia: while the example is good for people to understand what can be done, we prefer to avoid confusion that a particular design is a baseline, and would ask that it be removed from the proposal. We would be OK with focussing on much smaller codebook sizes, which seems to be the intent of the example proposal. Therefore we suggest:  ***Updated Proposal 3.5:*** *For non-coherent uplink precoding with rank≤8 by an 8TX UE,*   * Alt1. – All 255 combinations of non-coherent rank1 precoders are supported * Alt2. – Only a subset of Alt1. is supported, striving for a substantial reduction in precoders   + ~~Example (ZTE, Samsung): For the shown antenna set up, NC precoders can be defined as follows,~~ |
| IDC | P3.1, Support, and okay with Apple’s update.  P3.5, Support the proposal, but the example can be deleted at this moment. |
| FL | **Please provide your inputs for the following updated proposals:**  ***Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.*  *Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated,*    + *When two TMPIs are indicated, the first is applied on one of antenna group, and the second is applied on the other antenna group,*   + *FFS: details of TPMI indicating when one TPMI is indicated.* * *Option 4 – A single 8TX TPMI is indicated* * *Other options are not precluded*   ***Proposal 3.4b:***  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,   * The following rank and layer splitting cases are supported,   + Cases presented in […] may be down-selected based on benefits, use-case and overall DCI overhead  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Rank* | *All layers in one Antenna Group* | *Layers split across 4 Antenna Groups*  *(All possible permutations)* | | *3* |  | *Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,0,0), (2,0,1,0), (2,0,0,1),*  ***[****(0,2,1,0), (0,2,0,1), (0,0,2,1),*  *(1,2,0,0), (1,0,2,0), (0,1,2,0),*  *(1,0,0,2), (0,1,0,2), (0,0,1,2)****]***    *Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(1,1,1,0), (1,1,0,1), (1,0,1,1), (0,1,1,1)* | | *5* |  | *Transmission by 3 of the antenna groups:*  *(2,2,1,0), (2,2,0,1), (2,1,2,0), (2,1,0,2), (2,0,2,1), (0,2,2,1), (0,2,1,2), (1,2,2,0), (1,2,0,2)*  ***[****(2,0,1,2), (0,1,2,2), (1,0,2,2)****]***    *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(1,1,2,1), (1,1,1,2),* ***[****(2,1,1,1), (1,2,1,1)****]*** | | *6* |  | *Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,2,2,0), (2,2,0,2), (2,0,2,2), (0,2,2,2)*    *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,2,1), (1,2,1,2), (1,2,2,1), (2,1,1,2),* ***[****(2,2,1,1), (1,1,2,2****]*** | | *7* |  | *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,2,2), (1,2,2,2),*  ***[****(2,2,2,1), (2,2,1,2)****]*** |   ***Proposal 3.6:*** *For non-coherent uplink precoding with rank≤8 by an 8TX UE, support  ~~down-select from~~*   * Alt1. – All 255 combinations from 8 non-coherent rank1 precoders are supported * ~~Alt2. – Only a subset of Alt1. is supported,~~~~striving for a substantial reduction in the number of precoders~~   **FL Argument for Proposal 3.6:** In Proposal 3.6, the overhead of Alt1 is exactly 8 bits that is equal to the overhead required for FC precoder indication. On the other hand, if the group agrees to go with Alt2, and **IF** we manage to eliminate 128 or 192 different precoders, then the overhead will be reduced to 7 or 6 bits; resulting in a saving of only 1 or 2 bits, respectively. Therefore, given the little potential saving in overhead, to maintain full flexibility and save a significant time in the next meeting, I would like to encourage companies to agree with Alt1, so that we can have a better focus on other remaining issues. |
| QC | Proposal 3.1: We support the proposal.  Proposal 3.4b: We are fine with the spirit of the proposal. But we have different view on how the down-selection can be considered.  We think one principle can be used to do down-selection to reduce the overhead is: go over all the permutation for potential antenna group selections (for hand blockage or for fallback to 4Tx or 6Rx). While for the selected antenna groups, we think (2,1) vs (1,2) do not make too much difference (since both panels/groups are selected anyway), and only keep one of them is enough.  With the above principle, the following are the precoders we suggested.  **For rank 3:**  *Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,0,0), (2,0,1,0), (2,0,0,1),*  *(0,2,1,0), (0,2,0,1), (0,0,2,1),*  ***[*** *(1,2,0,0), (1,0,2,0), (0,1,2,0),*  *(1,0,0,2), (0,1,0,2), (0,0,1,2)****]***    *Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(1,1,1,0), (1,1,0,1), (1,0,1,1), (0,1,1,1)*  **For rank 5:**  *Transmission by 3 of the antenna groups:*  *(2,2,1,0), (2,2,0,1),* ***[****(2,1,2,0), (2,1,0,2)****]****, (2,0,2,1), (0,2,2,1),* ***[****(0,2,1,2), (1,2,2,0), (1,2,0,2)*  *(2,0,1,2), (0,1,2,2), (1,0,2,2)****]***    *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(1,1,2,1),* ***[****(1,1,1,2), (2,1,1,1), (1,2,1,1)****]***  **For rank 6:**  *Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,2,2,0), (2,2,0,2), (2,0,2,2), (0,2,2,2)*    *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,2,1),* ***[*** *(1,2,1,2), (1,2,2,1), (2,1,1,2), (2,2,1,1), (1,1,2,2****]***  **For rank 7:**  *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,2,2),* ***[*** *(1,2,2,2),*  *(2,2,2,1), (2,2,1,2)****]***  Proposal 3.6: We support the proposal. We basically agree with FL’s assessment. This is just an trade-off between overhead and throughput. Decision of overhead reduction should be driving by performance study. For the over-sampling factor study, we observed 4% difference between (O1, O2)=(1,1) vs (O1, O2)=(2,2), considering 4x overhead vs 4% gain, we go with no oversampling. For this proposal, if proponents can show simulation results that by going down to 128 precoders, there is only marginal performance loss, we will consider Alt 2. |
| Apple | P3.1: generally fine with the proposal, but slightly prefer “*FFS: details of TPMI indication~~ng~~ when one antenna group is used ~~TPMI is indicated~~*”  P3.5b:  we still think for rank 4 we should include transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups. Note that we are including the case of 3 antenna groups for all the other ranks. For overhead consideration, we can include e.g. two combinations:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *4* |  | *Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,1,0), (0,1,2,1)* |   It seems that we are prioritizing the cases where the first antenna group has more layers. In this case, it would be good to be consistent so that the UE can number of the antennas properly. Therefore, we suggest for rank 5, Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups, we keep at least (2, 1, 1, 1).  *[(1,1,2,1), (1,1,1,2),]* ***~~[~~****(2,1,1,1), [(1,2,1,1)****]***  Also, as a general principle, we would prefer to agree on a smaller set of combinations, with the rest for further down-selection.  e.g. for rank 5 transmissions by 3 antenna groups, we keep  *(2,2,1,0), (2,2,0,1), (2,0,2,1), (0,2,2,1)*  For rank 6 Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups, we keep one or two, and the rest for down-selection.  P3.6: support |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 3.1: Support  Proposal 3.4b: This is the proposal for rank 3, 5, 6, 7. Suggest adding “For rank 3, 5, 6, 7, ….”  Table indicates that “all possible permutations”. Therefore, we may modify the proposal as:  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,   * All permutations of ~~The following~~ rank and layer splitting cases are supported,   + Cases presented in […] may be down-selected based on benefits, use-case and overall DCI overhead   Proposal 3.6: okay |
| Google | P3.1: I am afraid I am a bit confused with the proposal. It seems the main-bullet already suggests option 3. But in our understanding, it is the principle for codebook design, similar to previous agreements. How about the following change?  ***Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on ~~indication of~~ up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.*  *Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated,*    + *When two TMPIs are indicated, the first is applied on one of antenna group, and the second is applied on the other antenna group,*   + *FFS: details of TPMI indicating when one TPMI is indicated.* * *Option 4 – A single 8TX TPMI is indicated* * *Other options are not precluded* |
| Ericsson | **New P3.1:** Support.  **New P3.4b:** Why are fewer precoders supported for rank 3 than for rank 5? In the rank 3 case, there are 3 splits with 2 group transmission, and 4 splits with 3 group transmission, for a total of 7. In the rank 5 case, there are 9 splits with 3 group transmission, and 2 splits with 4 group transmission, for a total of 11, which is about 60% more than rank 3. For rank 5, we find that good performance is possible with 2 splits each for the 3 and 4 group cases, or 4 splits total, so it is possible to dramatically reduce the rank 5 precoders. And in general, we don’t see a strong need to downselect the rank 3 layer splits, but are open to further study.  Another important consideration going forward is that the number of precoders can vary quite a bit between the rank splits according to whether rank 1 or rank 2 precoders are used in the groups, so we should not focus only on the number of rank splits but how many precoders are needed overall for a given rank, and also to consider further reduction in the number of Rel-15 precoders used to construct the codebooks.  **So our proposal would be to remove the red brackets for rank 3 (i.e. support all layer splits shown) allow possible downselection, and further study which splits are needed for ranks 5, 6, and 7 as in:**  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,   * The following rank and layer splitting cases or subsets thereof are supported for rank 3   + FFS whether and which subsets are supported * For ranks 5, 6, and 7, subsets of the cases presented ~~in […]~~are to be ~~may be down~~- selected based on benefits, use-case and overall DCI overhead     **P3.6:** Do not support. We think that 6, 5, or even fewer bits can be considered for TPMI/TRI for non-coherent codebooks. The design principles are much simpler than for coherent and partially coherent cases, and so it is more of a matter of determining the number of precoders needed for reasonable performance. Since it is only recently that coherent UL MIMO has commercial interest, non-coherent has been the only kind of UL MIMO in commercial use for NR since Rel-15. Given its simplicity, low overhead, and robustness, we expect it is not likely to go away any time soon. So it is worth a little time to get a good design in our view.  As we discussed earlier, the use of non-coherent precoders is important in a nested codebook design, since they allow power saving, coherence fallback, and support for directional antennas. If the non-coherent codebook is compact enough, it will fit nicely into a nested codebook with fully coherent precoders. |
| Lenovo | Proposal 3.1: We are generally OK with this proposal, but option 4 (a single 8TX TPMI) is not clear to us. So far there is no 8TX TPMI defined. We propose the following change  *Option 4 to: Up to two 4TX TPMIs are jointly indicated.*  Proposal 3.4b: It is not clear why some entries are selected for potential down selection (and others are not). We should keep all the combinations for potential down-selection with performance evaluation. There is still benefit for DCI overhead reduction and simple UE implementation to reduce the codebook size.  Proposal 3.6: Support. |
| Samsung | Re P3.1:   * we should separate the two aspects, indication and codebook design. The indication should be discussed in Section 6. * Option 3, 1 TPMI case: we should include “when 1 TPMI is indicated, then it applies to one of the two groups”. We are OK to include the FFS. But, it will be better to list the alts for the FFS.   ***Proposal 3.1a:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder ~~indication~~ is based on ~~indication of~~ up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.*  ***Proposal 3.1b: (should be moved to section 6)***  *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based, Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*   * *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated,*    + *When two TMPIs are indicated, the first is applied on one of antenna group, and the second is applied on the other antenna group*   + *When one TPMI is indicated, the TPMI is applied to one of the two groups*   + *FFS: details of TPMI indicating when one TPMI is indicated. Down-select from*     - *Alt1: separate indication of the group index*     - *Alt2: indicate all zero matrix for the other group* * *Option 4 – A single 8TX TPMI is indicated* * *Other options are not precluded*   Proposal 3.4b:   * we had the following note in previous version, we prefer to include to ensure that these layer split don’t mean all of them can be configured for TPMI indication.   + ***Note: Above is not relevant to how precoders are indicated.*** * Not sure, why cases in[…] may be down-selected? We should treat all combinations equally.   + Some Cases ~~presented in […]~~ may be down-selected based on benefits, use-case and overall DCI overhead   ***Proposal 3.4b:***  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,   * The following rank and layer splitting cases are supported,   + Some Cases ~~presented in […]~~ may be down-selected based on benefits, use-case and overall DCI overhead  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Rank* | *All layers in one Antenna Group* | *Layers split across 4 Antenna Groups*  *(All possible permutations)* | | *3* |  | *Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,0,0), (2,0,1,0), (2,0,0,1),*  ***~~[~~****(0,2,1,0), (0,2,0,1), (0,0,2,1),*  *(1,2,0,0), (1,0,2,0), (0,1,2,0),*  *(1,0,0,2), (0,1,0,2), (0,0,1,2)****~~]~~***    *Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(1,1,1,0), (1,1,0,1), (1,0,1,1), (0,1,1,1)* | | *5* |  | *Transmission by 3 of the antenna groups:*  *(2,2,1,0), (2,2,0,1), (2,1,2,0), (2,1,0,2), (2,0,2,1), (0,2,2,1), (0,2,1,2), (1,2,2,0), (1,2,0,2)*  ***~~[~~****(2,0,1,2), (0,1,2,2), (1,0,2,2)* ***~~]~~***    *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(1,1,2,1), (1,1,1,2),* ***~~[~~*** *(2,1,1,1), (1,2,1,1)* ***~~]~~*** | | *6* |  | *Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,2,2,0), (2,2,0,2), (2,0,2,2), (0,2,2,2)*    *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,2,1), (1,2,1,2), (1,2,2,1), (2,1,1,2),* ***~~[~~*** *(2,2,1,1), (1,1,2,2****~~]~~*** | | *7* |  | *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,2,2), (1,2,2,2),*  ***[~~[~~*** *(2,2,2,1), (2,2,1,2)* ***~~]~~*** |   *Note: Above is not relevant to how precoders are indicated.*  P 3.6: Do not support. Same view as E///, we don’t think we need to include all possible NC precoders. The design of FC and NC precoders are quite different, targeting different device types and scenarios. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 3.1: We are generally fine with proposal, and have preference on option 3.  Proposal 3.4b: We are generally fine with proposal. Also, for additional Rank 4 case by Apple, we are fine to include this on top of agreement.  Proposal 3.6: Support. |
| OPPO | Proposal 3.1: Fine with the proposal.  Proposal 3.4b: We intend to agree with QC. In our understanding, selection of antenna port group is more important than allocation of layers to selected antenna port group. Hence the suggestion from QC is preferred.  Proposal 3.6: Though we think further down selection is beneficial for overhead reduction, we can be fine with the proposal considering the work load for further down selection. |

# Support of Two Codewords

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  To support dual CW PUSCH transmission for rank>4 by an 8TX UE, for MCS indication, support   * Alt.2: A second MCS field (5 bits) is indicated for the second codeword   **Agreement**  To support dual CW PUSCH transmission for rank>4 by an 8TX UE, a second set of NDI (1 bit) and RV (2 bits) fields are indicated.   * FFS: Details on how to signal   **Agreement**  To support dual CW PUSCH transmission for rank>4 by an 8TX UE, reuse DL PDSCH scrambling mechanism to initialize the scrambling sequence generator for codeword q{0,1},  where , and are defined similar to the legacy single CW PUSCH transmission.  **Agreement**  To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the CWs, down-select from,   * Alt1: First CW * Alt2: The CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW) |

On the support of two codeword transmissions, several key agreements were reached, however there are a few more issues to be discussed in this meeting. Following the discussion from the preparation phase, proposals 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 are adjusted to better reflect companies’ views. Here is a summary of changes,

* Proposal 4.1: Clarified that configuration of max layers is by extension of the legacy maxRank parameter
* Proposal 4.2: To ensure flexibility for network, the target CW is configured by RRC
* Proposal 4.3: Add the alternative of disabling a CW through rank indication
* Proposal 4.4: Add bracket to confirm the range of the N later
* Proposal 4.5: No update.
  + @Apple: The previous agreement was intended for dynamic scheduling.
  + @Ericsson, Intel: There are several scenarios, such as warehouse monitoring, port automation, factory setting where 2CW-based Type1 CG-PUSCH could be used to enhance spectrum efficiency of the network.

***~~Proposal 4.1: To configure dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, down-select from,~~***

* ***~~Alt1: Max number of codewords is RRC configured.~~***
* ***~~Alt2: Max number of MIMO layers is RRC configured.~~***
* ***~~Note: Either alternative will be subject to UE capability.~~***

***~~Proposal 4.2: To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the CWs,~~***

* ***~~Alt2: The CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)~~***

***~~Proposal 4.3: To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, the DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of a transport block, where~~***

* ***~~The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable transmission of its corresponding TB,~~***
* ***~~The remaining transport block is mapped to the first CW.~~***
* ***~~Note: When the transmission of a transport block is disabled, the maximum number of layers is ≤ 4.~~***

***~~Proposal 4.4: To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE,~~******~~if CBG-based transmission is configured, the DL principle for CBGTI DCI field is reused where,~~***

* ***~~The first half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the first transport block, while the second half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the second transport block.~~***
* ***~~The bit field may be configured to have a length of N bits that can support operation of N/2 CBGs, where N=2, 4, 6 or 8.~~***

***Proposal 4.1: To configure PUSCH transmission by an 8TX UE,***

* ***Alt2: Max number of MIMO layers is RRC configured by extending the range of the legacy parameter maxRank to 8***

***Proposal 4.2: To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the scheduled CWs, where the target CW is configured by RRC from,***

* ***Alt1: First CW***
* ***Alt2: The CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)***

***Proposal 4.3: To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, down-select from,***

* ***Alt1 – DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of a transport block, where*** 
  + ***The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable transmission of its corresponding TB,***
  + ***The remaining transport block is mapped to the first CW.***
  + ***Note: When the transmission of a transport block is disabled, the maximum number of layers is ≤ 4.***
* ***Alt2 – Disabling of a transport block can be implicitly determined from the indicated rank for re-transmission of a transport block.***

***Proposal 4.4: To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE,*** ***if CBG-based transmission is configured, the DL principle for CBGTI DCI field is reused where,***

* ***The first half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the first transport block, while the second half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the second transport block.***
* ***The bit field may be configured to have a length of N bits that can support operation of N/2 CBGs, where N=[2, 4, 6 or 8].***

