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# Introduction

This email thread discusses the general and UE parts for Rel-17 demodulation performance enhancement WI in AI 8.14.1 and 8.14.2.

List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round:

* 1st round: Invite companies to review the recommended WF in section 1~3, and provide comments (if any) in section 1.3, 2.3 and 3.3.
* 2nd round: TBA

# Topic #1: General

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104951 | China Telecom | Work plan for Further enhancement on NR demodulation performance WI |
| R4-2104952 | China Telecom | TR skeleton (V0.0.1) for Inter-user interference suppression for NR Multiple-User Multiple-Input Multiple-Output (MU-MIMO) |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1: Work plan

**Issue 1-1: Work plan**

* Proposals
	+ Initial work plan in R4-2104951
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage comments if any

### Sub-topic 1-2: TR skeleton

**Issue 1-2: TR skeleton**

* Proposals
	+ TR skeleton in R4-2104952: According to the approved WID, the TR skeleton (V0.0.1) is proposed to capture Phase I outcome of Inter-user interference suppression for NR MU-MIMO.
		- Note: With the new objective on LTE CRS-IM performance evaluation added at RAN #91e, the TR title in the WID would probably be updated in the June RAN #92e meeting.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage comments if any

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Company A | Issue 1-1: Work planIssue 1-2: TR skeleton |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Issue 1-1: Work planWe are fine with the work planIssue 1-2: TR skeletonWe are fine with the TR skeleton. |
| Ericsson | Issue 1-1: For LTE CRS-IM, we don’t think it is possible to provide the initial simulation results in RAN4#99 in May. The following work plan is preferred from Ericsson’s view.**RAN4 #99*** Discussion on the link simulation assumptions

**RAN4 #100*** Continue the discussion on the link simulation assumptions
* Discussion on the possible impact to other WGs, if necessary.

**RAN4 #101*** Collection of initial ideal simulation results
* Update of link simulation assumptions if needed

**RAN4 #102*** Collection of updated ideal and impairment results
* Update of link simulation assumptions if needed
* Draft CRs endorsed

**RAN4 #102b*** Collection of updated ideal and impairment results
* CRs approved
 |
| Qualcomm | Issue 1-1: Work planSimilar concern as Ericsson.Issue 1-2: TR skeletonAdditional sections will be needed for LTE CRS-IM performance evaluation. |
| ZTE | Issue 1-1: Work planSeveral comments from us: 1) Since Scenario 2 has a lower priority than Scenario 1, for discussions on CQI reporting in RAN4#98-b-e(this meeting), we can focus on necessity of CQI reporting for Scenario 1, and similar discussion for Scenario 2 can be left to RAN4#102 with a condition that Scenario 1 works are completed; 2) For LTE CRS-IM, the very first simulation collection scheduled in May, same meeting for discussion on simulation assumption, might be based on un-aligned assumptions, and may have no meaning to collect such un-calibrated numerical results, therefore, better to schedule the initial simulation results one meeting after the assumptions are agreed. |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

## Discussion on 2nd round

# Topic #2: MMSE-IRC receiver for inter-cell interference

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104606 | CMCC | Proposal 1: Introduce the Micro-cell (victim cell) and Macro-cell (interfering cell) scenario for R17 demodulation enhancements inter-cell interference suppressing. Proposal 2: the following scenarios should be considered:* FR1, FDD sync scenario;
* FR1, FDD async scenario;
* FR1, TDD sync scenario;

Proposal 3: the following SCS and bandwidth combination should be considered:* FDD
* 10MHz/15kHz
* 50MHz/15kHz
* TDD
* 40MHz/30kHz
* 100MHz/30kHz

Proposal 4: For TDD 30kHz, use typical 7D1S2U(S=6D+4G+4U) for TDD configuration.Proposal 5: * For victim cell, first consider rank-1 transmission.
* For MIMO rank transmission probability on the interference cells, take rank-1 transmission probability 70% as the starting point.

Proposal 6:* For victim cell, take 2Tx as the baseline.
* For interference cells, consider both 4Tx and 2Tx.

Proposal 7: SSB configuration for victim cells and interference cells can be aligned. * SSB position in burst: first SSB in Slot#0
* SSB periodicity: 20ms.

Proposal 8: Use throughput vs SNR as the test metric for MMSE-IRC receiver demodulation performance requirements, and consider 70% relative throughput for the test points. |
| R4-2104846 | Apple | Observation #1: DMRS based interference covariance estimation suffers degradation when there is no interference on DMRS REs.Proposal #1: For requirements with DMRS based interference covariance estimation, limit scenarios to cases where interference can be rejected with DMRS based covariance estimation.Proposal #2: Introduce requirements with ICI for QPSK and 16QAM.Proposal #3: Further discuss interference model for NR.  |
| R4-2104953 | China Telecom | The following proposals were made w.r.t. the network scenario:Proposal 1: Cover both sync and async network scenarios for FDD, and sync network scenario for TDD.Proposal 2: For the SCS, cover at least 15kHz SCS for FDD and 30kHz SCS for TDD.Proposal 3: For the channel bandwidth, cover 10 MHz and 40 MHz channel bandwidth for FDD 15kHz SCS, 40MHz and 100MHz channel bandwidth for TDD 30kHz SCS.Proposal 4: Consider two TDD configurations for 30kHz SCS:* Configuration 1: 7D1S2U, S = 6D:4G:4U
* Configuration 2: DDDSUDDSUU, S1=10G: 2G: 2U, S2 = 10G: 2G: 2U

Proposal 5: Only consider PDSCH to PDSCH interference. Use symbols #0 and #1 of each slot for control channel in all the considered cells.The following observation and proposals were made w.r.t. the reference receiver:Observation 1: It is unknown whether the precoding matrix in any two contiguous PRBs in the neighboring/interfering cell(s) is the same.Proposal 6: The estimation of interference covariance matrix can be performed at per PRB and per slot basis.Proposal 7: Reuse the interference profiles for LTE MMSE-IRC receiver, i.e., assume target geometry of -2.5dB, use DIP1/2= -1.73/-8.66 dB for synchronous network, and use DIP1/2= -2.23/-8.06 dB for asynchronous network.Proposal 8: The number of explicit interferers can be 2 or 1 for different tests, by considering the tradeoff between test complexity and the gain of MMSE-IRC over MMSE receiver.Proposal 9: Assume 70% and 30% probability for rank 1 and rank 2 transmission in the interfering cell(s).Proposal 10: For the interferers, assume random precoding per slot and per PRB bundling granularity, with PRB bundling size of 2.Proposal 11: Assume 16QAM randomly modulated symbols in the interfering PDSCH.The following proposals were made w.r.t. the target PDSCH parameters:Proposal 12: Use rank 1 for target PDSCH.Proposal 13: As baseline, choose MCS for which the resulting geometry value falls in the range ~[-2.5dB, 0dB] with typical margin considered.Proposal 14: For the precoding model of target PDSCH, further discuss whether to use random precoding or follow PMI.Proposal 15: For the throughput test point, use 70% of max TP as baseline.Proposal 16: Re-use the Rel-15 assumptions on HARQ process number, i.e., 4 for FDD 15kHz SCS and 8 for TDD 30kHz SCS.The following proposals were made w.r.t. the common parameters for target and interfering PDSCH:Proposal 17: For the antenna configuration, use 2Tx as baseline, and cover both 2Rx and 4Rx.Proposal 18: For the propagation condition, include both TDLA30-10 and TDLC300-100 at this early phase, and decide whether down-selection is needed later. Use ULA low for the antenna correlation.Proposal 19: In both target and interfering PDSCH, assume PDSCH mapping type A with full PRB allocation, use DMRS Type 1 with single symbol front loaded and 1 additional DMRS, with FDM applied between DMRS and data.Proposal 20: For SSB in both target and interfering cells, reuse the Rel-15 assumptions , i.e., configure the first SSB in slot #0 in every 20 slots, and the slot #0 in every 20 slots is not scheduled for PDSCH transmission.Proposal 21: Use Physical cell ID of 0 for the serving cell, and cell ID 1 and 2 for the two interfering cellsProposal 22: Further discuss whether TRS/CSI-RS are collided among cells, as well as whether DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS are collided among cells.The following observation and proposals were made w.r.t. the CQI reporting requirements:Observation 2: Two categories of scenarios can be considered for further discussion on CQI reporting requirement:* A) Interference is precoded as data, i.e., in serving cell’s NZP CSI-RS REs, DMRS and/or data is transmitted in interfering cell. For these scenarios, MMSE-IRC based CQI calculation is beneficial for the PDSCH performance.
* B) Interference is not precoded as data, i.e., in serving cell’s NZP CSI-RS REs, NZP CSI-RS or ZP CSI-RS is transmitted in interfering cell. For these scenarios, check the performance benefits brought by MMSE-IRC based CQI calculation over MMSE based CQI calculation if needed.

Proposal 23: For MMSE-IRC based CQI reporting, the interference covariance can be estimated and averaged among multiple PRBs, and the exact PRB number for interference covariance averaging needs further discussion.Proposal 24: As the starting point, model one inter-cell interferer with DIP of -0.41dB and static propagation condition.Proposal 25: Reuse the LTE test metric as a starting point, which include: 1) the relative increase of the throughput obtained when the transport format is that indicated by the reported CQI subject to an interference model compared to the case with a white Gaussian noise model, and 2) when transmitting the transport format indicated by each reported wideband CQI index subject to an interference source with specified DIP, the average BLER for the indicated transport formats shall be greater than or equal to 2%. |
| R4-2104977 | NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Proposal 1: For MMSE-IRC receiver for inter-cell interference test, the following test parameters are applied;

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameters | Value |
| Duplex mode/SCS | FDD 15kHz, TDD 30kHz |
| Channel Bandwidth | FDD 10MHz, TDD 40MHz |
| TDD pattern | 7D1S2U (S= 6D:4G:4U) |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2, 2x4 |
| PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 |
| PDCCH allocation | Symbol 0,1 |
| Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput |

 |
| R4-2106426 | Intel Corporation | Proposal 1: Define CQI reporting requirements for MMSE-IRC receiver for scenario with inter-cell interference.Proposal 2: Use the following LTE NAICS assumptions for interference modelling for initial alignment of NR MMSE-IRC performance: * Explicit modelling of 2 interference cells with INRs 13.91 and 3.34 dB or 7.77 and 2.29 dB
* Interference signal is transmitted in each slot with 16QAM randomly modulated symbols and with random rank (Rank 1 – 80% and Rank 2 – 20 %)

Proposal 3: Analyse the SINR and INRs distributions for “Urban macro” NR scenarios using methodology from TR 36.866 and system level assumptions from TR 38.913 and 38.901.Proposal 4: Consider the following simulation assumptions for Scenario 1 requirements: * SCS/CBW: 15 kHz / 10 MHz for FDD and 30 kHz / 40 MHz for TDD
* TDD pattern: 7D1S2U, S = 6D+4G+4U
* PDSCH configuration for serving and interference cells
	+ Type A PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 2 and duration 12
	+ DMRS Type 1 with 1 additional RS
	+ Number of PDSCH DMRS CDM group(s) without data = 1
* Serving PDSCH Rank 1, MCS 5 or 13 or 19.
* Channel model: TDL-A, 30 ns, 10 Hz
* Antenna configuration: 2x2 and 2x4 with ULA Low correlation
* Receiver assumptions: MMSE-IRC with DMRS based covariance matrix estimation and without time selective interference handling

Proposal 5: Consider the following simulation assumptions for Scenario 2 requirements: * SCS/CBW: 15 kHz / 10 MHz for FDD and 30 kHz / 40 MHz for TDD
* TDD pattern: 7D1S2U, S = 6D+4G+4U
* PDSCH configuration for serving cell
	+ Type A PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 2 and duration 12
	+ DMRS Type 1 with 1 additional RS
	+ Number of PDSCH DMRS CDM group(s) without data = 1
	+ RMC: Rank 1, MCS 5 or 13 or 19.
* PDSCH configuration for interference cells
	+ Option 1: Type A PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 2 and duration 5 for both cells
	+ Option 2:
		- Type A PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 2 and duration 5 for cell #1
		- Type B PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 7 and duration 7 for cell #2
	+ Option 3: Type B PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 4 and duration 7 for both cells
* Channel model: TDL-A, 30 ns, 10 Hz
* Antenna configuration: 2x2 and 2x4 with ULA Low correlation
* Receiver assumptions:
	+ Option 1: MMSE-IRC with DMRS based covariance matrix estimation and without time selective interference handling
	+ Option 2: MMSE-IRC with DMRS based covariance matrix estimation and with time selective interference handling
	+ Option 3: MMSE-IRC with DMRS and Data based covariance matrix estimation

Observation #1: MMSE-IRC allows to achieve ~3.5 dB performance benefits in comparison to MMSE-MRC for Scenario 1 with considered simulation assumptionsObservation #2: MMSE-IRC allows to achieve ~3-4 dB performance benefits in comparison to MMSE-MRC for Scenario 2-1 and 2-2 with considered simulation assumptions.Observation #3: No MMSE-IRC performance benefits in comparison to MMSE-MRC are observed for Scenario 2-3.Observation #4: MMSE-IRC processing with time selective interference handling allows to achieve additional ~1-2 dB performance benefits in comparisons to basic MMSE-IRC processing for Scenario 2-1 and 2-2 with considered simulation assumptions.Observation #5: MMSE-IRC processing with time selective interference handling allows to achieve additional ~6-8 dB performance benefits in comparison to MMSE-MRC or basic MMSE-IRC processing for Scenario 2-3 with considered simulation assumptions. |
| R4-2106833 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: We propose the following configurations for PDSCH and DMRS:* PDSCH configuration for serving cell and neighboring cell:
* PDSCH Mapping Type: Type A
* Starting symbol: 2
* Length: 12
* PDSCH DMRS configuration for serving cell and neighboring cell:
* DMRS Type: Type 1
* Number of additional DMRS: 1
* Scheduling with data multiplexed on the DMRS symbols

Proposal 2: We propose to define the requirements for 15 kHz/10 MHz for FDD and 30 kHz/40 MHz for TDD.Proposal 3: We propose to use DIP ratio to define the interference profiles.Proposal 4: We propose to consider two neighbour cells as the interference cells.Proposal 5: We propose to use TDLA30-10 as the propagation condition.Proposal 6: We propose to use 16QAM as the target MCS for inter-cell MMSE IRC requirements.Proposal 7: We propose to further discuss whether to introduce the corresponding CQI reporting test. |
| R4-2106867 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: RAN4 should agree with the inter-cell interference model before discussing the detailed simulation assumption for inter-cell interference scenario.Proposal 2: RAN4 defines the interference modes for NR performance enhanced requirements as follows, by reusing LTE interference model. Some values in [] in the texts below may be discussed further.

