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1. Introduction

Following email thread is assigned for discussion:

[100b-e-NR-eMIMO-ULFPTx-01] Email discussion on Issue #2 in R1-2002746: For 4Tx and partial-coherent UE in Mode 2, when the SRS resource set is configured with 2 ports SRS and 4 ports SRS, and the codebook subset associated with 2 port SRS resource. By 4/24 and corresponding TP (if any) by 4/30 – Rakesh (vivo)

1. Discussion on issue 2[1]
   1. Issue 2: For 4Tx and partial-coherent UE in Mode 2, when the SRS resource set is configured with 2 ports SRS and 4 ports SRS, and the codebook subset associated with 2 port SRS resource:

* Alt1: introduce a new UE capability, UE indicates whether it is *fullyAndPartialAndNonCoherent or nonCoherent*
* Alt2: the codebook subset is *nonCoherent*
* Alt3: the codebook subset is *fullyAndPartialAndNonCoherent*

Please provide your views/comments in the table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company/organization | Comments |
| OPPO | Support Alt.2   1. According to the LS R1-2001513, some new RRC parameter is needed for Alt.1. Introducing non-essential new RRC parameter at a so-late stage is not a wise design, and may lead to further workload and more risk for ASN.1 frozen 2. As explained several times, it cannot be guaranteed that the 2 ports are coherent. Thus Alt.3 does not work for many UE implementations. |
| CMCC | We support Alt2, since we think the motivation of Alt1 or Alt3 is not clear. In our understanding, the 2 ports can be considered as coherent only when the 2 ports are virtualized from the first and third port (i.e., using [1 0 1 0]) or from the second and fourth port (i.e., using [0 1 0 1]) of the 4 ports. Let’s take the former case as an example, we can assume both the first and the third port can support 20dBm in order to support full power transmission. However, in that case, the 2-port is equivalent to the 4-port using reported TPMIs (e.g., using G4, ; ) which can support full power transmission. |
| LG | Support Alt 2. Similar view with OPPO, in order to avoid new RRC parameter, Alt 2 or Alt 3 can be considered. Between Alt 2 and Alt 3, we think Alt 2 is more preferable, since Alt 3. may require higher UE implementation complexity/cost compared to Alt 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Alt.2. Here the condition is 2-port SRS and 4 port SRS resources are both configured. For the following all three cases:  If each antenna port is virtualized from a group of two coherent antennas, then after virtualization, it will be non-coherent between the two ports.  If each antenna port is virtualized from a group of two non-coherent antennas, the after virtualization, the phase in each port is difficult to be guaranteed. So, it results to non-coherent between two ports.  If each antenna port is virtualized from a group of two non-coherent antennas with [1 0] or [0 1], yes, the two ports will be coherent. However, the case is equivalent to non-virtualized case with [1 0 1 0] or [0 1 0 1], without any benefits.  From above, only Alt.2 makes sense. Some detailed discussion also can be find in R1-2001565. |
| Samsung | We prefer Alt 1 due to the following reason:   * The virtualization of 2 ports (from 4 ports) is up to UE implementations, and the UE should have the freedom/flexibility to implement any virtualization of 2 ports. This freedom is completely lost in Alt2 since it restricts 2 ports to be non-coherent. Alt3 is also restrictive, but it is better than Alt 2, at least in the sense that TPMI can be non-coherent or full-coherent. * Re the comment “If each antenna port is virtualized from a group of two non-coherent antennas with [1 0] or [0 1], yes, the two ports will be coherent. However, the case is equivalent to non-virtualized case with [1 0 1 0] or [0 1 0 1],” we also need to look at TPMI payload, which is certainly not the same. In particular, the TPMI payload is more in case of 4 ports than in case of 2 ports. Hence, the two cases are not equivalent operationally.   Re CMCC comment, in our view, mode 2 has two solutions: (1) based on TPMI group signaling and (2) based on multiple SRS resources with different number of SRS ports. This email discussion pertains to (2), not (1). |
| CATT | OK with alt-2 and alt-3, with slight preference on alt-2.  Alt-1 is not preferred due to RRC impact. In our view this is not a critical issue to warrant RRC changes at this late stage. Last but now least, there has been no thorough evaluation on the performance gain over the other simpler alternatives. |
| Apple | We are okay with Alt 2, slightly prefer Alt 1 |
| ZTE | We support Alt 2 with the following two reasons.   1. For Mode 2, no matter whether through intra-pair or inter-pair ports combination of 4 partial-coherent ports, due to there is no guarantee of coherence between the pairs, the 2 virtualized ports are always non-coherent. 2. Some companies mentioned that that non-coherent operation loses the benefit of coherent combining gain. Based on the so-called ‘gain’, if the virtualization is only port selection of two pairs with same order/ rule, such as [1 0] or [0 1], the coherent capability of such 2 virtualized ports is coherence. But this case is same as 4 partial-coherent ports with [1 0 1 0] or [0 1 0 1]. Thus, full-coherent codebook of 2 ports SRS resource in this case is redundant. |
| Intel | We support Alt 2. For Alt 1, it requires additional RRC signaling. For Alt 3, the coherence can’t be guaranteed after antenna virtualization. |
| Spreadtrum | We are Ok with Alt1 or Alt2. |
| DOCOMO | We prefer Alt2. This is because, Alt1 requires additional RRC signaling which we think is not desirable to handle at this moment. Further, Alt3 expects coherency between ports after virtualization which is not realistic at all the time. |
| QC | We support Alt2. As mentioned by many companies, Alt 1 has RRC impact. Alt 3 forces UE to keep coherency after virtualization which is too restrictive to UE implementation. |
| Ericsson | We prefer Alt 3, and are OK with Alt 1.   * **The need for new RRC does not differentiate Alt 1 from Alt 2 or Alt 3.** According to RAN2 guidance, new RRC signaling is generally needed to enable Rel-16 capabilities. Therefore, the RRC signaling needed for Alt-1 is no different than any other capability we are introducing in this meeting. * **Operating with e.g. [1 0 1 0] or [0 1 0 1] on 4 ports is not the same as [1 0] or [0 1] on two virtualized ports.** Virtualized 2 port SRS could be transmitted less frequently than 4 port SRS to save overhead, and UE power can be saved by turning off Tx chains (e.g. in a 4 x 20 dBm UE). * **Our expectation is that Alt 3 is feasible for all partially coherent UEs, not just those using a subset of Tx antennas for Mode 2 with 2 port SRI.** * UE implementations that have at least ½ power on the fully coherent pairs can clearly support Alt 3 by transmitting on ½ of the Tx chains. * A partially coherent UE that has ¼ power PAs can map Tx chains{0,1} to two port SRS 0 and {2,3} to two port SRS 1. The two port SRSs can combine coherently, since the relative phase can be maintained across Tx chains {0,2} and {1,3}. Here, two port SRS 0 and 1 are created with non-coherent combining; using non-coherent combining is needed when this ¼ power PA UE forms one full power port that is required for Mode 2 operation. Note that this non-coherent per port combining has the normal behavior with non-coherent virtualization that the phase of a given RE on a port may vary from slot to slot, but again the relative phase across ports for the RE will be controlled from slot to slot when coherent port pairs are mapped as described above.   If UE vendors have a different understanding, I’d appreciate comments. |

Observation:

Proposal:

# References

[1] R1-2002746, Summary of prep email discussion on ULFPTx, RAN1#100b-e