Table 3 – Companies’ views

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Perspective** |
| Google | 4.1: Support  4.2: As we mentioned, current formulation on Alt2 would cause the incorrect CW selection when the indicated MCS is reserved MCS (e.g., MCS = 29/30/31 as follows). In our view, it should be “MCS with highest SE” instead of “the highest MCS”. Current Alt2 can only work for initial transmission.    4.3: Support Alt1.  4.4: OK.  4.5: For Type-2 CG, we think we should exclude DCI format 0\_0. |
| NTT DOCOMO | 4.1: support.  4.2: not support. We donot need to support two alts by configuration. One alt is sufficient.  4.3: OK.  4.4: support.  4.5: support. |
| NEC | 4.1: Support.  4.2: We also think there is no need of two schemes. Support Alt 2 only.  4.3/4/5: Fine. |
| OPPO | Fine with 4.1, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5.  For 4.2, we prefer to down-select one of the options. |
| Lenovo | Proposal 4.1: Support.  Proposal 4.2: Do not support. We think Alt 1 is sufficient. We prefer Alt 1 due to its simplicity.  Proposal 4.3-4.5: Support. |
| CATT | **Proposal 4.1:**  Support.  **Proposal 4.2**:  Not support. We support Alt 2 and only one alt for this proposal is sufficient.  **Proposal 4.3:**  Support the proposal in general with preference on Alt2. Same view as in the last round discussion. Specifically, the indication mentioned is the same as that for PDSCH. For PUSCH, reusing the same scheme is not necessary. Since only one CW is enabled when rank4, and 2 CWs are enabled when rank>4, the number of transmission layers can be used to determine whether the second transport block is disabled.  **Proposal 4.4&4.5**: support. |
| ZTE | **Proposal 4.1:** Support.  **Proposal 4.2:** Do not support the compromised Proposal 4.2.  Since MCS fields of two CWs are all configured/indicated to UE, gNB can know which CW is multiplexed with the UCI bits. Therefore, no additional complexity will be introduced to gNB side if Alt 2 is adopted. Meanwhile, UCI capacity in Alt 2 will be higher than that Alt 1 due to the mapping of layer to CW. In short, it is unnecessary to support both Alts, so we prefer Alt 2.  **Proposal 4.3**: Support Alt 1.  In our understanding, Proposal 4.3 is for dynamical disabling one of the two CWs for PUSCH transmission with rank > 4, and the application scenario is for retransmission of PUSCH.  For instance, UE is scheduled an initial transmission of a PUSCH with 2 CWs, and then gNB only requires UE to re-transmit either first or second CW of the PUSCH retransmission, the other CW can be dynamically disabled.  However, for Alt 2, if the rank of initial transmission of PUSCH is indicated to be >4, and the rank of retransmission of PUSCH is indicated to be <4, UE can not know which CW/TB/UL-SCH should be disabled. It is confusing how Alt 2 work for dynamical disabling one of the CWs.  In Alt 1, if the first CW is indicated to be disabled, only the second CW will be transmitted, and layers of PUSCH transmission will be <=4. In such case, from the perspective of specification, single CW is mapped for the PUSCH and it can be regarded as the first CW accordingly (i.e., q =0). In our view, ‘***The remaining transport block is mapped to the first CW.’*** In the proposal might be ambiguous, hence we prefer to revise the proposal as follows:  ***Proposal 4.3: To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, ~~down-select from~~,***   * ***Alt1 – DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of a transport block, where***    + ***The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable transmission of its corresponding TB,***   + ***The remaining transport block is mapped to the ~~first~~ enabled CW transmission.***   + ***Note: When the transmission of a transport block is disabled, the maximum number of layers is ≤ 4.*** * ***~~Alt2 – Disabling of a transport block can be implicitly determined from the indicated rank for re-transmission of a transport block.~~***   **Proposal 4.4:** Support in principle.  **Proposal 4.5:** Support.  Besides MCS parameter for CG-PUSCH, we would like to clarify the RV sequence parameter (*repK-RV*) as well. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 4.1:** Support.  **Proposal 4.2:** We support down selecting one option only. Our preference is Alt 1.  **Proposal 4.3/4.4 and 4.5:** Fine |
| QC | Proposal 4.1: support  Proposal 4.2: don’t support. There is no need to introduce RRC signaling to support both in spec. Down selecting to one was agreed in last meeting and we should do the down selection.  Proposal 4.3: support Alt 1.  Proposal 4.4 and 4.5: support. |
| Intel | *Proposal 4.1*  Besides *maxRank*, the maximum number of layers is also configured by *maxMIMO-Layers*.  Suggest the following update to make the proposal more accurate.  ***Proposal 4.1: To configure PUSCH transmission by an 8TX UE,***   * ***Alt2: Max number of MIMO layers is RRC configured by extending the range of the legacy parameter maxRank and maxMIMO-Layers to 8***   *Proposal 4.2*  Similar view as other companies, it’s not necessary to have RRC configuration.  *Proposal 4.3*  For Alt 1, when the configured max number of layers is larger than 4, single CW is possible if the transmission rank is <=4. The note text should be updated for accuracy.  For Alt 2, we don’t understand why it is only for retransmission.  The following update is suggested.  ***Proposal 4.3: To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, down-select from,***   * ***Alt1 – DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of a transport block, where***    + ***The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable transmission of its corresponding TB,***   + ***The remaining transport block is mapped to the first CW.***   + ***Note: When the transmission of a transport block is disabled, the ~~maximum~~ number of layers is ≤ 4.*** * ***Alt2 – Disabling of a transport block can be implicitly determined from the indicated rank ~~for re-transmission of a transport block~~.***   *Proposal 4.4*  Generally fine.  *Proposal 4.5*  We still don’t see strong need for dual CW operation for CG PUSCH. But we could be open for discussion. |
| KDDI | Proposal 4.1: Support. We are also fine with intel’s modification.  Proposal 4.2: As indicated by other companies, we also think that it is not necessary to have two schemes. Also, the agreement made in the last meeting mentions that one scheme is down-selected from the listed two schemes. So, we should do so.  Proposal 4.3: Fine.  Proposal 4.4: Support.  Proposal 4.5: Support |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 4.1: fine with the proposal  Proposal 4.2: same view with companies, down selection is needed and we prefer alt.1.  Proposal 4.3 ,4.4,4.5 : fine to support |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 4.1: support  Proposal 4.2: support  Proposal 4.3: okay  Proposal 4.4: okay  Proposal 4.5: we may need to have a discussion on the support of the configured grant for 8Tx. |
| LG | 4.1: support.  4.2: No need to introduce RRC signalling. Support Alt2.  4.3: OK.  4.4: support.  4.5: agree with Nokia. |
| Sharp | 4.1: Support  4.2: Not support. One Alt is sufficient.  4.3/4.4/4.5: Support. |
| Apple | P4.1: support  P4.2: should down-select, and avoid RRC configuration.  P4.3: Thanks ZTE’s explanation on the motivation of Alt 1. Now we support Alt 1.  P4.4: Support. But we would like to understand why a bracket is added around “2, 4, 6 or 8”. What is the alternative proposal if these numbers are not used?  P4.5: Fine, but would like to propose a sub-bullet for the 2nd bullet saying that “Note: This is the same as the second MCS field (5 bits) that was agreed earlier for the indication for the second codeword.” |
| CMCC | Proposal 4.1: support  Proposal 4.2: support Alt 2. Similar view as other companies, it’s not necessary to have RRC configuration.  Proposal 4.3: support Alt 1.  Proposal 4.4&4.5: support. |
| Samsung | 4.1: support  4.2: support Alt1 since (1) it is simple (less UE complexity), (2) can be as competitive as Alt2, and (3) 2 CWs happens only when rank > 4, which is an optional feature, and rank > 4 may be possible only for some Ues, e.g. in cell-center and having several multipath components. So, overall, we don’t see any need/benefit with specifying a complex solution (Alt2).  4.3: OK  4.4,4.5: open to discuss as long as legacy (DL principles) are reused |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For Proposal 4.1, we are fine to it.  For Proposal 4.2, we don’t support to have both supported. Between the two, we prefer Alt 2 to save the number of resource elements for UCI multiplexing.  For Proposal 4.3, we prefer Alt 1. As explained by ZTE, the downlink principle is needed in case of retransmission of one TB. Assuming TB1 is successfully received and TB2 needs retransmission. TRP must notice UE that TB2 needs retransmission. For Alt1, such notice can be implicitly by indicating the first MCS=26 and first rv=1. But for Alt2, UE can only knows there is a TB needs retransmission, but does not known which TB needs retransmission.  For Proposal 4.4 and 4.5, support. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 4.1: Support  Proposal 4.2: Support Alt1  Proposal 4.3: Support Alt1  Proposal 4.4, 4.5: Support |
| Ericsson | **P4.1**: OK  **P4.2**: Appreciate the effort to compromise; OK in principal, but it seems better to decide this after P4.3. Alt 2 seems to depend on P4.3, since then the UCI should be mapped to the CW with highest MCS on the initial transmission, right?  **P4.4**: Reusing the approach for the DL seems reasonable, but we would like to check.  **P4.5**: We wonder about the use case for 8 Tx CG, and so hesitate to support. Type 2 has some possibility for link adaptation, but Type 1 seems hard to justify without some further discussion. We can be OK with Type 2, but do not support Type 1 at this stage. |
| IDC | Proposal 4.1: Support  Proposal 4.2: Support. Or, down-select to Alt2.  Proposal 4.3: OK, and prefer Alt1  Proposal 4.4, 4.5: Support |
| **FL:**  **Updated proposals for Round2** | ***Proposal 4.2:*** *To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the scheduled CWs, where the target CW is configured by RRC from,*   * *Alt1: First CW* * *Alt2: The CW with the MCS with highest SE (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)*   ***Proposal 4.3:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, down-select from,*   * *Alt1 – DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of a transport block, where*    + *The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable transmission of its corresponding TB,*   + *The remaining transport block is mapped to the first CW.*   + *Note: When the transmission of a transport block is disabled, the ~~maximum~~ number of layers is ≤ 4.* * *~~Alt2 – Disabling of a transport block can be implicitly determined from the indicated rank for re-transmission of a transport block~~*   ***Proposal 4.4:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE,* *if CBG-based transmission is configured, the DL principle for CBGTI DCI field is reused where,*   * *The first half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the first transport block, while the second half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the second transport block.* * *The bit field may be configured to have a length of N bits that can support operation of N/2 CBGs, where N=[2, 4, 6 or 8].*   ***Proposal 4.5:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE,*   * *For Type-1 CG:* *A second mcsAndTBS parameters is configured in rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant.* * *FFS if Type-2 CG is supported.*   + *If supported, for Type-2 CG:* *A second MCS field is added in DCI format activating a Type-2 CG-PUSCH.* |
| Apple | P4.2: we appreciate the effort to reach a compromised decision. But for such a matter, we still think we should down-select. This is not worth a RRC configuration. Maybe we can simply follow the majority, as either way would work well.  P4.3 we are generally fine, but wonder if we can remove “The remaining transport block is mapped to the first CW”. This sentence is a bit confusing, in terms of what is considered as the first CW.  P4.4: fine in general, but we still would like to understand why the brackets.  P4.5: OK in general, but the concerns seemed to be either for both types or for Type 1 (Ericsson)? |
| Vivo | Proposal 4.2: Support alt 2.  Proposal 4.3: fine  Proposal 4.4: fine.  Proposal 4.5: fine. |
| FL | @Apple: Thanks for your question.  For proposal 4.3, I see your point, the wording is changed to “enabled” as used in 38.214.  ***Updated Proposal 4.3:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, down-select from,*   * *Alt1 – DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of a transport block, where*    + *The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable transmission of its corresponding TB,*   + *The ~~remaining~~ enabled transport block is mapped to the first CW.*   + *Note: When the transmission of a transport block is disabled, the ~~maximum~~ number of layers is ≤ 4.* * *~~Alt2 – Disabling of a transport block can be implicitly determined from the indicated rank for re-transmission of a transport block~~* |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 4.2: similar view as Apple. Down-selection is needed. We’re fine to follow majority.  Proposal 4.3: we think it should be,   * + *The remaining transport block is mapped to the ~~first~~ enabled CW.*   Proposal 4.4: support  Proposal 4.5: support. And we support Type-2 CG. |
| Google | Proposal 4.2: We suggest we add a sub-bullet under Alt2:   * Above is applicable when none of the indicated MCSs is reserved MCS.   Proposal 4.3: It seems the following should be changed, otherwise to disable the CW could be come less useful.   * + *The remaining transport block is mapped to the ~~first~~ enabled CW.*   Proposal 4.4: OK.  Proposal 4.5: We think DCI format 0\_0 should be precluded for Type2 CG, anyway it is FFS. |
| Sharp | P4.2: Prefer to down-select the one Alt.  P4.3: Support.  P4.4: Support.  P4.5: Support. |
| FGI | Proposal 4.2: Support Alt2.  Proposal 4.3: Support.  Proposal 4.5: Fine. |
| QC | Proposal 4.2: Support Alt2. We prefer using original wording higher MCS. If the concern is about reserved MCS for retransmission, we think it is fine by simply pick CW based on MCS rather than seek for the optimization for this retransmission scenario. The concern with “highest SE” is that UE will keep tracking MCS(or SE) of previous PUSCH transmissions to prepare the MCS/SE of previous PUSCH to be used in later retransmission’s UCI multiplexing, which is inconvenient for UE implementation.  By the way, following “higher MCS” is the current UE behaviour anyway for PTRS DMRS association.  Proposal 4.3: Support.  Proposal 4.4: Support.  Proposal 4.5: We think Type 2 CG with 2 CW is already support by the following agreement. In this agreement, we did not limit the PUSCH to DG-PUSCH.  **Agreement**  To support dual CW PUSCH transmission for rank>4 by an 8TX UE, for MCS indication, support  Alt.2: A second MCS field (5 bits) is indicated for the second codeword  Actually, all the previous agreements we made on dual CW PUSCH did not limit the PUSCH to DG-PUSCH, which means both CG (including type 1 and type 2) and DG PUSCH are supported already, in our understanding. |
| Samsung | Proposal 4.2: we continue to support Alt1 due to reasons explained above.  Proposal 4.3: OK, but this applies only when maxRank>4  ***Proposal 4.3:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, when maxRank > 4, down-select from,*   * *Alt1 – DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of a transport block, where*    + *The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable transmission of its corresponding TB,*   + *The remaining transport block is mapped to the first CW.*   + *Note: When the transmission of a transport block is disabled, the ~~maximum~~ number of layers is ≤ 4.*   Proposal 4.4/5: OK |
| Lenovo | Proposal 4.2: We do not see a need to use RRC to configure one of the two, because the performance is similar for the two alternatives. We prefer to have Alt 1 only for it is simplicity.  Proposal 4.3: We still think Alt 2 should be supported. The number of codewords is inherently tied to the number of layers transmitted, and there is no need to signal this explicitly given the UE already knows how many layers to send.  Proposal 4.4: Support.  Proposal 4.5: Support |
| ZTE | **Proposal 4.2**: Not support this proposal to allow both Alts. We support Alt 2. Agree with Apple that there is no need to introduce an RRC configuration, as we stated in round 1.  **Proposal 4.3**: Generally fine, and suggest following updates:  ***Updated Proposal 4.3:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, ~~down-select from,~~*   * *Alt1 – DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of a transport block, where*    + *The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable transmission of its corresponding TB,*   + *The ~~remaining~~ ~~enabled~~* ***remaining*** *transport block is mapped to the ~~first~~* ***enabled*** *CW.*   + *Note: When the transmission of a transport block is disabled, the ~~maximum~~ number of layers is ≤ 4.* * *~~Alt2 – Disabling of a transport block can be implicitly determined from the indicated rank for re-transmission of a transport block~~*   **Proposal 4.4:** Support in principle.  **Proposal 4.5:** Support.  Besides MCS parameter for CG-PUSCH, we would like to clarify the RV sequence parameter (*repK-RV*) as well. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 4.2: Prefer to down-select and support Alt1  Proposal 4.3, 4.4, 4.5: Support |
| LG Electronics | P4.2: Prefer to down-select the one of Atls. Btw, we prefer Alt.2  P4.3: Support.  P4.4: Support.  P4.5: Support. |
| CATT | **Proposal 4.2**: Prefer to down-select the Alts. We prefer to alt2.  **Proposal 4.4& Proposal 4.5**: Support. |
| OPPO | Proposal 4.2: Prefer down selection and prefer Alt1. Alt2 is also fine to us.  Proposal 4.3: Fine with the wording from ZTE.  Proposal 4.4 and 4.5: Fine. |
| Intel | *Proposal 4.2*  Same comment as previous round. There is no need to introduce RRC configuration. One alternative is sufficient.  *Proposal 4.3*  The update from ZTE looks good.  *Proposal 4.4*  Generally fine.  *Proposal 4.5*  It could be further discussed whether other additional parameters should be added. Suggest the following update.  ***Proposal 4.5:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE,*   * *For Type-1 CG:* *A second mcsAndTBS parameters is configured in rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant.*   + *FFS: whether other parameters should be additionally configured* * *FFS if Type-2 CG is supported.*   + *If supported, for Type-2 CG:* *A second MCS field is added in DCI format activating a Type-2 CG-PUSCH.* |
| MediaTek | Proposal 4.3: Support, we prefer Alt. 1.  Proposal 4.3: fine  Proposal 4.4: fine.  Proposal 4.5: fine. |
| ZTE2 | Add more comments on **Proposal 4.2.**  We tend to agree with QC, and we also prefer to use original wording with “higher MCS” instead of “*the MCS with highest SE*”.  There is no issue to determine a MCS for a retransmission when the indicated MCS is a reserved MCS as raised by Google. According to clause 6.1.4.2 in TS 38.214, if a reserved MCS value is indicated, UE would determine MCS based on a latest PDCCH rather than the indicated MCS value. So the original Alt2 can work well, and no need to introduce a new criteria of “highest SE” which is more complicated for UE implementation as QC pointed out. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal4.2: RRC configuration is not needed, Either way can work, and we prefer to down-select to Alt.1 for simplicity.  Proposal 4.3,4.4: fine to support  Proposal 4.5: support. We support the enhancement on Type 2 CG. |
| CMCC | Proposal 4.2: Support Alt 2 only, RRC configuration is not needed.  Updated Proposal 4.3: Support.  Proposal 4.4&4.5: Support. |
| IDC | Proposal 4.2: Support. Or, down-select to Alt2.  Proposal 4.3: Support (Alt1)  Proposal 4.4, 4.5: Support |
| Ericsson | **P4.2** Alt 2 needs clarification. Is UCI multiplexed on the highest initial MCS or not?  **P4.3:** Support  **P4.5**: Do not support. Making Type 2 FFS makes no sense to us: Type 1 performance will be worse than Type 2 since there is no possibility to indicate e.g. TPMI/RI via DCI with Type 1. We are open to further discussion to better understand the use cases people have in mind. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 4.2: We don’t support RRC configuration. Our preference is alt 2, we can also follow majority view.  Proposal 4.3: fine  Proposal 4.4: fine.  Proposal 4.5: fine. |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 4.2: We would prefer Alt 1. If there is no agreement, we can compromise to this proposal with RRC configuration.  Proposal 4.3: support  Proposal 4.4: support  Proposal 4.5: okay |
| NEC | Proposal 4.2: Support Alt 2 only. |
| QC | To Ericsson, Google, FL,  For proposal 4.2, to answer Ericsson’s question “Is UCI multiplexed on the highest initial MCS or not?”, our view is that there is no need to check associated SE with the MCS. As far as I know, even for reserved MCS for retransmission, higher MCS indicates that higher QAM is used for the CW in the original transmission, which is equivalent to higher SE.  Therefore, reverting back to the original wording “higher MCS” is good enough. If we really want to make it more precise, we can use the wording “higher MCS index” as suggested below.  ***Proposal 4.2:*** *To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the scheduled CWs, where the target CW is configured by RRC from,*   * *Alt1: First CW* * *Alt2: The CW with the higher MCS index ~~with highest SE~~ (if MCS~~s~~ indices are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)* |
| FL | **Please provide your input for the following updated proposal:**  ***Updated Proposal 4.5:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE,*   * *[Working Assumption]For Type-1 CG:* *A second mcsAndTBS parameters is configured in rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant.* * *For Type-2 CG:* *A second MCS field is added in DCI format activating a Type-2 CG-PUSCH.* |
| Apple | OK with updated proposal 4.5 |
| LG | Fine with proposal 4.5. |
| QC | For the updated Proposal 4.2 suggested by us, the comment was mainly for the “SE” part. We still don’t support RRC configuration of the two alternatives. Having said that, our suggesting is  ***Proposal 4.2:*** *To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the scheduled CWs, which is down selected from ~~where the target CW is configured by RRC from~~,*   * *Alt1: First CW* * *Alt2: The CW with the higher MCS index ~~with highest SE~~ (if MCS~~s~~ indices are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)*   For the updated proposal 4.5, we support. |
| CATT | Fine with proposal 4.5. |
| vivo | Fine with updated proposal 4.5 |
| ZTE | Support the updated proposal 4.5.  For Proposal 4.2, in our views, Alt2 is straightforward (aligned with LTE), then Alt1 is fixed to first CW (but which may have less rank number (less SE) than second CW, e.g., (2,3) or (3,4) for rank 5/7 case). |
| Nokia, NSB | Updated Proposal 4.5: Support  For Proposal 4.2 from QC: This proposal is no different from the agreement we had in the last RAN1 meeting:  **Agreement (RAN1 #112)**  To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the CWs, down-select from,   * Alt1: First CW * Alt2: The CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW) |
| Ericsson | **New P4.5**: Appreciate the FL’s effort to move this issue forward, but CG PUSCH is not a critical feature for 8 TX MIMO. Fine to leave it open, but we should prioritize the work on essential aspects like a good codebook design.  **@QC on P4.2:** LTE uses the highest initial MCS, and my understanding of a main motivation for using the highest MCS is because LTE does so. Moreover, since we have agreed to codeword disabling, we should clarify the behavior for UCI multiplexing in the case of retransmissions. |
| IDC | OK with updated proposal 4.5 |
| QC | @Nokia, on Proposal 4.2, yes, I also think we should stick with last meeting’s agreement. Since there was some discussion on whether update the previous agreement with “highest MCS with SE”, I was trying to clarify there is no need to mention SE here.  @Ericsson, using highest MCS in DCI scheduling the reTx, seems better to me. The three reserved MCS, 26, 27, 28 (or 27, 28, 29? I don’t recall exactly. But this does not matter) are corresponding to indicating QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM for retransmission. So using higher MCS index in DCI scheduling the reTx can make sure UCI is muxed on the CW with higher SNR, which is aligned with the principle of Alt2. |
| QC | @Ericsson, actually, after a second thought. I now think following LTE using initial MCS is better. The reason is the granularity of SE change for reTx is too coarse, which only have three QAM levels. If gNB just needs to lower the PUSCH SE a little bit pass the decode for ReTx, but it has to use a lower level of QAM, which can drastically lower the actual MCS(or SE) of the reTx. So the actual MCS or SE derived for reTx is not very meaningful. |
| FL | ***Proposal 4.2:*** *To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the scheduled CWs, where the target CW is configured by RRC from,*   * *Alt1: First CW* * *Alt2: The CW with the higher initial MCS index ~~with highest SE~~ (if MCS~~s~~ indices are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)*  |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Alt1* | *Lenove, MediaTek, Xiaomi, Sharp, Samsung, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Nokia* | | *Alt2* | *NEC, CATT, ZTE, Qualcomm, LG, CMCC, Huawei, vivo, FGI, IDC,* |   ***Proposal 4.5:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, further study whether CG is supported. If supported,*   * *For Type-1 CG: A second mcsAndTBS parameters is configured in rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant* * *For Type-2 CG: A second MCS field is added in DCI format activating a Type-2 CG-PUSCH* |
| QC | Proposal 4.2: We thank FL for the proposal and take QC and Ericsson discussion on reserved MCS into account. However, our main concern of this proposal is that it reverts a previous agreement, which was clearly agreed a down selection is needed for these two alternatives. While this agreement is supporting both in spec and allow gNB to use RRC to configure UE to do one. We don’t think spec should support duplicated functionality. So we insist a down selection.  A quick comment on Alt 1: We all know that in case of rank = 5, 7, CW1 has one less layer than CW2. If we do static CW selection, isn’t better to mux on CW2 (if CW2 exist)?  For Alt 2: If we want to clarify the reserved MCS issue. We think it is better to clarify with a note.   * *Alt2: The CW with the higher ~~initial~~ MCS index ~~with highest SE~~ (if MCS~~s~~ indices are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)*   + *Note: in case of PUSCH retransmission, the initial MCS is used for CW selection.* |
| Apple | P4.2: we still have strong concern on the RRC configuration for such a minor issue. Our preference is Alt 2, but we can be flexible to go with majority. Also OK with QC’s modification.  P4.5: OK |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 4.2: support. We were supportive to Alt 1. This is no ideal, however, this compromise would work.  Proposal 4.5: okay. |
| Google | P4.2: We can accept current Alt2.  P4.5: We think DCI format 0\_0 should be precluded for Type2 CG. |
| Ericsson | **P4.2:** We do share misgivings about RRC configuring this as well, but this seems like the most pragmatic way forward, and we can support just to move forward. Regarding Qualcomm’s question, it’s not clear to us that the larger codeword is the better one to multiplex the UCI on, since a) it does not necessarily minimize the number of UCI symbols (the TBS of a higher MCS codeword 0 can be smaller than codeword 1), b) multiplexing on the second codeword only happens for rank 5 and up, and c) the network may set a higher MCS codeword to be more or less robust than a lower MCS codeword. Moreover, we think the network has more control over the codeword carrying the UCI by not forcing the UCI to be on the higher initial MCS codeword.  **P4.5:** ‘If supported’ as used here seems inconsistent with ‘study’ to me, as the listed aspects shall be supported rather than other possibilities that could arise in the study. Can we clarify as:  ***Proposal 4.5:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, further study whether CG is supported, including; ~~. If supported,~~*   * *For Type-1 CG: A second mcsAndTBS parameters is configured in rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant* * *For Type-2 CG: A second MCS field is added in DCI format activating a Type-2 CG-PUSCH* |
| Lenovo | Proposal 4.2: We do not see the benefit for supporting both alternatives. Which CW to use for UCI multiplexing should be defined in the spec, instead of configuration in RRC. We propose to have a majority vote and go with whichever alternative with more support.  Proposal 4.5: Support. |
| Samsung | P 4.2: our preference is Alt1, but can live with this proposal for progress  P 4.5: OK |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 4.2: We do not support introducing RRC configuration. One option should be sufficient and our preference is Alt 2. QC’s revision is fine for us.  Proposal 4.5: Support. |
| OPPO | Proposal 4.2: We cannot see the necessity of RRC configuration. Either alternative is fine to us.  Proposal 4.5: Fine. |

# Full Power Operation

Void

# TRI/SRI/TPMI Indication for Codebook UL Transmission

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  For fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, based on NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook, the following pairs of (N1, N2) values are supported,   * (N1, N2) = (4, 1) * (N1, N2) = (2, 2)`   A pair of (N1, N2) can be configured with subject to UE capability.  **Agreement**  For fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, based on NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook (CodebookMode=1),   * Study whether/how to support (O1, O2) = (2,1), (2,2)   + whether for all rank, or rank 1-2, or rank 3-8   + applicability of different (O1, O2) values per agreed (N1, N2)   + companies are encouraged to submit simulation results |

For precoding by coherent Ues, RAN1 has agreed to use NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook (CodebookMode=1). The next step of the discussion for coherent precoding is related to TPMI indication. Legacy TPMI definition has been based on simple indexing of different precoding options that can be re-used for the partial and non-coherent 8TX precoders. However, for TPMI indication of full-coherent precoders, where Rel-15 DL codebook is utilized, it seems more efficient to re-use the DL indication mechanism based on *ix* values.