|  |
| --- |
| This subclause provides interference modelling for each explicitly modelled interfering cell in the requirement scenario. In each slot, each interfering cell shall transmit randomly modulated data over the entire PDSCH region and the full transmission bandwidth according to the probabilities of occurrence. Transmitted physical channels shall include SS/PBCH block. Probabilities of occurrence in each slot are as specified in the requirement scenario. If the probabilities of occurrence in each slot are not specified in the requirement scenario, as default, they are equal to 1.For each slot and each [smallest] subband as defined in subclause 5.2.1.4 of TS38.214, a transmission rank shall be randomly determined independently from other subbands as well as other interfering cells. Probabilities of occurrence of each possible transmission rank are as specified in the requirement scenario.For each slot and each subband, a precoding matrix for the number of layers v associated to the selected rank shall be selected randomly from [single panel type I].The generic beamforming model in subclause B.4 shall be applied assuming DM-RS and CSI reference signals as specified in the requirement scenario. Random precoding with selected rank and precoding matrices for each slot and each subband shall be applied to [16QAM] randomly modulated layer symbols including the DM-RS over antenna port [1000] when the rank is one and antenna ports [1000/1001] when the rank is two.For unallocated REs in the CORESET region, precoding of randomly selected from single panel type I, per slot with equal probability of each applicable i1, i2 combination, and with REG bundling granularity for number of Tx larger than 1, shall be applied to QPSK randomly modulated layer symbols. |

Proposal 3: Neighboring cell(s) schedule SSB at the same location as the serving cell.Proposal 4: Neighboring cell(s) schedule CSI reference signals (for both tracking and CSI acquisition) at the same location as the serving cell.Proposal 5: RAN4 use the dominant interference proportion (DIP) to specify the received signal powers from interfering cells:

|  |
| --- |
| $$DIP\_{i}=\frac{\hat{I}\_{or\left(i+1\right)}}{N\_{oc}^{'}}$$Where  $\hat{i}\_{or(i+1)}$ is the average received power spectral density from the i-th strongest interfering cell involved in the requirement scenario and $N\_{oc}^{'}=\sum\_{j=2}^{N}\hat{i}\_{oc(j)}+N\_{oc}$, where $N\_{oc}$ is the average power spectral density of a white noise source consistent with the definition provided in TS38.101-4 subclause 4.4.3, and $N$ is the total number of cells involved in a given requirement scenario. Note  $\hat{i}\_{or(1)}$ is assumed to be the power spectral density associated with the serving cell.  |

Proposal 6: RAN4 specify the NR UE demodulation requirements for MMSE-IRC suppressing the inter-cell interference with regard to SINR to achieve 70% of maximum throughput. Proposal 7: Define SINR (for FR1) as follows, and capture it in TS38.101-4 Clause 4.4.2.

|  |
| --- |
| $$SINR=\frac{\sum\_{j=1}^{N\_{RX}}E\_{s}^{\left(j\right)}}{\sum\_{j=1}^{N\_{RX}}N'\_{oc}^{\left(j\right)}} $$Where $E\_{s}^{(j)}$ is the averaged received energy per Hz of the wanted signal during the useful part of the symbol, i.e. excluding the cyclic prefix, at the j-th UE receiver antenna connector ; average power is computed within a set of REs used for the transmission of physical, divided transmission bandwidth within the set.And $N\_{oc}^{'(j)}$ is the power spectral density (average power per RE normalised to the subcarrier spacing) of the summation of the received power spectral densities of the strongest interfering cells explicitly defined in a test procedure plus $N\_{oc}^{(j)}$, as measured at the j-th UE receiver antenna connector. The respective power spectral density of each interfering cell relative to $N\_{oc}^{(j)}$ is defined by its associated DIP value, or the respective power spectral density of each interfering cell relative to $N\_{oc}^{(j)}$ is defined by its associated Es/Noc value.  |

Proposal 8: RAN4 should study first the MMSE-IRC receiver performance with interfering cell(s) whether it shows the gain compared with the case without neighboring interfering cell(s), i.e., AWGN-only scenario.Proposal 9: Use Rel-11 LTE DIP settings as the starting point, i.e., (DIP Cell 2, DIP Cell 3) = (-2.23, -8.06), (-2.23, -Inf), (-1.73, -8.66), (-1.73, -Inf). Proposal 10: In Rel-17, MMSE-IRC receiver performance requirements with interference cell condition is defined only for single carrier scenario.Proposal 11: For the Rel-17 MMSE-IRC receiver performance evaluation, RAN4 should assume the following parameters as the starting point:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameters | FDD | TDD |
| CBW | 10MHz (single carrier only) | 40MHz (single carrier only) |
| TDD configuration | N/A | 7DS2U,S=6D+4G+4USchedule PDSCH in special slots |
| SCS | 15kHz | 30kHz |
| PDSCH configuration | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12​ | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12​ |
| PRB bundling size  | 2 | 2 |
| PDSCH DMRS configuration | Type 1, 1+1 | Type 1, 1+1 |
| MCS | MCS 4 (QPSK, CR=0.3)MCS 13 (16QAM, CR=0.5) | MCS 4 (QPSK, CR=0.3)MCS 13 (16QAM, CR=0.5) |
| Rank | 1 | 1 |
| PDSCH precoder | Single Panel Type I, Random precoder selection updated per slot,with equal probability of each applicable i1, i2 combination, and with PRB bundling granularity | Single Panel Type I, Random precoder selection updated per slot,with equal probability of each applicable i1, i2 combination, and with PRB bundling granularity |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2, 2x4 | 2x2, 2x4 |
| Propagation condition | TDLA30-10TDLC300-100 | TDLA30-10TDLC300-100 |
| DIP | (DIP1, DIP2) = (-2.23, -8.06)(DIP1, DIP2) = (-2.23, -Inf)(DIP1, DIP2) = (-1.73, -8.66)(DIP1, DIP2) = (-1.73, -Inf) | (DIP1, DIP2) = (-2.23, -8.06)(DIP1, DIP2) = (-2.23, -Inf)(DIP1, DIP2) = (-1.73, -8.66)(DIP1, DIP2) = (-1.73, -Inf) |
| Time Offset relative to serving cell | 0 us | 0 us |
| Metric  | SINR to achieve 70% of maximum throughput | SINR to achieve 70% of maximum throughput |

Proposal 12: RAN4 defines the CSI reporting tests with neighboring cell(s) interference condition. Proposal 13: RAN4 discuss whether the UE demodulation and CQI reporting requirements with inter-cell interference is released independent from Rel-15 or not, after RAN4 agree with the detailed simulation assumption. |
| R4-2107093 | MediaTek inc. | Proposal 1: Determine the number of interferers and the corresponding interference profiles first.Proposal 2: Regarding CQI report, discuss the assumption of interference for DM-RS and PDSCH first.  |

## Open issues summary

**Note:** The issues in sub-topic 2-1 to 2-5 are for scenario 1 with slot-based transmission and aligned SCS among cells.

### Sub-topic 2-1: Interference model for scenario 1

**Issue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: (CMCC, China Telecom)
		- FDD sync scenario
		- FDD async scenario
		- TDD sync scenario
	+ Option 2: FDD and TDD sync scenario (E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 2-1-2: Interference profile**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Reuse the DIP based interference profiles from LTE MMSE-IRC receiver (China Telecom, Huawei, E///, [MediaTek])
		- China Telecom:
			* Assume target geometry of -2.5dB, use DIP1/2= -1.73/-8.66 dB for synchronous network, and use DIP1/2= -2.23/-8.06 dB for asynchronous network.
			* The number of explicit interferers can be 2 or 1 for different tests, by considering the tradeoff between test complexity and the gain of MMSE-IRC over MMSE receiver.
		- HW: Consider two neighbour cells as the interference cells
		- E///: Use Rel-11 LTE DIP settings as the starting point, i.e., (DIP Cell 2, DIP Cell 3) = (-2.23, -8.06), (-2.23, -Inf), (-1.73, -8.66), (-1.73, -Inf).
	+ Option 2: In addition to the Macro cell scenario considered for LTE MMSE-IRC receiver, introduce the Micro-cell (victim cell) and Macro-cell (interfering cell) scenario (CMCC)
		- CMCC: we observe the interference in realistic deployment
	+ Option 3: (Intel)
		- Use the following LTE NAICS assumptions for interference modelling for initial alignment of NR MMSE-IRC performance
			* Explicit modelling of 2 interference cells with INRs 13.91 and 3.34 dB or 7.77 and 2.29 dB
		- Analyse the SINR and INRs distributions for “Urban macro” NR scenarios using methodology from TR 36.866 and system level assumptions from TR 38.913 and 38.901.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCH**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Reuse LTE MMSE-IRC assumption for DMRS-based transmission mode, i.e., random rank with 70% and 30% probability for rank 1 and rank 2 transmission in the interfering cell(s), as the starting point (CMCC, China Telecom)
	+ Option 2: Reuse LTE NAICS assumption, i.e., random rank with 80% and 20% probability for rank 1 and rank 2 transmission in the interfering cell(s) (Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 2-1-4: Precoding of interfering PDSCH**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Random precoding (China Telecom, Ericsson)
		- Option 1A: Random precoding per slot and per PRB bundling granularity, with PRB bundling size of 2 (China Telecom)
		- Option 1B: Random precoding per slot and per [smallest] subband as defined in subclause 5.2.1.4 of TS38.214; [single panel type I] codebook (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCH**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Reuse LTE assumption for MMSE-IRC receiver, i.e., 16QAM randomly modulated symbols (China Telecom, [E///], Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

### Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiver for scenario 1

**Issue 2-2-1: DMRS configuration**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: limit scenarios to cases where interference can be rejected with DMRS based covariance estimation. (Apple)
		- Apple: DMRS based interference covariance estimation suffers degradation when there is no interference on DMRS REs.
	+ Option 2: for both serving and interfering cells, DMRS Type 1 with single symbol front loaded and 1 additional DMRS, with FDM applied between DMRS and data (China Telecom, Intel, Huawei)
	+ Option 3: DMRS Type 1 with single symbol front loaded and 1 additional DMRS (E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: The estimation of interference covariance matrix can be performed at per PRB and per slot basis (China Telecom, Intel)
		- China Telecom: It is unknown whether the precoding matrix in any two contiguous PRBs in the neighboring/interfering cell(s) is the same.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

### Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parameters for scenario 1

**Issue 2-3-1: Transmission rank**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: rank 1 (CMCC, China Telecom, Intel, E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Use rank 1 as baseline

**Issue 2-3-2: MCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: QPSK and 16QAM (Apple, E///)
		- Option 1A: MCS 4 (QPSK, CR=0.3), MCS 13 (16QAM, CR=0.5) (E///)
	+ Option 2: choose MCS for which the resulting geometry value falls in the range ~[-2.5dB, 0dB] with typical margin considered (China Telecom)
	+ Option 3: MCS 5 or 13 or 19 (Intel)
	+ Option 4: 16QAM (HW)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Further discuss whether to use random precoding or follow PMI (China Telecom)
	+ Option 2: Single Panel Type I, Random precoder selection (E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-3-4: PRB bundle size**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2 (E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 70% relative throughput(CMCC, China Telecom, DCM, E///)
		- Option 1A: S**I**NR (not SNR) at 70% TP (E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Use Option 1 + Option 1A as baseline

**Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process number**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Re-use the Rel-15 assumptions on HARQ process number, i.e., 4 for FDD 15kHz SCS and 8 for TDD 30kHz SCS (China Telecom)
* Recommended WF
	+ Use Option 1 as baseline

### Sub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCH for scenario 1

**Issue 2-4-1: SCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: FDD 15kHz, TDD 30kHz (CMCC, China Telecom, DCM, Intel, Huawei, E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Agree Option 1

**Issue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidth**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1 (CMCC)
		- FDD 15kHz: 10MHz, 50MHz
		- TDD 30kHz: 40MHz, 100MHz
			* CMCC: We also support to consider the maximum bandwidth for FDD and TDD, which is 50MHz for FDD and 100MHz for TDD.
	+ Option 2 (China Telecom)
		- FDD 15kHz: 10MHz, 40MHz
		- TDD 30kHz: 40MHz, 100MHz
	+ Option 3 (DCM, Intel, Huawei, E///)
		- FDD 15kHz: 10MHz
		- TDD 30kHz: 40MHz
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 7D1S2U(S=6D+4G+4U) (CMCC, DCM, Intel)
	+ Option 2: Consider two TDD configurations(China Telecom)
		- Configuration 1: 7D1S2U, S = 6D:4G:4U
		- Configuration 2: DDDSUDDSUU, S1=10G: 2G: 2U, S2 = 10G: 2G: 2U
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: In Rel-17, MMSE-IRC receiver performance requirements with interference cell condition is defined only for single carrier scenario. (E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocation**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: for serving and interfering cells (China Telecom, Intel, DCM, Huawei, E///)
		- Use symbols #0 and #1 of each slot for PDCCH
		- PDSCH Start symbol 2, Duration 12
* Recommended WF
	+ Agree Option 1

**Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna number**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 2Tx as baseline for serving cell, both 4Tx and 2Tx for interfering cells (CMCC)
	+ Option 2: 2Tx as baseline for serving cell and interfering cells (China Telecom, DCM, Intel, E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-4-7: Propagation condition**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Include both TDLA30-10 and TDLC300-100 at this early phase (China Telecom, E///)
	+ Option 2: TDLA30-10 (Intel, HW)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-4-8: Antenna correlation**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: ULA low (China Telecom, Intel)
* Recommended WF
	+ Can we use Option 1 as baseline?

**Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping type**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: PDSCH mapping type A for serving and interfering PDSCH (China Telecom, DCM, Huawei)
* Recommended WF
	+ Can we agree Option 1?

**Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocation**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Full PRB allocation for serving and interfering PDSCH (China Telecom)
* Recommended WF
	+ Can we agree Option 1?

**Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cells**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Aligned SSB configuration for serving and interference cells(CMCC, China Telecom, E///)
		- Option 1A: (CMCC, China Telecom)
			* SSB position in burst: first SSB in Slot#0; SSB periodicity: 20ms.
			* The slot #0 in every 20 ms is not scheduled for PDSCH transmission
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 2-4-12: Physical cell ID**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Physical cell ID of 0 for the serving cell, and cell ID 1 and 2 for the two interfering cells (China Telecom)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 2-4-13: TRS/CSI-RS among cells**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Further discuss whether TRS/CSI-RS are collided among cells (China Telecom)
	+ Option 2: Neighboring cell(s) schedule CSI reference signals (for both tracking and CSI acquisition) at the same location as the serving cell (E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 2-4-14: DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS among cells**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Further discuss whether DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS are collided among cells (China Telecom)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

### Sub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirements for scenario 1

**Issue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirements**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (China Telecom, Intel, E///)
	+ Option 2: Further discuss (Huawei, MediaTek)
		- MediaTek: Enhancement on CQI can be considered only if network can guarantee same interference is experienced by CSI-RS and PDSCH.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion

**Issue 2-5-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity for CQI reporting**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: the interference covariance can be estimated and averaged among multiple PRBs, and the exact PRB number for interference covariance averaging needs further discussion (China Telecom)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 2-5-3: Interference model for CQI reporting**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: As the starting point, model one inter-cell interferer with DIP of -0.41dB and static propagation condition (China Telecom)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 2-5-4: Test metric for CQI reporting**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Reuse the LTE test metric as a starting point, which include (China Telecom)
		- 1) the relative increase of the throughput obtained when the transport format is that indicated by the reported CQI subject to an interference model compared to the case with a white Gaussian noise model, and
		- 2) when transmitting the transport format indicated by each reported wideband CQI index subject to an interference source with specified DIP, the average BLER for the indicated transport formats shall be greater than or equal to 2%.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

### Sub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmission

**Issue 2-6-1: Test parameters**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1 (Intel)
		- SCS/CBW: 15 kHz / 10 MHz for FDD and 30 kHz / 40 MHz for TDD
		- TDD pattern: 7D1S2U, S = 6D+4G+4U
		- PDSCH configuration for serving cell
			* Type A PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 2 and duration 12
			* DMRS Type 1 with 1 additional RS
			* Number of PDSCH DMRS CDM group(s) without data = 1
			* RMC: Rank 1, MCS 5 or 13 or 19.
		- PDSCH configuration for interference cells
			* Option 1: Type A PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 2 and duration 5 for both cells
			* Option 2:
		- Type A PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 2 and duration 5 for cell #1
		- Type B PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 7 and duration 7 for cell #2
			* Option 3: Type B PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 4 and duration 7 for both cells
		- Channel model: TDL-A, 30 ns, 10 Hz
		- Antenna configuration: 2x2 and 2x4 with ULA Low correlation
		- Receiver assumptions:
			* Option 1: MMSE-IRC with DMRS based covariance matrix estimation and without time selective interference handling
			* Option 2: MMSE-IRC with DMRS based covariance matrix estimation and with time selective interference handling
			* Option 3: MMSE-IRC with DMRS and Data based covariance matrix estimation
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

### Sub-topic 2-7: Release independence

**Issue 2-7-1: Release independence**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: RAN4 discuss whether the UE demodulation and CQI reporting requirements with inter-cell interference is released independent from Rel-15 or not, after RAN4 agree with the detailed simulation assumption (E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Company A | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1Issue 2-1-2: Interference profileIssue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHIssue 2-1-4: Precoding of interfering PDSCHIssue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHSub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationIssue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularitySub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank Issue 2-3-2: MCS Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model Issue 2-3-4: PRB bundle size Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberSub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSIssue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidthIssue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSIssue 2-4-4: Number of carriers Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationIssue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberIssue 2-4-7: Propagation conditionIssue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationIssue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeIssue 2-4-10: PRB allocationIssue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cellsIssue 2-4-12: Physical cell IDIssue 2-4-13: TRS/CSI-RS among cellsIssue 2-4-14: DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS among cellsSub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity for CQI reportingIssue 2-5-3: Interference model for CQI reportingIssue 2-5-4: Test metric for CQI reportingSub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmissionIssue 2-6-1: Test parametersSub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independence |
| China Telecom | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1Support option 1. LTE UE MMSE-IRC test has covered both sync and async for FDD. For the simulation work, sync FDD/TDD can be prioritized over async FDD.Issue 2-1-2: Interference profileFor HomNet, support to reuse the DIP based interference profile from LTE, i.e., option 1.We also support to cover HetNet as proposed in option 2. In HetNet with co-channel micro cells, the interference will be severer, and MMSE-IRC can help suppress the inference. The DIP values for HetNet need further discussion; one option could be to translate the INRs in NAICS scenario 2 to DIPs, in order to avoid additional system simulation.Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHNot sure if there will be obvious performance difference for the two options. Maybe we can select one as baseline by following the majority view after the 1st round.Issue 2-1-4: Precoding of interfering PDSCHFor the codebook, ok to use single panel type I as proposed in option 1B.For the granularity of precoding in frequency-domain, either option 1A or 1B is fine.Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHSupport option 1.Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationIt seems the three options do not conflict with each other. Option 2 gives more details, and we support option 2.Issue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularitySupport option 1.Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank Support the recommended WF.Issue 2-3-2: MCS Given the different options here, for the initial simulation, maybe we can select one MCS for QPSK and one MCS for 16QAM, e.g., MCS 5 and 13, and the MCSs can adjusted later after more simulation results are collected.Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model It is fine to use option 2 in the initial simulation, while follow PMI is not precluded.Issue 2-3-4: PRB bundle size Ok with option 1.Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point Support the recommended WF. With explicit inter-cell interference modelling, SINR instead of SNR should be used.Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberSupport the recommended WF.Sub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSSupport the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidthIn addition to FDD 15kHz 10MHz and TDD 30kHz 40MHz, a larger CBW should be considered for FDD and TDD respectively. The difference between option 1 and option 2 is to include 40MHz or 50MHz for FDD 15kHz, and we still prefer 40MHz since 50MHz may not be implemented in many bands/UEs.So, we still support option 2.Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSWe will not insist on option 2, and option 1 can be fine for us.Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers Fine with option 1.Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationSupport option 1.Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberEither option 1 or 2 is ok.Issue 2-4-7: Propagation conditionSupport option 1. MMSE-IRC performance should be checked in different typical scenarios, which is an important aspect for performance testing.Issue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationOption 1.Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeOption 1.Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocationOption 1.Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cellsOption 1.Issue 2-4-12: Physical cell IDOption 1.Issue 2-4-13: TRS/CSI-RS among cellsOk with option 1 or use option 2 as starting point.Issue 2-4-14: DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS among cellsSub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirementsSupport option 1. It is important to define CQI reporting requirements, otherwise the gain by MMSE-IRC will be only on BLER reduction but not MCS/throughput increase. Issue 2-5-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity for CQI reportingSupport option 1 as a general consideration for further discussion.Issue 2-5-3: Interference model for CQI reportingSupport option 1, to reuse the LTE CQI reporting test setup.Issue 2-5-4: Test metric for CQI reportingSupport option 1Sub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmissionIssue 2-6-1: Test parametersProbably can be discussed later.Sub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independenceSupport to release independent from Rel-15, and option 1 is ok to us. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1We prefer to only consider the sync scenario for both of FDD and TDD.Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHOption 1 is fine for us. We prefer to reuse LTE MMSE-IRC assumptions as the starting point.Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHOption 1 is fine for us.Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationOption 2 is fine for us. In addition, number of CDM group should be defined to 1 for both of serving cell and interference cells.Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank The recommended WF is fine for us. Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model Option 2 is fine for us. Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point The recommended WF is fine for us. As SINR is also used for LTE MMSE-IRC test case.Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberThe recommended WF is fine for us.Sub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSThe recommended WF is fine for us.Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSPrefer option 1 as it is commonly used.Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers We agree with option 1 that only define test cases for single carrier scenario.Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationThe recommended WF is fine for us.Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberWe prefer option 2.Issue 2-4-7: Propagation conditionWe support to only consider TDLA30-10 for cell-edge users.Issue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationThe recommended WF is fine for us.Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeThe recommended WF is fine for us.Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocationThe recommended WF is fine for us.Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cellsOption 1+1A is fine for us.Issue 2-4-12: Physical cell IDOption 1 is fine for us.Sub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirementsWe prefer to further discuss this issue. Before making the decision, test scenario should be discussed clearly to make sure the CQI reporting requirements is meaningful.Sub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmissionIssue 2-6-1: Test parametersWe should focus on the scenario 1 firstly.Sub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independenceOption 1 is fine for us. |
| DOCOMO | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHBoth Option 1 and Option 2 are acceptable for us.Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHWe support Option 1.Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationWe support Option 2.Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank We support Option 1. Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point We support the recommended WF.Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberWe support the recommended WF.Sub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSWe support the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidthSince “FDD 15kHz:10MHz” and “TDD 30kHz:40MHz” are included in all Options, Option 3 can be agreed first. Also, we are fine to consider the additional CBW, i.e., both Option 1 and Option 2 are acceptable for us.Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSWe support Option 1.Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers We support Option 1. It is acceptable for us to assume only single carrier scenario in Rel-17.Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationWe support the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberBoth Option 1 and Option 2 are acceptable for us.Issue 2-4-7: Propagation conditionWe support Option 1.Issue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationWe support Option 1.Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeWe support Option 1.Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocationWe support Option 1.Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cellsWe support Option 1 + 1A.Issue 2-4-12: Physical cell IDWe support Option 1.Sub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmissionIssue 2-6-1: Test parametersWe prefer to discuss this issue later.Sub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independenceWe support Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1We prefer Option 2. In NR, we think not only TDD but also FDD is also synchronized. We would like to understand how this sync/async assumption affects to the simulation parameters. Even if the TDD synchronized network, the signal reception timing could not be aligned between the serving cell and neighbouring cell(s) according to the assumption of UE location. Issue 2-1-2: Interference profileOption 1.From our understanding, the NW deployment in FR1 is basically similar as LTE. Thus, we suggest to reuse the DIP based interference profiles from LTE MMSE-IRC receiver as a start point. If we cannot obtain enough gains with MMRS-IRC receiver compared with AWNG-only condition, we may further evaluate other DIP models.To option 2, as SS/PBCH blocks only use 4 OFDM symbols with 240 subcarriers, we don’t think the interference from SSB to PDSCH is too much. Also RAN4 demodulation requirements dose not scheduled PDSCH in slot 0, where SSB is transmitted.Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHOption 1.It’s reasonable to reuse LTE IRC assumption as a start point, and we also don’t see too much difference with option 2.Issue 2-1-4: Precoding of interfering PDSCHWe slight prefer Option 1B, to apply the random precoding per subband size instead of PRB bundling size because PRB bundling is configured per UE. But we are also fine with Option 1A if companies want to assume the minimum PRB size for precoding. For Precoder codebook, we prefer to use the single panel type I. Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHOption 1 is fine with us.Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationOption 2 is fine with us.Issue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularityOption 1 is fine, but we think it is up to UE implementation. Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank Support the recommended WF. Issue 2-3-2: MCS Option 1. But we also tend to agree with Option 2. We should revisit MCS/Rank if UE cannot achieve 70% of maximum throughput with a given condition. Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model Option 2. We would like to consider the same method as other UE demodulation requirements. We are wondering if UE can report the correct PMI because CSI-RS is also collided by the neighbouring cells.Issue 2-3-4: PRB bundle size Option 1. Reuse the existing PDSCH demodulation requirement parameter. Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point Support the recommended WF. Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberSupport the recommended WF. Sub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSSupport the recommended WF. Issue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidthOption 3. We would like to keep the Rel-15/16 assumption. In our understanding, we set 10MHz for FDD SCS=15kHz and 40MHz for TDD SCS=30kHz, considering the supported bands in RF core requirements (TS38.101-1). For example, we are wondering how many FDD bands support CBW of 50MHz.Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSOption 1.Configuration 2 in Option 2 is also fine in addition to Configuration 1, depending on the number of test cases. Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers Option 1.Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationSupport the recommended WF. Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberOption 2. We prefer to keep the same number of Tx antennas for both serving cell and interfering cell(s).Issue 2-4-7: Propagation conditionOption 1. Depending on the number of test cases, we configure TDLA30-10 for some test cases and TDLC300-100 for other test cases. Issue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationSupport the recommended WF. Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeSupport the recommended WF. Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocationSupport the recommended WF. Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cellsWe support Option 1A.It is aligned with the practical deployment.Issue 2-4-12: Physical cell IDOption 1 could be fine.Issue 2-4-13: TRS/CSI-RS among cellsOption 2.It’s important to align CSI-RS configuration for serving and interference cells which also align with practical deployment. Also this assumption can minimize the CSI-RS/TRS interference from neighbouring cell(s) to PDCSH in the serving cell.Issue 2-4-14: DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS among cellsAs we mentioned before, from real NW deployment, NW will align the DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS configuration among cells. Thus, we don’t need to consider the collision between DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS.Sub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirementsOption 1.As we mentioned before, from real NW deployment, NW will align TRS/CSI-RS configuration among cells. It is therefore beneficial to define CQI reporting requirements under the neighbouring cell interference environment. We think LTE CQI tests with neighbouring interference are good starting point. Issue 2-5-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity for CQI reportingOption 1 seems fine, but we think it is up to UE implementation. Issue 2-5-3: Interference model for CQI reportingFine with Option 1 as a starting point. Issue 2-5-4: Test metric for CQI reportingSupport Option 1. Sub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmissionIssue 2-6-1: Test parametersWe should follow the WID. RAN4 should discuss scenario 2 (non-slot-based transmission) after we conclude the scenario/feasibility of scenario 1 (slot-based transmission). Sub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independenceOption 1. |
