

Simulation Results for Several of the Proposed Pilot Format Designs in IEEE 802.16m

Document Number:

IEEE C802.16m-08/253r1

Date Submitted:

2008-03-20

Source:

Fred Vook, Tim Thomas, Mark Cudak
Motorola

E-mail: fred.vook@motorola.com

*<http://standards.ieee.org/faqs/affiliationFAQ.html>>

Venue:

TGm Call for contributions on 802.16m System Description Document, IEEE 802.16m-08/005.

Topic: "Pilot structures as relevant to downlink MIMO" and "Downlink Physical Resource Allocation Unit"

Abstract:

Simulation results for various different pilot format designs in IEEE 802.16m

Purpose:

Informational – Provide assistance for selection between proposals

Notice:

This document does not represent the agreed views of the IEEE 802.16 Working Group or any of its subgroups. It represents only the views of the participants listed in the "Source(s)" field above. It is offered as a basis for discussion. It is not binding on the contributor(s), who reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.

Release:

The contributor grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate material contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.16.

Patent Policy:

The contributor is familiar with the IEEE-SA Patent Policy and Procedures:

<http://standards.ieee.org/guides/bylaws/sect6-7.html#6> and <http://standards.ieee.org/guides/opman/sect6.html#6.3>.

Further information is located at <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-material.html> and <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat>.

Introduction


- Purpose
 - Summarize and compare several of the proposed MIMO pilot formats
 - Provide basis for further harmonization and additional design considerations
- Scope
 - Examine formats proposed for use with dedicated pilots
 - Examine formats that support up to 4 transmission streams
 - Did not examine formats for use with broadcast pilot
 - Did not examine formats that included control information
- Basis for comparison:
 - Link-level hull curve
 - Shows the throughput taking into account both FER and pilot overhead
 - Channel Estimation Mean Square Error (MSE)
 - 2-D MMSE channel estimator

Pilot Formats Considered in this Study

Author Affiliation	Contribution
ETRI	C802.16m-08/194
Intel	C802.16m-08/121r1
LG Electronics	C802.16m-08/153
MediaTek	C802.16m-08/139r2
Motorola	C802.16m-08/123
Nortel	C802.16m-08/172r1
Samsung	C802.16m-08/188r2


802.16e Downlink PUSC (PUSC-like)

- 14x4
- Overhead:
 - 7.14% per stream
- Rate matching assumed (i.e., data is not punctured when transmitting streams 3 and/or 4)




ETRI's Pilot Format

- From 08/194
- 10x6
- Overhead:
 - 6.67% per stream




Intel's Pilot Formats

- From 08/121r1
- 18x6 (or 12x6)
- Overhead:
 - 3.7% per stream for B
 - 5.56% per stream for A
- Format A is for 1 and 2 streams
- Format B is for 3 and 4 streams




Format A



Format B


LG Electronic's Pilot Format (type B)

- From 08/153
- 18x6
- Overhead:
 - 5.56% for one stream
 - 11.11% for two streams
 - 14.81% for three streams
 - 18.52% for four streams




MediaTek's Pilot Format

- From 08/139r2
- 18x6
- Overhead:
 - 5.56% per stream




Motorola's Pilot Format

- From 08/123
- 18x6
- Overhead:
 - 5.56% for 1 stream
 - 11.11% for two streams
 - 14.81% for three streams
 - 18.52% for four streams



Nortel's Pilot Format


- From 08/172r1
- 12x6
- Overhead:
 - 8.3% per stream if single resource tile allocation
 - 6.3% for two resource tiles in frequency
 - 5.6% for three resource tiles in frequency
 - 4.2% for N resource tiles in frequency (N large)




Note: Only single resource tile format shown. When concatenated in frequency the format will have lower overhead.

Samsung's Pilot Formats

- From 08/188r2
- 18x6
- Overhead:
 - 2.78% per stream for C
 - 5.56% per stream for B&D
- Format B is for 2 streams and is Format D with D_3 and D_4 replaced with data (rate matching is assumed)



Format C



Formats B&D


Downlink Performance Comparisons

- BS: 4 or 8 Tx antennas *
 - 1/2 lambda spacing, vertical polarization, 3 degree angular spread
- MS: 2 or 4 Rx antennas *
 - independent fading
- Doppler/Delay Spread Model *
 - 3 kph-modified PedB channel,
 - 120 kph-modified VehA channel
- Single 18x6 resource tile data allocation (except ETRI which is 10x6)
 - Dedicated pilots
 - 2 dB boosting of pilot power
- 2-D MMSE channel estimation
 - Per-tile channel estimation
 - 3.2 usec window for mPedB
 - 3.2 usec window for mVehA if $SNR \leq 10$ dB
 - 4.3 usec window for mVehA if $SNR > 10$ dB
 - Doppler window is flat profile with Doppler frequency matched to mobile speed
- SU-MIMO downlink transmission
 - Number of streams adapted to current channel conditions
 - All streams have same TX power
 - Modulation and coding rate can be different on each stream
- UL Sounding (TDD):
 - UL sounding from all MS antennas simulated with channel estimation
 - Sounding matched to resource tile, 18dB DL-UL total power difference, power concentration on UL Sounding
 - 3 symbol delay from sounding to beginning of DL transmission
- Rx weights: successive cancellation
- Pilot overhead is accounted for in the throughput results


Results with 3 kph, mPedB

Performance Comparisons for 4 Tx, 2 Rx, 3 kph, mPedB

Throughput




Throughput Loss over Best




- Observations:
 - Intel/LG best at SNRs < 17 dB
 - Samsung C best at SNRs > 18

Performance Comparisons for 4 Tx, 4 Rx, 3 kph, mPedB

Throughput




Throughput Loss over Best




- Observations:
 - Motorola best at SNRs < 16 dB
 - MediaTek and Intel close to Motorola at SNRs < 18 dB
 - Samsung C best at SNRs > 16 dB

Channel Estimation MSE Results for 4 Tx, 3 kph, mPedB

4 Tx, 2 Rx




4 Tx, 4 Rx




- Observations:
 - All but Samsung-C have similar performance
 - MediaTek/Motorola has slightly better performance than rest

Performance Comparisons for 8 Tx, 2 Rx, 3 kph, mPedB

Throughput



Throughput Loss over Best




- Observations:


- MediaTek best at SNRs < 18 dB
- Intel, LG, Motorola, Samsung-D close to MediaTek at SNRs < 18 dB
- Samsung C best at SNRs > 18 dB

Performance Comparisons for 8 Tx, 4 Rx, 3 kph, mPedB

Throughput



Throughput Loss over Best




- Observations:


- Motorola best at SNRs < 13 dB
- MediaTek and Intel's formats close to Motorola's performance at SNRs < 13 dB
- Samsung-C best at SNRs > 14 dB

Channel Estimation MSE Results for 8 Tx, 3 kph, mPedB

8 Tx, 2 Rx



8 Tx, 4 Rx




- Observations:
 - All but Samsung-C have similar performance
 - MediaTek/Motorola has slightly better performance than rest


Results with 120 kph, mVehA

Performance Comparisons for 4 Tx, 2 Rx, 120 kph, mVehA

Throughput




Throughput Loss over Best




- Observations:
 - Motorola best at all SNRs
 - MediaTek and Intel fairly close to Motorola
 - Samsung C&D, PUSC do not perform well in velocity

Performance Comparisons for 4 Tx, 4 Rx, 120 kph, mVehA

Throughput




Throughput Loss over Best




- Observations:
 - Motorola best at all SNRs
 - MediaTek and Intel fairly close to Motorola
 - Samsung C&D, PUSC do not perform well in velocity

Channel Estimation MSE Results for 4 Tx, 120 kph, mVehA

4 Tx, 2 Rx




4 Tx, 4 Rx




- Observations:
 - Motorola has best CE MSE performance
 - Bump in CE MSE around 10 dB due to switching delay spread window for MMSE CE

Performance Comparisons for 8 Tx, 2 Rx, 120 kph, mVehA

Throughput




Throughput Loss over Best




- Observations:
 - Motorola best at all SNRs
 - MediaTek and Intel fairly close to Motorola
 - Samsung C&D, PUSC do not perform well in velocity

Performance Comparisons for 8 Tx, 4 Rx, 120 kph, mVehA

Throughput




Throughput Loss over Best




- Observations:
 - Motorola best at all SNRs
 - MediaTek fairly close to Motorola (Intel close at SNR < 11 dB)
 - Samsung C&D, PUSC do not perform well in velocity

Channel Estimation MSE Results for 8 Tx, 120 kph, mVehA

8 Tx, 2 Rx



8 Tx, 4 Rx



- Observations:
 - Motorola has best CE MSE performance
 - Bump in CE MSE around 10 dB due to switching delay spread window for MMSE CE

Summary of Results

- Motorola's format is most robust to all cases (Intel's and MediaTek's formats a close second)
- Motorola's format best at 120 kph (mVehA)
- Results for Nortel were based on single resource tile which has a very high overhead (multiple resource tile formats will improve Nortel's results)
- Samsung's and PUSC formats have poor performance in velocity

Considerations for improving all designs:

- Are these pilot formats robust to high delay spreads?
- Does one format support pilot power boosting better than the others?
- Can performance be improved at low speeds by dropping pilot density at very high SNRs (>20 dB)?
- Implementation issues to consider:
 - Motorola's formats do not require the mobile to change the one- and two-stream channel estimator when changing from one and two streams to three and four streams (Intel's does require a change)
 - MS channel estimation is simplified with fewer tile types