*~~Proposal 6.1 – For TPMI indication of full-coherent codebook, the TPMI ignalling is based on indication of i~~~~1,1~~~~, i~~~~1,2~~~~, i~~~~1,3~~ ~~and i~~~~2~~ ~~values.~~*

* *~~FFS details related to applicability of each value.~~*

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,   * All SRS port combinations are supported * For SRI indication, down-select from,   + Option 1: Use an bit length bitmap   + Option 2: Use a legacy-based solution * Consideration of Lmax for SRI indication   For , Rel-15 SRI indication is reused |

In the last meeting, for a UE configured for NCB-based PUSCH transmission with , RAN1 has agreed to down-select from two identified options for SRI indication with following design principles,

* Support of all SRS port combinations,
* Consideration of Lmax for SRI indication,
* For , Rel-15 SRI indication is reused.

***~~Proposal 6.2~~***

***~~Version A – For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,~~***

* *~~Support Option 1 where an bit length bitmap is used~~*

***~~Version B – For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,~~***

* *~~Support Option 2 where a legacy-based solution is used.~~*

Another topic related to codebook-based operation is related to codebooksubset configuration. According to the legacy operation, fully-coherent Ues can be configured with ‘fullyAndPartialAndNonCoherent’, ‘partialAndNonCoherent’ or ‘nonCoherent’ codebook subset. However, given different nature of codebook design for fully-, partial- and non-coheremt Ues in Rel-18, the legacy mechanism cannot be easily realized and supported.

*~~Proposal 6.3: For codebook-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, legacy codebooksubset mechanism is not supported. Down-select from the~~*

* *~~Alt1. – Further study whether,~~* 
  + *~~A fully-coherent UE can be configured to operate only with partially- or non-coherent codebook.~~*
  + *~~A partially-coherent UE can be configured to operate only with non-coherent codebook~~*
  + *~~Note: This is subject to UE capability.~~*
* *~~Alt2. – Fully- and partially-coherent Ues cannot be configured with any other codebook, except their corresponding full- and partially-coherent codebooks.~~*

Based on the provided comments during the preparation phase, Proposal 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 are updated. Here is a summary of the updates,

* Proposal 6.1: The only objective of Proposal 6.1 is to avoid creation of several tables as they exist today in the specifications. Needless to say, that the tables for 8TX will be even larger than the ones for 4TX. Also, as stated in the FFS, which *ix* to be used is for further discussion and not the intention of the proposal to specify which and in what range. Further, to address a comment, an additional FFS related to TRI is added.
* Proposal 6.2: There seem to be a majority in support for Version B, however Version A is still kept for this round. Also, for version B, alternative way-forwards are suggested for down-selection.
* Proposal 6.3: There were a few alternative formulations of the original proposal provided by companies. Based on the suggested alternatives, the proposal is updated, and an additional alternative is included.

Table 4 – Companies’ views

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Perspective** |
| Google | 6.1: Support in principle  6.2: Support version B.  6.3: For partial-coherent, we think we need to consider 4-port partial coherent and 2-port partial coherent. We suggest adding the following alternative:   * *Alt4*    + *A fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully-coherent and partially-coherent (Ng=2 and Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2 and Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can be configured with partially-coherent precoders (Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders* |
| NTT DOCOMO | 6.1: OK.  6.2: slightly prefer version A. Also okay with version B.  6.3: If we consider the two partial coherent cases separately, as suggested by Google, we suggest adding sub-alt under partially-coherent UE for each Alt.  *Proposal 6.3: For codebook-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, down-select from,*   * *Alt1*    + *A fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully- and partially- (Ng=2 and Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE can be configured with partially- and non-coherent precoders*     - *Alt1-1: A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2 and Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders. A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can be configured with partially-coherent precoders (Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders*     - *Alt1-2: xxx*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders* * *Alt2*    + *A fully-coherent UE can only be configured with fully- or partially- (Ng=2 or Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE can only be configured with partially- or non-coherent precoders*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can only be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2) or non-coherent precoders. A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can only be configured with partially-coherent precoders (Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders.*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders*   + *FFS whether the configuration can be done dynamically, e.g., MAC-CE or DCI* * *Alt3*   + *A fully-coherent UE can only be configured to operate with fully-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE can only be configured to operate with partially precoders*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can only be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2). A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can only be configured with partially-coherent precoders (Ng=4).*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders* |
| OPPO | 6.1: Fine  6.2: Support version B.  6.3: Fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Proposal 6.1: OK.  Proposal 6.2: Support Version A. A bitmap-based design reduces the standardization effort.  Proposal 6.3: We prefer to postpone this decision after the precoders for full/partial(Ng=2,4)/non-coherent Ues are finalized. |
| CATT | **Proposal 6.1:**  Not support. It is our view that codebook design should be discussed firstly. BTW, we are fine for adding more tables on the specs.  **Proposal 6.2:**  Support version B. Alt 1 is preferred.    **Proposal 6.3**:  Support Alt 1. |
| ZTE | **Proposal 6.1**: Support in principle  **Proposal 6.2:** Support version B and select Alt1. From perspective of spec drafting, it may not need 8 tables for Lmax=1, 2, ..., 8, as legacy. That would be very redundant. It can define only one complete table for Lmax=8, then describe that only part of entries are used for other values of Lmax for each column of NSRS.  For Alt2, the overhead cannot be reduced in some cases, e.g., if Lmax=2, and 2 SRS resources are from 2 groups, two 4-bit SRIs are needed with Alt2, but only 5 bits is needed with Alt1.  **Proposal 6.3:** For partial-coherent, we agree with DOCOMO’s suggestion for clarification.  Among the 3 Alts, we prefer Alt2 in principle, and suggest the following changes based on DOCOMO’s version:   * *Alt2*    + *A fully-coherent UE can only be configured with at least one of fully- or partially- (Ng=2 ) or partially-(Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE can only be configured with at least one of partially- or non-coherent precoders*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can only be configured with at least one of partially-coherent (Ng=2) or partially-(Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders.*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can only be configured with at least one of partially-coherent precoders (Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders.*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders*   + *FFS whether the configuration can be done dynamically, e.g., MAC-CE or DCI* |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 6.1**: Support in principle  **Proposal 6.2:** Support Version A, as it is a simpler design.  **Proposal 6.3:** Agree with the modified proposal by DOCOMO/ZTE. We prefer Alt 3. |
| QC | Proposal 6.1: Don’t support. Whether reuse *i1,1, i1,2, i1,3 and i2* or define a table for 8 Tx coherent CB can be up to editor.  Proposal 6.2: Support version B. Given we already agreed use legacy approach, we support also using legacy approach to have a unified ignalling design. It does not make sense to have two different signalling designs for and If bitmap was agreed for , we could support it for as well. But that is not the case here.  Proposal 6.3: needs more discussion. What is the different between Alt 1 and Alt 2? Is the only difference the FFS? We don’t support adding the FFS. We don’t see the motivation to change the configuration dynamically. |
| Intel | *Proposal 6.1*  Support the proposal in principle.  *Proposal 6.2*  Prefer with Version B. We also think rank restriction could be introduced to further reduce the overhead.  In Alt 1 of Version B, why only N\_SRS=8 is included? What about N\_SRS=5,6,7?  *Proposal 6.3*  Some question for clarification. What is the difference among the alternatives regarding the codebook subset configuration? |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 6.1: Do not support. Indication of the parameters leads to higher DCI overhead generally.  Proposal 6.2: prefer Version A.  Proposal 6.3: Fine with Google’s or DOCOMO’s versions. |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 6.1: we are supportive to the general principle.  Proposal 6.2: Support Version A:  Proposal 6.3: Alt3 shall be the default choice. Alt 1 and Alt2 provide more flexibility. We need to justify the benefit (gains?) of using Alt 1/2 if more flexible Alt 1 or Alt 2 is supported. |
| QC2 | A question to DCM: Regarding this proposal “*Alt1-1: A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2 and Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders…*”, do we really such flexibility, i.e., to configure a Ng=2 partial coherent UE as a Ng=4 partial coherent UE? This seems like an over-design to me. |
| LG | 6.1: Agree with QC.  6.2: Support Version A.  6.3: Support Alt 1. |
| Sharp | 6.1: Fine with the proposal.  6.2: Support Alt 1 of Version B. We don’t see the benefit of Alt 2. Version B is simpler than Version A.  6.3: We support DOCOMO’s modified Alt 3. |
| Apple | P6.1: support in principle but the detailed ignalling needs to be discussed. In this sense, this proposal basically says that we will include a TPMI that maps to a precoder, and it may not move us forward much. So we would also be fine with not agreeing to it if companies have concern.  P6.2: We support Version B Alt 1.  It is not clear to us how Alt 2 works. What would be the lmax assumed for each group? This may not be as efficient as Alt 1.  P6.3: fine in general, but  Alt 1: does it mean e.g. a fully-coherent UE can also be configured to operate with fully-coherent precoders only? This needs to be clarified, which seems to be the difference between Alt1 and Alt2.  Alt 2: we do not support the FFS. RRC configuration should be sufficient. |
| CMCC | Proposal 6.1: Not support, indication i1,1, i1,2, i1,3 and i2 values will not reduce the overhead of DCI. So, we support to create several tables as they exist today in the specifications.  Proposal 6.2: Support version B with Alt 1.  Proposal 6.3: Agree with the modified proposal by DOCOMO/ZTE. We prefer Alt 1. |
| Samsung | 6.1   * Not sure what “*at least one of i1,1, i1,2, i1,3 and i2 values*” means, the precoder requires all at least *i1,1 and i2.* * Agree with QCM, it is editorial, although DL PMI reporting can be reused.   6.2: We don’t agree with the comment on “two separate design for N\_srs<=4 and N\_srs>4”. If an 8Tx UE is configured with N\_srs<=4, then we already have a solution (legacy). There is no reason to change that, i.e., to have two different design for 2/4Tx and 8Tx. We support Version A since it is much simpler, avoids specifying very long tables, and in the worst case, there is no overhead saving between Option 1 and 2.  6.3: similar comment as Google, we need to include Ng=2 and 4 PC cases. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For proposal 6.1, fine with it.  For proposal 6.2, support version B, which can save more DCI bits if Lmax<8. For the second bullet of version B, we support Alt1.  For proposal 6.3, we prefer Alt1 as legacy to accommodate dynamically varied channel environments. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 6.1: Don’t support. We prefer to consider a unified TPMI design with lower DCI overhead  Proposal 6.2: prefer Version B.  Proposal 6.3: support and prefer Alt1. |
| Ericsson | **P6.1**: Do not support at this time. If we have a codebook of 272 precoders for ranks 1-8 and each has a QPSK entry for each antenna, a brute force approach could fit on a few pages. Tables on this order are already around (e.g. LDPC, RACH configurations, etc.) This is something that can be considered after the precoders are identified. Overall, editors have been quite able to capture complicated MIMO tables in the past; I don’t see why they would need us for this. We are opening to revisiting this question after the precoders are selected / codebooks are designed.  **P6.2**: Support (prefer version B Alt 1 for simplicity and overhead)  **P6.3**: Do not support, and think that further discussion is needed. While it is true the issue has been around for a while, it is not clear that companies have looked at this from enough perspectives. We think that nesting different coherence precoders has 4 potential benefits: UE power saving (by turning off ports), ability to fall back to lower coherence (when SRS is not transmitted recently enough), support for directional antennas, and improved performance by selection diversity. In simulation, we did not find the selection diversity gains, and often found that the large increase in precoders from partially coherent operation did not improve performance. Therefore, we think we can focus on non-coherent precoders for nested operation, since they can provide the benefits for power saving, coherence fallback, and directional antennas. Partial coherent precoders can be further studied and added if found beneficial.   * *Alt1a*    + *A fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully- and non-coherent precoders*     - FFS: A fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully- and partially- and non-coherent precoders   + *A partially-coherent UE can be configured with partially- and non-coherent precoders*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders* |
| IDC | Proposal 6.1: Support in principle  Proposal 6.2: Support Version B.  Proposal 6.3: Support, and **prefer Alt2**. Note, responding to QC at least, the main difference between Alt1 and Alt2 is that Alt1 is described, e.g., with “*configured with fully-* ***and*** *partially-* ***and*** *non-coherent precoders*” which we have concern on the overhead for TPMI field design as Alt1 is requiring to have all possible precoders in one DCI. However, Alt2 is described with, e.g., “*configured with fully-* ***or*** *partially-* ***or*** *non-coherent precoders*”, meaning one type of FC, PC, NC will be configured to the UE (although the UE is capable of FC).  In that sense, we prefer Alt2 (as simpler) than Alt1. Alt3 seems to unnecessarily restrict too much, i.e., flexibility issue. |
| **FL:**  **Updated proposals for Round2** | ***Proposal 6.2***  ***Version A –*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,*   * *Support Option 1 where an bit length bitmap is used*   ***Version B –*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,*   * *Support Option 2 where a legacy-based solution is used.* * *Down-select from*   + *Alt1. – Extend the existing SRI indication tables to include NSRS=8 and lmax=8*   + *Alt2. – Reuse the existing SRI indication tables by dividing the NSRS ports to two groups of 4 ports*   *Proposal 6.3: For codebook-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, down-select from,*   * *Alt1*    + *A fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully- and partially- (Ng=2 and Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE can be configured with partially- and non-coherent precoders*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2 and Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders. A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can be configured with partially-coherent precoders (Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders*   + A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders * *Alt1a*    + *A fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully- and non-coherent precoders*     - FFS: A fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully- and partially- and non-coherent precoders   + *A partially-coherent UE can be configured with partially- and non-coherent precoders*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders* * *Alt2*    + *A fully-coherent UE can only be configured with at least one of fully- or partially- (Ng=2 ) or partially-(Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE can only be configured with at least one of partially- or non-coherent precoders*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can only be configured with at least one of partially-coherent (Ng=2) or partially-(Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders.*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can only be configured with at least one of partially-coherent precoders (Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders.*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders*   + *FFS whether the configuration can be done dynamically, e.g., MAC-CE or DCI* * *Alt3*   + *A fully-coherent UE can only be configured to operate with fully-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE can only be configured to operate with partially precoders*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can only be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2). A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can only be configured with partially-coherent precoders (Ng=4).*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders* |
| Apple | P6.2: same comments as in the earlier round.  We support Version B Alt 1.  It is not clear to us how Alt 2 works. What would be the lmax assumed for each group? This may not be as efficient as Alt 1. At least it should be clarified to be listed as an alternative.  P6.3: we are fine with the direction in general, but feel the details may still need a bit more massage.  **Alt 1**: we assume it is the baseline that a fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully-coherent precoders only. Can you please confirm? If yes, it would be good to clarify.  We would like add FFS on whether both Ng=2 and Ng=4 partially-coherent precoders are included, or UE may be configured with just one of them. Maybe adding “FFS Ng = 2 and/or Ng=4” could address the concern.  **Alt 1a**: is this considered as a superset of Alt 1? Ng=2 vs Ng=4 information is missing here.  **Alt 2**: by “at least”, does it mean that any combinations can be configured? It also has the word “only”, which makes it unclear whether the intention is to support the configuration of one of them or any combinations of them. |
| Vivo | Proposal 6.2: as a compromise between version A and B, for Lmax=1 and 2 support version B, for Lmax>2 support version A. This strikes balance between overhead and work load.  Proposal 6.3: alt 3 is unnecessary restriction. We can be supportive of alt2 if subset is selected using MAC-CE, using DCI in this case the overhead is too much. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 6.2: first preference is version A, and second preference is version B Alt1.  Proposal 6.3:  For Alt2, we think the intention is to configure one codebooksubset only, instead of ‘at least’. Thus, we suggest deleting ‘at least’ for each bullet. In addition, for a partially-coherent UE (Ng=2), we think it can only be configured with ~~at least~~ one of partially-coherent (Ng=2) ~~or partially-(Ng=4)~~ or non-coherent precoders. |
| Google | Proposal 6.2: Support version B.  Proposal 6.3: Support |
| Sharp | P6.2: Support the Version B Alt1. Same comments as in the earlier round.  P6.3: We can agree that a non-coherent precoder is needed. Also, as the companies recognize, coherent for Ng=2 and Ng=4 is different. Thus, we support the modified Alt1-a as bellow.   * *Alt1a (modified)*   + *A fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully- and non-coherent precoders*     - FFS: A fully-coherent UE can be configured with fully- and partially- and non-coherent precoders   + *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2) and non-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can be configured with partially-cohenret (Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders* |
| FGI | Proposal 6.2: Support Version B Alt 1.  Proposal 6.3: Support Alt 2. |
| QC | Proposal 6.2: support Version B, Alt 1.  Proposal 6.3: we object Alt 2. With Alt 2, one fully coherent UE, with all the efforts and cost spend on UE side to make it support coherent precoders, can be downgraded to a partial coherent or noncoherent UE for no reason. Then who will have motivation to build full coherent UE?  For Alt 1, regarding “*A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2 and Ng=4) and non-coherent precoders*”, we see the intention to allow NW full flexibility here. But we don’t think we have to extend the flexibility to the extreme. We prefer only allow configuring A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) with partially-coherent (Ng=2) and non-coherent precoders. |
| Samsung | Proposal 6.2: we support version A as there is **no saving** with version A in most of the cases, summarized below. Also, the cases for which there are some overhead saving are not typical NW configuration. Why would NW configure 5-8 SRS resources and L\_max=1,2,3. A proper NW should configure <=4 SRS resources when L\_max <= 4, and save SRI overhead. So, overall, we don’t think it is worth specifying very long table (a few pages), which is not really beneficial in practical NW configuration.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | N\_SRS | L\_max=1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |   Proposal 6.3: in our view, a more important question is the max TPMI payload. With Alt1, it seems that TPMI payload can be large, since every possible codebookSusbet is supported. We don’t think such as large TPMI payload is needed. 1 bit over legacy (which is 6 bits max) should be sufficient. So, our preference is Alt2, with the clarification (same as NTT Docomo) that at least doesn’t mean that we can support 2, 3, or even 4 codebookSubsets.  *Proposal 6.3: For codebook-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, down-select from, considering the max TPMI payload of x bits, [x=7bits].*  …   * *Alt2*    + *A fully-coherent UE can only be configured with only ~~at least~~ one of fully- or partially- (Ng=2 ) or partially-(Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders*   + *A partially-coherent UE can only be configured with only ~~at least~~ one of partially- or non-coherent precoders*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=2) can only be configured with only ~~at least~~ one of partially-coherent (Ng=2) or partially-(Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders.*     - *A partially-coherent UE (Ng=4) can only be configured with at least one of partially-coherent precoders (Ng=4) or non-coherent precoders.*   + *A non-coherent UE can only be configured with non-coherent precoders*   + *FFS whether the configuration can be done dynamically, e.g., MAC-CE or DCI* |
| Lenovo | Proposal 6.2: Support Version A.  Proposal 6.3: Can the FL clarify if we need to support all the rank (1-8) for full power mode? |
| ZTE | **Proposal 6.2**: Support version B and Alt1. We do not think Alt2 has any benefit as we commented in last round.  **Proposal 6.3**: We support Alt2. Maybe “only” can be removed from Alt2 to make it clearer due to comment pointed out by Apple. RRC can configure one or more coherent level, then a precoder can be dynamically indicated among the candidates corresponding to the configured one or more coherent levels. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 6.2: Support Version B.  Proposal 6.3: Fine with Alt1 and agree with QC’s comment, i.e. a PC UE (Ng=2) can be configured with partially-coherent (Ng=2) and non-coherent precoders. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 6.2: Support version A.  Proposal 6.3: Support, and prefer Alt 1 which follows legacy rule. |
| CATT | **Proposal 6.2:**  Support version B. Alt 1 is preferred.    **Proposal 6.3**:  Support Alt 1. |
| OPPO | Proposal 6.2: support Version B and Alt 1.  Proposal 6.3: we object Alt 2. We agree with DOCOMO and QC that a partially-coherent UE with Ng=2 cannot be configured with partially-coherent codebook designed for Ng=4. |
| Intel | *Proposal 6.2*  Generally ok with Version B and Alt 1.  *Proposal 6.3*  For Alt-2, fine to remove “at least”.  But in Proposal 6.3, mixing the configuration of partial coherent precoders with Ng=2 or Ng=4 makes the proposal more complicated. It might be better to put the partial coherent precoder configuration with Ng=2 and Ng=4 into separate proposal. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 6.2:** We are fine supporting the majority view, i.e., Version B, Alt 1.  **Proposal 6.3**: We agree with the modified Alt 1a by Sharp. Our top preference is Alt 3, however we are ok with Alt 1a as a compromise. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 6.2: we prefer Version A for the simplicity.  Proposal 6.3: Prefer Alt1. |
| CMCC | Proposal 6.2: Support Version B with Alt1 as legacy scheme.  Proposal 6.3: Support Alt1. |
| IDC | Proposal 6.2: Support Version B, and further details can be done in next meeting.  Proposal 6.3: Support. Alt3 is unnecessarily restrict too much. We prefer Alt2, and we are open for further discussions on Alt1. |
| Ericsson | **P6.2:** Support; prefer version B.  **P6.3:** Support. While this is for further discussion, we are not not so wild about Alt 3: for the fully coherent UE, there is no possibility for power savings through the use of lower coherence TPMIs, no possibility for coherence fallback, nor ability to exploit directional antennas. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 6.2: As we have commented in last round, we support Version B, Alt 1.  Proposal 6.3: support for further discussion. We prefer Alt 1 to follow legacy principle. |
| Samsung | **P6.2**: as mentioned in previous comment, the overhead saving is only when L\_max<=3, and there is no saving for L\_max>3, so why specifying redundant long tables. Could somebody provide technical justification? We can’t accept Version B for L\_max>3. |
| Vivo | **On p6.2,** as analysed by Samsung above, as a compromise when L\_max<=3 support version B, when L\_max>3 support version A. |
| Nokia, NSB | **Proposal 6.2:** Last meeting we have this agreement:  **Agreement**  For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,   * All SRS port combinations are supported * For SRI indication, down-select from,   + Option 1: Use an bit length bitmap   + Option 2: Use a legacy-based solution * Consideration of Lmax for SRI indication   For , Rel-15 SRI indication is reused  If we follow Version B, supporting all SRS port combinations with legacy-based solution would have signification spec impact.  Proposal 6.3: Alt3 shall be the default choice. Alt 1 and Alt2 provide more flexibility. We need to justify the benefit (gains?) of using Alt 1/2 if more flexible Alt 1 or Alt 2 is supported. |
| NEC | Proposal 6.2: We support version B  Proposal 6.3: Support Alt 1. |
| FL | **Please provide your inputs only for the following proposal:**  *Updated Proposal 6.3: For codebook-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, down-select from,*   * *Alt1 (Nested codebook)*   + *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can also be configured with precoders associated with at least one or more other Ng cases, i.e., Ng=2, 4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2 can also be configured with precoders associated with at least one or more other Ng cases, i.e., Ng=4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can also be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*   + *A non-coherent UE, Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8* * *Alt2 (Nested-like codebook but needs re-configuration)*    + *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can only be configured with precoders associated with one of Ng cases, i.e., Ng=1, 2, 4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2, can only be configured with precoders associated with one of Ng cases, i.e., Ng=2, 4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can only be configured with precoders associated with one of Ng cases, i.e., Ng=4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A non-coherent UE, with Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*   + *FFS whether the configuration can be done dynamically, e.g., MAC-CE or DCI.* * *Alt3 (Not Nested)*   + *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng=1*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng=2*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng=4*   + *A non-coherent UE, with Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8* |
| Samsung | Updated 6.3: OK with the following bullet since the payload can be large for Alt1, which is not needed.   * The TPMI payload can be at most 7bits. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Updated 6.3:  Alt2 and Alt3 are clear. But Alt1 is not clear enough. For each bullet, it seems that the configuration of precoders associated with Ng of itself is not included. For example, for following bullet, precoders associated with Ng=4 is not mentioned.   * + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can also be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*   Regarding SS’s comment, we think 7-bit is too restrictive. Afterall, in NCB-based TX, there is 8-bit for SRI indication. |
| Apple | On updated P6.3, Alt 2 and Alt 3 are ok.  For Alt 1, it is not very clear to us exactly what cases are supported.  E.g. for a fully-coherent UE, my understanding is that it can support:  Case 1: precoders with Ng=1 plus one or more of Ng=2, 4, 8  But it is not clear to me whether Alt 1 also supports e.g.  Case 2: precoders with Ng = 1 (fully-coherent only)  Case 3: precoders with Ng = 2 (partial-coherent only)  Case 4: precoders with Ng = 2 & Ng = 8  …  Would be good to get clarification.  We think at least case 2 should be supported. |
| LG | Regarding comment by Samsung on limitation of DCI overhead, we also think 7 bit is too restrictive. This is because fully coherent TPMI with (*N*1, *N*2, *O*1, *O*2)= (2, 2, 1, 1) requires 128 code-points.  Another point is association between Ng value and coherency capability is not preferred since there are ongoing FFS points as below.  **Agreement**  Support the following cases for codebook design for 8TX precoders   * Full coherent precoders with Ng=1   + FFS: Full coherent precoders with Ng=2, Ng=4 * Partial coherent precoders with Ng=2 and Ng=4   + This does not imply any relation with the number of TPMI indications for 8TX precoder * Non-coherent precoders   **Agreement**  For 8TX PUSCH, at least support   * Ng=1, 2, 4   Note: The above does not restrict the Ng for the non-coherent case |
| QC | Proposal 6.3: Thank FL for the nice formulation of the proposal. We understand some of the alternatives, such as Alternative 1, aim to cover all fallback scenarios. But we still think we don’t have to optimize to that extreme to cover all the cases. We suggest to add “Other alternatives are not precluded” to allow simplified alternatives.  By the way, we agree with DCM that 7-bit is too restrictive. This UE is targeting 8L on UL. How come on DL it cannot receive a DCI with a few more bits? |
| Lenovo | We are OK with the updated proposal 6.3. The down selection should be made in the next meeting. |
| CATT | **Updated Proposal 6.3:**  We raise the concern of wording for the alt1 in the Updated Proposal 6.3. We understand the aim while prefer to use the version in the last round of alt1. |
| vivo | Proposal 6.3, my understanding of Alt1 is that a big codebook which includes full-coherent, partial-coherent (multiple versions with Ng=2 or 4) and non-coherent precoders, similar to Rel-15 design. To avoid confusion, maybe simpler wording like this can be helpful  In Alt2, the statement in parenthesis “re-configuration” means RRC re-configuration, right? If it is RRC re-configuration, which means a UE supporting full-coherent codebook can be RRC configured with one of the “Ng=2 partial-coherent” or “Ng=4 partial-coherent” or “non-coherent codebook”. With FFS bullet, whether configuration can be done by MAC CE, it means a UE supporting full-coherent codebook is RRC configured with all of the “Ng=2 partial-coherent” or “Ng=4 partial-coherent” or “non-coherent codebook”, then MAC CE select one of the codebook subsets. Is it current understanding?  Alt3 is too restrictive  We also agree 7-bits is too restrictive |
| ZTE | Proposal 6.3: We support Alt2. We are open to RRC or MAC-CE level re-configuration.  Technical speaking, for Alt1, for avoiding ambiguities, “can also be configured with” should be updated as “is always associated with” |
| Intel | Firstly, we agree with LG’s observation that there is no Ng=8 case yet. So, associating coherence with Ng value is not preferred.  Regarding Alt 1, we agree with DOCOMO’s view that some clarification is needed on the Ng that could be configured.  Regarding Alt-2, with “Nested-like codebook”, my interpretation is the UE could be configured with more than one type of precoders. But in the sub-bullets, looks only one type of precoders can be configured. Some clarification is needed.  We also agree that 7-bits is too restrictive. |
| Samsung | Proposal 6.3: if 7-bits is too restrictive, then 10 bit is too much in our view. We need to agree to a max TPMI payload in DCI, without which these alts don’t mean much. Everything under the sun in included in Alt1. We don’t need to support all possible combinations and report a large size TPMI in DCI. |
| Nokia, NSB | Updated Proposal 6.3:  Fully agree with companies’ comments that 7-bits is too restrictive. Rel-15 has 6-bits in the field of “precoding information and number of layers” for 4Tx. For 8Tx we can add extra 3 or 4 bits with a target of 9 bit or 10 bit to support Max 8 layer transmission.  We are supportive to Alt 3, however we are open to Alt 2. |
| FL | Thanks very much for your comments.  @ Samsung: As for 7 bits, we cannot force any specific value at this time. Please keep in mind that each Alt. has its own impact on the DCI overhead.  @ NTT: For each bullet, configuration of precoders associated with Ng of itself is indeed included as the sentence reads “can also be configured”, which means besides what it can do by default.  @Apple: What cases will be supported for Alt1 is for further discussion, please note that the FFS reads “FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered”. Therefore, both of your Case 1 and Case2 can be supported, which can be discussed in the next step.  @LG: Thank you. I try to find a better wording than associated.  @QCOM: I think all potential alternatives are already included, but I may add that bullet as well.  @vivo: Yes, your understanding is correct for both Alt1 and Alt2. Since Alt1 will be costly in terms of overhead, Alt2 is an attempt to bring the flexibility of Alt1 at the expense of reconfiguration of the codebook. Regarding your other point, I started with a much simpler version of this, but companies wanted to have a more elaborate and inclusive definition.  @ZTE: As I mentioned in my reply to NTT, the wording “can also” is used to say that precoders associated with Ng of itself is already included, but other Ng can be considered as well.  @Intel: Please see my reply above to NTT and LG above. Regarding the Alt2, as I replied to vivo, Alt2 is an attempt to bring the flexibility of Alt1 at the expense of reconfiguration of the codebook. Therefore, a UE can be configured with multiple codebook, but one at the time and switching from one to other requires some sort of reconfiguration. |
| Ericsson | **New 6.3:** We can accept the proposal, although it has a lot of configurability. In our view for Alt 1, adding a small number of non-coherent precoders will give all the benefits of power saving, coherence fallback, and directional antenna support, and these can fit into a single codebook. We can accept some extra configurations & UE capabilities if they is essential to other companies, however we would like some further discussion on if we can have some simpler solutions. QC’s proposal to add “Other alternatives are not precluded” to Alt 1 to allow simplified alternatives then seems like a very good idea to us. |
| IDC | Support Alt2. We also agree to simplify the wording on Alt1, as Alt1 is essentially “a big codebook” which includes all possible FC, PC, NC precoders, similar to Rel-15 design, as vivo mentioned. Just highlighting this essence seems sufficient for describing Alt1. Since the drawback of Alt1 is its too big size for 8Tx case, Alt2 is a good way forward in consideration of different codebook design principle for FC vs. PC, as well as the DCI overhead. |
| FL | **Please provide your inputs for the following updated proposals:**  ***Proposal 6.2***  ***Version A –*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,*   * *Support Option 1 where an bit length bitmap is used*   ***Version B –*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,*   * *Support Option 2 where a legacy-based solution is used by extending the existing SRI indication tables to include NSRS=8 and lmax=8*   ***Version A+B –*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,*   * *For Lmax=1 and 2, support Option 1 where an bit length bitmap is used* * *For Lmax>2, support Option 2 where a legacy-based solution is used by extending the existing SRI indication tables to include NSRS=8 and lmax=8*  |  |  | | --- | --- | | *A* | NTT, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Nokia, LG, Samsung, | | *B* | Google, NTT, OPPO, CATT, ZTE, Qualcomm, Intel, Sharp, Apple, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, FGI, Ericsson, IDC, MediaTek, Huawei, NEC | | *A+B* | *vivo* |   *Proposal 6.3: For codebook-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, down-select from,*   * *Alt1 (Nested codebook)*   + *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can also be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for at least one or more other Ng cases, i.e., Ng=2, 4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2 can also be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for at least one or more other Ng cases, i.e., Ng=4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can also be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*   + *A non-coherent UE, Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for Ng = 8* * *Alt2 (Nested-like codebook but needs re-configuration)*    + *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for one of Ng cases, i.e., Ng=1, 2, 4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2, can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for one of Ng cases, i.e., Ng=2, 4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for one of Ng cases, i.e., Ng=4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A non-coherent UE, with Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*   + *FFS whether the configuration can be done dynamically, e.g., MAC-CE or DCI.* * *Alt3 (Not Nested)*   + - *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng=1*     - *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng=2*     - *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng=4*     - *A non-coherent UE, with Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8* * *Other alternatives are not precluded*   *Note: For an 8TX UE, Ng=8 can represent a non-coherent UE.* |
| QC | Proposal 6.2: Version A and Version B seem having the same DCI overhead, i.e., both need bits. Given version B is legacy UE behaviour and a unified design between and , we support version B. Version A+B seems unnecessarily complicated.  For this proposal, I think we should simply go with majority. The situation is quite clear.  Proposal 6.3: We think another alternative, which can simplify the nest codebook design can be added to the proposal, for the completeness. We can call this Alt 1a.   * *Alt1a (Nested codebook)*   + *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can also be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for at most ~~least~~ one ~~or more other~~ Ng cases, i.e., Ng=2, 4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2 can also be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for at most ~~least~~ one ~~or more~~ other Ng cases, i.e., Ng=4, 8*     - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*   + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can also be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*   + *A non-coherent UE, Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for Ng = 8*   We are fine to analyse the pros and cons of each proposal and make a decision in next meeting. |
| Apple | P6.2: we also think Version A+B is unnecessarily complicated. We still support Version B.  P6.3:  Still a few clarification questions for Alt 1. I understand many cases are for further study, but what about the following two cases?  (1) for fully-coherent UEs, are the precoders for Ng=1 always configured? I assume the answer is yes?  (2) for fully-coherent UEs, is it allowed to only configure the precoders for Ng=1? It has the phrase “at least one or more”, so it seems to imply such a case is not allowed?  Also, is there any specific meaning by using “considered for”?  Since we have “other alternatives are not precluded”, it would be good to change “down-select” in the main bullet to “further consider”. |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 6.3: Support in general. Each alternative may have different implication on overall TPMI overhead. In general, more flexibility needs higher overhead. Suggest adding the text:  *For codebook-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, down-select these alternatives based on DCIM overhead ~~from~~,* |
| Google | P6.2: Support Version B.  P6.3: We are not sure whether we should say Ng=1 and Ng=8 for full coherent or non-coherent, since this was not agreed. But if everyone shares the same understanding, we can be fine. |
| Ericsson | **New P6.2:** Version B is the cleanest solution, and is already defined. We expect the editor can manage expressing the tables in a sufficiently compact form.  **New P6.3:**  Support; thanks for the update. Going forward, I hope we can exploit FFS’s to help limit the large amount of configurability in Alt 1. Minor comment: an ‘associated with’ seems to not have been updated for Ng=4 in Alt1:   * + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can also be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*   + *A non-coherent UE, Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for Ng = 8* |
| Lenovo | Proposal 6.2: Support Version A because the standardization effort is less.  Proposal 6.3: We understand the motivation for the proposal. For Alt 3, since only one precoder can be used by one type of UE, the association should be fixed in the spec instead of through RRC configuration. Suggest to change Alt 3 to:     * *Alt3 (Not Nested)*   + - *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can only ~~be configured with~~ use precoders associated with Ng=1*     - *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2, can only ~~be configured with~~ use precoders associated with Ng=2*     - *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can only ~~be configured with~~ use precoders associated with Ng=4*     - *A non-coherent UE, with Ng=8, can only ~~be configured with~~ use precoders associated with Ng = 8*   Regarding the alternatives, we do not see much benefit in Alt 1 for configuring a UE with Ng<8 with more than more than types of precoder at the same time. This will incur too much TPMI overhead. The codebooks for FC, PC Ng=2, PC Ng=4, and NC are designed separately without considering the nested structure. It is also not immediately to us clear a FC UE can achieve better performance with a PC or NC precoder, or a PC UE can achieve better performance with a NC precoder. But if a FC UE can benefit from a PC or NC precoder, it can be configured with a PC or NC codebook, or it can signal to the gNB with a different UE capability so it will use another type of codebook. Both Alt 2 and Alt 3 are OK with us. |
| Samsung | P 6.2   * As commented previously, there is no overhead saving with Ver B when Lmax>3. When Lmax<=3, there is some saving, but the same can be achieved by reducing N\_SRS to 4. For Lmax<=3, there won’t be much difference between N\_SRS=4 and N\_SRS >4. The NW would perhaps configure <=4 SRS resources when L\_max <= 4. * Version A+B: I think vivo’s proposal is opposite, Ver B when Lmax<=2, Ver A when Lmax>2. * Finally, there is almost no difference between Version A+B and Ver B in terms of signaling. Then, why specifying redundant tables in the spec, if the SRI indication is essentially a bitmap?  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | N\_SRS | L\_max=1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |   P 6.3: OK |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 6.2: Support Version A which has less specification impact. Version B also works, but it will introduce about 26 new tables in TS38.212.    Proposal 6.3: We understand the intention of the proposal. However, our previous concern was not resolved. Association btw Ng and coherency capability introduces more confusion. |