| Qualcomm | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1Prefer Option 2. MMSE-IRC receiver based on DMRS based interference covariance won’t have different implementation for sync and async scenarios since it will just look at the interference seen by its DMRS.Issue 2-1-2: Interference profilePrefer to keep DIP levels open and decide based on simulations. Also, prefer to keep only 1 interfering cell.Question to proponents of 2 interfering cells: What is the motivation for introducing the requirements with 2 interfering cells? What additional demod algorithm testing are we doing for 2 interfering cells that we can’t test with just 1 interfering cell?Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHPrefer to keep this open.Issue 2-1-4: Precoding of interfering PDSCHPrefer Option 1A, similar to existing test cases.Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHPrefer to keep it open in this meeting. For initial simulation assumptions, ok to assume 16QAM but other options not precluded.Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationIn our opinion, these options are not mutually exclusive and we can combine all three options and focus on scenarios where interference can be rejected with DMRS based covariance estimation.Issue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularityThis is up to UE implementation, so RAN4 should not enforce any particular granularity. For simulation assumptions, RAN4 can assume granularity of PRB bundling size similar to other test cases.Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank Ok with recommended WF.Issue 2-3-2: MCS Prefer QPSK. Ok with QPSK and 16QAM as two separate options and decide later based on simulation results.Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model Prefer random precoding. It is not a good idea to mix fixed MCS simulations with CSI reporting. Otherwise, it will be hard to focus the test on only demod performance in presence of interferer.Issue 2-3-4: PRB bundle size Ok with Option 1.Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point Ok with recommended WF.Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberOk with recommended WF.Sub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSOk with Option 1. Assumption is same duplex/SCS for serving and interfering cell?Issue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidthPrefer Option 3. From UE demod perspective, testing for multiple CBWs does not bring any new insights.Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSPrefer Option 1.Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers Ok with Option 1.Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationOk with recommended WF.Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberPrefer Option 2. In LTE, both 2Tx and 4Tx interfering cell scenarios were considered because it changed number of CRS symbols/ports. In case of NR, that is not the case. So, there is no need to test for both configurations.Issue 2-4-7: Propagation conditionPrefer Option 2. If PRB bundling granularity is 2 PRBs, it doesn’t matter whether channel is frequency selective or not, because UE will do channel estimation based on PRB Bundling size.Issue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationOk with Option 1.Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeOk with Option 1.Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocationOk with Option 1.Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cellsThis should be discussed together with Issue 2-4-13. It doesn’t make sense to have both SSB and TRS colliding because UE will not have any good quality RS to run time/frequency tracking. It can’t be assumed for UE to do interference cancellation on these RS as baseline. Our preference is that at least TRS should not see any interference. If it’s not possible to protect TRS, we would at least want SSB to not see any interference.Issue 2-4-12: Physical cell IDQuestion to China Telecom: How does physical cell ID matters for this scenario? In LTE, CRS vshift was related to cell ID but that is not the case in NR. Am I missing something here?Issue 2-4-13: TRS/CSI-RS among cellsPrefer TRS to not see any interference. See comment for Issue 2-4-11.Issue 2-4-14: DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS among cellsPrefer TRS from serving cell to not collide with interference. Serving cell DMRS can collide with DMRS or PDSCH as long as TRP is same for both interfering DMRS and PDSCH. If that’s not possible, then serving cell DMRS should collied with interfering cell PDSCH.Sub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirementsAgree with MediaTek’s observation. Also, CSI-IM of serving cell should also see PDSCH interference from interfering cell.Issue 2-5-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity for CQI reportingSame comment as Issue 2-2-2. This is up to UE implementation, so RAN4 should not enforce any particular granularity. For simulation assumptions, RAN4 can assume granularity of PRB bundling size similar to other test cases.Issue 2-5-3: Interference model for CQI reportingFor static condition, test metric (2) in Issue 2-5-4 may not work. In LTE, these requirements were defined for fading conditions where this may make more sense.Issue 2-5-4: Test metric for CQI reportingFurther discuss whether this test metric makes sense for static channel condition.Sub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmissionIssue 2-6-1: Test parametersAs per WID, this scenario is second priority. So, we prefer to discuss this issue after Scenario 1 is stable.Sub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independencePrefer to keep this open. |
| Intel | **Issue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1**We fine to consider sync and async cases for FDD. Same time, we suggest to prioritize sync case. Rx processing will be the same for both cases. Therefore, there is no big benefits from introduction of requirements for both cases.**Issue 2-1-2: Interference profile**LTE interference profile was analysed in different release. The latest analysis was done for NACS and CRS-IM WIs. Therefore, we think that it is better to rely on analysis from these WIs. Based on our understanding, it also was discussed whether to use DIP or INR methodology for NAICS analysis. It was agreed to use INR methodology. Based on our understanding, INR methodology is more straightforward in comparison to DIP and provide clear information on signal power difference between serving and interference signals. Therefore, INR methodology and values from NAICS are more preferable for us. Same time, we think that it is rather important to define requirements which reflect practical NR interference conditions and show MMSE-IRC performance under such conditions. Therefore, we suggest to make system level analysis to find proper interference modelling.**Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCH**Both options are fine for us as starting point. We don’t expect big performance difference. We can also use system level analysis to find typical rank distribution for NR system.**Issue 2-1-4: Precoding of interfering PDSCH**Option 1A is fine for us.**Issue 2-2-1: DMRS configuration**Based on our understanding, all options are rather same in case of Type A full slot PDSCH mapping**Issue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity**Based on our understanding, at least we can assume per slot time domain granularity. As for frequency domain granularity, we probably can keep it up to implementation.**Issue 2-3-1: Transmission rank**Support recommended WF**Issue 2-3-2: MCS**There is a typo in our proposal. There should be MCS 4 instead of MCS 5. Same time, option 1A is also fine for us.**Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model**Support Option 2. We think that random precoding can be used. (i.e. similar to Rel-15 and Rel-16 PDSCH requirements)**Issue 2-3-4: PRB bundle size**Option 1 is fine for us**Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point**We suggest to SNR at 70% TP (i.e. similar to NAICS). Such methodology allows to consider existing SNR definition in Section 4.4.2 without any modifications.**Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process number**Option 1 is fine for us**Issue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidth**Based on our understanding, testing of single CBW per SCS is sufficient from coverage point of view. Therefore, we suggest to go with Option 3 as more typical configuration for Rel-15 and Rel-16 PDSCH requirements.**Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCS**Support Option 1. Testing of single UL/DL configuration is from coverage point of view.**Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers** Support Option 1.**Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna number**Analysis for scenarios with 2 Tx case should be sufficient.**Issue 2-4-7: Propagation condition**We are fine to consider several conditions at the initial stage (i.e. Option 1). Same time, requirements should be defined for one channel model.**Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping type**Support Option 1**Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocation**Support Option 1**Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cells**Support Option 1A**Issue 2-4-12: Physical cell ID**Support Option 1**Issue 2-4-13: TRS/CSI-RS among cells**We can check PDSCH performance for scenarios with colliding and non-colliding TRS configuration.**Issue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirements**We support definition of CQI requirements because it allows to verify that UE makes IRC processing for both blocks (demodulation and CSI).**Issue 2-5-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity for CQI reporting**We think that more analysis is needed to understand the impact of different covariance matrix estimation granularities on reporting statistics and requirements,**Issue 2-5-3: Interference model for CQI reporting**We suggest to align with assumptions for demodulation requirements. If INR methodology will be used for demod then we suggest to use same methodology for CQI.**Issue 2-5-4: Test metric for CQI reporting**We are fine to check LTE metric as starting point.**Issue 2-6-1: Test parameters**We understand that definition of requirements for Scenario 1 is prioritized for this meeting. Our intention is to collect early comments from interested companies.**Issue 2-7-1: Release independence**Option 1 is fine for us. We can comeback to this question later. |
| Apple | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1Option 2. Sync assumptions for FDD and TDD. Issue 2-1-2: Interference profileThe interference profile will have to be decided based on simulations, we support keeping both DIP and NAICS based modelling open (Option1,3).Also, propose to introduce 1 interferer cell as a starting point.Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHSupport option 2. Issue 2-1-4: Precoding of interfering PDSCHSupport option 1A.Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHWe can agree to option 1 as baseline. Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationWe prefer to have non-overlapping DMRS between target and interferer. If companies have strong preference for option 2, we propose to study both cases where DMRS is seeing PDSCH vs DMRS from interferer. Option 1 should be the guiding principle while configuring DMRS for target cell and interferer. Issue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularityWe are not sure if we should discuss this as a configuration parameter. Setting the precoding granularity of interferer is sufficient. Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank We support the recommended WF. Issue 2-3-2: MCS We support option 1. QPSK and 16QAM are more practical for interference limited scenarios. OMCS 4, 13 can be re-used as other demod requirements. Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model We support option 2- random precoder. Since Rel-15 we have tried to separate demod and CSI reporting requirements and we should aim to maintain it. Issue 2-3-4: PRB bundle size Option 1 is fine. Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point SINR @ 70% Max TP.Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberWe support the recommended WF.Sub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSWe support the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidthWe support option 3. We don’t see the necessity to include additional CBW. Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSWe support option 1. Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers We support option 1. Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationWe support the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberWe support option 2. Issue 2-4-7: Propagation conditionWe support to have option 2 as the baseline. Issue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationWe support the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeWe support the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocationWe support the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cellsWe don’t see a reason to aligned SSB configuration between target and interferer. Issue 2-4-12: Physical cell IDDoes PCI matter for demod requirements, since we don’t test SSB detection/initial access? Issue 2-4-13: TRS/CSI-RS among cellsWe don’t see why TRS/CSI-RS should collide. There is so much flexibility in scheduling these and seems very pessimistic to assume they collide between target and interferer. Issue 2-4-14: DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS among cellsSame view as issue 2-4-13 and 2-2-1. Sub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirementsWe don’t see strong motivation to introduce CQI reporting in the presence of interferer. We should avoid introducing requirements just because we also had them in LTE. We don’t think it provides any additional coverage. We would like to understand the motivation and added coverage with this. Issue 2-5-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity for CQI reportingThis should be left to UE implementation in our understanding and not be a config / sim parameter. Issue 2-5-3: Interference model for CQI reportingIssue 2-5-4: Test metric for CQI reportingSub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmissionIssue 2-6-1: Test parametersWe think this is a bit early to discuss this as the first priority is Scenario 1. Sub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independenceWe think this is very early to discuss this.  |
| MediaTek | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1Prefer Option 2.Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHOption 1 is fine for us. Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHOption 1 is fine for us. Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationOption 2 is fine for us.Issue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularityWe think the estimation granularity is up to UE implementation.Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank Support the recommended WF.Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model Prefer Option 2. Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point Support the recommended WF.Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberSupport the recommended WF.Sub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSSupport the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidthPrefer Option 3.Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSSupport Option 1.Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers Support Option 1.Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationSupport the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberPrefer Option 2.Issue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationSupport the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeSupport the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocationSupport the recommended WF.Sub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirementsWe prefer Option 2.Sub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independenceOption 1 is fine for us. |
| CMCC | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1Option1.Issue 2-1-2: Interference profileWe prefer Option1+Option2. The DIP values for Option2 need further discussion;To Ericsson: In our contribution, we give an observation about the micro will be infected severely when macro transmit SSBs. It does not mean that there is interference only in this case. The reason for this observation is the workload of marco is light for now, so the interference is generated when marco transmit mandatory SSBs. In the future, if the workload of macro is heavy, the interference will be obvious in all slots. In a word, the interference in this “micro-macro” scenario is common and have limited relations with SSBs position.Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHOption1 can be the starting point.Issue 2-1-4: Precoding of interfering PDSCHOption1A is OK for us. Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHWe support Option1Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationThese options are not conflict with each other; We are OK to go with Option2. Issue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularityWe share similar views with QC, it is up to UE implementation.Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank Support the recommended WF.Issue 2-3-2: MCS We agree with Option2 and take Option1 as the baseline for initial simulation.Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model We prefer Option2.Issue 2-3-4: PRB bundle size OK with Option1.Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point Support the recommended WFIssue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberSupport the recommended WFSub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSSupport the recommended WFIssue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidthWe prefer Option1 and we can give our compromise to Option2 considering of companies concerns about the application scenario of 50MHz, we think it is necessary to test the typical bandwidth configuration and a larger bandwidth configuration from test coverage perspective.Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSWe are both OK with Option1 and Option2.Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers Ok with Opiton1Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationSupport the recommended WF.Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberWe support Option1, Option2 is also acceptable for us. Issue 2-4-7: Propagation conditionSupport Option1, TDLA30-10 can be prioritized over TDLC300-100 for simulationIssue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationWe can use Option1 as baselineIssue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeOption1Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocationOption1Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cellsWe support Option1+Option1AIssue 2-4-12: Physical cell IDOption1 is fine for us.Issue 2-4-13: TRS/CSI-RS among cellsOption1 to have more discuss or further down-selection based on simulation results.Sub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirementsWe support Option1.Issue 2-5-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity for CQI reportingWe think it is up to UE implementation, further discussion may be needed.Issue 2-5-3: Interference model for CQI reportingWe can start with Option1 and further discuss.Issue 2-5-4: Test metric for CQI reportingTake Option1 as the starting point if we agreed to define the CQI reporting requirements.Sub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmissionIssue 2-6-1: Test parametersWe support to discuss scenario 1 first, then come back to Scenario2 after Scenario 1 is stable.Sub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independenceSupport Option1. |
| ZTE | Sub-topic 2-1: Interference modelIssue 2-1-1: Sync and async network for FR1Option 2, sync assumption should be prioritized.Issue 2-1-2: Interference profileOption 1.Issue 2-1-3: Transmission rank of interfering PDSCHSlightly Option 1 preferred.Issue 2-1-4: Precoding of interfering PDSCHSlightly Option 1B preferred.Issue 2-1-5: Modulation order of interfering PDSCHFine with Option 1.Sub-topic 2-2: DMRS configuration and reference receiverIssue 2-2-1: DMRS configurationOption 2.Issue 2-2-2: Interference covariance estimation granularityUp to receiver implementation, not sure if we need to have it aligned.Sub-topic 2-3: Target PDSCH parametersIssue 2-3-1: Transmission rank Fine with Option 1.Issue 2-3-2: MCS If only one MCS is selected, Option 4 could be a good choice. If two MCS values selected, Option 1.Issue 2-3-3: Precoding model Option 1 slightly preferred.Issue 2-3-4: PRB bundle size Fine with Option 1.Issue 2-3-5: Performance measurement point Ok with WF.Issue 2-3-6: HARQ process numberOk with WF.Sub-topic 2-4: Other parameters for target and interfering PDSCHIssue 2-4-1: SCSOk with WF.Issue 2-4-2: Channel bandwidthStart with Option 3, and discuss other options once it is completed.Issue 2-4-3: TDD DL/UL configuration for 30kHz SCSOption 1 start with one configuration.Issue 2-4-4: Number of carriers Fine with Option 1.Issue 2-4-5: PDCCH and PDSCH allocationFine with Option 1.Issue 2-4-6: Tx antenna numberOption 2.Issue 2-4-7: Propagation conditionOption 2.Issue 2-4-8: Antenna correlationFine with Option 1.Issue 2-4-9: PDSCH mapping typeFine with Option 1.Issue 2-4-10: PRB allocationFine with Option 1.Issue 2-4-11: SSB configuration for serving and interfering cellsFine with Option 1.Issue 2-4-12: Physical cell IDFine with Option 1.Issue 2-4-13: TRS/CSI-RS among cellsOption 2 would make more sense.Issue 2-4-14: DMRS and TRS/CSI-RS among cellsThis issue is partly overlapped with Isse 2-4-13?Sub-topic 2-5: CQI reporting requirementsIssue 2-5-1: Whether to define CQI reporting requirementsOption 2. It is not sufficiently studied thus we could not conclude on whether or not to define CQI reporting requirements at this very first meeting. Issue 2-5-2: Interference covariance estimation granularity for CQI reportingUp to implementation. Not sure if this should be aligned.Issue 2-5-3: Interference model for CQI reportingFine with Option 1 as a starting point.Issue 2-5-4: Test metric for CQI reportingHold until the conclusion is made.Sub-topic 2-6: Scenario 2 with non-slot-based transmissionIssue 2-6-1: Test parametersOk to start with Option 1.Sub-topic 2-7: Release independenceIssue 2-7-1: Release independenceFine with Option 1. |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

