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# Introduction

In RAN#86, the Rel-17 WID of further enhancements on MIMO for NR is approved [1]. In the approved WID, a particular point is about SRS enhancements in terms of flexibility, coverage and capacity, targeting both FR1 and FR2. The detailed scope of the SRS enhancement is given as follows.

*3. Enhancement on SRS, targeting both FR1 and FR2:*

* 1. *Identify and specify enhancements on aperiodic SRS triggering to facilitate more flexible triggering and/or DCI overhead/usage reduction*
  2. *Specify SRS switching for up to 8 antennas (e.g., xTyR, x = {1, 2, 4} and y = {6, 8})*
  3. *Evaluate and, if needed, specify the following mechanism(s) to enhance SRS capacity and/or coverage: SRS time bundling, increased SRS repetition, partial sounding across frequency*

23 contributions have been submitted to RAN1#102e on these SRS enhancements [3]-[25]. In this document, companies’ views are summarized based on the submitted contributions.

The priority levels of different issues are labelled as **High (H)**, **Medium (M)** and **Low (L)**. FL recommends to focus our discussion on the **H** and **M** issues in RAN1#102e as given in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EVM (Section 2) | **H** |
| Flexible triggering offset (Section 3.1) | **H** |
| Flexible DCI (Section 3.2) | **H** |
| Supported configurations for antenna switching up to 8Rx (Section 4.1) | **H** |
| Scheme categorization for coverage/capacity enhancements (Section 5.1) | **H** |
| Flexible antenna switching (Section 3.3) | **M** |
| Usage/overhead reduction (Section 3.4) | **M** |
| Antenna switching using multiple UE panels (Section 4.2) | **M** |

# Remaining issues on evaluation methodology (H)

Prior to RAN1#102e, an offline discussion has been conducted in RAN1 NR reflector on the evaluation methodology for SRS enhancements [2]. The three EVM proposals given in Appendix are the outcome of this discussion.

Several contributions submitted to RAN1#102e propose to refine the three EVM proposals.

## EVM proposal 1

Qualcomm proposes to update EVM proposal 1 as

* *LLS is used to evaluate SRS enhancements in Rel-17 FeMIMO, while SLS can be used additionally for evaluating data throughput and utilized SRS resources for a given SRS capacity enhancement design*

***FL Proposal 2-1:*** *LLS is used to evaluate SRS enhancements in Rel-17 FeMIMO, while SLS can be used additionally for evaluating data throughput for a given SRS design.*

Companies’ views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Rapporteur’s assessment | In SLS, SRS resource utilization can be reflected in data throughput. For example, for a given number of UEs in a cell, a particular scheme with larger overhead reduces the number of UEs which can be multiplexed in a slot. Then to accommodate SRS transmission for all the UEs in a cell, a larger SRS periodicity is required, which reduces data throughput due to larger CSI latency. Hence to investigate the overall impact of SRS overhead/capacity, data throughput is critical and sufficient to be the metric in SLS. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Agree with Rapporteur. Resource utilization can determine the periodicity of SRS in the capacity limited scenario, while periodicity will impact throughput. So data throughput is sufficient for SLS. |
| Futurewei | Suggest keeping the original proposal 1, which has a broader scope. The original has “*for a given SRS design*” whereas the updated has “*for a given SRS capacity enhancement design*”. The updated seems to be limiting. |

## EVM proposal 2

The following updates are proposed by companies on EVM proposal 2.

* Baseline
  + Samsung proposes to remove “FG 10-11” in baseline.
* Carrier frequency
  + Qualcomm proposes to remove “3.5GHz” and “FR2”.
* DL/UL prioritization
  + Qualcomm proposes to prioritize DL over UL.
  + Nokia proposes to prioritize UL over DL.
* UE antenna configuration
  + CATT proposes to consider directional antennas additionally for more than 2 antennas in FR1.
  + Samsung and ZTE propose not to consider directional antennas for FR1.
* SRS periodicity
  + Samsung propose to remove “Note: SRS triggering may be aperiodic.”
* Scenario and angular scaling
  + ZTE proposes to add “Companies to state whether angle scaling is performed, and if so, the desired angle spread and mean angle”.
* Difference between UL SNR and DL SNR
  + ZTE and Ericsson suggest to let companies to state one signal value. The value may depend on link budget analysis.
* Phase coherency modeling
  + Alt 1 (Qualcomm): for per SRS port
  + Alt 2 (Qualcomm): for per SRS port
  + Alt 3 (CATT): Phase noise model as in R1-165685
  + Alt 4 (Huawei, HiSilicon): Random phase rotation for each transmitted SRS in different slots follows a uniform distribution [-pi\*Δf\*x/Ts, pi\*Δf\*x/Ts], where Δf denotes the gap between central frequency and UE's SRS frequency position and Ts for sampling frequency. x can be 0.1, 0.2, 0.4.