# Feature-lead Proposals for Approval

# Round 1

Conclusion

For fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, based on NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook (CodebookMode=1), there is no consensus to support any optional over-sampling ratio.

**Working Assumption**

For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, Ng=2,

* At least the following combinations of layer splitting are supported
  + FFS: For rank>4, all the layers for each CW is mapped to only one antenna group

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** |
| 2 | (2,0), (0,2) |  |
| 2 |  | (1,1) |
| 3 | (3,0), (0,3) |  |
| 3 |  | (1,2), (2,1) |
| 4 | (4,0), (0,4) |  |
| 4 |  | (2,2) |
| 5 |  | (2,3), (3,2) |
| 6 |  | (3,3) |
| 7 |  | (3,4), (4,3) |

**Agreement**

To configure PUSCH transmission by an 8TX UE,

* Alt2: Max number of MIMO layers is RRC configured by extending the range of the legacy parameter *maxRank* and *maxMIMO-Layers* to 8

**Agreement**

To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, if CBG-based transmission is configured, the DL principle for CBGTI DCI field is reused where,

* The first half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the first transport block, while the second half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the second transport block.
* The bit field may be configured to have a length of N bits that can support operation of N/2 CBGs , where N=[2, 4, 6 or 8].

**Agreement**

Framework for full power PUSCH transmission by an 8TX UE

* To support full power transmission with Mode0, Rel-16 Mode0 (fullPower ) is re-used.
  + FFS if any change is required in the specifications.
* **Working Assumption** To support full power transmission with Mode1, Rel-16 Mode1 (fullPowerMode1) is re-used.
  + FFS if more than one of the 8TX full coherent precoders is used ~~per rank~~.
* **Working Assumption** To support full power transmission with Mode2, Rel-16 Mode2 (fullPowerMode2) is re-used.
  + FFS definition of precoder groups (G0, G1, …)
  + FFS enhancements for SRS configuration

**Agreement**

For 8TX UE supporting dual CW PUSCH (Maximum number of layers configured for the UE is larger than 4)

* Alt1 – DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of a transport block, where
* The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable (when transmission rank<=4) transmission of its corresponding TB
* The enabled transport block is mapped to the first CW.
* Note: When the transmission of a transport block is disabled, the number of layers is ≤ 4.
* Note: the first CW refers to the enabled CW.

# Round 2

**Agreement**

For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4, Alt1 is supported where

* Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook,
  + Full-coherent precoders are used
* Further study codebook size reduction

**Agreement**

For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,

* The following rank and layer splitting cases are supported,

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rank | All layers in one Antenna Group | Layers split across 4 Antenna Groups |
| 1 | (1,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0), (0,0,1,0), (0,0,0,1) |  |
| 2 | (2,0,0,0), (0,2,0,0), (0,0,2,0), (0,0,0,2) |  |
| 2 |  | Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:  (1,1,0,0), (1,0,1,0), (1,0,0,1)  (0,1,1,0), (0,1,0,1), (0,0,1,1) |
| 4 |  | (1,1,1,1) |
| 4 |  | Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:  (2,2,0,0), (2,0,2,0), (2,0,0,2)  (0,2,2,0), (0,2,0,2), (0,0,2,2) |
| 8 |  | (2, 2, 2, 2) |

Note: Above is not relevant to how precoders are indicated.