## Discussion on 2nd round

1. MMSE-IRC receiver for intra-cell inter-user interference

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104607 | CMCC | Proposal 1: the following SCS and bandwidth combination should be considered:* FDD
	+ 10MHz/15kHz
	+ 50MHz/15kHz
* TDD
* 40MHz/30kHz
* 100MHz/30kHz

Proposal 2: For TDD 30kHz, use typical 7D1S2U(S=6D+4G+4U) for TDD configuration.Proposal 3: For Tx antenna number, we propose to consider 8 and 16 Tx antenna number.Proposal 4: For MIMO correlation, include XP High and XP Medium in this phase.Proposal 5: * For FDD, the number of HARQ processes set to 4;
* For TDD, the number of HARQ processes set to 8;

Proposal 6: For propagation channel, TDLA30-10 can be the baseline.Proposal 7: * SSB position in burst: first SSB in Slot#0
* SSB periodicity: 20ms.

Proposal 8: For the number of paired UEs, we propose to consider 1, 2, 3 paired UEs.Proposal 9: For Rank configuration, at least include Rank1 and further evaluate Rank2 in this phase.Proposal 10: * Target PDSCH MCS configuration:
	+ QPSK/0.30, 16QAM/0.48 and 64QAM/0.5 for Rank 1
	+ 64QAM for Rank 2
* Interference PDSCH MCS configuration
	+ 16QAM/0.48 as the baseline

Proposal 11: Use target UE’s throughput vs SNR as the test metric for MMSE-IRC receiver demodulation performance requirements, and consider 70% relative throughput for the test points. |
| R4-2104847 | Apple Inc. | Proposal #1: Transmit co-scheduled UE on different CDM group as target UE.Proposal #2: Use number of CDM groups without data on target UE as 2.Observation #1: ZF precoder is effective in nulling inter-user interference when UE reported PMI or actual channel is used rather than random PMI.Observation #2: 1.5 - 3dB performance improvement is observed with QRD orthogonalization over ZF precoding with randomly generated PMI.Proposal #3: Use QRD orthogonalization to generate precoders for MU-MIMO.Proposal #4: The total number of layers transmitted shall be less than or equal to the number of UE RX antenna.Proposal #5: Limit the study and evaluation for MU-MIMO to up to 16QAM for 2x2 and up to 64QAM for 4x4.Proposal #6: For 4x4 limit the layers combinations to [1,1], [1,2], [2,1] on target and co-scheduled UE respectively. |
| R4-2106427 | Intel Corporation | Proposal 1: Consider the following assumptions for MU-MIMO modelling:Explicit modelling of PDSCH+DMRS signal for one interference UERandom or feedback-based precoder selection of serving UESelection of precoder for interference UE to ensure orthogonality of serving and interference precodersRandom PDSCH signal generation for interference UE with 16QAM modulationProposal 2: Consider the following simulation assumptions for MMSE-IRC requirements for scenario with intra-cell inter-user interference:SCS/CBW: 15 kHz / 10 MHz for FDD and 30 kHz / 40 MHz for TDDType A PDSCH mapping with starting symbol 2 and duration 12Serving PDSCH Rank 1 or Rank 2, MCS 5 or 12 or 19Interference PDSCH Rank is same as for Serving PDSCHDMRS Type 1 with 1 additional RSDMRS AP mapping:Rank 1 – Option 1: Number of CDM groups without data is equal to 1, UE #1 uses AP 1000, UE #2 uses AP 1001.Rank 1 – Option 2: Number of CDM groups without data is equal to 2, UE #1 uses AP 1000, UE #2 uses AP 1002.Rank 2: Number of CDM groups without data is equal to 2, UE #1 uses APs 1000 and 1001, UE #2 uses AP 1002 and 1003.TDD pattern: 7D1S2U, S = 6D+4G+4UChannel model: TDL-A, 30 ns, 10 HzAntenna configuration: 2x2 or 4x2 and 2x4 or 4x4Candidate receivers:Option 1: MMSE-IRC processing with serving signal demodulationOption 2: MMSE-IRC processing with joint (serving + interference) signal demodulationObservation #1: MMSE-IRC does not allow to improve MU-MIMO performance for scenarios with QPSK modulation.Observation #2: MMSE-MRC cannot reach maximum throughput for scenarios with 16QAM modulation.Observation #3: Using of MMSE-IRC processing with interference-plus-noise covariance matrix estimation based on active serving DMRS positions leads to significant performance degradation for scenarios with 2 DMRS CDM groups. |
| R4-2104954 | China Telecom | Proposal 1: Cover 8Tx and 16 Tx antenna ports, 2Rx and 4Rx antennas.Proposal 2: Only measure the PDSCH throughput performance of one target UE, and use follow PMI in the PDSCH simulation.Proposal 3: Use random PMI selection for the paired UE(s).Proposal 4: Use Zero Forcing as the BS precoding algorithm if the feasibility can be confirmed by the TE vendor.Proposal 5: For 8Tx, use type I single panel codebook with wideband PMI for all the target and paired UEs, and the same BS precoding matrix is applied in the whole transmitted bandwidth.Proposal 6: For 16Tx, use Rel-15/16 (e)type II codebook for all the target and paired UEs, and use subband PMI if it is feasible for TE to calculate ZF precoding matrix per subband.Proposal 7: Assume low correlation among the co-scheduled UEs.Proposal 8: In the initial simulation, consider different options for the number of co-scheduled UEs an the number of layers per UE:* 2 co-scheduled UEs (1 target UE and 1 paired UEs) and 1 layer per UE.
* 2 co-scheduled UEs (1 target UE and 1 paired UEs) and 2 layers per UE.
* 4 co-scheduled UEs (1 target UE and 3 paired UEs) and 1 layer per UE.
* 4 co-scheduled UEs (1 target UE and 3 paired UEs) and 2 layers per UE.

Proposal 9: In both target and interfering PDSCH, assume PDSCH mapping type A with full PRB allocation.Proposal 10: Use Type 1 DMRS with 1 additional DMRS:* Use single symbol front loaded DMRS for cases with no more than 4 layers for all the considered UEs, and use double symbol front loaded DMRS for cases with 5-8 layers for all the considered UEs.
* Assume FDM between DMRS and data, i.e., the number of DMRS CDM groups without data as 1, for no more than 2 layers for all the considered UEs; and assume TDM between DMRS and data, i.e., the number of DMRS CDM groups without data as 2, for 3-8 layers for all the considered UEs.
* For the i-th UE with 2-layer transmission, DMRS port 2i-2 and 2i-1 (i = 1, 2,...) are used.

Proposal 11: The ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPRE is assumed as 0 dB and -3 dB when the number of DM-RS CDM groups without data is 1 and 2 respectively.Proposal 12: Assume 16QAM randomly modulated symbols in the interfering PDSCH.Proposal 13: Cover QPSK MCS 4, 16QAM MCS 13, and 64QAM MCS 19 in the initial simualtions.The following observation and proposals were made w.r.t. the reference receiver:Observation 1: It is unknown whether the precoding matrix in the multiple contiguous PRBs for the co-scheduled UE(s) is the same.Proposal 14: The estimation of interference covariance matrix can be performed at per PRB and per slot basis.Proposal 15: For cases with 2 DMRS CDM groups, the interference should be estimated based on the REs occupied by both of the two DMRS CDM groups.The following proposals were made w.r.t. other PDSCH simulation parameters:Proposal 16: Cover at least 15kHz SCS for FDD and 30kHz SCS for TDD.Proposal 17: Cover 10 MHz and 40 MHz channel bandwidth for FDD 15kHz SCS, 40MHz and 100MHz channel bandwidth for TDD 30kHz SCS.Proposal 18: Cover two TDD configurations for 30kHz SCS:* Configuration 1: 7D1S2U, S = 6D:4G:4U
* Configuration 2: DDDSUDDSUU, S1=10G: 2G: 2U, S2 = 10G: 2G: 2U

Proposal 19: Re-use the Rel-15 assumptions on HARQ process number, i.e., 4 for FDD 15kHz SCS and 8 for TDD 30kHz SCS.Proposal 20: For the propagation condition, include TDLA30-10 and TDLC300-100 in Phase I, and decide whether down-selection or adjustment is needed later. Use XP high or XP medium for the antenna correlation.Proposal 21: For SSB position, reuse the Rel-15 assumptions , i.e., configure the first SSB in Slot #0 in every 20 slots, and the slot #0 in every 20 slots is not scheduled for PDSCH transmission.Proposal 22: For TRS and ZP CSI-RS, reuse the Rel-15 assumptions for PDSCH demodulation requirement. For NZP CSI-RS, reuse the Rel-15 general assumptions for PDSCH demodulation requirement and extend the configuration for more than 4 ports. |
| R4-2106868 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Specify intra-cell inter-user interference model as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| Precoded modulation symbols of an interference signal are randomly mapped onto one of the remaining DMRS antenna port. The update granularity for randomized mapping antenna port is PRB bundling size in frequency domain and slot in time domain.For each slot and each PRB bundling size, a precoding matrix for the number of layers, $v$, associated to the selected rank shall be selected randomly from [Single Panel Type I]. The selected precoding matrix shall not be identical to the precoding matrix applied for the UE under test. |

Proposal 2: For inter-user interference scenario, configure 2 DMRS CDM groups without data, that is, DMRS ports 1000/1001 are assigned for the UE under test and DMRS ports 1002/1003 are assigned for the co-scheduled UE.Proposal 3: For the MMSE-IRC receiver performance evaluation, RAN4 should assume the following parameters as the starting point.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameters | FDD | TDD |
| CBW | 10MHz | 40MHz |
| TDD configuration | N/A | 7DS2U,S=6D+4G+4USchedule PDSCH in special slots |
| SCS | 15kHz | 30kHz |
| PDSCH configuration | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12​ | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12​ |
| PRB bundling size  | 2 | 2 |
| PDSCH DMRS configuration | Type 1, 1+1 | Type 1, 1+1 |
| DMRS port assignment | 1000 for UE under test for rank 11000/1001 for UE under test for rank 21002 for co-scheduled UE for rank 11002/1003 for co-scheduled UR for rank 2 | 1000 for UE under test for rank 11000/1001 for UE under test for rank 21002 for co-scheduled UE for rank 11002/1003 for co-scheduled UR for rank 2 |
| MCS | MCS 4 (QPSK 0.3)MCS 13 (16QAM 0.48)MCS 19 (64QAM 0.5) | MCS 4 (QPSK 0.3)MCS 13 (16QAM 0.48)MCS 19 (64QAM 0.5) |
| Rank | 1 and 2 | 1 and 2 |
| PDSCH precoder | Single Panel Type I, Random precoder selection updated per slot,with equal probability of each applicable i1, i2 combination, and with PRB bundling granularity | Single Panel Type I, Random precoder selection updated per slot,with equal probability of each applicable i1, i2 combination, and with PRB bundling granularity |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2, 2x4 for rank 14x2, 4x4 for rank 2 | 2x2, 2x4 for rank 14x2, 4x4 for rank 2 |
| Propagation condition | TDLA30-10 | TDLA30-10 |
| Metric  | SNR to achieve 70% of maximum throughput | SNR to achieve 70% of maximum throughput |

Proposal 4: For evaluation RAN4 should compare the performance difference between the case with co-scheduled UE and without co-scheduled UE. |
| R4-2106834 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Observation 1: Intra-cell interference between paired UEs has significant impact on system performance Proposal 1: Define PDSCH demodulation requirement for intra-cell inter-user interference suppressingObservation 2: LTE MU-MIMO test case has verified one single-layer transmission companied by one interfering simultaneous transmission, which indicates two UEs a pairProposal 2: Take two Users as a pair and network does not need to ensure the perfect orthogonality between these two UEs Observation 3: LTE MU-MIMO test cases use randomly selected precoder for both paired UEsProposal 3: Reuse LTE precoding method of random selection without identical as a starting point for evaluation, fixed PMI for both UEs or at least one of them is not precluded Proposal 4: Use 4 as the precoding granularity for both UEsProposal 5: Use a multi-path fading channel with relative high frequency selective characteristic as channel model, take TDLC300 as a start to evaluateProposal 6: Consider low correlation level for defining requirementProposal 7: Not to consider any Null-forming method or any other interference suppression or scheduling schemes from BS sideProposal 8: RAN4 discusses and decides whether to introduce network assistance Proposal 9: Consider this draft interference model for further evaluationProposal 10: PDSCH mapping type: Type AProposal 11: Consider 2x2, 2x4 for antenna configurationProposal 12: Use same DMRS pattern and same sequence for both paired UEsProposal 13: The DUT and the co-scheduled UE can be either in the same CDM group or not, but with same PRG configurations |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modeling for phase I evaluation

**Issue 3-1-1: Paired UE number**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Consider 1, 2, 3 paired UEs. (CMCC)
	+ Option 2: Consider both 1 and 3 paired UEs, make down-selections later based on the simulation outcome (CTC)
	+ Option 3: Only 1 paired UE (HW)
		- HW: Same with LTE MU-MIMO test cases.
* Recommended WF
	+ For initial evaluation, can we take option 2 as a compromise among different options?

**Issue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCH**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: At least cover rank 1 (CMCC)
	+ Option 2: Rank 1 or rank 2 for target UE, and the rank for interference UE is same with that for target UE (Intel)
	+ Option 3: Cover both rank 1 and rank 2 per UE (CTC, E///)
	+ Option 4: Limit the rank combinations to [1,1], [1,2], [2,1] on target and co-scheduled UE for 4x4 (Apple)
		- Apple: The total number of layers transmitted shall be less than or equal to the number of UE RX antenna.
* Recommended WF
	+ For initial evaluation, can we include both rank 1 and rank 2 per UE (with the same rank for target and interference UEs)?

**Issue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEs**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Low (CTC, HW)
* Recommended WF
	+ For initial evaluation, can we take option 1 as starting point to simplify the simulation setup?

**Issue 3-1-4: Antenna configuration**

* Proposals
	+ Tx antenna number:
		- Option 1: 8Tx and 16Tx (CMCC, CTC)
			* CMCC, CTC: Under MU-MIMO test setup, the number of transmit antenna will be larger than that of SU-MIMO test setup.
		- Option 2: 2Tx or 4Tx (Intel)
		- Option 3: 2Tx for rank 1 and 4Tx for rank 2 (E///)
		- Option 4: 2Tx only (HW)
			* HW: 2Tx was selected for LTE MU-MIMO test cases.
	+ Rx antenna number:
		- Option 1: Cover both 2Rx and 4Rx (CMCC, CTC, Intel, E///, HW)
* Recommended WF
	+ For Tx antenna number, companies’ views are divergent, encourage more discussion in the first round by taking into account the practical scenario and test complexity
	+ For Rx antenna number, agree option 1.

**Issue 3-1-5: Codebook type**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: (CTC)
		- For 8Tx, use type I SP codebook with wideband PMI reporting for target and paired UEs.
		- For 16Tx, use Rel-15/16 (e)type II codebook for target and paired UEs. Use subband PMI if it is feasible for TE to calculate ZF precoding matrix per subband.
			* CTC: For 8Tx, type I single panel codebook with wideband PMI is a mandatory UE feature without capability.
	+ Option 2: For 2Tx and 4Tx, use Type I SP codebook. Type II precoder can also be applied for 4Tx (E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion in the first round.

**Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generation**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Random based target UE PMI selection (Apple, Intel, E///, HW)
		- Option 1A: Random selection based precoder generation with QRD orthogonalization processing as below (Apple)

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Choose precoders of the $N$ co-scheduled users randomly and horizontally concatenate them to get the overall precoder matrix $P$as follows:

$$P=\left[\begin{matrix}P\_{1}&\cdots &P\_{N}\end{matrix}\right]$$1. Compute the $l\_{2}$-norm squared of every column of $P$ as follows:

$$r=diag\left(P^{H}P\right) $$where $r$is a vector of length $N\_{L}≜\sum\_{i=1}^{N}N\_{L\_{i}}$1. Use QRD or SVD to get the orthonormal basis of $P$ as follows:

$$\left[Q,R\right]=qr(P)$$1. Keep only the first $N\_{L}$ columns of $Q$and scale every column using its corresponding value in $r$vector as follows

$$Q=Q\left(:,1:N\_{L}\right)×diag\left(\sqrt{r}\right)$$where $diag\left(\sqrt{r}\right)$ is a diagonal matrix with the square root of $r$entries of its diagonal. The purpose of this scaling is to preserve the power of every column such that the Frobenius norm of $P\_{i}^{'}$ is one for $i=1,2…,N$ as in the codebook.1. $P\_{1}^{'}$ is the first $N\_{L\_{1}}$ columns of $Q$; $P\_{2}^{'}$ is the next $N\_{L\_{2}}$ columns of $Q$, and so on., i.e.

$$P\_{i}^{'}=Q\left(:,\sum\_{j=1}^{i-1}N\_{L\_{j}}+1:\sum\_{j=1}^{i}N\_{L\_{j}}\right), i=1,2,…,N$$ |

* + - Option 1B: Random PMI selection for the target UE, and select the precoder for the interference UE to ensure orthogonality (Intel)
			* Intel: Feedback-based PMI selection mode is more preferable solution because it close to practical assumptions. However, we can check two PMI selection procedures and analyze pros and cons of each option.
		- Option 1C: Random PMI selection for both target and interference UE, with ensuring the selected PMI matrix shall not be identical to the precoding matrix applied for the UE under test. (E///, HW)
			* HW: 1) LTE MU-MIMO test cases use randomly selected precoder for both paired UEs; 2) Not to consider any Null-forming method or any other interference suppression or scheduling schemes from BS side
	+ Option 2: Feedback-based target UE PMI selection (CTC, Intel)
		- Option 2A: If the feasibility can be confirmed by the TE vendor, use ZF precoding based on the reported PMI from the target UE, and the randomly generated PMI from the interference UE(s). (CTC)
		- Option 2B: Feedback-based PMI selection for the target UE, select the precoder for the interference UE to ensure the orthogonality (Intel)
	+ Option 3: Fixed precoding matrix for one or both co-scheduled UEs (HW)
* Recommended WF
	+ For option 1A and 2A with QRD/ZF processing from Apple/CTC, invite the inputs from TE vendors on the test feasibility.
	+ For option 1B and 2B from Intel, it seems more details on how to ensure the orthogonality are needed.
	+ Encourage more discussion, aiming to come up with one baseline option for initial evaluation

**Issue 3-1-7: PRB bundling size and precoding granularity**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Per 2 PRBs for frequency domain and per slot for time domain (E///)
	+ Option 2: 4 for both target and interference UEs (HW)
	+ Option 3: (CTC)
		- Wideband for 8Tx for target and paired UEs.
		- For 16Tx, use subband precoding if it is feasible for TE to calculate ZF precoding matrix per subband.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion in the first round.