***FL Proposal 2-2:*** *Adopt the following LLS assumptions at least for SRS enhancements on coverage/capacity in Rel-17.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| Metric | UL/DL BLER or throughput  Note: Other metrics like MSE can be considered optionally. |
| Baseline | Rel-15 SRS + FG 10-11. Companies to state the detailed configuration used as baseline scheme.  ~~FFS: converged baseline(s).~~ |
| Carrier frequency, SCS, System BW | FR1: 3.5GHz or 4GHz, 30kHz, 20, 40 or 100 MHz  FR2: 30 GHz, 120kHz |
| Channel model | CDL-B or CDL-C in TR 38.901 with 30ns or 300ns delay spread as baseline  Note: other delay spread is not precluded.  Companies to state whether angle scaling is performed, and if so, the desired angle spread and mean angle.  ~~FFS: whether and how to define scenario~~  ~~FFS: whether and how to use CDL in MU-MIMO~~ |
| UE speed | 3km/h , 30km/h or 120km/h |
| Number of UE antennas | 1T4R, 2T4R or 4T4R |
| Number of gNB antennas | 32T32R or 64T64R |
| UE antenna configuration | FR1: omni as baseline   * + ~~FFS: whether direction can also be considered for more than 2 antennas~~   FR2: directional |
| Rank, precoder and MCS | Precoder is adaptive. Rank/MCS can be adaptive or fixed. |
| Precoding granularity | Fixed: 2, 4 or wideband for DL, wideband for UL. |
| SRS periodicity | Companies to state the used SRS periodicity.  Note: SRS triggering may be aperiodic. |
| SRS Comb | Comb 2 or 4 |
| SRS frequency hopping | Companies to state whether SRS frequency hopping is enabled and the hopping pattern if so. |
| DL SNR | Companies to state the used difference between DL SNR and UL SNR   * + ~~FFS detailed values~~ |
| Phase coherency | Companies to state whether the phase coherency in time domain is modelled and if so, ~~how~~ the model is chosen from the following   * Alt 1: for per SRS port * Alt 2: for per SRS port * Alt 3: Phase noise model as in R1-165685 * Alt 4: Random phase rotation for each transmitted SRS in different slots follows a uniform distribution [-pi\*Δf\*x/Ts, pi\*Δf\*x/Ts], where Δf denotes the gap between central frequency and UE's SRS frequency position and Ts for sampling frequency. x can be 0.1, 0.2, 0.4. |