**Agreement**

For non-coherent uplink precoding with rank≤8 by an 8TX UE, down-select from

* Alt1. – All 255 combinations from 8 non-coherent rank1 precoders are supported
* Alt2. – Only a subset of Alt1. is supported, striving for a substantial reduction in the number of precoders

# Round 3

***Proposal 3.4b:***

For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,

* Following ranks are supported,
* The following rank and layer splitting cases are supported,
  + Cases presented in […] may be down-selected based on benefits, use-case and overall DCI overhead

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Rank* | *All layers in one Antenna Group* | *Layers split across 4 Antenna Groups*  *(All possible permutations)* |
| *3* |  | *Transmission by 2 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,0,0), (2,0,1,0), (2,0,0,1),*  ***[****(0,2,1,0), (0,2,0,1), (0,0,2,1),*  *(1,2,0,0), (1,0,2,0), (0,1,2,0),*  *(1,0,0,2), (0,1,0,2), (0,0,1,2)****]***    *Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(1,1,1,0), (1,1,0,1), (1,0,1,1), (0,1,1,1)* |
| *5* |  | *Transmission by 3 of the antenna groups:*  *(2,2,1,0), (2,2,0,1), (2,1,2,0), (2,1,0,2), (2,0,2,1), (0,2,2,1), (0,2,1,2), (1,2,2,0), (1,2,0,2)*  ***[****(2,0,1,2), (0,1,2,2), (1,0,2,2)****]***    *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(1,1,2,1), (1,1,1,2),* ***[****(2,1,1,1), (1,2,1,1)****]*** |
| *6* |  | *Transmission by 3 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,2,2,0), (2,2,0,2), (2,0,2,2), (0,2,2,2)*    *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,2,1), (1,2,1,2), (1,2,2,1), (2,1,1,2),* ***[****(2,2,1,1), (1,1,2,2****]*** |
| *7* |  | *Transmission by 4 of the 4 antenna groups:*  *(2,1,2,2), (1,2,2,2),*  ***[****(2,2,2,1), (2,2,1,2)****]*** |

***Proposal 3.6:*** *For non-coherent uplink precoding with rank≤8 by an 8TX UE, support  ~~down-select from~~*

* Alt1. – All 255 combinations from 8 non-coherent rank1 precoders are supported
* ~~Alt2. – Only a subset of Alt1. is supported,~~~~striving for a substantial reduction in the number of precoders~~

***Proposal 6.2***

***Version A –*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,*

* *Support Option 1 where an bit length bitmap is used*

***Version B –*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,*

* + *Support Option 2 where a legacy-based solution is used by extending the existing SRI indication tables to include NSRS=8 and lmax=8*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A | NTT, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Nokia, LG, Samsung, |
| B | Google, NTT, OPPO, CATT, ZTE, Qualcomm, Intel, Sharp, Apple, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, FGI, Ericsson, IDC, MediaTek, Huawei, NEC |
| A+B | vivo |

***Version A+B –*** For Lmax=1 and 2 support version B, and for Lmax>2 support version A.

*Proposal 6.3: For codebook-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, down-select from,*

* *Alt1 (Nested codebook)*
  + *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can also be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for at least one or more other Ng cases, i.e., Ng=2, 4, 8*
    - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*
  + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2 can also be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for at least one or more other Ng cases, i.e., Ng=4, 8*
    - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*
  + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can also be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*
  + *A non-coherent UE, Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for Ng = 8*
* *Alt2 (Nested-like codebook but needs re-configuration)* 
  + *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for one of Ng cases, i.e., Ng=1, 2, 4, 8*
    - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*
  + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2, can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for one of Ng cases, i.e., Ng=2, 4, 8*
    - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*
  + *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can only be configured with precoders ~~associated with~~ considered for one of Ng cases, i.e., Ng=4, 8*
    - *FFS which Ng value(s), if any, to be considered*
  + *A non-coherent UE, with Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*
  + *FFS whether the configuration can be done dynamically, e.g., MAC-CE or DCI.*
* *Alt3 (Not Nested)*
  + - *A fully-coherent UE (Ng=1) can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng=1*
    - *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=2, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng=2*
    - *A partially-coherent UE, with Ng=4, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng=4*
    - *A non-coherent UE, with Ng=8, can only be configured with precoders associated with Ng = 8*
* *Other alternatives are not precluded*

*Note: For an 8TX UE, Ng=8 represents a non-coherent UE.*

***Proposal 4.2:*** *To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the scheduled CWs, where the target CW is configured by RRC from,*

* *Alt1: First CW*
* *Alt2: The CW with the higher MCS index ~~with highest SE~~ (if MCS~~s~~ indices are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Alt1* | *Lenove, MediaTek, Xiaomi, Sharp, Samsung, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Nokia* |
| *Alt2* | *NEC, CATT, ZTE, Qualcomm, LG, CMCC, Huawei, vivo, FGI, IDC,* |

***Proposal 3.1:*** *For partially coherent 8TX precoding with Ng=2, the precoder indication is based on indication of up to two full-coherent 4TX precoders.*

*Down-select at least one of the following options for precoder indication,*

* *Option 3 – Up to two 4TX TPMIs are indicated,* 
  + *When two TMPIs are indicated, the first is applied on one of antenna group, and the second is applied on the other antenna group,*
  + *FFS: details of TPMI indicating when one TPMI is indicated.*
* *Option 4 – A single 8TX TPMI is indicated*
* *Other options are not precluded*

***Proposal 4.5:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH operation by an 8TX UE, further study whether CG is supported. If supported,*

* *For Type-1 CG: A second mcsAndTBS parameters is configured in rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant*
* *For Type-2 CG: A second MCS field is added in DCI format activating a Type-2 CG-PUSCH*

# List of Companies’ Proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **InterDigital** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Confirm the working assumption to support dual codeword when more than 4 layers, where it is applicable associated with considered UE types, coherency types, etc., based on UE capability.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, support multiplexing the UCI on the CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW).*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Consider UE to report its capabilities on the number of antenna groups, supported type of antenna/panel structure or virtualization capability across UE antenna ports, etc.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For partially coherent uplink precoding for 8TX UE, consider supporting a precoder generation capturing from Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook commonly for both Ng=2 and Ng=4.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For fully-coherent precoding case based on using NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook, supported pairs of (N1, N2) values should be a part of UE capability parameters, and a pair of them can be confirmed by RRC to be enabled and used for the UE.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Only the pair of (O1, O2) = (1, 1) is supported as a minimal set of oversampling factors supported for fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, based on NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook, in consideration of the overhead associated for precoding indication.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *RAN1 studies determination of preferred basis vectors based on UE’s precoded SRS transmissions, where the gNB can signal preferred basis vectors, through SRI indication.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *To reduce signaling overhead associated to SRI/TPMI indication for a 8TX UE, RAN1 studies partial update of TPMI/SRI information for 8TX UE.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *RAN1 defines some basic PA architecture for UEs with CAP2 capability.* |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Confirm the WA that supporting dual CW for uplink transmission with rank>4.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For dual CW PUSCH transmission with up to 8 layers by an 8TX UE*   * *support to reuse Rel-15 NR DL scheme to indicate CBGTI* * *support to reuse Rel-15 NR DL enabling/disabling scheme* * *support to always multiplex UCI on the CW with the highest MCS.*   ***Proposal 3:*** *For SRS configuration required for non-codebook-based UL transmission by an 8TX UE, configuration of up to two, or four SRS resource sets is not supported.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with* 𝑵𝑺𝑹𝑺>𝟒*, a legacy-based SRI indication solution is supported.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Consider to use the reserved NDI field of the disabled transport block for rank<=4 to reduce DCI overhead.*  ***Proposal 6*：***For fully coherent precoder by an 8TX UE, don’t support larger O1, O2 values.*  ***Proposal 7*：***For fully coherent precoder by an 8TX UE, support to enhance DL Type I SP codebook to mitigate the impact of phase alignment error.*  ***Proposal 8*：***For partially coherent precoder with Ng=2 by an 8TX UE, support all possible layer splitting schemes for each rank.*  ***Proposal 9*：***For partially coherent precoder with Ng=4 by an 8TX UE, support to design precoder based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook.*  ***Proposal 10*：***For partially/non-coherent precoder by an 8TX UE, support the following precoding structures*   * *For rank = 1*   + ***or*** * *For rank = 2, 3, 4*   + ***or or*** * *For rank >4,*   *where* 𝑨*,* 𝑨𝟏 *and* 𝑨𝟐 *are fully coherent or partially coherent or non-coherent precoding matrices taken from Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook for partial coherent precoders with Ng=2 or partial coherent precoders Ng=4 or non-coherent precoders.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *The beamformed CSI-RS should be considered to indicate UL precoders to UE.* |
| **ZTE** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Regarding full-coherent codebook design for UL 8-Tx based on Rel-15 DL type I codebook, value range of parameters of DL Type-I 8-Tx codebook should be determined as:*   * *(O1, O2) = (2, 2) can be supported for (N1, N2) = (2, 2), at least for lower ranks, e.g., 4 for rank<=2 or 3* * *(O1, O2) = (2, 1) can be supported for (N1, N2) = (4, 1) and (N1, N2) = (2, 2), at least for lower ranks, e.g., 4 for rank<=2 or 3* * *Definition and range of (i1,1, i1,2, i1,3, i2) in DL Type-I 8-Tx codebook should be reused.*   ***Proposal 2:*** *Regarding partial-coherent codebook design for UL 8-Tx with Ng=2 and Ng=4 based on NR Rel-15 UL 4-Tx/2-Tx UL codebooks,*  - *For TPMI of each port group, only full-coherent UL 4-Tx/2-Tx UL codebook is preferred instead of full+partial+non coherent UL 4-Tx/2-Tx UL codebooks,*  - *For layer splitting, group balanced codebooks can be supported without rank permutation; group selected codebooks can be considered for some UEs with special antenna layout; other codebooks should NOT be supported.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Regarding non-coherent codebook design, the following aspects can be considered to reduce number of candidate non-coherent codebooks:*   * *Number of port groups* * *Limited starting port index, e.g., depending on number of port groups* * *A predefined port index order, e.g., (0,4,1,5,2,6,3,7)*   ***Proposal 4:*** *Regarding port index order,*   * *For Ng=2, select Alt 2: two coherent groups of {0,1,4,5} and {2,3,6,7}* * *For Ng=4, select* *Alt 1: four coherent groups of {0,4}, {1,5}, {2,6}, and {3,7}*   ***Proposal 5:*** *Regarding codebook indication for 8-Tx, individual TPMI indication for each group based on indication of number of port groups should be supported:*   * *For 1-group: one TPMI indicates one 8Tx precoder which needs new defined UL 8Tx codebook for rank 1-8* * *For 2-group: 2 TPMI (rank and UL precoding info), and each for a respective port group* * *For 4-group: 4 TPMI (rank and UL precoding info), and each for a respective port group* * *For 8-group or non-coh: 8 or less bits indicate presence of respective ports*   ***Proposal 6:*** *Regarding overhead reduction for codebook indication for 8-Tx:*   * *A set of available Ng(s) can be configured by RRC, and then one from the set can be dynamically indicated for a scheduled PUSCH transmission.* ▪ *For instance, for a UE supporting full-coherent 8-Tx ports, a list of candidate values of Ng=1, and Ng=2 can be configured by RRC, and DCI only needs to indicate one of them as UL codebook selection.*   ***Proposal 7:*** *Regarding codebook-based SRS configuration,*   * *One SRS resource set is enough, i.e., no need to extend to more than one SRS resource set.* * *One SRI in one SRS resource set indicating one SRS resource is enough, i.e., no need to support more than one SRI in one SRS resource set, or one SRI to indicate more than one SRS resource to combine 8 ports.*   ***Proposal 8:*** *Regarding non codebook based transmission design for 8-Tx, option 2 is supported for SRI indication*   * *Option 2: Use a legacy-based solution*   ***Proposal 9:*** *Regarding non-codebook-based SRS configuration,*   * *One SRS resource set is enough, i.e., no further extension for having more than one SRS resource set.*   ***Proposal 10:*** *To support 2 CWs for PUSCH transmission with rank > 4, CBGTI field is used as for legacy PDSCH, i.e., the first half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the first transport block, while the second half of CBGTI field bits is used to indicate the transmission state of CBGs of the second transport block.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *To support 2 CWs for CG-PUSCH transmission with rank > 4, support to introduce MCS, RV, NDI and CBGTI field for the second transport block of DG-PUSCH in DCI format 0\_1 and format 0\_2.*   * *For Type-1 CG-PUSCH, a second MCS field is indicated in DCI format activating the CG-PUSCH.* * *For Type-2 CG-PUSCH, a second mcsAndTBS parameter is configured for the second CW.* * *A RV sequence parameter (repK-RV) is commonly used by two codewords.*   ***Proposal 12:*** *To support 2 CWs for UL 8-Tx transmission, disabling one of the codewords can be applied in case of retransmission of one of the CWs, where the CW which does not require retransmission can be disabled.*   * *Note: Legacy mechanism defined for PDSCH to disable one of the CWs is reused.*   ***Proposal 13:*** *To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH with rank>4, UCI is multiplexed on the CW with the highest MCS (Alt 2).*  ***Proposal 14****: Regarding full power mode for Rel-18 UL Tx, full power mode 2 is supported as a starting point.* |
| **vivo** | ***Proposal 1****: Configuration of up to two SRS resource sets, each configured with up to 4, or 2 single-port SRS resources is supported.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *At least for 1 max L = when 𝑵𝑺𝑹𝑺 > 𝟒 legacy combinatorial SRI indication is supported, and for larger 𝑳max value when 𝑵𝑺𝑹𝑺 > 𝟒 bitmap is used to indicate SRI.*  ***Proposal 3****: Support indicating 2 SRI fields in DCI, which jointly indicates transmission rank. Further study whether/how to split number of layers between two SRI fields.*  ***Proposal 4****: For 8Tx UE, support SRS configuration of an SRS resource set, configured with at least two 4-port SRS resources.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *At least for configured max rank=1, TPMI indices as in legacy is used, for larger configured max rank value a bitmap of 8 bits is used to indicate precoders.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Support indicating 8Tx non-coherent precoder by 2 TPMI fields in DCI, further study how to select one of the 2 TPMI fields, e.g. for rank=1 transmission*  ***Proposal 7:*** *for rank>4, if dual CW is supported, support one CW is transmitted from one antenna group*  ***Proposal 8****: Support antenna port grouping as {0, 2, 1, 3} and {4, 6, 5, 7}, legacy 4Tx precoders can be applied directly where antenna group {4, 5, 6, 7} corresponds to precoder elements {0, 1, 2, 3}.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *For UEs supporting 2CWs transmission, different codebook subsets are used when 2nd CW is disabled and 2nd CW is enabled by DCI.*  ***Proposal 10****: Codebook constructed by two 4Tx precoders indicated by two TPMI fields is supported for partial-coherent 8Tx UE, one codebook can support antenna structure with Ng=2 and Ng=4.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *Support additional field in DCI to indicate whether one or both of the 2 TPMI fields are applicable for current transmission.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *Do not support additional precoders generated via Alt2a*  ***Proposal 13:*** *Do not support other O1, O2 values than 1, 1 for all rank values*  ***Proposal 14:*** *TPMI for full coherent codebook is generated by sequential indexing of codebook parameters such as rank, i\_1,1, i\_1,2, i\_1,3.*  ***Proposal 15:*** *Confirm the working assumption “for uplink transmission with rank>4, support dual CW transmission”.*  ***Proposal 16:*** *Maximum number of codewords is RRC configured, and second codeword is enabled/disabled dynamically indicated by DCI.*  ***Proposal 17:*** *Support alt 2, that is, UCI is multiplexed on the CW with highest MCS.*  ***Proposal 18:*** *Consider the following full power enhancement for CPE/FWA 8 Tx operation.*   * *Depending on UE capability, UL full-power mode0 is supported.* * *Depending on UE capability, UL full-power mode1 can be supported by introducing non-antenna selection matrices, especially for lower rank* * *Depending on UE capability, further discuss UL full-power mode2 for partial and non-coherent UEs*   + *For partial-coherent codebook, take Ng values {2, 4} into account for full-power precoders grouping*   ***Proposal 19:*** *Discuss potential UE capabilities/features after the overall design becomes clear.*  ***Proposal 20:*** *Further discuss PTRS-DMRS association indication when rank>4, if supported* |
| **OPPO** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For full-coherent uplink codebook, (O1 O2) = (1,1) is sufficient.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For partial-coherent uplink codebook with Ng=4, Alt2 is preferred for unified signaling design with different values of Ng.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For partial-coherent uplink codebook with Ng=2, the following layer splitting is supported for each rank:*   * *(1,1) or (0,2) or (2,0) for rank2* * *(1,2) or (0,3) or (3,0) for rank3* * *(2,2) for rank4* * *(2,3) for rank5* * *(3,3) for rank6* * *(3,4) for rank7* * *(4,4) for rank8*   ***Proposal 4:*** *For non-coherent 8Tx codebook, consider whether all the antenna port combinations are supported or not.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Strive for unified TPMI signaling at least for partial coherent codebook with different Ng and non-coherent codebook.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *For Ng=2, support two coherent groups of {0,1,4,5} and {2,3,6,7}; For Ng=4, support four coherent groups of {0,4}, {1,5}, {2,6} and {3,7}.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Support separate indication of TRI and TPMI.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *Multiple SRS resource sets for CB or NCB based 8-port transmission is not needed.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *one SRI/TRI/TPMI indication is sufficient for uplink codebook based 8-port transmission.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *For uplink transmission with rank>4, support UCI to be always multiplexed on the first CW.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with NSRS>4, prefer option 2 (legacy mechanism) for SRI indication.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *For study of full power transmission, antenna ports in one antenna port group can be assumed with the same maximal transmit power.* |
| **Spreadtrum Communications** | ***Proposal1:*** *For a fully-coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE,*   * *Only support NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook.* * *Only support Ng=1.*   ***Proposal 2:*** *For a partially-coherent 8TX UE with Ng=2, support the following precoding structure based on Rel-15 UL 4TX fully-coherent codebook*   * *or for rank=1* * *or for rank=2~4* * *for rank=5~8*   *where* 𝑨, 𝑨𝟏 *and* 𝑨𝟐 *are precoding matrices taken from Rel-15 4TX UL fully-coherent codebook.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For a partially-coherent 8TX UE with Ng=4, support the similar principle as Ng=2, i.e. the precoding matrices for 4 antenna groups are taken from Rel-15 2TX UL fully-coherent codebook.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For a non-coherent 8TX UE, support the same codebook structure as partially-coherent codebook, and the precoding matrices can be taken from Rel-15 4TX UL non-coherent codebook for Ng=2 and from Rel-15 2TX UL non-coherent codebook for Ng=4.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For enabling/disabling CW,*   * *An RRC parameter is configured in PUSCH-config to indicate the maximal number of CWs scheduled by DCI.* * *The special values of MCS field and RV field can be used to enable/disable the corresponding transport block.*   ***Proposal 6:*** *For CBG based dual CW transmission for PUSCH, the design principle in DL DCI can be reused for CBGTI field in UL DCI.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, support Alt1, i.e. UCI is always multiplexed on the first CW.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *Don’t support more than one SRS resource sets configuration for non-codebook-based UL transmission by an 8TX UE.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *For SRI indication for non-codebook-based UL transmission by an 8TX UE, support Option 2, i.e. legacy-based solution.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *Consider the potential method to reduce SRI overhead.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *Only support one SRS resource set containing 8-port SRS resource(s) for codebook-based UL transmission by an 8TX UE.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *For codebook-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, TPMI design should be decided after codebook design.*  ***Proposal 13:*** *Support full power mode1 for an 8TX UE and introduce 8TX full power precoder(s).* |
| **CATT** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For UL 8TX operation, whether a subset or all of precoding matrices in non-coherent codebook are included in partial-coherent codebook and full-coherent codebook shall be studied.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For UL 8TX operation, if a subset of port selection precoding matrices is supported for non-coherent codebook, where all port selection precoding matrices for low ranks (e.g. for rank=1,2) are kept and precoding matrices for high ranks (e.g. for rank>2) are down selected.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=2, the following rank and layer splitting cases are supported:*   * *For rank 1, support (1,0) and (0,1);* * *For rank 2, support (1,1);* * *For rank 3, support (1,2);* * *For rank 4, support (2,2);* * *For rank 5, support (2,3);* * *For rank 6, support (3,3);* * *For rank 7, support (3,4);* * *For rank 8, support (4,4).*   ***Proposal 4:*** *For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=2,*   * *For rank 3, precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook with a full-coherent precoder and a partial-coherent precoder used;* * *For rank 5, precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook with two partial-coherent precoders used;* * *For rank 7, precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook with a partial-coherent precoder and a non-coherent precoder used.*   ***Proposal 5****: For partially coherent uplink precoding (maxRank = 4) by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=4,*   * *Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook,*    + *If Alt 1 (i.e., precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook) is adopted, down selection on precoders for several ranks is considered to restrict the codebook size be the same level as that for Ng=4.*   + *If Alt 2 (i.e., precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook) is adopted, the number of precoding matrixes for rank 3 and rank 4 shall be larger than that for rank 1 and rank 2.*   ***Proposal 6:*** *For fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, based on NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook (CodebookMode=1), combinations of (O1, O2) other than (1, 1) are not supported.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *For TPMI indication for codebook based 8TX PUSCH, the legacy framework in Rel-15 is reused, i.e., TPMI and TRI are jointly indicated by a single field.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For SRS configuration for non-codebook based 8TX PUSCH, except for M-TRP transmission schemes, configuring multiple SRS resource sets is not supported.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with 𝑵𝑺𝑹𝑺>𝟒, a legacy-based SRI indication solution is supported.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, candidate values of 𝑳𝒎𝒂𝒙 is extended to include values of up to 8.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *Confirm the following working assumption:*   * *For uplink transmission with rank>4, support dual CW transmission.*   ***Proposal 12:*** *For PUSCH transmission with rank>4, UE always applies 2 CWs transmission.*  ***Proposal 13:*** *For codebook based 8TX PUSCH transmission, maxRank and maxRankDCI-0-2 are used to indicate whether two CWs transmission is enabled for DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2 respectively.*  ***Proposal 14:*** *For non-codebook based 8TX PUSCH transmission, maxMIMO-Layers, if is configured, is used to indicate whether 2 CWs transmission is enabled; if maxMIMO-Layers is not configured, if the maximum number of layers for PUSCH supported by the UE is larger than 4, 2 CWs transmission is enabled, and if the maximum number of layers for PUSCH supported by the UE is no more than 4, 2 CWs transmission is disabled.*  ***Proposal 15:*** *For 8TX PUSCH transmission, if 2 CWs for rank>4 is supported, the number of transmission layers for the PUSCH is used to determine whether the second transport block is disabled.*  ***Proposal 16:*** *To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on the CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW).*  ***Proposal 17:*** *To support dual CW PUSCH transmission for rank>4 by an 8TX UE, two new fields are used to indicate the second set of NDI (1 bit) and RV (2 bits) fields respectively.*  ***Proposal 18:*** *For 8TX PUSCH transmission with rank > 4 and configured with maximum 2 PTRS ports, the reserved field in antenna ports field is used to indicate the associated DMRS for UL PTRS port 1.*  ***Proposal 19:*** *For an 8TX UE with UE Capability 1, scaling factor s=1 for all precoders is supported.*  ***Proposal 20:*** *Support Rel-16 UL FTxP mode 2 for an 8TX UE with UE Capability 2/3.* |
| **Lenovo** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Use antenna grouping to represent different UL Tx coherence assumptions, with the following conditions*   * *Antennas within an antenna group are coherent.* * *Antennas within an antenna group are uniformly spaced.* * *Antenna configurations of different antenna groups are identical.* * *Coherence assumptions of two antennas across two antenna groups are the same.*   ***Proposal 2:*** *A number of antenna coherence groups Nc is used to characterize the coherence assumption across Ng antenna groups, where Nc is the number of antenna groups in which all antennas of the antenna groups are coherent, and* 𝑵𝒄≤𝑵𝒈*.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For coherence-based antenna grouping under partial-coherent UEs:*   * *Nc=2: Support Alt-2, i.e.,: two coherent groups of {0,1,4,5} and {2,3,6,7}* * *Nc=4: Support Alt-1, i.e.,: four coherent groups of {0,4}, {1,5}, {2,6}, and {3,7}*   ***Proposal 4:*** *Support layer splitting across two antenna groups in Table 1 for Ng=2.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Support to have separate fields for TRI and TPMI in the DCI.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *At least for rank 1 and 2, consider using non-coherent and partial coherent and full coherent codewords from R15 rank 1 codebook.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *When codewords for each antenna group can be non-coherent or partial coherent or full coherent codeword, the two 4TX codewords shall have the same type.*  ***Propoal 8:*** *The TPMI field indicates a combination of two precoding matrices of the corresponding rank for the two antenna groups.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *Support to base the precoders for Ng=4 on R15 2TX full coherent codewords (Alt 1).*  ***Proposal 10:*** *Construct the rank 1 and rank 2 codebook for individual antenna group for Ng=4 using the four rank 1 full coherent precoders* (𝟏√[],𝟏√𝟐[],𝟏√𝟐[],𝟏√𝟐[]) *alone, and apply multiple such codewords to multiple antenna groups for high rank transmission.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *For Ng=4, r=1,2,3, the TPMI signals r rank-1 2TX full coherent precoders for r antenna groups, each codeword applied to an antenna group.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *For Ng=4, r=4, the four rank-1 2TX full coherent precoders are applied to the four antenna groups in a fixed order, giving a single rank-4 precoder.*  ***Proposal 13:*** *For Ng=4, r>4, r-4 additional rank-1 2TX full coherent precoders are applied to r-4 antenna groups on top of the respective rank-1 precoders used for rank-4 transmission, making these r-4 antenna groups each transmit two layers. The additional rank-1 2TX full coherent precoders shall be different from the rank-1 precoders used for rank-4 transmission in the same group, and shall be different from each other.*  ***Proposal 14:*** *The TPMI field in the DCI scheduling PUSCH signals (antenna groups, codewords) combination jointly.*  ***Proposal 15:*** *Study mechanism to indicate paramters for a UE to obtain a full coherent precoding matrix and use only mode 1 of Rel-15 DL Type 1 codebook for full coherent 8TX UE.*  ***Proposal 16:*** *TPMI signaling overhead is considered as a performance metric together with the performance.*  ***Proposal 17:*** *For full coherent UE, support (O1, O2)=(2,1) for (N1,N2)=(4,1), and (O1, O2)=(2,2) for (N1,N2)=(2,2) in addtion to* (O1, O2) = (1, 1)*.*  ***Proposal 18:*** *Define the supported values for* (O1, O2) as UE capability.  ***Proposal 19:*** *Introduce bitmap based TPMI indication for non-coherent 8Tx.*  ***Proposal 20:*** *Introduce bitmap based SRI indication for non-codebook based 8Tx PUSCH transmission for NSRS>4.*  ***Proposal 21:*** *Introduce two SRI fields for transmission rank higher than 4.*  ***Proposal 22:*** *The maximal number of layer is RRC configured subject to UE capability. When a UE is configured to support more than 4 layers of PUSCH transmission, dual CW is automatically enabled.*  ***Proposal 23:*** *When dual CWs PUSCH transmission is enabled by the NW, the UL grant should indicate the MCS, NDI, RV indication for the second CW.*  ***Proposal 24:*** *For two codewords, UCI is always multiplexed in the first codeword.*  ***Proposal 25:*** *Support permutation of the layers in the precoding matrix.*  ***Proposal 26:*** *De-prioritize the full power operation for partial and non-coherent 8Tx UE based on full power mode 1.*  ***Proposal 27:*** *Study the performance benefits, signaling overhead and specification impact of supporting frequency-selective precoding for 8Tx UE.* |
| **Intel Corporation** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For the design of 8-port full coherent precoders based on DL Type I codebook, the overhead should be considered – in order to enable TPMI signaling efficiency, introducing restrictions on parameters* 𝑖1,1*,* 𝑖1,2*,* 𝑖1,3*, and* 𝑖2 *could be considered.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For partial coherent precoders with two antenna groups (Ng=2), support the layer splitting across both antenna groups for Rank-{2,3,4}.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For partial coherent precoders with four antenna groups (Ng=4), support Alt 1, i.e., the precoding design could be based on Rel-15 UL 2Tx full coherent codebook.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For partial coherent precoders with four antenna groups (Ng=4), RAN1 to further discuss the layer splitting among antenna groups to reduce TPMI overhead.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For non-coherent precoder design with 8-port, consider similar design scheme as partial coherent precoder construction, i.e., based on up to two Rel-15 4Tx non-coherent precoders.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *For full coherent precoder indication, support DCI indication of the parameters for Type I codebook, i.e.,* 𝑖1,1*,* 𝑖1,2*,* 𝑖1,3*, and* 𝑖2*.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *For 8-port partial coherent precoders with Ng=2, up to two Rel-15 4Tx full coherent precoders could be indicated in DCI.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For 8-port partial coherent precoders with Ng=4, up to four Rel-15 2Tx full coherent precoders could be indicated in DCI.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *For 8-port non-coherent precoders, up to two Rel-15 4Tx non-coherent precoders could be indicated in DCI.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *For the indication of 8-port precoder with different coherence, discuss whether the TPMI components are signaled separately (via single or multiple TPMI fields) or jointly (via single TPMI field).*  ***Proposal 11:*** *Regarding the separate encoding or joint encoding between rank indication and precoder indication, discuss whether the same scheme or different scheme could be applied for precoders with different coherence type.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *Consider flexible rank restriction (bitmap) to reduce the DCI overhead for TPMI indication.*  ***Proposal 13:*** *RAN1 to discuss the following options on codebook subset configuration in Rel-18:*   * *Option 1: the codebook subset contains precoders of only one coherence type* * *Option 2: the codebook subset contains precoder of multiple coherence types (similar as Rel-15). MAC-CE or DCI could further indicate the coherence type which is used for precoder indication.*   ***Proposal 14:*** *Regarding UCI multiplexing, support Alt 1, i.e., UCI is multiplexed with the first codeword.*  ***Proposal 15:***   * *When the configured maximum number of layers is <=4, only one MCS/NDI/RV field is present in DCI.* * *When the configured maximum number of layers is >4, both MCS/NDI/RV fields are present in DCI. The DL principle is reused for disabling transmission of one codeword.*   ***Proposal 16:*** *RAN1 to consider supporting full power Mode 0 for 8Tx UE.*  ***Proposal 17:*** *For full power Mode 1 operation, RAN1 to consider similar design principle as Rel-16, i.e., adding full coherent precoder to the non-coherent codebook subset and the partial coherent codebook subset.*  ***Proposal 18:*** *For full power Mode 2 operation, RAN1 to consider extending the Rel-16 framework to 8Tx UE.*  ***Proposal 19:*** *For non-codebook based PUSCH transmission with 8Tx, support joint encoding of SRI and rank indicator. Rank restriction (e.g., a bitmap) could be considered to further reduce overhead.* |
| **Sony** | ***Proposal 1:*** *RAN1 should confirm the working assumption*   * *For uplink transmission with rank>4, support dual CW transmission.*   ***Proposal 2:*** *For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4, support Alt 1: First CW*  ***Proposal 3:*** *A second set of NDI and RV fields for the second CW should be indicated by UL grant.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For codebook design of an 8TX partial-coherent UE, the following alternative for coherent groups should be supported*   * *For when Ng=2, the following convention for assumption of port coherency scheme is used*   + *Alt 2: two coherent groups of {0,1,4,5} and {2,3,6,7}* * *For when Ng=4, the following convention for assumption of port coherency scheme is used*   + *Alt 1: four coherent groups of {0,4}, {1,5}, {2,6}, and {3,7}* |
| **Xiaomi** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Confirm the Working Assumption to support dual CW for RANK>4 8Tx transmission.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Support separate MCS, NDI and RV indication fields for the second CW, the definition for each indication field can be the same as the first codeword.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Specify the RRC signaling to enable/disable the second CW.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For better scheduling flexibility, support configuration of up to 2 or 4 SRS resource sets, each configured with up to 4 or 2 single-port SRS resources accordingly.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For non-codebook based PUSCH transmission with 8Tx, support Option 1 to use a bitmap corresponding to all SRS resources configured which is preferred for the simplicity without any effort on the design of new SRI tables.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Introduce a UE capability to report the supported antenna configuration to gNB.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *To make a trade-off among performance, signalling overhead, and implementation complexity, only support (O1,O2) = (1,1) for (N1,N2) = (4,1) and (N1,N2) = (2,2).*  *Observation 4: For both (N1,N2) = (4,1) and (N1,N2) = (2,2), when rank=4, there is almost no performance loss for the codebook with fixed i1,3={0} compared to the codebook with flexible i1,3={0,1,2,3}.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For Rel-18 UL 8Tx fully-coherent codebook, support the following configuration parameters.*   * *(N1,N2,O1,O2) = (4,1,1,1)* ▪ *Rank=1: i1,1={0,1,2,3}, i1,2={0}, i2={0,1,2,3}*    + *Rank=2,3,4: i1,1={0,1,2,3}, i1,2={0}, i1,3={0}, i2={0,1}*   + *Rank=5,6: i1,1={0,2}, i1,2={0}, i2={0,1}*   + *Rank=7,8: i1,1={0}, i1,2={0}, i2={0,1}* * *(N1,N2,O1,O2) = (2,2,2,2)* ▪ *Rank=1: i1,1={0,1}, i1,2={0,1}, i2={0,1,2,3}*    + *Rank=2,3,4: i1,1={0,1}, i1,2={0,1}, i1,3={0}, i2={0,1}*   + *Rank=5,6: i1,1={0,1}, i1,2={0}, i2={0,1}*   + *Rank=7,8: i1,1={0}, i1,2={0}, i2={0,1}*   ***Proposal 9:*** *For Rel-18 UL 8Tx fully-coherent codebook, support the union set of codebook with (N1,N2) = (4,1) and codebook with (N1,N2) = (2,2).*  ***Proposal 10:*** *For Rel-18 UL 8Tx fully-coherent codebook, further study how to introduce the non DFT codewords or select the indices {i1,1, i1,2, i1,3, i2} candidate.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *Support Alt2 for two coherent groups of {0,1,4,5} and {2,3,6,7} for Ng=2. Support Alt1 for four coherent groups of {0,4}, {1,5}, {2,6}, and {3,7} for Ng=4.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *Support the following rank splitting rule for Ng=2.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Rank* | *All layers in one Antenna Group* | *Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups* | | *2* | *(2,0), (0,2)* | - | | *2* | - | *(1,1)* | | *3* | *(3,0), (0,3)* | - | | *3* | - | *(1,2), (2,1)* | | *4* | *(4,0), (0,4)* | - | | *4* | - | *(2,2)* | | *5* | - | *(2,3), (3,2)* | | *6* | - | *(3,3)* | | *7* | - | *(3,4), (4,3)* |   ***Proposal 13:*** *For PUSCH transmission by a partially-coherent 8TX UE with Ng=2, support the precoding structure**where and are precoding matrices taken from Rel-15 UL 4Tx fully-coherent codebook or empty matrix, the rank=rank****()*** *+ rank****()*** *is one of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8, and rank****(****) and rank****()*** *are determined based on the rank splitting rule.*  ***Proposal 14:*** *For partially-coherent codebook, the candidate of Rel-15 UL 4Tx fully-coherent codebook should be further down-selected to reduce the signalling overhead, e.g., based on the principle that minimizing the cosine similarity between each codewords.*  ***Proposal 15:*** *For PUSCH transmission by a partially-coherent 8TX UE with Ng=4, support the precoding structure**where* ***, ,*** *and**are precoding matrices taken from Rel-15 2TX UL fully-coherent codebook or empty matrix, the rank= rank****()*** *+ rank****()*** *+ rank****()*** *+ rank****()*** *is one of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8, and rank****(),*** *rank****(****), rank****()****, and rank****()*** *are determined based on the rank splitting rule for Ng=4 when Rel-15 UL 2Tx fully-coherent codebook is used.*  ***Proposal 16:*** *For PUSCH transmission by a partially-coherent 8TX UE with Ng=4, support the precoding structure**where and are precoding matrices taken from Rel-15 UL 4Tx partially-coherent codebook or empty matrix, the rank=rank****()*** *+ rank****()*** *is one of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8, and the rank splitting rule can follow the same rule as that of Ng=2.*  ***Proposal 17:*** *Row/Column-interleaving operation should be used for Rel-18 UL 8Tx partially-coherent codewords to satisfy different port coherency schemes.*  ***Proposal 18:*** *Antenna selection vectors/matrixes can be used for the Rel-18 UL 8Tx non-coherent codebook. Considering the signalling overhead, all antenna selection vectors/matrixes can be used for 1≤rank≤X, a part of antenna selection vectors/matrixes can be used for X<Rank≤Y, and only one antenna selection vector/matrix can be used for Y<Rank≤8. The value of X and Y can be left for further study, e.g., X=2 and Y=4.*  ***Proposal 19:*** *For Rel-18 8Tx UE, the legacy codebook subset configuration rule can be reused, i.e., the fully-coherent UE can be configured with 'fullyAndPartialAndNonCoherent' codebook, partially-coherent UEs can be configured with 'partialAndNonCoherent' codebook, and non-coherent UE can be configured with 'NonCoherent' codebook.*  ***Proposal 20:*** *For TPMI design, reusing the joint indication of TRI and TPMI (legacy rule). Considering the signalling overhead, the bit width of precoding information and number of layers for Rel-18 UL 8Tx codebook can be set as 7 or 8 bits.*  ***Proposal 21:*** *For TPMI design, using 2 bits to indicate the coherence type (fully-coherent, or partially-coherent, or non-coherent), and in each coherence type, legacy joint indication of TRI and TPMI is supported.*  ***Proposal 22:*** *For TPMI design, using 1 bit to indicate the coherence type (fully-coherent, or partially-coherent + non-coherent), and in each coherence type, legacy joint indication of TRI and TPMI is supported.*  ***Proposal 23:*** *For TPMI design, considering non-unified indication rule for different coherence types if non-nested codebook is supported. For example, using i1,1, i1,2, i1,3, and i2 to indicate fully-coherent codebook and using two/four fields to indicate two/four Rel-15 UL 4Tx/2Tx precoding matrices.*  ***Proposal 24:*** *If separate/joint indication of antenna group and TPMI as well as the nested codebook are supported, the actual antenna group number of the precoding matrix indicated by the gNB should be defined, e.g., using notation Ng’.* |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For (N1, N2) = (4,1), consider supporting at least (O1, O2) = (4,1) based on UE capability. For (N1, N2) = (2,2), consider supporting at least (O1, O2) = (4,4) based on UE capability.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For Ng=2, study the listed TPMI designs of either single TPMI or two TPMIs with system-level simulations, together with consideration of TPMI signaling size.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For Ng=4, study the listed TPMI designs of 4 TPMIs, 2TPMIs and 1 TPMI with system-level simulations, together with considerations of precoder indication size.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Study other possible implementations other than Ng=2 and Ng=4*  ***Proposal 5:*** *The precoder indication field in DCI can be shared for both coherent codebook and partial/non-coherent codebook, subject to UE capability indication and gNB RRC signaling.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Support all SRS port combination and 8-bit bit-map SRI for 8Tx.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Study channel models that capture the effect of differing average per layer BLER performance for link level evaluation of 8TX.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *Study and support Rel-16 full power mode 1 and mode 2 for 8Tx support.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *Use these two antenna layouts with Ng=2 and Ng=4 to support model-1 and model-2 for full Tx power feature.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, support Alt 1: UCI is always multiplexed on the first CW.* |
| **Google** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support a modified Alt2 for UCI multiplexing as follows:*   * *Alt2: The CW with the MCS with highest SE (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)*   ***Proposal 2:*** *Support the 8Tx UE to report the UE capability with regard to spatial domain fallback operation, including:*   * *Supported UL full power mode when it is configured as 2Tx, 4Tx and 8Tx based UL transmission* * *Supported codebook coherency subset when it is configured as 2Tx, 4Tx and 8Tx based UL transmission*   ***Proposal 3:*** *Support joint indication of TRI and TPMI for 8Tx PUSCH.* |
| **Sharp** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Rel-18 8TX does not support the pairs of values other than (N1, N2) = {(4,1), (2,2)}.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Support the pairs of oversampling value (O1, O2) = {(1,1), (2,1), (2,2)}.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *UE should report the capability of supported (O1, O2).*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Support the following precoding structure of codebook design for partial-coherent with Ng = 2 according to the agreement in the previous meeting.*  ***,*** *where 𝐀𝟏 and 𝐀𝟐 are precoding matrices taken from Rel-15 4TX UL codebook, the rank = rank(𝐀𝟏) + rank(𝐀𝟐) is one of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *The performance difference between Alt1 and Alt2 of codebook design for partial coherent with Ng = 4 should be clarified.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *The codebookSubset should be separated by one coherent capability.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Support the following precoding structure of codebook design for partial-coherent with Ng = 2 and 4.*  ***,****where 𝐀𝟏 and 𝐀𝟐 are precoding matrices taken from Rel-15 4TX UL codebook, the rank = rank(𝐀𝟏) + rank(𝐀𝟐) is one of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8.*   * *Ng = 2: A1 and A2 correspond to only FC precoder.* * *Ng = 4: A1 and A2 correspond to only PC precoder.*   ***Proposal 8:*** *It should be a UE capability for rank>4 to support dual codeword transmission.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *Support the disabling the second CW following method, used for DL specification.*   * *The combination of IMCS = 26 and rvid = 1 indicated for a CW is used as an indication to disable transmission of its corresponding TB.*   ***Proposal 10:*** *Support the Alt2 for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE.*   * *Alt2: The CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)*   ***Proposal 11:*** *UE capability should indicate only the number of antennas needed to achieve full power transmission.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *Both of Mode 0 and Mode 1 for uplink full power transmission should be supported.* |
| **LG Electronics** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For full coherent 8Tx UL codebook, oversampling factor other than (O1, O2) = (1, 1) is not supported.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Support Ng=2 and Ng=4 for fully coherent codebook.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Support two-level partial coherency for codebook based 8Tx UL transmission.*   * *Level-1: 2-group 4Tx coherency (Ng=2)*    + *Coherency PUSCH port groups consist of {1000, 1001, 1004, 1005} and {1002, 1003, 1006, 1007}.* * *Level-2: 4-group 2Tx coherency (Ng=4)*    + *Coherency PUSCH port groups consist of {1000, 1004}, {1001, 1005}, {1002, 1006}, and {1003, 1007}.*   ***Proposal 4:*** *For Ng=2 partially coherent codebook, layer split across 2 antenna groups can be prioritized. FFS on further reduction.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For Ng=4 partially coherent codebook, Alt 1 (using Rel-15 2 Tx fully coherent codebook) can be prioritized.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *For non-coherent codebook, discuss how to efficiently reduce the number of codebooks especially for rank 3 to 7.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Reuse principle of Rel-15 codebook subset for CB based UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *Rank-1 uplink codebook for DFT-s-OFDM is supported in 8 Tx UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *For UCI multiplexing for 2CW, support Alt 2 (The CW with the highest MCS).*  ***Proposal 10:*** *For indication of disabled TB of 8Tx transmission with rank>4, use MCS=26 and RV=1 combination.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *Postpone the discussion of full power operation until finalizing the non and partial coherent codebook.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *For SRS configuration of non-codebook based UL, support Option 1 (use an bit length bitmap bit-map).*  ***Proposal 13:*** *Further consider following alternatives for overhead reduction for 8Tx codebook based UL transmission.*   * *Alt1. Codebook sub sampling* * *Alt2. Hierarchical indication (e.g., MAC-CE + DCI)* |
| **Samsung** | ***Proposal 1****: antennae within a group are coherent, and antennae across multiple groups are non-coherent*   * *Do not support full coherent precoders with 𝑁𝑔=2,4*   ***Proposal 2:*** *reuse DL Type I codebook parameters (*𝑁𝑔,𝑁1,𝑁2*) to describe/configure 8Tx UL codebook for different coherence types*   * *FC: (𝑁𝑔,𝑁1,𝑁2,𝑃)=(1,4,1,2),(1,2,2,2)* * *PC: (𝑁𝑔,𝑁1,𝑁2,𝑃)=(2,2,1,2),(4,1,1,2)* * *NC: (𝑁𝑔,𝑁1,𝑁2,𝑃)=(8,−,−,−)* * *FC/PC precoders: comprises two components*   + *selection of antenna group(s)*   + *precoder associated with the selected antenna group(s)*   1. • *NC precoders: selection of antenna group(s), where a group comprises single antenna*   ***Proposal 3****: similar to Rel.16-18 Type II codebook design, the metric for evaluating different 8Tx codebook alternatives should be UPT gain vs codebook size (TPMI overhead).*  ***Proposal 4:*** *support the following regarding full-coherent precoder design*   * *Codebook parameters*    + *𝐿=1*   + *Oversampling factor 𝑂𝑖=2 can be supported at least for rank 1-2* * *Codebook subsampling: Rel. 16 DL Type I single codebook is subsampled by a factor 𝑁, i.e., a subset of Rel. 15 Type I codebook is used as FC precoders in 8Tx UL codebook*   + *Rank 1-2: 𝑁=1 (no subsampling)*   + *Rank 3-4: 𝑁=2 (subsampling by 2)*   + *Rank 5-8: 𝑁=4 (subsampling by 4)*   + *(𝑖1,1,𝑖1,2,𝑖2): number of supported values decreases with rank (e.g. rank 1-2 supports all values, and rank > 2 supports a subset of values)*   + *𝑖1,3: support only 𝑖1,3=0*   ***Proposal 5:*** *support the following regarding partial coherent precoder design*   * *𝑁𝑔*=2*: based on one Rel. 15 UL 4Tx full-coherent precoder* 𝑃𝑅 o *Group 1: Layers (columns)* 1,…𝐿1 *of the 4Tx precoding matrix* 𝑃𝑅   + *Group 2: Layers (columns)* 4−𝐿2+1,…4 *of the 4Tx precoding matrix* 𝑃𝑅 * *𝑁𝑔*=4*: Alt2 (based on Rel. 15 UL 4Tx partial-coherent precoders)*   ***Proposal 6:*** *support the following mechanisms to reduce TPMI payload*   * *Mechanism 1: based on codebook parameter*   + *𝐿=1*   + *Lower oversampling factors: 𝑂𝑖=2 for rank 1-2 and 𝑂𝑖=1 for rank > 2* * *Mechanism 2: based on efficient signalling for the indication of (A) antenna group(s), and (B) UL precoding matrix, e.g.* two separate indicators, e.g. SRI for (A) and TPMI for (B)   ***Proposal 7****: Discussion on full power modes can start after the 8Tx codebook design is sufficiently mature*  ***Proposal 8****: regarding 8Tx NCB based UL transmission,*   * *Number of SRS resource sets: support two SRS resource sets in addition to one SRS resource set* * *When 𝑁𝑆𝑅𝑆>4, support Option1 (the SRI indication is based on a length-𝑁𝑆𝑅𝑆 bitmap*   ***Proposal 9****: regarding 2 CWs for > 4 layers*   * *confirm the working assumption* * *UCI multiplexing: support Alt1 (UCI is multiplexed on the 1st CW)* * *Enable/disable 2nd CW: do not support any new signalling, and higher layer indication of maxRank can be used to enable/disable the 2nd CW.* |
| **CMCC** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, (O1, O2) = (1,1) is supported for (N1, N2) = (4, 1), and (O1, O2) = (2,1), (2,2) is supported for (N1, N2) = (2, 2).*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For codebook design of an 8TX partial-coherent UE, when Ng=2, support Alt 2: two coherent groups of {0,1,4,5} and {2,3,6,7}, when Ng=4, support Alt 1: four coherent groups of {0,4}, {1,5}, {2,6}, and {3,7}.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For codebook design of an 8TX partial-coherent UE, one precoding matrix* 𝑾𝟎 *and phase offset* 𝜶 *are indicated to UE for generating 8 TX codebook* ***.***  ***Proposal 4:*** *For codebook design of an 8TX partial-coherent UE, the phase offset equals to 0 could support to indicate the codebook of antenna groups selection.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Support joint indication of rank and precoding information, where RI is the total number of transmission layers from different antenna groups.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Support the following combinations of layer splitting:*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Rank | All layers in one Antenna Group | Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups | | 2 | (2,0), (0,2) |  | | 2 |  | (1,1) | | 3 | (3,0), (0,3) |  | | 3 |  | (2,1), (1,2) | | 4 | (4,0), (0,4) |  | | 4 |  | (2,2)~~, (3,1), (1,3)~~ | | 5 |  | ~~(4,1), (1,4),~~ (2,3), (3,2) | | 6 |  | ~~(4,2), (2,4),~~ (3,3) | | 7 |  | (4,3), (3,4) |   ***Proposal 7:*** *For 8 TX CAP1 UE, fullpower mode specified in Rel-16 can be reused for 8TX full power transmission, where the power scaling factor is fixed to 1 for PUSCH power control.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For fullpowerMode1, at least one full coherent precoder per rank is selected for full power transmission.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *For fullpowerMode2 with antenna virtualization, a maximum of 4 SRS resources with 8 ports, 4 ports, 2 ports, or 1 port can be supported for usage set to ‘codebook’ in a set to not increase the overhead of SRI field in DCI.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *The enhancement of fullpowerMode2 with TPMI groups indication can be discussed later when codebook design has been finished.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *Support Option 2 that use a legacy-based solution for SRI indication for NCB transmission.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *The UE capable of “fullyAndPartialAndNonCoherent” transmission could be configured with fullCoherent codebook subset, or partialCoherent codebook subset or nonCoherent codebook subset, the UE capable of “partialAndNonCoherent” transmission could be configured with partialCoherent codebook subset or nonCoherent codebook subset, the UE capable of “nonCoherent” transmission only could be configured with nonCoherent codebook subset.* |
| **MediaTek Inc.** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Consider only (O1, O2) = (1,1) with DL Type I CBs for full coherent UE as there is not significant benefits observed with oversampling factor greater than 1.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Prioritize CB design for Ng = 2, specifically for partial coherent transmission.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Support to split the layers across the coherency groups as it allows for efficient power utilization in case of different PAs associated with different coherency groups.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Restrict layer splitting combinations as explained in the Table III to limit the TPMI field size.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Precoder structure as presented in Table II can be adopted for partial coherent CBs.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Consider 2Tx basis and co-phasing factors to generate co-phased beams which will serve as the precoders of partially coherent UE (Ng = 2 or 4). The following predefined basis set is considered to generate all the possible precoders.*   * {[11];[1−1];[1j];[1−j]}; {[111−1];[11j−j]}; ∅∈{1,j,−1,−j}   ***Proposal 7:*** *Rank dependent co-phasing factors restriction to be considered for DCI overhead saving.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *Support to reuse Rel-16 Mode 0 full power operation for UL 8Tx.* |
| **FGI** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support configuration of at least one SRS resource set, configured with 𝟖/𝑴 of M-port SRS resources for SRS configuration supporting codebook-based UL transmission by an 8TX UE (𝑴=𝟐,𝟒)*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For codebook design of an 8TX partial-coherent UE*   * *Support antenna numbering with two coherent groups with {0,1,2,3} and {4,5,6,7} when 𝑵𝒈=𝟐* * *Support antenna numbering with four coherent groups with {0,1} and {2,3} and {4,5} and {6,7} when 𝑵𝒈=𝟒*   ***Proposal 3:*** *Support joint indication of TRI and TPMI for CB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For partial coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook,*   * *When Ng=4, support Alt1: Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook,* * *Full-coherent precoders are used* |
| **KDDI Corporation** | **Proposal 1:** MCS, NDI and RV indication for 2nd CW is specified in DCI format 0\_1.  **Proposal 2:** if the gain when multiplexing UCI to the CW with a higher MCS among the two CWs can be  sufficiently confirmed, Alt 2 should be adopted.  **Proposal 3:** The bit field for MCS, NDI and RV for the second codeword is included in the DCI format only when the maximum number of layers that UE can transmit is configured by maxrank to be greater than 4.  **Proposal 4:** Even if the bit field for MCS, NDI and RV for the second codeword is included in the DCI format, UE ignores the field for the second CW and only transmit the first CW when the number of layers indicated by the field “Precoding information and number of layers” or "SRS resource indicator" is less than or equal to 4. |
| **Apple** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For the support of 8 Tx UL with codebook based transmission scheme, UE reports:*   * *Whether it supports full coherent, partial coherent, and/or non-coherent codebook.* * *For a UE supporting a full-coherent codebook, it further reports whether it supports (N1, N2) = (2, 2) or (N1, N2) = (4, 1).* * *For a UE supporting a partial coherent codebook, it further reports the number of non-coherent antenna group, i.e., Ng = 2 or 4.*   ***Proposal 2:*** *For a UE with 8 Tx UL configured with full coherent codebook, by default partial/non-coherent precoders are not included. For a UE with 8 Tx UL configured with partial coherent codebook, by default non-coherent precoders are not included.*   * *FFS whether gNB can configure whether partial or non-coherent precoders are included*   ***Proposal 3:*** *For 8Tx full coherent codebook design based on R15 single DL Type I codebook, do not support precoding matrices generated according to (O1, O2) where O1>1 and/or O2>1.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For partial coherent codebook design with Ng = 2, each antenna group is indicated with a NR Rel-15 UL full coherent 4TX precoder, with separate TPMI field provided in the DCI. Each TPMI field is 5 bit.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For partial coherent codebook design with Ng = 2, there is no restriction that one codeword is mapped to one antenna group only.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *For partial coherent codebook design with Ng = 4, adopt Alt 1 (precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook).*  ***Proposal 7:*** *For non-coherent codebook design, TPMI indication reuses the mechanism for SRI for non-codebook based transmission, which requires up to 8 bits.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For non-codebook based transmission scheme with 8Tx UL, the existing SRI indication mechanism is extended to support up to 8 single-port SRS resources in a resource set.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *For 8 Tx PUSCH, new fields are added in the DCI to indicate NDI and RV for the second codeword.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *For 8 Tx PUSCH with two codewords, UCI is always multiplexed only on the CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW).*  ***Proposal 11:*** *For 8 Tx PUSCH, two codewords are used whenever rank > 4, and no additional signaling is necessary.* |
| **Qualcomm Incorporated** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For 8 Tx PUSCH in Rel-18, Ng=2, 4 are not applicable to fully coherent 8 Tx.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For a fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, 26/28*   * *Support NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook mode 1 as the starting point for design of the codebook* * *Do not support sub-band based precoding.*   ***Proposal 3:*** *Do not support O1>1 and O2>1 for fully coherent uplink 8 Tx codebook.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Do not support different (O1, O2) values per rank.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Update the agreement made in RAN1 #111 as the following.*  *For a fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE,*   * *Support NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of the codebook o FFS: For a constructed codebook with size M based on above method, unless 𝑴=𝟐𝑵; otherwise, round up the codebook size to the smallest integer 𝟐𝑵>𝑴 by adding 𝟐𝑵−𝑴 precoders generated via Alt 2a.* * *No LS to RAN4 will be needed*   ***Proposal 6:*** *For fully coherent 8 Tx codebook, further study the following hybrid codebook design.*   * *Reduce the number of DFT precoders for rank 1,2,3,4 generated based on NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook* * *Add nonDFT precoders generated via Alt 2a to rank 2, 3, 4.*   ***Proposal 7:*** *Following Table 5 and Table 6, NR Rel-18 concatenate existing Rel-15 4 Tx or 2 Tx PUSCH precoders to support 8 Tx PUSCH precoders with partial coherent or noncoherent 8 Tx.*   * *FFS how to reduce the size of the codebook.*   ***Proposal 8:*** *For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook,*   * *When Ng=2, do not support using Rel-15 UL 4 TX partial-coherent precoders to construct 8 Tx partial coherent codebook.* * *When Ng=4, support the following Alt 1.*   + *Alt1:*      - *Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook,*     - *Full-coherent precoders are used.*   ***Proposal 9:*** *update the agreement made in RAN1 112 as the following.*  *For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=2,*   * *Following rank and layer splitting cases are supported*  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | | 1 | (1,0), (0,1) | - | | 8 | - | (4,4) |  * *Support the following cases. Select from the following cases based on the performance and overall DCI overhead*  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | | 2 | (2,0), (0,2) | - | | 2 | - | (1,1) | | 3 | (3,0), (0,3) | - | | 3 | - | (2,1), (1,2) | | 4 | (4,0), (0,4) | - | | 4 | - | (2,2), (3,1), (1,3) | | 5 | - | (4,1), (1,4), (2,3), (3,2) | | 6 | - | (4,2), (2,4), (3,3) | | 7 | - | (4,3), (3,4) |  * *Note: Above is not relevant to how precoders are indicated.*   ***Proposal 10:*** *Following Table 5 and Table 6, a single TPMI is used to signal the precoder index for partial coherent and noncoherent 8 Tx PUSCH.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *For codebook design of an 8TX partial-coherent UE, configured with an 8-port SRS resource*   * *For when Ng=2, the following convention for assumption of port coherency scheme is used*   + *Alt 3: two coherent groups of {0,1,2,3} and {4,5,6,7}* * *For when Ng=4, the following convention for assumption of port coherency scheme is used*   + *Alt 2: four coherent groups of {0,1}, {2,3}, {4,5}, and {6,7}*   ***Proposal 12:*** *For SRS configuration for non-codebook UL transmission for an 8TX UE, further support configuration of up to two, or four SRS resource sets, each configured with up to 4, or 2 single-port SRS resources, respectively.*  ***Proposal 13:*** *For SRI indication for NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with 𝑵𝑺𝑹𝑺>𝟒, support Option 2: Use a legacy-based solution, as in Rel-15.*  ***Proposal 14:*** *In DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2, use a combination of MCS=26 and RV ID =1 corresponding to a CW/TB to disable the TB for a 2 TB PUSCH transmission, and gNB make sure the indicated rank is not exceeding 4 for this PUSCH.*  ***Proposal 15:*** *Support CBG based PUSCH with 2 CWs by reusing the design principle as Rel-15 CBG based PDSCH with 2 CWs.*   * *Configure up to 2X (where X≤𝟒) CBGs for a UE supports 2 CW PUSCH.* * *Up to 2X bits of CBGTI is allowed in an UL grant to schedule the CBG based PUSCH with 2 CWs. The first X CBGTI bits are for 1st CW and the second X CBGTI bits are for the 2nd CW.* * *If only 1 CW is scheduled in the UL grant, only the X bits of CBGTI corresponding to the scheduled CW are valid, the rest X bits of CBGTI are obsolete.*   ***Proposal 16:*** *in Rel-18, for a PUSCH transmission with 2 TBs/CWs, the two TBs/CW are with a same PHY layer priority.*  ***Proposal 17:*** *For PUSCH transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed on one of the CWs with higher MCS. If both CWs have the same MCS, UCI is multiplexed on the first CW.*  ***Proposal 18:*** *Confirm the scope of Rel-18 8Tx PUSCH includes CG-PUSCH with 2 TBs/CWs and up to 8 layers.*  ***Proposal 19:*** *For CG-PUSCH with 2 TBs/CWs, support new CG-UCI fields of “Redundancy version” and “new data indicator” for the second TB/CW.*  ***Proposal 20:*** *For CG-PUSCH with 2 TBs/CWs, study the following*   * *How to enable/disable the second CW of the CG-PUSCH* * *How to multiplex the CG-UCIs for the two TBs/CWs onto the CG-PUSCH.*   ***Proposal 21:*** *Full power operation for a partial/non-coherent 8TX UE should support at least PA architecture which does not have full rated PA on each of the 8 Tx chains.*  ***Proposal 22:*** *In addition to reusing Rel-16 full power mode 0/1/2, support a new mode 0A for full power transmission for PUSCH with 8 Tx.*   * *Mode 0A set the power scaling factor 𝜶 = (𝟏,Σ𝜶𝒊𝜹𝒊𝟖𝒊=𝟏) for a PUSCH transmission, where 𝜶𝒊 is the power scaling factor the i-th Tx port. 𝜹𝒊=𝟏 if i-th Tx port is used in the PUSCH transmission, 𝜹𝒊=𝟎 otherwise.* |
| **Ericsson** | ***Proposal 1:*** *For UL 8 Tx partial-coherent codebooks with two antenna groups, i.e., 𝐍𝐠=𝟐, ‘Group-Selection + Balanced’ partial-coherent precoders are used, including (a) precoders where a single antenna group is selected and a single UL Rel-15 4 Tx precoder is used for rank ≤𝟒 and additionally (b) precoders where combinations of two UL Rel-15 4 Tx precoders with a nearly equal number of layers are used. The following additional restrictions are applied to limit the codebook size:*   * *Restrict the UL Rel-15 4 Tx precoders to the precoders with the oversampling factor of 𝐎𝟏=𝟏, and* * *Restrict the layer distribution over the antenna groups to match the DL codeword-to-layer mapping for 𝐫>𝟒, i.e., the larger number of layers is mapped to the second group.*   ***Proposal 2:*** *For UL 8 Tx partial-coherent codebooks with four antenna groups, i.e., 𝐍𝐠=𝟒, ‘Group-Selection + Balanced’ partial-coherent precoders are used, including (a) precoders that strive to minimize the number of active antenna groups and one or more Rel-15 2 Tx UL precoders are used and additionally (b) precoders where combinations of Rel-15 2 Tx UL precoders with a nearly equal number of layers are used. The following further restrictions are used to limit the codebook size:*   * *Restrict the 2 Tx FC precoders to the precoders with co-phasing factors between the two antenna ports restricted to {𝟏,−𝟏}, and* * *Form two antenna group pairs, each with two antenna groups and restrict the layer distribution over the antenna group pairs to match the DL codeword-to-layer mapping for 𝐫>𝟒, i.e., the larger number of layers is mapped to the second antenna group pair.*   ***Proposal 3:*** *Restrict codebooks for 8 TX UEs such that elements of the precoding matrices are limited to the set {+1, +j, -1, -j}. This implies that (𝐎𝟏, 𝐎𝟐) = (1,1) for 𝐍𝐠 = 1 and (𝐍𝟏, 𝐍𝟐) = (4, 1), and that (𝐎𝟏, 𝐎𝟐) = (2, 2) for 𝐍𝐠 = 1 and (𝐍𝟏, 𝐍𝟐) = (2, 2).*  ***Proposal 4:*** *8 Tx codebook subset design uses at least fully- and non-coherent precoders, targeting power saving, coherence fallback, and directional antennas with the non-coherent precoders.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *8 Tx fully coherent precoders are not constructed by cophasing across Rel-15 precoders*  ***Proposal 6:*** *In addition to the PA powers per Tx chain of [0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0], [0 -9 -9 -9 -9 -9 -9 -9], and [-9 -9 -9 -9 -9 -9 -9 -9] dB relative to their power class agreed for study in RAN1#111, consider at least a [-3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3] configuration when designing Rel-18 8 Tx full power UL MIMO operation*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Focus study of UL FPTx on minimal implementations of each of Modes 0, 1, and 2*  ***Proposal 8:*** *A working assumption is made that CSI is multiplexed with UL-SCH only on the first codeword.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *Unless multi-SRS resource set operation is defined for 8 Tx CB-based operation, it is not defined for 8 Tx NCB-based operation.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *Support indication of up to 8 single port SRS resources using the Rel-15 non-codebook based mechanisms by expanding the number of single port SRS resources.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *A PDCCH carries a single TPMI/TRI field for 8 Tx operation, where the indicated precoder corresponds to one SRS resource.* |
| **NEC** | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support (O1,O2) where O1>1 or O2>1, for example, (O1, O2) = (2,2) for (N1,N2) = (2,2) and (O1, O2) = (2,1) for (N1,N2) = (4,1).*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For 8Tx partial coherent codebook with Ng=2, at least support percoders with layer split for rank = 2/3/4, specifically, support layer split (2,2) for rank =4, layer split of (2,3), (3,2) for rank =5, and layer split of (3,3) for rank =6.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For 8Tx partial coherent codebook with Ng=2 and rank = 2/3/4, support at least 4Tx precoders with rank = 2/3/4 with subset of column(s) mapped on one of the two antenna groups, respectively.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For 8Tx partial coherent codebook with Ng=4, support precoding design based on 2Tx full-coherent precoders.* |
| **NTT DOCOMO, INC.** | **Proposal 1:** *Confirm the working assumption to support dual CW for uplink transmission with rank>4.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For UCI multiplexing, Alt2 is preferred.*   * *Alt2: The CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)*   ***Proposal 3:*** *Support 2-CW PUSCH transmission only, in case of rank>4.*   * *If DL principle is reused for disabling UL transmission of a transport block, its impact to RI indication design should be considered.*   ***Proposal 4:*** *Separate the discussions on port indexing and codebook structure.*   * *The precoders from the determined codebook structure can be re-permuted based on the port indexing.*   ***Proposal 5:*** *For non-coherent precoders for a rank i other than 1, support one of following options based on supported codebooksubset configuration method. Option 1 is preferred.*   * *Option 1: all the port selection precoders are supported (if nested codebook is not supported and new codebooksubset configuration is introduced).* * *Option 2: a subset of precoders can be selected and supported from all the port selection precoders (if nested codebook is supported and legacy codebooksubset configuration is reused).*   ***Proposal 6:*** *For partially-coherent precoders with Ng=2,*   * *For rank=2, 3, 4, both cases of ‘all layers in one antenna group’ and ‘layers split across 2 antenna groups’ are supported.* * *For rank=4, 5, 6, for the case of ‘layers split across 2 antenna groups’, the almost equal layer split cases are supported.*    + *For rank=4, the layer split cases of (4,0), (0,4) and (2,2) are supported.*   + *For rank=5, the layer split cases of (3,2) and (2,3) are supported.*   + *For rank=6, the layer split case of (3,3) is supported.* * *To reduce the number of precoders for a certain layer split case for a certain rank,*    + *support precoder selection for layer split cases of (1,1), (1,2), (2,1).*   + *study precoder selection for layer split cases of (2,2), (3,2), and (2,3).* * *(Above proposals are also shown in Table 3 and Table 4.)*   ***Proposal 7:***   * *For partially-coherent precoders with Ng=2, partial-coherent precoders from Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook are not used.* * *For partially-coherent precoders with Ng=2, following codebook structure is supported,*    + *For rank<=4,*   + *For rank>1, , where rank=rank() + rank()*   ***Proposal 8:*** *For partially-coherent precoders with Ng=4, support Alt1.*   * *Alt1: Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook.*    + *Full-coherent precoders are used.*   **Proposal 9:** For partially-coherent precoders with Ng=4, following codebook structure is the starting point.   * *For rank=1, or or or* * *For rank=2, one or two 2TX precoders can be selected to use one or two antenna groups for transmission.* * *For 2<rank<=6, two or three or four 2TX precoders can be selected to use corresponding antenna groups for transmission.* * *For 6<rank<=8,* * *, , , and are full-coherent precoders from Rel-15 2TX UL precoders.*   ***Proposal 10****: For partially-coherent precoders with Ng=4,*   * *Support all the layer splitting cases across 4 antenna groups for each rank.* * *Support to study precoder selection for each layer split case for each rank.*   **Proposal 11:**   * *For fully-coherent precoders, not support additional oversampling values other than (O1, O2) = (1, 1).* * *For fully-coherent precoders, support one codebook mode only, e.g., codebook mode 1.*   **Proposal 12:** *Support to discuss codebooksubset configuration mechanism before TPMI/RI indication method. Option 2 is preferred.*   * *Option 1: codebooksubset configuration follows legacy mechanism, e.g., fully-coherent UEs can be configured with 'fullyAndPartialAndNonCoherent', 'partialAndNonCoherent' or ‘nonCoherent’ codebook subset; partial-coherent UE can be configured with 'partialAndNonCoherent' or ‘nonCoherent’ codebook subset.* * *Option 2: new codebooksubset configuration, e.g., fully-coherent UEs can be configured with 'fullyCoherent', or 'partialCoherent' or ‘nonCoherent’ codebook subset; partial-coherent UE can be configured with 'partialCoherent' or ‘nonCoherent’ codebook subset.*   **Proposal 13:**   * *For codebooksubset configurations of 'fullyCoherent', or ‘nonCoherent’, support joint indication of TRI and 8TX TPMI for from 1-layer transmission to 8-layer transmission, similar as legacy indication for ‘precoding information and number of layers’.* * *For codebooksubset configurations of 'partialCoherent' with Ng=2 or Ng=4, study following two options,*    + *Option 1: the same indication method as 'fullyCoherent' and ‘nonCoherent’, i.e., joint indication of TRI and 8TX TPMI for from 1-layer transmission to 8-layer transmission, similar as legacy indication for ‘precoding information and number of layers’*   + *Option 2: different indication method from 'fullyCoherent' or ‘nonCoherent’, e.g., multiple fields are used to indicate multiple antenna groups, with additional indication on layer-split case or whether a field for an antenna group exists or not.*   **Proposal 14:** *For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, for SRI indication, Option 1 is slightly preferred.*   * + *Option 1: Use an 𝐍𝐒𝐑𝐒 bit length bitmap* |

# RAN1 AGREEMENTS FOR SUB-AGENDA 9.1.4.2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RAN1 Meeting #112**  Agreement  For fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, based on NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook, the following pairs of (N1, N2) values are supported,   * (N1, N2) = (4, 1) * (N1, N2) = (2, 2)`   A pair of (N1, N2) can be configured with subject to UE capability.  **Agreement**  Fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, based on NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook   * Precoding matrices generated according to (O1, O2) = (1, 1) is supported * Further study additional support of precoding matrices generated according to (O1, O2) where O1>1 or O2>1   + Subject to UE capability * FFS: Different O1, O2 values for different ranks   **Agreement**  To support dual CW PUSCH transmission for rank>4 by an 8TX UE, for MCS indication, support   * Alt.2: A second MCS field (5 bits) is indicated for the second codeword   **Agreement**  To support dual CW PUSCH transmission for rank>4 by an 8TX UE, a second set of NDI (1 bit) and RV (2 bits) fields are indicated.   * FFS: Details on how to signal   **Agreement**  To support dual CW PUSCH transmission for rank>4 by an 8TX UE, reuse DL PDSCH scrambling mechanism to initialize the scrambling sequence generator for codeword q{0,1},  where , and are defined similar to the legacy single CW PUSCH transmission.  **Agreement**  For fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, based on NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook (CodebookMode=1),   * Study whether/how to support (O1, O2) = (2,1), (2,2)   + whether for all rank, or rank 1-2, or rank 3-8   + applicability of different (O1, O2) values per agreed (N1, N2)   + companies are encouraged to submit simulation results   **Agreement**  To support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, UCI is always multiplexed only on one of the CWs, down-select from,   * Alt1: First CW * Alt2: The CW with the highest MCS (if MCSs are the same, UCI is multiplex on the first CW)   **Agreement**  For non-coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE, following precoders are supported for 1 layer transmission.  with the scaling factor of .  **Agreement**  For NCB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission with , where is the number of configured single-port SRS resources in a resource set,   * All SRS port combinations are supported * For SRI indication, down-select from,   + Option 1: Use an bit length bitmap   + Option 2: Use a legacy-based solution * Consideration of Lmax for SRI indication   For , Rel-15 SRI indication is reused  **Agreement**  For CB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, where Mode 2 uplink full power transmission (if supported) is not used, re-use legacy Rel-15 mechanism, that is   * when only one SRS resource in a resource set is configured, the SRI field in DCI is absent, * when two SRS resources are configured in a resource set, 1 bit of SRI field in DCI is used to indicate the selected SRS resource in the set.   **Agreement**  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook,   * When Ng=2   + Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook,     - Full-coherent precoders are used       * FFS whether partial-coherent precoders are needed * When Ng=4, down-select from,   + Alt1:     - Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 2TX codebook,       * Full-coherent precoders are used   + Alt2:     - Precoding design is based on Rel-15 UL 4TX codebook,       * Partial-coherent precoders are used   **Agreement**  For partially coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE codebook, Ng=2,   * Following rank and layer splitting cases are supported  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | | 1 | (1,0), (0,1) |  | | 8 |  | (4,4) |  * Select from the following cases based on the performance and overall DCI overhead  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Rank** | **All layers in one Antenna Group** | **Layers split across 2 Antenna Groups** | | 2 | (2,0), (0,2) |  | | 2 |  | (1,1) | | 3 | (3,0), (0,3) |  | | 3 |  | (2,1), (1,2) | | 4 | (4,0), (0,4) |  | | 4 |  | (2,2), (3,1), (1,3) | | 5 |  | (4,1), (1,4), (2,3), (3,2) | | 6 |  | (4,2), (2,4), (3,3) | | 7 |  | (4,3), (3,4) |   Note: Above is not relevant to how precoders are indicated.  **RAN1 Meeting #111**  **Agreement**  For a fully coherent uplink precoding by an 8TX UE,   1. Support NR Rel-15 single panel DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of the codebook    1. FFS: For a constructed codebook with size M based on above method, unless ; otherwise, round up the codebook size to the smallest integer by adding precoders generated via Alt 2a. 2. No LS to RAN4 will be needed   **Agreement**  For PUSCH transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, to support dual CW transmission,   * specify MCS, NDI, RV indication for the second CW * specify PUSCH Scrambling for the second CW * specify UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for dual CW transmission * study whether/how Enabling/Disabling the second CW   FFS: Optimization of DCI to indicate the above  Note: Strive to reuse Rel-15 NR DL schemes where possible.  **Agreement**  For PUSCH transmission with rank>4 by an 8TX UE, to support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, down-select at least one of the following options in RAN1#112,   * Option1: UCI is always multiplexed on one of the CWs * Option2: UCI is multiplexed on both CWs * Option3: Based on UCI (e.g., type, payload size, etc.) UCI is multiplexed on one or both CWs * Option4: UCI is multiplexed only when single CW is enabled * Option5: UCI is repeated across the two CWs * Other options are not precluded   **Agreement**  For CB-based 8TX PUSCH transmission, for rank indication, down-select among the following   * Separate indication of TRI and TPMI * Joint indication of TRI and TPMI   **Agreement**  Study full TX power uplink codebook-based transmission by a partially/non-coherent 8TX precoder,   * Reuse Rel-16 UE capability definitions for discussion purpose, i.e., UE Capability 1, 2 and 3 * For full TX power transmission by UE Capability 2/3, at least, following exemplary PA architectures can be considered   + Other cases of interest are not precluded, down-select preferred potential architecture for the purpose of 8TX full power study in RAN#112.   + This can be used for other UE Power Classes as well.  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 8TX UE, Power class 3 (23 dBm)  Pi= Nominal power rating of each PA | | | |  | Regular UE | P1=P2= …=P8=14 dBm  (Full power supported by Mode1) | | Full-power capable UE | **Full power capability with any PA comb. (CAP1)**  Example:  P1=P2= …=P8= 23 dBm | | **Full power capability with 1 PA (CAP3)**  Example:  P1=P2= …=P7= 14 dBm  P8= 23 dBm | | **(lower priority) Full power capability with 2 PAs (CAP2)**  Example 2a:  P1=P2= …=P6= 14 dBm, P7=P8 ≥ 20 dBm  Example 2b:  P1=P2= …= P8= 20 dBm | | **(lower priority) Full power capability with 4 PAs (CAP2)**  Example 3a:  P1=P2= …=P4= 14 dBm, P5=P6= …=P8 ≥ 17 dBm  Example 3b:  P1=P2= …= P8 = 17 dBm | | **(lower priority) Full power capability with 6 PAs (CAP2)**  Example 4a:  P1=P2= 14 dBm, P3=P4= …=P8 ≥ 15.3 dBm  Example 4b:  P1=P2= …= P8≥ 15.3 dBm | |  | |  | |  |   **Agreement**  For an 8TX partial/non-coherent precoder, for study on full power codebook-based PUSCH transmissions, use Rel-16 full power modes as the starting point for the design.  Note: This does not mandate support of all Rel-16 modes.  **RAN1 Meeting #110bis-e**  **Agreement**  Support the following cases for codebook design for 8TX precoders   * Full coherent precoders with Ng=1   + FFS: Full coherent precoders with Ng=2, Ng=4 * Partial coherent precoders with Ng=2 and Ng=4   + This does not imply any relation with the number of TPMI indications for 8TX precoder * Non-coherent precoders   **Agreement**  For codebook design of an 8TX partial-coherent UE, configured with an 8-port SRS resource   * For when Ng=2, down-select of the following convention for assumption of port coherency scheme is used   + Alt 1: two coherent groups of {0,2,4,6} and {1,3,5,7}   + Alt 2: two coherent groups of {0,1,4,5} and {2,3,6,7}   + Alt 3: two coherent groups of {0,1,2,3} and {4,5,6,7} * For when Ng=4, down-select of the following convention for assumption of port coherency scheme is used   + Alt 1: four coherent groups of {0,4}, {1,5}, {2,6}, and {3,7}   + Alt 2: four coherent groups of {0,1}, {2,3}, {4,5}, and {6,7}   + Alt3: four coherent groups of {0, 2}, {4, 6}, {1, 3} and {5, 7} * Note: Other alternatives which are not foreseen are not precluded   **Agreement**  For SRI and/or transmitter precoder matrix indication for codebook-based uplink transmission by an 8TX UE, study   * Whether/how to indicate one or multiple TPMI/SRI, according to the number of antenna groups, coherence capability, codebooksubset configuration, etc. * Whether/how to extend Rel-17 framework, e.g., TPMI/SRI indication in MTRP PUSCH * Whether/how to separate/joint indication of rank and precoding information. * Whether/how to indicate n (<=Ng) selected antenna group(s) separately from TPMI/TRI indication   **Agreement**  In Rel-18, on support of full power operation by a partial/non-coherent 8TX UE configured with codebook-based transmission,   * Identify and agree on at least one potential PA architecture by RAN1 meeting #111   **Agreement**  For 8TX UE codebook-based uplink transmission,   * For partially/non-coherent precoding,support NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) as the starting point for design of codebook   **Agreement**  For SRS configuration required for non-codebook-based UL transmission by an 8TX UE, Alt1 is supported, that is   * Alt1: A single SRS resource set configured with up to 8 single-port SRS resources * FFS: Configuration of up to two, or four SRS resource sets, each configured with up to 4, or 2 single-port SRS resources, respectively.   **Agreement**  For SRS configuration supporting codebook -based UL transmission for an 8TX UE ,   * Support configuration of 1 SRS resource set containing up to X 8-port SRS resource(s), where X = 2   + FFS : Other values for X, if needed * FFS : Configuration of at least one SRS resource set, configured with more than one SRS resources where each SRS resource may have the same or different number of SRS ports, e.g., for support full power operation, if supported * FFS : Configuration of at least one SRS resource set, configured with 8/M of M-port SRS resources, for example,   + Configuration of an SRS resource set, configured with at least 4 of 2-port SRS resources   + Configuration of an SRS resource set, configured with at least 2 of 4-port SRS resources   **Working Assumption**  For uplink transmission with rank>4, support dual CW transmission.  **Agreement**  If dual CW is supported for uplink transmission with Rank>4 by an 8TX UE, reuse DL Rel-15 codeword to layer mapping for both codebook-based and non-codebook-based transmission.  **Agreement**  For SRS configuration supporting codebook -based UL transmission for an 8TX UE ,   * Support configuration of 1 SRS resource set containing up to X  8-port SRS resource(s), where X = 2   + FFS : Other values for X, if needed * FFS : Configuration of at least one SRS resource set, configured with more than one SRS resources where each SRS resource may have the same or different number of SRS ports, e.g., for support full power operation, if supported * FFS : Configuration of at least one SRS resource set, configured with 8/M of M-port SRS resources, for example,   + Configuration of an SRS resource set, configured with at least 4 of 2-port SRS resources   + Configuration of an SRS resource set, configured with at least 2 of 4-port SRS resources   **RAN1 Meeting #110**  **Agreement**  8TX PUSCH is supported in Rel-18  **Agreement**  For 8TX PUSCH, at least support   * Ng=1, 2, 4   Note: The above does not restrict the Ng for the non-coherent case  **Agreement**  For evaluation purpose of codebook alternatives when a precoder based on Rel-15 DL Type I is used, following oversampling ratios are assumed   * (O1, O2) = (1,1), (2,1), (2,2) * Note: Other values may be used and reported by companies * Note: When deciding the supported O1, O2 combination, the signalling overhead, performance, UE complexity, etc should be considered   **Agreement**  RAN1 further studies Alt1b and Alt2a for down-selection of one of the two in RAN1 meeting #110b-e.   * Transmission using one or multiple precoders corresponding to one or multiple SRS resources can be studied as part of the above alternatives.   **Agreement**  Support up to X layers for codebook and non-codebook UL transmission for 8TX UE where X=4, 8 is determined based on separate UE capability   * For uplink transmission with rank<=4, single CW is supported * For uplink transmission with rank>4, whether single or dual CW is used will be decided in RAN1 meeting #110b-e   The above applies only with regards to the work scope of this agenda item.  **Agreement**  For SRS configuration for non-codebook UL transmission for an 8TX UE, down-select from   * Alt1: A single SRS resource set configured with up to 8 single-port SRS resources * Alt2: Up to two SRS resource sets, each configured with up to 4 single-port SRS resources * Alt3: Support both alternatives.   **Agreement**  Study low overhead solutions for SRI and/or transmitter precoder matrix indication for codebook-based, and SRI indication for non-codebook-based UL transmission by an 8TX UE,   * FFS using single or separate (exiting or new) fields for the indication, other solutions are not precluded. * Note: Low overhead schemes for study include those using Rel-15 SRI/TPMI indication mechanisms   **RAN1 Meeting #109-e**  **Agreement**  **Study fully-coherent, partially-coherent and non-coherent UEs for uplink transmission with 8TX UEs.**    **Agreement**  **Study full power transmission for 8TX UEs.**   * **Details are FFS upon completion of codebook design**   Agreement  **Adopt the following Table as the reference EVM for LLS evaluation**   * **Companies may provide additional evaluation results per their case of interest** * **LLS is optionally used for 8Tx UL evaluation, if needed**  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Parameter** | **Value** | | Carrier Frequency | 3.5 GHz | | Waveform | CP-OFDM | | SCS | 30 KHz | | System bandwidth | 20 MHz, 100 MHz | | Scheduled PRBs | 5, 25, 50, 260 PRBs | | gNB RX antenna setup and port layouts  (𝑀,𝑁,𝑃,𝑀𝑔,𝑁𝑔,𝑀𝑝,𝑁𝑝) | (8,8,2,1,1,4,8) with (𝑑H, 𝑑V) = (0.5, 0.8)𝜆  (4,4,2,1,1,4,4) with (𝑑H, 𝑑V) = (0.5, 0.8)𝜆  (2,2,2,1,1,2,2) with (dH , dV ) = (0.5, 0.5)λ | | UE TX antenna configuration | To be defined according to outcome of Proposal 2.1 | | UE speed | 3 Km/h | | Number of Layers | Adaptive, Fixed (reported by company) | | AMC | Adaptive, Fixed (reported by company) | | DMRS configuration | Type 1; 1 front loaded + 1 additional symbol | | Channel estimation | Real | | Channel Model | CDL-A (30ns), CDL-B (100ns), CDL-C (300ns) |     **Agreement**  For 8TX UE uplink transmission, study codebook- and non-codebook-based transmission with maximal layer number of both 4 and 8 layers.  **Agreement**  [Adopt the following Table as the reference EVM for SLS evaluation.](x-msg://11/null)   * Companies may provide additional evaluation results per their case of interest.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Parameter** | **Value** | | Frequency range | 3.5 GHz | | Multiple access | OFDMA | | Numerology | 14 OFDM symbol slot  SCS , 30 KHz | | Scenario | Outdoor FWA (38.901): UMa (ISD = 500 m), 100% Outdoor, 3Km/h | | Indoor FWA (38.901): UMi (ISD = 200 m), 100% Indoor, 3Km/h | | Industrial (38.901): Indoor Office (Inh ), 3Km/h | | Channel model | 38.901 | | System bandwidth | 20 MHz, 100 MHz | | gNB RX antenna setup and port layouts  (𝑀,𝑁,𝑃,𝑀𝑔,𝑁𝑔,𝑀𝑝,𝑁𝑝) | Outdoor FWA :  (8,8,2,1,1,4,8) with (𝑑H, 𝑑V) = (0.5, 0.8)𝜆  (4,4,2,1,1,4,4) with (𝑑H, 𝑑V) = (0.5, 0.8)𝜆    Indoor FWA :  (8,8,2,1,1,4,8) with (𝑑H, 𝑑V) = (0.5, 0.8)𝜆  (4,4,2,1,1,4,4) with (𝑑H, 𝑑V) = (0.5, 0.8)𝜆    Industrial:  (2,2,2,1,1,2,2) with (dH , dV ) = (0.5, 0.5)λ | | gNB antenna radiation pattern parameters | Outdoor/Indoor FWA :  38.901 Table 7.3-1, 8 dBi , 65° HPBW    Industrial:  IMT.2412 Table 10,5 dBi , 90° HPBW | | gNB receiver noise figure | 5dB | | gNB receiver | MMSE-IRC | | gNB scheduler | Single user with proportional fair | | Modulation | -    Up to 64 QAM  -    Up to 256QAM | | MIMO scheme | SU-MIMO with rank adaptation | | UE speed | 3 Km/h | | UE TX antenna configuration | To be defined according to outcome of Proposal 2.1 | | Traffic model | -    FTP model 1: Packet size 500KB, RU= 50% and suggested low/high RU of values of 20% and 70%  -   Full buffer (optional) | | Suggested benchmarking | R15 UL 4-Tx codebook ,  Eigen-based, companies report PRG assumption | | Precoder granularity | Wideband | | Power control | Open loop,  -    alpha = 0.8  -    P0= -50, -80 dBm  to be selected according to the deployment scenario | | UE power rating | 23 dBm (UE, 38.101)  32 dBm (FWA, 38.101) | | Metric | UL mean-user throughput, 5%-ile and 95%-ile UPT |   **Agreement**  For 8TX UE, consider the following UE antenna layouts for codebook design,  ·        For non-coherent UEs, consider linear array (1D/2D) of cross-polarized or single-polarized antenna configuration  ·        For fully/partial-coherent UEs, consider linear array (1D/2D)  o   Where the array is either cross-polarized antenna configuration or single polarized antenna configuration  o   Ng>=1 antenna groups can be considered where each group comprises coherent antennas, and across groups, antennas can be non-coherent/coherent depending on device types  §  An example of an antenna group is a panel  o   Within an antenna group, antenna elements are uniformly spaced. Across different antenna groups, companies to provide details.   * Additional information for definition of antenna layout   + Based on the number of coherent groups, following exemplary cases can be considered where, within each group, antenna elements are spaced by 0.5λ, and then dG-H, dG-V represent the horizontal and vertical spacings between the centers of adjacent antenna groups, respectively     - Further down-selection can be done in the next meeting, if needed     - The shown exemplary placing of antenna groups can be used for evaluation purpose, but the codebook design is not restricted to shown cases.     - Other antenna layouts for other use cases are not precluded.     - **To start companies may report their results according to their preferred layout.**      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Case** | **Ng** | **(M, N, P) per group** | **Antenna Layout** | **Antenna Pattern/Antenna Element Gain** | | 1 | 1 | (2, 2, 2),  (1, 4, 2) | **A picture containing icon    Description automatically generated** | Isotropic (Indoor/Outdoor FWA & Industrial)    8 dBi, 65° HPBW(Outdoor FWA) | | 2 | 2 | (1, 2, 2) | Graphical user interface    Description automatically generated | Isotropic (Indoor/Outdoor FWA & Industrial)    8 dBi, 65° HPBW(Outdoor FWA) | | 3 | 4 | (1, 1, 2) |  | Isotropic (Indoor/Outdoor FWA & Industrial)    4 dBi, 110° HPBW(Indoor FWA & Industrial |     o   **Other UE antenna assumption for the purpose of evaluation**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Outdoor FWA | Indoor FWA | Industrial | | UE antenna height | 6, 3 m (To start) | According to 36.873 | According to 38.901 |   **Agreement**  For 8TX UE codebook-based uplink transmission, down-select one of   * Alt1-a:   + Study NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) as the starting point for design of the codebook for non-coherent UEs   + Study NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of the codebook for fully/partially-coherent UEs * Alt1-b:   + Study NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) as the starting point for design of the codebook for partially/non-coherent UEs   + Study NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of the codebook for fully-coherent UEs * Alt2-a:   + Study NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) as the starting point for design of codebook for fully/partially/non-coherent UEs * Alt2-b:   + Study NR Rel-15 UL 2TX/4TX codebooks and/or 8x1 antenna selection vector(s) in combination with those based on NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebooks as the starting point for design of codebook for fully/partially/non-coherent UEs * Alt3:   + Study NR Rel-15 DL Type I codebook as the starting point for design of codebook for fully/partially/non-coherent UEs * Transmission using one or multiple precoders corresponding to one or multiple SRS resources can be studied as part of the above alternatives. |
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