**Issue 3-1-8: MCS for interfering PDSCH**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Normal PDSCH with MCS 16QAM/0.48 as the baseline (CMCC)
	+ Option 2: Random 16QAM signal generation (Intel, CTC)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion in the first round.

### Sub-topic 3-2: DMRS configuration for phase I evaluation

**Issue 3-2-1: DMRS ports for target and interfering UEs**

* Proposals
	+ For rank 1 transmission per UE, with 1 target UE and 1 interference UE:
		- Option 1: DMRS port 0 for target UE, DMRS port 1 for the interference UE (China Telecom, Intel)
		- Option 2: DMRS port 0 for target UE, DMRS port 2 for the interference UE, i.e., different CDM groups (Intel, Apple, E///)
	+ For rank 1 transmission per UE, with 1 target UE and more than 1 interference UE:
		- Option 1: DMRS port 0 for target UE, DMRS port *i* for the *i*-th interference UE (*i* = 1, 2,...) (China Telecom)
	+ For rank 2 transmission per UE:
		- Option 1: DMRS port 0/1 for target UE, DMRS port 2*i* and 2*i*+1 for the *i*-th interference UE (*i* = 1, 2,...) (Intel, Apple, E///, CTC)
	+ When rank [1, 2] or rank [2, 1] transmission for the target and interference UEs:
		- Option 1: DMRS port 0 (and 1) for target UE, port 2 (and 3) for the interference UE, i.e., use different CDM groups for the target and interference UEs (Apple, E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion in the first round, aiming to come up with one baseline option for initial evaluation purpose

**Issue 3-2-2: DMRS type and DMRS additional position**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: DMRS Type 1 with 1 additional DMRS (Intel, CTC, E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Use option 1 if no objection during the first round discussion.

**Issue 3-2-3: Ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPRE**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 0 dB and -3 dB when the number of DM-RS CDM groups without data is 1 and 2 respectively (CTC)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 3-2-4: Whether to use the same DMRS pattern and the same sequence for all co-scheduled UEs**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes (HW)
		- HW: In real network deployment, same DMRS pattern for MU-MIMO paired UEs has been always used
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

### Sub-topic 3-3: Reference receiver for phase I evaluation

**Issue 3-3-1: Candidate Receivers**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: MMSE-IRC processing with serving signal demodulation (Intel)
		- $\hat{x}\_{S}=H\_{S}^{H}\left(H\_{S}H\_{S}^{H}+R\_{I+N}\right)^{-1}y$.
	+ Option 2: MMSE-IRC processing with joint (serving + interference) signal demodulation (Intel)
		- $\hat{x}\_{S+I}=H\_{S+I}^{H}\left(H\_{S+I}H\_{S+I}^{H}+R\_{N}\right)^{-1}y$, where $H\_{S+I}=\left[\begin{matrix}H\_{S}&H\_{I}\end{matrix}\right]$.
		- Intel: for MU-MIMO mode, UE has enough information to make channel estimation of interference signal and execute joint (serving + interference) demodulation processing.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 3-3-2: Interference estimation for cases with 2 DMRS CDM groups**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: For cases with 2 DMRS CDM groups, the interference should be estimated based on the REs occupied by both of the two DMRS CDM groups (CTC)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 3-3-3: Interference estimation granularity**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Per PRB and per slot based interference covariance matrix estimation (CTC)
		- CTC: It is unknown whether the precoding matrix in the multiple contiguous PRBs for the co-scheduled UE(s) is the same.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies

**Issue 3-3-4: Whether to introduce network assistance to assist the receiver**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: RAN4 discusses and decides whether to introduce network assistance (HW)
		- HW: With network assistance, the tested UE can perform interference cancellation with less cost by detection.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies.

### Sub-topic 3-4: PDSCH parameters for phase I evaluation

**Issue 3-4-1: SCS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Cover both 15kHz SCS for FDD and 30kHz SCS for TDD. (CMCC, CTC, Intel, E///)
* Recommended WF
	+ Use option 1 if no objection during the first-round discussion.

**Issue 3-4-2: Channel Bandwidth**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1 (CMCC)
		- For FDD 15kHz SCS: Cover 10MHz and 50MHz CBW.
		- For TDD 30kHz SCS: Cover 40MHz and 100MHz CBW.
			* CMCC: We also support to consider the maximum bandwidth for FDD and TDD, which is 50MHz for FDD and 100MHz for TDD.
	+ Option 2: 10 MHz for FDD 15kHz SCS and 40 MHz for TDD 30kHz SCS (Intel, E///)
	+ Option 3: (CTC)
		- For FDD 15kHz SCS: Cover 10MHz and 40MHz CBW.
		- For TDD 30kHz SCS: Cover 40MHz and 100MHz CBW.
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion during the first round.

**Issue 3-4-3: TDD Configuration**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 7D1S2U(6D+4G+4U) for 30kHz TDD (CMCC, Intel, E///)
	+ Option 2: Cover both of the TDD patterns below for 30kHz TDD (CTC)
		- 7D1S2U, S = 6D:4G:4U
		- DDDSUDDSUU, S1=10G: 2G: 2U, S2 = 10G: 2G: 2U
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage more discussion during the first round.

**Issue 3-4-4: MIMO correlation for each UE**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Consider both XP High and XP Medium, and make further down-selection based on evaluation results (CMCC)
	+ Option 2: XP High or XP Medium (CTC)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies.

**Issue 3-4-5: Propagation Condition**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: TDLA30-10 as baseline (CMCC, Intel, E///)
		- CMCC: We are also support to evaluate other propagation channel in Phase1.
	+ Option 2: Cover both TDLA30-10 and TDLC300-100 in phase I, and decide whether down-selection or adjustment is needed later (CTC, [CMCC])
	+ Option 3: TDLC300 channel (HW)
		- HW: When transmitted signal is experiencing large time delay and frequency selective propagation condition, the precoding performance will have an obviously loss compared to flat channel, which is matched with real network scenario.
* Recommended WF
	+ Considering the different preferences on TDLA30/TDLC300, can we include both and take option 2 for initial evaluation?

**Issue 3-4-6: MCS for Target UE**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: (CMCC)
		- QPSK MCS 4, 16QAM MCS 13 and 64QAM MCS 19 for Rank 1
		- 64QAM MCS 19 for Rank 2
	+ Option 2: MCS 5 or 12 or 19 (Intel)
	+ Option 3: Cover QPSK MCS 4, 16QAM MCS 13, and 64QAM MCS 19 for initial simulation (CTC, E///)
	+ Option 4: Up to 16QAM for 2x2 and up to 64QAM for 4x4 (Apple)
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage suggestions on how to down-select a MCS set for initial evaluation.

**Issue 3-4-7: PDSCH Mapping Type**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Type A (Intel, CTC, E///, HW)
* Recommended WF
	+ Use option 1 if no objection during the first-round discussion.

**Issue 3-4-8: PDSCH Resource Allocation**

* Proposals
	+ Time Domain:
		- Option 1: Starting symbol 2 and duration 12 (Intel, E///)
	+ Frequency Domain:
		- Option 1: Full PRB allocation (CTC)
* Recommended WF
	+ Use option 1 for both time and frequency domain as baseline

**Issue 3-4-9: HARQ Process Number**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 4 for FDD 15kHz SCS and 8 for TDD 30kHz SCS (CMCC, CTC)
		- CMCC: Reuse the typical HARQ configuration in R16 PDSCH demodulation requirements.
* Recommended WF
	+ Use option 1 as baseline

**Issue 3-4-10: SSB Configuration**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: (CMCC, CTC)
		- SSB position in burst: first SSB in Slot#0; SSB periodicity: 20ms.
		- The slot #0 in every 20 ms is not scheduled for PDSCH transmission
			* CMCC, CTC: Reuse the SSB configuration in NR PDSCH demodulation requirement.
* Recommended WF
	+ Use option 1 as baseline

**Issue 3-4-11: TRS, NZP CSI-RS and ZP CSI-RS Configuration**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: (CTC)
		- For TRS and ZP CSI-RS, reuse the Rel-15 assumptions for PDSCH demodulation requirement.
		- For NZP CSI-RS, reuse the Rel-15 general assumptions for PDSCH demodulation requirement and extend the configuration for more than 4 ports
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies.

**Issue 3-4-12: Performance evolution metrics**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Measure the 70% max throughput performance of the target UE (CMCC, CTC, E///)
		- Evaluate the gain of MMSE-IRC over MMSE under the same simulation setup
* Recommended WF
	+ Encourage feedback from more companies.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Company A | Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modeling for phase I evaluationIssue 3-1-1: Paired UE numberIssue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCHIssue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEsIssue 3-1-4: Antenna configurationIssue 3-1-5: Codebook typeIssue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationIssue 3-1-7: PRB bundling size and precoding granularityIssue 3-1-8: MCS for interfering PDSCHSub-topic 3-2: DMRS configuration for phase I evaluationIssue 3-2-1: DMRS ports for target and interfering UEsIssue 3-2-2: DMRS type and DMRS additional positionIssue 3-2-3: Ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPREIssue 3-2-4: Whether to use the same DMRS pattern and the same sequence for all co-scheduled UEsSub-topic 3-3: Reference receiver for phase I evaluationIssue 3-3-1: Candidate ReceiversIssue 3-3-2: Interference estimation for cases with 2 DMRS CDM groupsIssue 3-3-3: Interference estimation granularityIssue 3-3-4: Whether to introduce network assistance to assist the receiverSub-topic 3-4: PDSCH parameters for phase I evaluationIssue 3-4-1: SCSIssue 3-4-2: Channel BandwidthIssue 3-4-3: TDD ConfigurationIssue 3-4-4: MIMO correlation for each UEIssue 3-4-5: Propagation ConditionIssue 3-4-6: MCS for Target UEIssue 3-4-7: PDSCH Mapping TypeIssue 3-4-8: PDSCH Resource AllocationIssue 3-4-9: HARQ Process NumberIssue 3-4-10: SSB ConfigurationIssue 3-4-11: TRS, NZP CSI-RS and ZP CSI-RS ConfigurationIssue 3-4-12: Performance evolution metrics |
| China Telecom | Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modelling for phase I evaluationIssue 3-1-1: Paired UE numberSupport the recommended WF. More co-scheduled UE number should be considered for the phase I evaluation because it is a very typical scenario for MU-MIMO usage.Issue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCHSupport the recommended WF. MMSE-IRC receiver performance in MU-MIMO with both 1 layer and 2-layer transmission should be evaluated in phase I, because 2-layer transmission is also a typical scenario as UE mandatory 4Rx.Issue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEsSupport the recommended WF.In our understanding, since the channel of the paired UE is only reflected by its selected PMI, we would like to check if we can combine this issue with issue 3-1-6?Issue 3-1-4: Antenna configurationFor Tx antenna number, we support option 1 because it is typical that larger BS Tx number including 8Tx and 16Tx will be used for MU-MIMO scenario.For Rx antenna number, support the recommended WF.Issue 3-1-5: Codebook typeOption 1. Both Type I and Type II codebook should be considered in the phase I evaluation. It is common understanding that Type II is designed for MU-MIMO scenario.Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationIn practical, ZF/QRD/orthogonal precoding based on the reported PMI will always be used for MU-MIMO. Therefore, it is our view that the benefit of introducing MMSE-IRC receiver for MU-MIMO scenario need to be shown under more practical simulation assumptions, rather than introducing extra interference due to random precoding. Moreover, random PMI selection for the target UE will cause decreased performance (especially for 8Tx, 16Tx). So, we support option 2A from practical MU-MIMO implementation perspective.However, as pointed out in the recommended WF, the test feasibility for option 1A/2A is pending TE vendors’ feedback, and more details are needed for option 1B/2B. To assist the simulation evaluation work for the next meeting, we suggest to firstly evaluate the option with clear test feasibility, i.e., **New option 2C: Feedback-based PMI selection for target UE, and random PMI selection for interference UE, with ensuring the selected PMI matrix shall not be identical to the precoding matrix applied for the UE under test** and other options are not precluded.Issue 3-1-7: PRB bundling size and precoding granularityWe are fine with using smaller PRB bundling size and precoding granularity. But we need to check with TE vendors about the test feasibility if we are using ZF/QRD/orthogonal precoding per 2/4 PRBs.Issue 3-1-8: MCS for interfering PDSCHSince there will be no performance difference for the target UE between the 2 options, both options are ok for us. Slightly prefer option 2 for simulation simplification consideration.Sub-topic 3-2: DMRS configuration for phase I evaluationIssue 3-2-1: DMRS ports for target and interfering UEsIn our understanding, using separate DMRS CDM groups for the target UE and interference UE will improve the channel estimation accuracy by using DMRS power boosting. And better interference estimation can also be expected without the inter user interference on the DMRS. As a result, when rank [1, 1] or rank [2,2] for the target and interference UEs, we are also ok with separate CDM groups. However, for the other rank configurations, including rank [1, 2] or rank [2, 1] or rank 1/2 transmission per UE with more than 1 interference UE scenarios, we do not think separate DMRS CDM groups for the target UE and interference UE should be assumed, because such assumption is not a fair DMRS port assignation for all the co-scheduled UE, which will exaggerate the performance improvement for the target UE.Issue 3-2-2: DMRS type and DMRS additional positionSupport the recommended WF.Issue 3-2-3: Ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPRESupport option 1.Issue 3-2-4: Whether to use the same DMRS pattern and the same sequence for all co-scheduled UEsNeed more clarification on ‘DMRS pattern’, we are ok with using the same ‘DMRS type’ and ‘DMRS additional position’ for all co-scheduled UEs.We are ok with using the same sequence for all co-scheduled UEsSub-topic 3-3: Reference receiver for phase I evaluationIssue 3-3-1: Candidate ReceiversSupport option 1, and option 2 is also ok for us if the interference channel can be obtained without extra RRC message.Issue 3-3-2: Interference estimation for cases with 2 DMRS CDM groupsOption 1Issue 3-3-3: Interference estimation granularityOption 1Issue 3-3-4: Whether to introduce network assistance to assist the receiverWe need more clarification on what detailed information is needed.Sub-topic 3-4: PDSCH parameters for phase I evaluationIssue 3-4-1: SCSSupport the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-2: Channel BandwidthSupport option 3. In addition to FDD 15kHz 10MHz and TDD 30kHz 40MHz, a larger CBW should be considered for FDD and TDD respectively. The difference between option 1 and option 3 is to include 40MHz or 50MHz for FDD 15kHz, and we still prefer 40MHz since 50MHz may not be implemented in many bands/UEs.Issue 3-4-3: TDD ConfigurationWe will not insist on option 2, and option 1 can be fine for us.Issue 3-4-4: MIMO correlation for each UEIn our understanding, option 1/2 are of the same meaning. We suggest to include both correlation levels for initial evaluation simulation, and make down-selection based on simulation results, i.e., option 1 is also ok for us.Issue 3-4-5: Propagation ConditionSupport the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-6: MCS for Target UESupport option 3, for phase I, each modulation order QPSK, 16QAM and 64QAM need to be evaluated.Issue 3-4-7: PDSCH Mapping TypeSupport the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-8: PDSCH Resource AllocationSupport the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-9: HARQ Process NumberSupport the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-10: SSB ConfigurationSupport the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-11: TRS, NZP CSI-RS and ZP CSI-RS Configurationoption 1Issue 3-4-12: Performance evolution metricsOption 1, it is important that clear target UE performance improvement of MMSE-IRC over MMSE can be shown under MU-MIMO scenario, because in our understanding, MMSE receiver should be the baseline in our evaluation.The metric that target UE performance degradation from SU-MIMO to MU-MIMO does not show the overall network performance improvement under MU-MIMO, and it is hard to tell how much degradation is acceptable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modeling for phase I evaluationIssue 3-1-1: Paired UE numberWe prefer option 3, which is 1 target UE + 1 interference UE. With more number of interfering UEs exist, combined interference will tend to be white noise.Issue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCHWe support the recommended WFLayer combination for target UE and interference UE can be: 1+1 for 2Rx, 2+2 for 4RxCross polarization is usually used by the base station, and each paired UE will be equally treated in real network. Thus, we prefer to select same number of layer for paired UEs in testing. Issue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEsSupport the recommended WF. Do not add too much correlation on propagation channel so that the correlation of total equivalent channel sustain normal level. Because in real network scenario, if two users has high correlation, then they will not be paired by network.Issue 3-1-4: Antenna configurationOption 3 is fine for us.In our contribution, 2Tx are proposed for rank 1 configuration. We can also accept 4Tx for rank 2 configurations.Issue 3-1-5: Codebook typeWe think in phase I, type I single panel and type II codebook both can be evaluated before any down selection.Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationWe support option 1C. Random selection is easy to be implemented in testing and the equivalent channel correlation between paired UEs can be ensured to a low level by configuring channel and antenna correlation to low. Why we don't prefer feedback based precoding method:In real network scenario, feedback based precoding method refers to SRS measurement on uplink channel or PMI reporting, each of them will bring measuring errors into the calculation of precoder because of time delay or other factors. These errors will impact the observation of MMSE-IRC receiver performance. Why we don’t prefer ZF, QRD or other BS precoding schemes:Here we intend to measure the performance of UE receiver of MMSE-IRC by defining some requirements. Based on the ‘control variates’ method, we are supposed to reduce the factors that might have impact on demodulation performance as much as possible. To purely test the MMSE-IRC performance under some objective conditions, we need to remove network’s behaviour. Besides, performing ZF and QRD in testing will bring much more complexity to the test environment building for TE. We need to see if they are positive on performing any BS precoding schemes.Issue 3-1-7: PRB bundling size and precoding granularityWe prefer to consider 4 or 2 PRB for bundling size and precoding granularity. Wideband is not preferred since it cannot simulate the real network scenario for MU-MIMO.Issue 3-1-8: MCS for interfering PDSCHSub-topic 3-2: DMRS configuration for phase I evaluationIssue 3-2-1: DMRS ports for target and interfering UEsFor rank 1, we are open to consider target UE and interference UE to be either in the same CDM group or not. If they are in the same CDM group, then the interference PRG can be determined. The corresponding DMRS configuration is : 1. DMRS port 0 for target UE, DMRS port 1 for the interference UE
2. DMRS port 0 for target UE, DMRS port 2 for the interference UE