Companies’ views on the above are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Rapporteur’s assessment | * Baseline   + Rel-16 UE capability discussion for NR-U has concluded FG 10-11 can also be applied on licensed band. Hence it should be included in the baseline. * Carrier frequency   + FR2 or DL in 3.5GHz has global interest for operators’ deployment. It’s better not to disallow companies to conduct evaluation for them. * DL/UL prioritization   + Based on offline discussion prior to RAN1#102e and the submitted contributions, it’s impossible to prioritize one link to another. There are good points on both sides. DL may have more gain based on accurate CSI, while UL has more urgent need to enhance coverage. Hence it’s better not to prioritize any link in evaluation. * UE antenna configuration   + The current situation is to use omni antennas as baseline for FR1, as it is more useful for FR1. On the other hand, this does not preclude companies to evaluate directional antennas for FR1. Hence it is suggested to keep the current EVM proposal of having omni as baseline. * SRS periodicity   + The intention of the note is not to preclude companies to evaluate the utilization of aperiodic SRS for capacity coverage enhancement. Hence it seems fine to keep it. * Scenario and angular scaling   + Angle scaling reflects the angular spread and allows simulator to generate different angles for different UEs. Hence it is suggested to add “Companies to state whether angle scaling is performed, and if so, the desired angle spread and mean angle”. With this, we can remove the two FFS bullets in channel model. * Difference between UL SNR and DL SNR   + We can keep the current proposal to let companies report the difference and remove the FFS bullet. The reported value may depend on gNB/UE Tx power, noise figure, number of antennas, bandwidth, etc.. * Phase coherency modeling   + It’s better to align the modeling of phase coherency if it is used. Companies’ input on the three alternatives are encouraged. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | * Baseline   + Rel-15 can be baseline since no other enhancements on SRS in Rel-16.   + For the more SRS symbols introduced in NRU, the use case for FG 10-11 is still not clear yet, e.g., UL transmission, antenna switching, or BM. The UE capability will be further discussed in RAN2. So, we also fine to remove it in the baseline. * Carrier frequency   + 3.5GHz is the most common band for operators’ deployment. So it should be used. * DL/UL prioritization   + DL is more sensitive to SRS channel estimation accuracy, it’s better to focus on DL in LLS. * UE antenna configuration   + It is not necessary to use directional antenna modes for FR1 in UE side (we agree to use directional antennas in FR2). Till now, have not any simulation based on UE side directional mode in FR1 case, the UE side antenna is not the same as gNB antennas. We also have no any definition of UE directional antennas in RAN4 for FR1 * SRS periodicity   + In our understanding, aperiodic SRS is usually used when burst traffic arrives. So the notation: “SRS triggering may be aperiodic.” can be removed, since LLS don’t have traffic model. * Scenario and angular scaling   + We are fine with the moderator’s proposal “Companies to state whether angle scaling is performed, and if so, the desired angle spread and mean angle”. * Difference between UL SNR and DL SNR   + It’s fine to keep the current values and some additional values also can be reported by companies. * Phase coherency modeling   We have the following coherency modeling in the email discussion stage:   * + For SRS time bundling, when the start of the corresponding downlink frame of timing advance (TA) is controlled by UE only (i.e., R16), random phase rotation for each transmitted SRS in different slots follows a uniform distribution [-pi\*Δf\*x/Ts, pi\*Δf\*x/Ts], where Δf denotes the gap between central frequency and UE's SRS frequency position and Ts for sampling frequency. x can be 0.1, 0.2, 0.4. |

## EVM proposal 3

The following update is proposed on EVM proposal 3.

* Traffic model
  + Qualcomm proposes to add full buffer in the traffic model.

***FL Proposal 2-3:*** *Adopt the following SLS assumptions at least for SRS capacity enhancements in Rel-17.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| Metric | DL throughput |
| Baseline | Rel-15 SRS + FG 10-11. Companies to state the detailed configuration used as baseline scheme. |
| SRS error modelling | Table A.1-2 of TR 36.897 |
| SRS periodicity | Companies to state the simulated SRS periodicity.  Note: SRS triggering may be aperiodic |
| Carrier frequency, SCS and system bandwidth | 3.5GHz, 30KHz and 20MHz/40MHz/100MHz as baseline |
| Number of gNB antennas | (*M*, *N*, *P*, *M*g,*N*g; *M*p, *N*p) = (8,8,2,1,1,4,8). (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.8)λ |
| Number of UE antennas | 1T4R, 2T4R or 4T4R |
| Traffic model | FTP 1 or FTP 3  Note: Full buffer can also be considered optionally. |
| Handover margin | 3dB |
| Scenario | UMi/UMa with 200m ISD.  Note: UMa with 500m ISD can also be considered. |

Companies’ views on the above are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Rapporteur’s assessment | * Traffic model   + Burst model like FTP is closer to what we have in real network, esp. considering interference, MU paring, etc. caused by on-demand scheduling. Hence it is suggested to stick with FTP models. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | * Traffic model   + We support QC’s proposal to add full buffer as well. SLS is supposed to be used for capacity enhancement evaluation. In the capacity limited scenario, high traffic load should be assumed. So, burst buffer with high RU, e.g. 70% or 80%, should be used, and Full burst buffer also can be used. |
| Futurewei | Support to add full buffer in the traffic model. |

# Flexibility enhancements

## Flexible triggering offset (H)

In the contributions submitted to RAN1#102e, 22 companies (Apple, LG, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Nokia, NSB, Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurewei, ZTE, vivo, InterDigital, NEC, MediaTek, CATT, MotM, Lenovo, Intel, OPPO, Samsung, Spreatrum) see the need to enhance the determination of aperiodic SRS triggering offset. The issue comes from limited combinations of PDCCH location and SRS location for a configured SRS triggering offset, which causes PDCCH congestion or large SRS latency. See the following figure from [6] as an example.



The proposed enhancements can be categorized as follows.

* Increase the total number of available combinations of PDCCH location and SRS location for a given triggering offset:
  + Delay the SRS transmission to an available slot later than the triggering offset defined in current specification, including possible re-definition of the triggering offset
    - Supported by 12 companies (Ericsson, ZTE, Nokia, NSB, Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, CATT, Intel, OPPO, Samsung, InterDigital)
* Use more dynamic signaling:
  + Alt 1: Indicate triggering offset in DCI
    - Supported by 10 companies (LG, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Futurewei, InterDigital, MediaTek, CATT, OPPO, Samsung, Spreadtrum)
  + Alt 2: Update triggering offset in MAC CE
    - Supported by 6 companies (LG, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, MediaTek, MotM, Lenovo)

***FL Proposal 3-1:*** *Enhance the determination of aperiodic SRS triggering offset, considering the following aspects*

* + *Delay the SRS transmission to an available slot later than the triggering offset defined in current specification, including possible re-definition of the triggering offset*
  + *Use more dynamic signaling with at least one of the following alternatives*
    - *Alt 1: Indicate triggering offset in DCI*
    - *Alt 2: Update triggering offset in MAC CE*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Okay |
| NTT Docomo | We are fine with FL proposal. Regarding dynamic signaling, as an operator, we prefer not to increase DCI overhead further. Hence, MAC CE based solution is more preferable |

## Flexible DCI (H)

In RAN1#102e, 9 companies (Qualcomm, Ericsson, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Huawei, HiSilicon, Samsung, vivo) see the need to have a DCI to trigger SRS without data and without CSI, which is not supported in the current specification for non-carrier-switching cases. This enhancement enables use cases for gNB to acquire DL or UL CSI through SRS before scheduling data.

The proposed enhancements can be categorized as follows.

* Support to have at least one DCI format to trigger SRS without data and without CSI
  + Alt 1: Use UE-specific DCI, e.g., extending DCI 0\_1
    - Supported by 5 companies (ZTE, Qualcomm, Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo)
  + Alt 2: Use group-common DCI, e.g., extending DCI 2\_3
    - Supported by 3 companies (Ericsson, Qualcomm, Samsung)

***FL Proposal 3-2:*** *Support at least one DCI format to trigger SRS without data and without CSI, by at least one of the following two alternatives, where the triggered SRS is able to be used for cases other than carrier switching*

* + *Alt 1: Use UE-specific DCI, e.g., extending DCI 0\_1*
  + *Alt 2: Use group-common DCI, e.g., extending DCI 2\_3*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | We are okay to discuss, but we are not sure if it is truly high priority. 0\_1, 0\_2, 1\_1, 1\_2 and 2\_3 can all be used for AP-SRS triggering |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with further discussing this |

## Flexible antenna switching (M)

In RAN1#102e, 3 companies (Qualcomm, ZTE, Intel) see the need to enhance the flexibility of SRS antenna switching considering use cases like overhead/power saving, NW performance, etc..

The proposed enhancements can be summarized as following.

* Support triggering/updating a subset of the configured Tx/Rx antennas for antenna switching SRS.
  + Supported by 3 companies (Qualcomm, ZTE, Intel)

***FL Proposal 3-3:*** *For flexibility enhancement of SRS antenna switching, study the aspect of triggering/updating a subset of the configured Tx/Rx antennas, considering use cases like overhead/power saving, NW performance, etc..*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Okay |
| NTT DOCOMO | Even though we do not think this is of much importance, we are open to discuss it |

## Usage/overhead reduction (M)

In RAN1#102e, 7 companies (Apple, Ericsson, vivo, MediaTek, CATT, CMCC, Spreadtrum) propose to enhance resource reuse among multiple usages explicitly, in order to reduce SRS overhead.

The proposed enhancements are summarized as following.

* Support to reuse same resource(s) for multiple usages, at least for “codebook” and “antenna switching”
  + Supported by 7 companies (Apple, Ericsson, vivo, MediaTek, CATT, CMCC, Spreadtrum), while 1 company (ZTE) propose to further study this for the case antenna switch and PUSCH have different numbers of Tx antennas.

***FL Proposal 3-4:*** *For SRS overhead reduction, study reusing same resources among multiple usages, at least for “codebook” and “antenna switching”.*

* + *The study aspects include whether implementation approach based on legacy SRS configuration is sufficient, the case that antenna switching and PUSCH have different number of Tx antennas, etc..*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | We think it should be high priority. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with discussing it |

## Others (L)

The enhancements listed as following are proposed by 1 or 2 companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Enhancements** | **Companies** |
| Dynamic indication of SRS frequency resource in DCI | LG, Futurewei |
| Enhance cross-carrier SRS triggering | Qualcomm, Intel |
| Dynamic indication of associated CMR or IMR in DCI | Futurewei |
| Support flexible A-SRS triggering for interference probing | Futurewei |
| Support DCI to trigger SP SRS | Qualcomm |
| Support TRP-specific SRS triggering in multi-TRP | Intel |
| Joint triggering of SRS and CSI-RS for beam management | Intel |
| Support one usage with multiple time-domain types | CMCC |
| Enhance fast beam selection in SRS for non-codebook based UL | CEWiT |

# Antenna switching up to 8Rx

## Supported configurations (H)

To support SRS antenna switching xTyR up to 8Rx, 6 new configurations can be identified in total: {1T6R, 1T8R, 2T6R, 2T8R, 4T6R, 4T8R}. In RAN1#102e, companies’ input on supported configurations is summarized as the following table, where “Y” means this company supports the configuration, while “N” means this company does not think this configuration is needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1T6R | 1T8R | 2T6R | 2T8R | 4T6R | 4T8R |
| vivo | N | N | Y | Y | N | Y |
| ZTE | N | N |  | Y |  | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  |  | Y | Y |  | Y |
| LG |  |  | Y | Y |  | Y |
| NTT DOCOMO |  |  | Y |  | Y | Y |
| Sony |  | Y |  | Y |  | Y |
| OPPO | Y | Y | Y | Y |  |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Spreadtrum |  |  | Y | Y |  | Y |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  | Y |  |  |  |
| MotM, Lenovo | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| CATT |  |  |  | Y |  | Y |
| Samsung |  |  | Y |  | N (for FR1) | N (for FR1) |

In the above table, it can be observed that

* 2T6R and 2T8R are supported by most companies, where each of them are supported by 10 companies. No company shows concern on them.
* 4T8R is supported by 10 companies, but one company has concern on it.
* 1T6R is supported by 4 companies, but two companies have concern on it.
* 1T8R is supported by 5 companies, but two companies have concern on it.
* 4T6R is supported by 3 companies, but two companies have concern on it.

***FL Proposal 4-1:*** *For SRS antenna switching up to 8Rx, support at least the configuration of {2T6R, 2T8R}.*

* + *FFS: whether to support one or more from {1T6R, 1T8R, 4T6R, 4T8R}*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Okay |
| NTT DOCOMO | In addition to what is captured in the table (2T6R, 4T6R, and 4T8R), we also support 1T6R, 2T8R |

## Antenna switching using multiple UE panels (M)

In RAN1#102e, 4 companies (LG, Nokia, NSB, Sony) propose to enhance antenna switching for multi-panel UEs, especially considering CSI acquisition when fast panel switching is supported.

The proposed enhancement can be summarized as follows.

* Support SRS antenna switching over multiple UE panels, taking UE’s fast panel switching into account
  + Supported by 4 companies (LG, Nokia, NSB, Sony)

***FL Proposal 4-2:*** *Study SRS antenna switching over multiple UE panels, taking UE’s fast panel switching into account.*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with discussing it |

# Coverage and capacity enhancements

The Rel-17 FeMIMO WID gives three categories to be evaluated for SRS coverage and capacity enhancements, including time bundling, increase repetition and partial frequency sounding. In order to proceed with evaluating these candidates, it is needed to have clear definition and categorization on them.

## Scheme categorization (H)

### Class 1: Time bundling

Proposed definition for this category:

* This category utilizes relationship among two or more SRS resources or occasions to enable joint processing within time domain, without changing legacy SRS pattern in one resource.
  + 8 companies (Qualcomm, Huawei, HiSilicon, ZTE, MediaTek, Samsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum) think this category is potentially beneficial for coverage.

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | We have concern due to the phase continuity, which should be first addressed |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with Apple. It is better to address phase discontinuity issue first |

### Class 2: Increase repetitions

Proposed definition for this category:

* This category changes the legacy SRS pattern in one resource from time domain by adding more symbols for repetition.
  + 20 companies (Apple, Sharp, Nokia, NSB, Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurewei, ZTE, vivo, InterDigital, Sony, CATT, NEC, MotM, Lenovo, Intel, Samsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum, CEWiT) think this category is potentially beneficial for coverage.
    - Among them, 6 companies (Apple, Sharp, Futurewei, ZTE, CATT, Intel) propose to use TD-OCC to compensate its negative impact on SRS capacity.

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Okay |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with discussing it |

### Class 3: Partial frequency sounding

Proposed definition for this category:

* This category supports more flexible configuration on SRS frequency resources to allow SRS transmission on partial frequency resources within the legacy SRS bandwidth.
  + 10 companies (Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurewei, ZTE, vivo, MediaTek, NEC, OPPO, Samsung, Spreadtrum) think this category is potentially beneficial for coverage and/or SRS capacity.

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | This should have relatively lower importance in our view |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with discussing it |

***FL Proposal 5-1:*** *For SRS coverage/capacity enhancements, evaluate and, if needed, specify one or more from three categories based on the following definition.*

* + *Class 1 (Time bundling): Utilize relationship among two or more SRS resources or occasions to enable joint processing within time domain, without changing legacy SRS pattern in one resource.*
  + *Class 2 (Increase repetition): Change the legacy SRS pattern in one resource from time domain by adding more symbols for repetition.* 
    - *TD-OCC can be considered to compensate the negative impact on SRS capacity.*
  + *Class 3 (Partial frequency sounding): Supports more flexible configuration on SRS frequency resources to allow SRS transmission on partial frequency resources within the legacy SRS bandwidth.*

## Others (L)

In addition to the above, the enhancements listed as following are proposed by 1 or 2 companies. Whether these enhancements are in the WI scope is not clear.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Enhancements** | **Companies** |
| Support low PAPR waveform for SRS | MediaTek |
| Enhance SRS sounding for the case DL and UL BWPs are not aligned | Intel |
| Extend SRS root sequence | Huawei, HiSilicon |

# Conclusion

TBD

# Appendix

Outcome of the offline discussion on SRS enhancement EVM [2]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***EVM Proposal 1:*** *LLS is used to evaluate SRS enhancements in Rel-17 FeMIMO, while SLS can be used additionally for evaluating data throughput for a given SRS design.*  ***EVM Proposal 2:*** *Adopt the following LLS assumptions at least for SRS enhancements on coverage/capacity in Rel-17.*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Parameter** | **Value** | | Metric | UL/DL BLER or throughput  Note: Other metrics like MSE can be considered optionally. | | Baseline | Rel-15 SRS + FG 10-11. Companies to state the detailed configuration used as baseline scheme.  FFS: converged baseline(s). | | Carrier frequency, SCS, System BW | FR1: 3.5GHz or 4GHz, 30kHz, 20, 40 or 100 MHz  FR2: 30 GHz, 120kHz | | Channel model | CDL-B or CDL-C in TR 38.901 with 30ns or 300ns delay spread as baseline  Note: other delay spread is not precluded.  FFS: whether and how to define scenario  FFS: whether and how to use CDL in MU-MIMO | | UE speed | 3km/h , 30km/h or 120km/h | | Number of UE antennas | 1T4R, 2T4R or 4T4R | | Number of gNB antennas | 32T32R or 64T64R | | UE antenna configuration | FR1: omni as baseline   * + FFS: whether direction can also be considered for more than 2 antennas   FR2: directional | | Rank, precoder and MCS | Precoder is adaptive. Rank/MCS can be adaptive or fixed. | | Precoding granularity | Fixed: 2, 4 or wideband for DL, wideband for UL. | | SRS periodicity | Companies to state the used SRS periodicity.  Note: SRS triggering may be aperiodic. | | SRS Comb | Comb 2 or 4 | | SRS frequency hopping | Companies to state whether SRS frequency hopping is enabled and the hopping pattern if so. | | DL SNR | Companies to state the used difference between DL SNR and UL SNR   * + FFS detailed values | | Phase coherency | Companies to state whether the phase coherency in time domain is modelled and if so, how. |   ***EVM Proposal 3:*** *Adopt the following SLS assumptions at least for SRS capacity enhancements in Rel-17.*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Parameter** | **Value** | | Metric | DL throughput | | Baseline | Rel-15 SRS + FG 10-11. Companies to state the detailed configuration used as baseline scheme. | | SRS error modelling | Table A.1-2 of TR 36.897 | | SRS periodicity | Companies to state the simulated SRS periodicity.  Note: SRS triggering may be aperiodic | | Carrier frequency, SCS and system bandwidth | 3.5GHz, 30KHz and 20MHz/40MHz/100MHz as baseline | | Number of gNB antennas | (*M*, *N*, *P*, *M*g,*N*g; *M*p, *N*p) = (8,8,2,1,1,4,8). (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.8)λ | | Number of UE antennas | 1T4R, 2T4R or 4T4R | | Traffic model | FTP 1 or FTP 3 | | Handover margin | 3dB | | Scenario | UMi/UMa with 200m ISD.  Note: UMa with 500m ISD can also be considered. | |
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