, which can be further down select after evaluation. For rank 2, we prefer to consider target UE and interference UE to be in the different CDM group. The corresponding DMRS port configuration is:DMRS port 0, 1 for target UE, DMRS port 2, 3 for the interference UEIssue 3-2-2: DMRS type and DMRS additional positionWe support the recommended WF. Issue 3-2-3: Ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPREThe Ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DMRS EPRE can be further determined after we have agreements on the configuration of CDM group.Issue 3-2-4: Whether to use the same DMRS pattern and the same sequence for all co-scheduled UEsWe support option 1. Paired UEs should using the same DMRS Type and DMRS additional position. Sub-topic 3-3: Reference receiver for phase I evaluationIssue 3-3-1: Candidate ReceiversWe support option 1. MMSE-IRC processing with serving signal demodulation is the baseline implementation. Besides, if we consider random precoding method for interference UE, we don't have the real channel information from it. Whether the interference (fake) UE is able to give feedback of its channel information needs to be confirmed by TE.Issue 3-3-2: Interference estimation for cases with 2 DMRS CDM groupsWe are ok with option 1. Issue 3-3-3: Interference estimation granularityWe prefer to consider the same granularity as that of precoding. Issue 3-3-4: Whether to introduce network assistance to assist the receiverRAN4 can discuss whether to introduce the network assistance. Here are some expected pro’s and con’s:Pro’s:Such network assistance information usually contains information of co-scheduled UEs like resource allocation, modulation schemes or channel coding schemes, etc. With these parameters and configurations informed, the tested UE can perform interference cancellation with less cost by detection. Con’s:The potential impact on the other WG or spec. needs to be taken into account. Sub-topic 3-4: PDSCH parameters for phase I evaluationIssue 3-4-1: SCSOK with recommended WF. Issue 3-4-2: Channel BandwidthWe support to consider the maximum bandwidth for FDD and TDD, which is 50MHz for FDD and 100MHz for TDD, since under full bandwidth, it is more obvious to see the benefit by using MMSE-IRC. Issue 3-4-3: TDD ConfigurationOK with option 1. Issue 3-4-4: MIMO correlation for each UEWe prefer to consider low MIMO correlation for each UE. For example: XP low, or ULA low. Issue 3-4-5: Propagation ConditionWe support option 3. When transmitted signal is experiencing large time delay and frequency selective propagation condition, the precoding performance will have an obviously loss compared to flat channel, which is matched with real network scenario.Issue 3-4-6: MCS for Target UEOption 3 is fine for us. Prefer to further down select from MCS 4, 13 and 19 in phase I. Issue 3-4-7: PDSCH Mapping TypeOK with recommended WF. Issue 3-4-8: PDSCH Resource AllocationOK with recommended WF. Issue 3-4-9: HARQ Process NumberOK with recommended WF. Issue 3-4-10: SSB ConfigurationOK with recommended WF. Issue 3-4-11: TRS, NZP CSI-RS and ZP CSI-RS ConfigurationOK with TRS and ZP configuration of option 1. For NZP, only extend the configuration if more than 4 Tx ports are introduced. Issue 3-4-12: Performance evolution metricsOK with option 1. |
| Ericsson | Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modeling for phase I evaluationIssue 3-1-1: Paired UE numberOption 3 for the initial evaluation. It also depends on the outcome of Issue 3-1-4. Issue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCHWe support the recommended WF. It is also important to make sure co-scheduled UE(s) use different DMRS CDM group from the UE under test. Issue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEsSupport the recommended WF. Issue 3-1-4: Antenna configurationFor the evaluation, we prefer the simple setup, i.e., Option 3 as a start point, but we’re open with option 1. The most important thing is whether we show the performance gain with Rel-15 MMSE-IRC receiver compared with non-co-scheduled UE(s) scenario. Issue 3-1-5: Codebook typeOption 2.It depends on discussion on issue 3-1-4.Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationOption 1C.Any NW implementation assumption shall be precluded in UE Demod test, since it could be a risk of different test results depending on the test equipment. We suggest not to have any precoding algorithm assumption in the UE demodulation requirements.Issue 3-1-7: PRB bundling size and precoding granularityIt is our understanding it is the PRB bunding size for both UE under test and co-scheduled UE(s). We prefer to configure 2 PRBs, same assumption as the existing UE demodulation requirements. Issue 3-1-8: MCS for interfering PDSCHOption 2.Sub-topic 3-2: DMRS configuration for phase I evaluationIssue 3-2-1: DMRS ports for target and interfering UEsIt depends on the conclusion of number of so-scheduled UE(s) and their rank(s), but it is also important to make sure co-scheduled UE(s) use different DMRS CDM group from the UE under test. Issue 3-2-2: DMRS type and DMRS additional positionSupport the recommended WF. Issue 3-2-3: Ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPREThis configuration should follow RAN1 spec. Issue 3-2-4: Whether to use the same DMRS pattern and the same sequence for all co-scheduled UEsTo Hauwei, we are not sure if we understand the proposal correctly. Does this option propose the DMRS sequence generation specified in TS38.211 7.4.1.1.1? If so, it depends on the parameters like scramblingID or cell ID. Huawei: Correct. What we are proposing is to configure 1. Same DMRS type
2. Same DMRS additional position
3. Same scrambling ID
4. Same cell ID (of course, since they are inter-cell paired UEs)

for paired UEs in defining requirement. Sub-topic 3-3: Reference receiver for phase I evaluationIssue 3-3-1: Candidate ReceiversIt is up to UE implementation, as far as it does not require any UE capability. But we prefer to assume option 1 to define the minimum requirements. Issue 3-3-2: Interference estimation for cases with 2 DMRS CDM groupsIt is up to UE implementation, but option 1 is fine. Issue 3-3-3: Interference estimation granularityIt is up to UE implementation, but option 1 is fine. Issue 3-3-4: Whether to introduce network assistance to assist the receiverWe prefer to define the requirements based on Rel-15 MMSE-IRC receiver with the DMRS-based interference covariance estimation. We don’t want to consider the network assisted signalling. Sub-topic 3-4: PDSCH parameters for phase I evaluationIssue 3-4-1: SCSSupport the recommended WF. Issue 3-4-2: Channel BandwidthOption 2. Same comment as Issue 2-4-2, In our understanding, we set 10MHz for FDD SCS=15kHz and 40MHz for TDD SCS=30kHz, considering the supported bands. For example, we are wondering how many FDD bands support CBW of 50MHz.Issue 3-4-3: TDD ConfigurationOption 1. We would like to prioritize 7D1S2U. But DDDSUDDSUU is also fine, depending on the number of test cases. Issue 3-4-4: MIMO correlation for each UEOptions 1 and 2 are fine for evaluation. But we should not preclude low correlation also. But should we discuss it together with Issue 3-1-3?Issue 3-4-5: Propagation ConditionSupport the recommended WF. Issue 3-4-6: MCS for Target UEOption 3.Issue 3-4-7: PDSCH Mapping TypeSupport the recommended WF. Issue 3-4-8: PDSCH Resource AllocationSupport the recommended WF. Issue 3-4-9: HARQ Process NumberSupport the recommended WF. Issue 3-4-10: SSB ConfigurationSupport the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-11: TRS, NZP CSI-RS and ZP CSI-RS ConfigurationFor 2Tx/4Tx scenarios, we are fine to reuse Rel-15 assumption for TRS/ZP-CSI-RS/NZP-CSI-RS configurations. Issue 3-4-12: Performance evolution metricsSince Rel-15 NR baseline receiver is MMSE-IRC, we are wondering it is reasonable to study the gain of MMSE-IRC over MMSE. Probably we should compare the performance difference between the case with co-scheduled UE and without co-scheduled UE?  |
| Qualcomm | Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modeling for phase I evaluationIssue 3-1-1: Paired UE numberPrefer Option 3. As per our understanding of RAN1 spec, there is no restriction on having same scrambling id for both CDM groups. UEs in different CDM groups can have different scrambling id. Therefore, in practice, target UE can assume same scrambling id only for the UEs in its own CDM group. Hence, we can’t have more than one paired UE. We encourage companies to double check this with their RAN1 colleagues.Issue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCHPrefer rank1 for both target and co-scheduled UE based on comment in Issue 3-1-1.Issue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEsOk with recommended WF.Issue 3-1-4: Antenna configurationWith only 2 DMRS ports and random precoding, 2Tx or 4Tx should be enough. For following PMI, higher number of Tx will be useful. So, it should be discussed together with Issue 3-1-6.Issue 3-1-5: Codebook typeIt is related to Issue 3-1-6. With random PMI, single panel Type I codebook should be sufficient.Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationWe prefer to choose random PMI for target UE and then choose PMI matrix for co-scheduled UE from single panel type I codebook such that it is orthogonal. We think our proposal is similar to Option 1B, but we don’t support any feedback based PMI since that will mix the objective of the fixed MCS test with CSI reporting and it will be hard to tell what caused the UE to fail the test.Issue 3-1-7: PRB bundling size and precoding granularityOk with Option 1 or Option 2.Issue 3-1-8: MCS for interfering PDSCHNo preference. For joint decoding receiver, it has to be Option 1.Sub-topic 3-2: DMRS configuration for phase I evaluationIssue 3-2-1: DMRS ports for target and interfering UEsWe prefer to consider only the 1st scenario with Option 1 as commented in Issue 3-1-1.Issue 3-2-2: DMRS type and DMRS additional positionOk with Option 1.Issue 3-2-3: Ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPREThis is true by RAN1 spec.Issue 3-2-4: Whether to use the same DMRS pattern and the same sequence for all co-scheduled UEsAs per RAN1 spec, it can only be assumed for UEs within same CDM group. Spec allows for different scrambling id for different CDM groups. So, it’s not true for UEs in different CDM groups.Sub-topic 3-3: Reference receiver for phase I evaluationIssue 3-3-1: Candidate ReceiversPrefer Option 1.Issue 3-3-2: Interference estimation for cases with 2 DMRS CDM groupsWe prefer not to consider this scenario as commented in Issue 3-1-1.Issue 3-3-3: Interference estimation granularityThis is up to UE implementation, so RAN4 should not enforce any particular granularity. For simulation assumptions, RAN4 can assume granularity of PRB bundling size similar to other test cases.Issue 3-3-4: Whether to introduce network assistance to assist the receiverResource allocation, modulation order etc. can keep changing very quickly if co-scheduled UE is moving. Can network assistance keep up with that?Sub-topic 3-4: PDSCH parameters for phase I evaluationIssue 3-4-1: SCSOk with Option 1.Issue 3-4-2: Channel BandwidthPrefer Option 2.Issue 3-4-3: TDD ConfigurationOk with Option 1.Issue 3-4-4: MIMO correlation for each UEOk with Option 1.Issue 3-4-5: Propagation ConditionPrefer Option 1 since channel estimation is only based on PRB bundling size. So, frequency selectivity doesn’t matter that much for this test purpose.Issue 3-4-6: MCS for Target UEIf we can only have Rank1 for target UE, it may not be practical to go beyond 16QAM.Issue 3-4-7: PDSCH Mapping TypeOk with Option 1.Issue 3-4-8: PDSCH Resource AllocationOk with recommended WF.Issue 3-4-9: HARQ Process NumberOk with recommended WF.Issue 3-4-10: SSB ConfigurationOk with recommended WF.Issue 3-4-11: TRS, NZP CSI-RS and ZP CSI-RS ConfigurationOk with Option 1.Issue 3-4-12: Performance evolution metricsOk with Option 1. |
| Intel | **Issue 3-1-1: Paired UE number**Based on our understanding, testing of scenario with 1 serving UE and 1 interference UE will be sufficient from coverage point of view. Also, such scenario can be handled by 2 Rx and 4 Rx UEs. Same time, handling of interference from higher number of UEs can be applied only by 4 Rx UE in case we assume MMSE-IRC processing. Therefore, we support Option 3.**Issue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCH**We think that requirements should be defined at least for Rank 1 per UE, because it allows to define requirements for 2 Rx and 4 Rx UEs. Same time, 4 Rx UE is required to handle higher rank conditions with MMSE-IRC processing.**Issue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEs**Option 1 is fine for us.**Issue 3-1-4: Antenna configuration**As for Tx configuration, based on our understanding, using of configuration with high number of Tx antennas allows to achieve better spatial orthogonality for multiplexing of multiple UEs and is more practical assumption. Same time, using one or another configuration depends on agreement on PMI modelling. Using of random PMI modelling for scenarios with high Tx antennas will lead to very poor performance. Therefore, if follow PMI approach will be considered then we are fine to use 4, 8 or 16 Tx configuration. For random PMI approach it is better to use 2 or 4 Tx configuration.**Issue 3-1-5: Codebook type**To avoid connection with optional features, we suggest to consider Type I SP codebooks.**Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generation**Clarification for our options 1B and 2B. For example, for Rank 1 case, first we select precoder for serving UE (random or feedback based) WS then we select precoder for interference to ensure that WSH\*WI=0. In result, based on our understanding, we will get precoder corresponding to Rank 2 case (first layer is serving and second is interference).Probably we can check the performance for different case to understand more suitable configuration for requirements definition.**Issue 3-1-7: PRB bundling size and precoding granularity**We can consider 2 PRB bundling size and, depending PMI selection approach, 2 PRB (for small Tx number) or wideband (for large Tx number) precoding granularity.**Issue 3-1-8: MCS for interfering PDSCH**Based on our understanding, both options will be the same from performance point of view. Same time, option 2 is simpler in terms of generation process during the test. Therefore, we support Option 2.**Issue 3-2-1: DMRS ports for target and interfering UEs**As for scenario with rank 1 transmission per UE, with 1 target UE and 1 interference UE, probably, it is better to make down selection. We prefer Option 2. For other scenarios, Option 1 is fine for us.**Issue 3-2-3: Ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPRE**Support Option 1. Based on our understanding, it is the only possible configuration for NR system.**Issue 3-2-4: Whether to use the same DMRS pattern and the same sequence for all co-scheduled UEs**Support Option 1.**Issue 3-3-1: Candidate Receivers**We can check performance difference for both receiver algorithms to understand whether Option 2 can bring significant improvement. In case significant improvement is observed we can discuss whether to define dedicated requirements for such receiver.**Issue 3-3-2: Interference estimation for cases with 2 DMRS CDM groups**Support Option 1. Based on analysis from our paper, if UE uses only DMRS from one CDM group then we will observe significant performance degradation.**Issue 3-3-3: Interference estimation granularity**Based on our understanding, we can consider per PRB bundling estimation granularity (i.e. at least 2 PRBs) for MU-MIMO case. Because we assume that, PDSCH allocation for co-scheduled UEs will be aligned and precoder granularity also potentially will be aligned.**Issue 3-3-4: Whether to introduce network assistance to assist the receiver**Need more time to think about this.**Issue 3-4-2: Channel Bandwidth**Based on our understanding, single CBW per SCS is sufficient from test coverage point of view. Receive processing will be the same for different CBWs. Performance for different CBS is already verified in Rel-15 and Rel-16. Therefore, we support Option 2.**Issue 3-4-3: TDD Configuration**Testing of one typical UL/DL configuration is sufficient. Therefore, we support Option 1.**Issue 3-4-4: MIMO correlation for each UE**It depends on Tx antenna configuration assumption. ULA Low can be considered for 2 and 4 Tx cases. XP High or XP Medium can be considered for 8 and 16 Tx cases.**Issue 3-4-5: Propagation Condition**Option 2 is fine for us.**Issue 3-4-6: MCS for Target UE**There is a typo in our proposal for QPSK MCS. Support Option 3. As for down selection, based on our analysis in this meeting, for scenario with MCS 4, we can not verify whether UE uses MMSE-MRC or MMSE-IRC receiver for demodulation. Therefore, as potential down selection, we can consider only MCS 13 and MCS 19.**Issue 3-4-11: TRS, NZP CSI-RS and ZP CSI-RS Configuration**Option 1 is fine for us.**Issue 3-4-12: Performance evolution metrics**Option 1 is fine for us. |
| Keysight Technologies | Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modeling for phase I evaluationIssue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationFrom TE feasibility point of view:* Option 1A: more complex and does not 100% solves the issue. It’s feasible, but less predictable, with problems when the QRD is not guaranteeing orthogonality. And by far, the most complex to implement from TE point of view.
* Option 1B: It seems a better approach than option 1A. It’s much simpler and easier to guarantee orthogonality in all cases.
* Option 1C: It’s the easiest way of doing it from TE point of view. This is how it was done in LTE
* Option 2A: Same comment as 1A. If the random precoder is too similar to the PMI reported one, then orthogonality is hard to get. This is basically as complex as option 1A with the addition of adding PMI reports and derive the PMI from the reports.
* Option 2B: Same as 1B with the complexity of adding the PMI reports.
* Option 3: This is the easiest possibility.

Hence from TE point of view, the preferences are in this order **3, 1C, 1B, 2B** |
| Apple | Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modeling for phase I evaluationIssue 3-1-1: Paired UE numberWe support option 3. Only 1 paired UE along with target UE. With 2 RX, we can only have max 2 layers transmission. Issue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCHFor 2RX we can only have 1+1 combination. With 4x4, 2+2 shows performance degradation, as shown in our paper. We should limit such scenarios or at least further study the different combinations. Issue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEsWe support the recommended WF. Issue 3-1-4: Antenna configurationWe think 2, 4TX should be sufficient for performance evaluation. Also related to PMI selection issue. We shouldn’t use large number of TX with random PMI and the performance will be degraded. Issue 3-1-5: Codebook typeWe support to use SP Type I codebook. Type II precoder requires additional UE capability and also random precoder generation for Type II cannot be well aligned between companies based on the discussions in Rel-16 Demod Enhancements and eMIMO WIs. Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationWe support to use random PMI and also prefer to avoid combining requirements for PDSCH demod and CSI feedback. We would like to understand feasibility of QRD orthogonalization from TE vendors. Based on our results and analysis, it provides better interference suppression compared to ZF precoding. It would be impractical not to employ any nulling or interference suppression techniques at gNB side for MU transmission. When the rank of target and paired UE are the same we can pick a pair of precoders randomly and they would be orthogonal, but not when the rank are different. Issue 3-1-7: PRB bundling size and precoding granularityWe can go with option 1 as baseline assumption. Issue 3-1-8: MCS for interfering PDSCHThe difference between options is unclear – normal vs random PDSCH. Okay with 16QAM as baseline. Sub-topic 3-2: DMRS configuration for phase I evaluationIssue 3-2-1: DMRS ports for target and interfering UEsWe propose to limit to 1 paired UE. For all combinations the target and paired UE should be on different CDM grps. Issue 3-2-2: DMRS type and DMRS additional positionWe support the recommended WF. Issue 3-2-3: Ratio of PDSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPREWe support option 1. This need not explicity specified in our understanding. Issue 3-2-4: Whether to use the same DMRS pattern and the same sequence for all co-scheduled UEsWe’re not sure what same DMRS pattern and sequence means. We should have the same DMRS type and position, but different scr ID can be used in our understanding. Sub-topic 3-3: Reference receiver for phase I evaluationIssue 3-3-1: Candidate ReceiversWe prefer option 1.We would like to understand the motivation to consider joint signal demodulation. Would we specify requirements for both? Issue 3-3-2: Interference estimation for cases with 2 DMRS CDM groupsWe think this is UE implementation specific and cannot be specified as simulation assumption.Issue 3-3-3: Interference estimation granularityWe think this is UE implementation specific and cannot be specified as simulation assumption.Issue 3-3-4: Whether to introduce network assistance to assist the receiverNetwork assistance could be very useful for MU interference mitigation. Considering that paired UE might not always be on the reserved CDM group. We can further discuss details of such assistance information.Sub-topic 3-4: PDSCH parameters for phase I evaluationIssue 3-4-1: SCSWe support the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-2: Channel BandwidthWe support option 2 and don’t see the need to introduce different CBW. Issue 3-4-3: TDD ConfigurationWe support option 1. Issue 3-4-4: MIMO correlation for each UEWe would like to understand why only medium and high correlation are considered and not Low correlation. For 2x2 with 1 layer per UE, high correlation would largely degrade performance. Issue 3-4-5: Propagation ConditionWe support option 1 as baseline. Issue 3-4-6: MCS for Target UEFor initial evaluation we are okay with option 3. But we prefer to limit 64QAM to 4x4 only.Issue 3-4-7: PDSCH Mapping TypeWe support the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-8: PDSCH Resource AllocationWe support the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-9: HARQ Process NumberWe support the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-10: SSB ConfigurationWe support the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-11: TRS, NZP CSI-RS and ZP CSI-RS ConfigurationWe support the recommended WF.Issue 3-4-12: Performance evolution metricsOkay with performance metric as SNR @70% max TP. Not sure if we should also evaluate against MMSE receiver. Perhaps performance against SU-MIMO to understand degradation introduced due to co-scheduled UE would be a better criteria. We should further downselect scenarios/ parameters that results in less degradation compared to SU-MIMO to achieve better system performance.  |
| Anritsu | Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationUnfortunately we came to a conclusion that we need more time to study the feasibility of this MU-MIMO test by our equipment.There are some fundamental questions with this test such as:1. Does this interference test need to be carried out by conducted method, or OTA, or both?

If it needs to be carried out by the conducted method, then we need to consider a way to evaluate interference between multiple carriers under a condition that each (or all) carrier is delivered to UE via cables.To see influence between carriers, we imagine that we perhaps need to create all the DL 8 or 16 carriers by either of the precoding methods (random or feedback-based), combine them all, and again split them to transmit to UE antenna connectors. (Sorry this is just my image and there might be more smart way to achieve it….)If the test need to be carried out by OTA, then we need to think about the number and placement of probes in the test chamber1. What is the hardware configurations to achieve this test by our system?
* This depends on the outcome above.
 |
| Rohde & Schwarz | Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationSome of the options seem to be very complex when it comes to TE implementation. We are currently reviewing the options internally, but cannot make a final judgement right now, which options may be feasible to implement or not. Therefor we would suggest to not conclude on this issue right now and have more time to perform a more in-depth analysis. |
| MediaTek | Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modeling for phase I evaluationIssue 3-1-1: Paired UE numberPrefer Option 3.Issue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCHSupport the recommended WF.Issue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEsSupport the recommended WF.Sub-topic 3-2: DMRS configuration for phase I evaluationIssue 3-2-1: DMRS ports for target and interfering UEsFor the scenario with rank 1 transmission per UE, with 1 target UE and 1 interference UE, we supprot Option 2.  |
| CMCC | Sub-topic 3-1: Inter-user interference modeling for phase I evaluationIssue 3-1-1: Paired UE numberWe prefer Option1 can take Option2 as a compromise considering of simulation efforts.Issue 3-1-2: Rank for target and interference PDSCHSupport the recommended WFIssue 3-1-3: Correlation between the propagation channel of the paired UEsSupport the recommended WFIssue 3-1-4: Antenna configurationIt is related to Issue 3-3-1 and Issue3-3-6. For Tx antenna number, if there are 3 paired UEs and support Rank 2, or we use following PMI, the number of transmit antenna should be larger than 8. However, if we only consider 1 paired UE and random PMI finally, we also support Option2 and Option3.For Rx antenna number, agree option 1.Issue 3-1-5: Codebook typeThis issue is based on issue 3-1-4;If we consider 8Tx or 16Tx, then we can take Option1 as the starting pointIf we consider 2Tx and 4Tx, then we prefer to use TypeI codebook.Issue 3-1-6: PMI selection and precoding matrix generationOption 1 is fine for us. The specific PMI selecting methodology can be further discussed.Issue 3-1-7: PRB bundling size and precoding granularityThis issue is based on issue 3-1-4;If we consider 8Tx or 16Tx, then we can take Option3 as the starting pointIf we consider 2Tx and 4Tx, then we prefer to use Option1.Issue 3-1-8: MCS for interfering PDSCHOption2 is also OK for us that reuse LTE methodology.Sub-topic 3-2: DMRS configuration for phase I evaluationIssue 3-2-2: DMRS type and DMRS additional positionSupport Opion1.Sub-topic 3-3: Reference receiver for phase I evaluationIssue 3-3-1: Candidate ReceiversPrefer option 1.Issue 3-3-2: Interference estimation for cases with 2 DMRS CDM groupsOption1 makes sense, however, it may decide by UE implementation.Issue 3-3-3: Interference estimation granularityIt may decide by UE implementation.Issue 3-3-4: Whether to introduce network assistance to assist the receiverNeed further discussionSub-topic 3-4: PDSCH parameters for phase I evaluationIssue 3-4-1: SCSOption1Issue 3-4-2: Channel BandwidthWe support Option1 to consider both typical configuration and maximum bandwidth configuration.Issue 3-4-3: TDD ConfigurationBoth Option1 and Option2 is OK for us.Issue 3-4-4: MIMO correlation for each UEOption1Issue 3-4-5: Propagation ConditionSupport recommended WFIssue 3-4-6: MCS for Target UESupport Option1Issue 3-4-7: PDSCH Mapping TypeOption 1Issue 3-4-8: PDSCH Resource AllocationSupport the recommended WFIssue 3-4-9: HARQ Process NumberSupport the recommended WFIssue 3-4-10: SSB ConfigurationSupport the recommended WFIssue 3-4-11: TRS, NZP CSI-RS and ZP CSI-RS ConfigurationOption1 can be the starting point.Issue 3-4-12: Performance evolution metricsSupport Option1 |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

## Discussion on 2nd round

1. Recommendations for Tdocs
	1. 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on … | YYY |  |
| LS on … | ZZZ | To: RAN\_X; Cc: RAN\_Y |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation**  | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
	1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
	2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents
	1. 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation**  | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-210xxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
	1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
	2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents