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## Introduction

The scope given in the Rel-19 NR MIMO Phase 5 WID pertaining to CSI enhancement is as follows (2d added in [1]):

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Specify CSI support for up to 128 CSI-RS ports, targeting FR1    1. Type-I codebook refinement supporting up to a total of 128 CSI-RS ports across all resources, assuming legacy CSI-RS resources (with up to 32 CSI-RS ports per resource), based on extension of legacy codebooks    2. Type-II codebook refinement supporting up to a total of 128 CSI-RS ports across all resources, assuming legacy CSI-RS resources (with up to 32 CSI-RS ports per resource), based on extension of legacy codebooks, **without modifying any codebook parameter other than** introducing additional values for the number of ports codebook parameter(s)    3. Extension of CRI(s)-based CSI reporting (CQI/PMI/RI calculated per CRI for ≥1 CRIs) for hybrid beamforming supporting up to a total of 128 CSI-RS ports across all resources, with up to 32 CSI-RS ports per resource, without new codebook design    4. SRS port grouping and its association to the two codewords for the 6/8Rx low complexity receiver supporting more than 4 layers, with legacy codebook       * No enhancement on codeword-to-layer mapping, DL resource allocation, CSI feedback, and DCI format       * Note: Whether to support 6Rx with more than 4 layers is to be decided in RAN4 Rel-19 RF enhancements WI 2. Specify UE reporting enhancement for CJT deployments under non-ideal synchronization and backhaul, targeting FR1, both FDD and TDD 3. Inter-TRP time misalignment and frequency/phase offset measurement and reporting, assuming legacy CSI-RS design, with stand-alone aperiodic reporting on PUSCH |

## Summary of companies’ proposals and views

***Ground rules in sharing your inputs:***

* **Please do NOT input anything in Tables 1A, 2A, and 3A**
  + **Including company names - appreciate your trying to save me some work, but …**
  + **For some reason, most likely due to poor MS Word inter-platform/version compatibility support (if any), the formatting of the FL proposals will change (for the worse) if you do so. This has happened several times in Athens and Changsha ☹**
* **Please input your comments ONLY in Tables 1C, 2C, and 3C, thanks! 😊**

### Issue 1 (WID objective 2a and 2b): Type-I and Type-II codebook refinement for up to 128 CSI-RS ports

Table 1A Summary: issue 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue/proposal** | **Companies’ views** |
| **New issues** | | |
| 1.1.2 | **[119] Agreement**  For the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook refinement for 48, 64, and 128 CSI-RS ports, regarding per-layer scaling factor applied to each of the selected SD basis vectors associated with RI=*v=*2 for the 3-bit scaling factor(s):   * … * Regarding the configuration of the value (3-bit indicator per SD basis vector group), decide, by RAN1#119, between the following:   + Alt1. RI=1 and RI=2 are separately configured (RI-specific)   + Alt2. A same configuration is used for RI=1 and RI=2 (RI-common)   **Proposal 1.A.2:** For the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook refinement for 48, 64, and 128 CSI-RS ports, regarding per-layer scaling factor applied to each of the selected SD basis vectors for the 3-bit scaling factor(s), the configuration of the value (3-bit indicator per SD basis vector group) is RI-common (a same configuration is used for RI=1 and RI=2)  **FL assessment**: While it can be argued that RI-specific is a better choice, the only two simulation results available in this meeting (from Ericsson and Nokia) suggest that RI-common setting performs well enough. It can be argued that RI-common is the baseline due to, e.g. its lower RRC overhead.   * We can also check if RI-specific is acceptable to the supporters of RI-common | **Support/fine:** ZTE, Huawei/HiSi, Samsung, Ericsson, Apple, Xiaomi, Qualcomm, NTT DO-COMO, NTT CORP, Intel, MediaTek, Tejas, Sharp, Nokia/NSB, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, IDC, KDDI, Rakuten,  **Not support (RI-specific):** [vivo, New H3C, NEC, OPPO, Lenovo/MotM, Google, CMCC] |
| 1.1.3 | **[119] Agreement**  For the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook refinement for 48, 64, and 128 CSI-RS ports, regarding per-layer scaling factor applied to each of the selected SD basis vectors associated with RI=*v=*2 for the 3-bit scaling factor(s):   * The scaling formula is where is a multiplicative factor independent of *i*   + Reuse legacy precoder normalization (per discretion of the spec editor)   + FFS (RAN1#119): Whether min( , 1) operation is needed   + FFS (RAN1#119): Whether other than 1 (baseline) is needed (e.g. or ) * ...   **Question 1.A.3:** For the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook refinement for 48, 64, and 128 CSI-RS ports, regarding per-layer scaling factor applied to each of the selected SD basis vectors associated with RI=*v=*2 for the 3-bit scaling factor(s), please share your view, if any, on the following issues:   * Whether other than 1 (baseline) is needed (e.g. or )   + 1 when b0=b1, else : Qualcomm, Xiaomi,   + : Huawei/HiSi   + No ( only): Ericsson, Intel, Rakuten, Samsung, vivo, * Whether min( , 1) operation is needed   + Yes:   + No:   **FL assessment**: If no consensus is reached on something else different from ρ=1 (baseline), ρ=1 is the natural outcome. In this case min(.) operation is not needed. | |
| 1.5.2 | **[119] Agreement**  For the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook refinement for P=48, 64, 128 CSI-RS ports, when the UE reports or multiplexes the CSI on PUCCH, the PUCCH resource, the number of PRBs for the PUCCH resource, and/or the number of Part 2 CSI reports are determined based on the RI value that results in the largest UCI payload.   * [For Scheme-B, the RI value that results in the largest UCI payload is determined as min(4, maximum configured rank per CSI reporting configuration)] * [For Scheme-A, the RI value that results in the largest UCI payload is determined as maximum configured rank per CSI reporting configuration] * FFS: Whether the largest UCI payload includes the CQI associated with the 2nd CW when RI>2   **Question 1.E.2**: For the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook refinement for P=48, 64, 128 CSI-RS ports, when the UE reports or multiplexes the CSI on PUCCH, please share your view, if any, on the 3 yellow highlighted bullets  **FL assessment**: The three bullets need some resolution | |
| **From previous round(s)** | | |
| 1.2 | **Proposal 1.B**: For the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook refinement for 48, 64, and 128 CSI-RS ports, extend the agreed Scheme-A and Scheme-B to 16, 24, and 32 CSI-RS ports, for all applicable RI values with K=1 only, and without any further modification/enhancement of the sub-features pertinent to the Rel-19 Type-I SP design (including, e.g. the Rel-19 Type-I SP CBSR, soft scaling).   * For the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook, the support for 16, 24, and 32ports are 3 separate UE capabilities from the support for the previously agreed number of ports (48, 64, 128 ports) * The Rel-18 SD NES schemes applicable to Rel-15 Type-I SP codebooks are also applicable to the extension of the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook to 16, 24, and 32 ports * FFS: whether to adopt the extended orthogonal set for the 2nd SD basis for Scheme-A, RI=2-4 and 16, 24, and 32 CSI-RS ports   **FL assessment**: This was discussed OFFLINE [1]. | **Support/fine (A+B):** ZTE, IDC, Samsung, Xiaomi, Nokia/NSB, NEC, Fujitsu, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, Spreadtrum, UNISOC, CMCC, MediaTek, Ericsson, Apple, Google, IDC, Tejas, Sharp, Orange, Lenovo/MotM (ok, low priority), China Telecom, KDDI, Intel (ok), New H3C,  **Fine only Scheme-A RI=3-4 (2nd):** Huawei/HiSi  **Support/fine B only, concern A:** CATT, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Rakuten,  **Not support:** OPPO,HONOR, TCL, vivo, Xiaomi, Huawei/HiSi, |
| 1.4. | **Proposal 1.D**: For the Rel-19 Type-I SP codebook refinement for P=48, 64, 128 CSI-RS ports, regarding Scheme-B, when the UE is configured to report wideband CSI on PUCCH:   * For PUCCH format 2, one-part CSI is used * For PUCCH formats 3 and 4, two-part CSI is used where SD basis selection is reported in CSI-part2   + CSI fields in CSI-part1 and part2 follows the legacy sub-band CSI   **FL assessment**: This proposal is scheme-B optimization for WB PUCCH reporting. Whether a two-part CSI is needed or not can be discussed, e.g. whether the difference in payload across RIs is enough to justify the use of two-part CSI on PUCCH F3/4 especially for WB.   * From moderator perspective, **the difference in payload across RIs will be much larger when Nrep>1 is configured to be reported on the same PUCCH**.   + **[JD/Qualcomm] Nrep>1 on PUCCH is practical for CA, since only one (or optionally, two) cell can have PUCCH to convey all DL CCs’ CSI reports.** * To minimize spec impact, PF2 is still kept 1-part (since 2-part isn’t supported for PF2 in legacy). * Therefore, this proposal is technically sound | **Support/fine:** Qualcomm,Xiaomi (open), Fraunhofer IIS/HHHI (open), Samsung (ok), Tejas (open), vivo (open), Sharp, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, Apple (open), TCL,  **Not support:** Google, CMCC, Lenovo/MotM, OPPO, Fujitsu, ZTE, CATT, Spreadtrum, Intel, Huawei/HiSi, New H3C, |
|  |  | |
|  |  |  |

Table 1B SLS results: issue 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **SLS results** | | |
| **Issue #** | **Metric** | **Observation** |
| ZTE | 1.2 | 5%/95%/avg UPT gain | Performance comparison between Rel-19 Type-I codebook (Scheme-A) and Rel-15 Type-I codebook for RI=3-4  *It is shown in the figure of SLS results above that Rel-19 Type-I codebook (Scheme-A) for rank-3/4 offers a significant UPT gain (i.e., ~21.2% for cell-edge UE, ~3.8% for near-field UE, ~8.1% in average) over Rel-15 SP Type-I codebook for PCSI-RS = 32.* |
| Samsung | 1.2 | Avg UPT gain vs overhead | *It is shown in the figures of SLS results above that Both schemes A and B yield avg UPT gain over the Rel-15 T1 for at least configurations of 32 and 16 ports. Especially, scheme B yields significant UPT gains 8% and 4.5% over both Scheme A and Rel-15 T1 in the legacy number of CSI-RS ports 32 and 16 ports, respectively.* |
| Vivo | 1.2 | Cell mean SE | Cell mean SE comparison for different CB schemes  *It is shown in the figure of SLS results above that when rank adaptation up to rank 2 is enabled, Rel-19 Type-I Scheme B yields 1~2% Cell-mean SE gain over Rel-15 Type-I for 8T4R, 16T4R, and 32T4R.* |
| Nokia/NSB | 1.2 | Mean UPT gain vs overhead | Mean throughput gain vs mean overhead comparison between Rel-15 Type-I, Scheme-A and Scheme-B for maximum rank 8, with 16 (4x2) and 32 (8x2) ports.  *It is observed from the SLS results above that:* *for 16 ports, Scheme-A shows about 5.6% mean throughput gain over Rel-15 Type-I with about 5 bits increase in mean overhead. Scheme-B shows about 11.5% mean throughput gain over Rel-15 Type-I with about 58 bits increase in mean overhead.* *For 32 ports, Scheme-A shows about 6% mean throughput gain over Rel-15 Type-I with about 10 bits increase in mean overhead. Scheme-B shows about 13% mean throughput gain over Rel-15 Type-I with about 59 bits increase in mean overhead.* |
| Nokia/NSB | 1.1 | Mean UPT gain, 5% UPT gain |  |
| Ericsson | 1.1 | Mean UPT gain, 5% UPT gain | Comparison of alternatives A and B for 3-bit scaling factor applied to RI=v=2  *It is observed from the SLS results above that Alt A outperforms Alt B (i.e., Alt B incurs 9% and 26% loss for 50% and 70% RU, respectively).* |
| 1.2 | Mean UPT gain, 5% UPT gain | Comparison between Rel-15 and Rel-19 Type I codebooks for 32 ports for ranks 1-4  *It is observed from the SLS results above that Rel-19 Type I Scheme A (no array splitting) shows around 3% (4%) gain at 50% RU and around 7% (8%) gain at 70% RU when compared to the Rel-15 baseline for mean user throughput (cell edge throughput). Rel-19 Type I Scheme B shows around 7% (12%) gain at 50% RU and around 16% (24%) gain at 70% RU when compared to the Rel-15 baseline for mean user throughput (cell edge throughput).* ***​*** |
| CATT | 1.2 | Mean UPT | Average throughput performance comparison between Rel-15 Type I SP codebook and extension of scheme A and B with 32 ports, up to 4 layers. Ok to extend scheme B to <=32 ports but have concerns for scheme A. we suggest to remove scheme A from the proposal. |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 1C Additional inputs: issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your inputs on each of the issues and, if applicable, proposals in TABLE 1A** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Issue 2 (WID objective 2c): CRI-based CSI for hybrid beamforming (HBF)

Table 2A Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| **New issues** | | |
| 2.1 | **[116bis] Agreement**  For the Rel-19 CRI-based CSI refinement for up to 128 CSI-RS ports, on the configured KS>1 NZP CSI-RS resources, reuse the legacy CMR and IMR rules for the Rel-15 CRI-based reporting. This includes:   * All the KS NZP CSI-RS resources are associated with a same CSI-RS resource set * …   **Proposal 2.A**: For the Rel-19 CRI-based CSI refinement for up to 128 CSI-RS ports, regarding aperiodic CSI-RS resource configuration, an RRC-configured resource-level slot offset (relative to the resource-set-level slot offset, using the same design as Rel-19 Type-I/II codebook refinement for 48, 64, and 128 ports) is supported for aperiodic CSI-RS resource set   * FFS: The number of bits for indicating the resource-level slot offset (relative to the resource-set-level slot offset) for KS resources, including the value(s) of the slot offset * FFS: Whether, in addition, configuring an *available* slot offset for each CSI-RS resource within the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set   + Note: “*Available* slot offset” is analogous to the Rel-17 SRS triggering offset enhancement   **FL assessment**: The proposal is unclear. It was agreed that all the KS resources are associated with a same resource set. In this case, all the restrictions apply including the permitted resource-level slot offset | **Support/fine**: Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, Qualcomm, China Telecom, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, MediaTek, CMCC, NEC, Tejas, CATT, IDC, vivo, Sharp, Intel, Rakuten, Ericsson, Apple, Huawei/HiSi, TCL,  **Not support**: Google (configure 1 vs 2 slots), Xiaomi, Lenovo/MotM, OPPO, Fujitsu, Spreadtrum, New H3C, |
| 2.3 | **Proposal 2.C**: For the Rel-19 CRI-based CSI refinement for up to 128 CSI-RS ports, regarding one-part CSI wideband reporting, if resource-specific RI restriction is configured, the zero padding bits for each of the M reported CRI are determined as follows:   * For a k-th CRI from the M reported CRIs, , where:   + , where *Q* is the set of CRIs corresponding to Ks resources and is the maximum payload size of associated CSI fields for a j-th CRI, and , where is the set of rank values that are allowed to be reported for the j-th CRI;   + , where is the reported rank for k-th CRI;   + Note: is the size of RI field corresponding to k-th CRI.   + Note: The definition of the operator B(∙) is as legacy (as defined in 38.212).   + Note: the is in the same place as legacy padding bits.   **FL assessment**: The proposal is needed analogous to CSI part 1. From 1st online session, some comments on the applicability for one-part PUSCH were made and need resolution | **Support/fine**: Samsung, Google, Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, MediaTek, Xiaomi, CMCC, NEC, Fujitsu, Tejas, ZTE, CATT, IDC, Spreadtrum, OPPO (ok), Sharp, KDDI, Intel, Rakuten, Ericsson, Apple, Huawei/HiSi (open), TCL, New H3C,  **Not support**: Nokia/NSB (leave to editor), vivo bitwidth for each RI= max(RI), |
| 2.8 | **Proposal 2.H**: For the Rel-19 CRI-based CSI refinement for up to 128 CSI-RS ports, support dropping of CSI part-2 (PMI, LI, CQI for 2nd CW) for a CRI corresponding to out-of-range WB CQI reported in the CSI part-1  **FL assessment**: The proposal intends to reduce CSI part-2 overhead | **Support/fine**: Intel,  **Not support**: |
| 2.9 | **Proposal 2.I**: For the Rel-19 CRI-based CSI refinement for up to 128 CSI-RS ports with the Rel-15 Type-I SP codebook, joint operation with the Rel-18 NES framework is not supported.   * Using different power control offset values for multi-CRI reporting across different CSI-RS resources is not precluded.   **FL assessment**: The proposal attempts to avoid ambiguity since Rel-18 SD NES supports Rel-15 Type-I codebook | **Support/fine**: Lenovo/MotM,  **Not support**: |
| **From previous round(s)** | | |
| 2.6 | Proposal 2.F: For the Rel-19 CRI-based CSI refinement for up to 128 CSI-RS ports, regarding UCI omission for the UCI reported in CSI part-2, support the following method for assigning priority levels to multiple CRIs in a single CSI instance.   * For the non-reported *MR* CRIs, priority order (from higher to lower) is assigned based on the RRC configured order of *MR*. * For the reported *M*-*MR* CRIs (or *M* CRIs if *MR* is not configured), priority order (from higher to lower) is assigned based on a beam quality measure like, CRIs’ SINR or CRIs’ RSRP or a combination of resource specific RI and resource specific CQI.   **FL assessment**: The proposal introduces additional priority rules for the (M-MR) CRIs. Given the previous agreement on priority rules and packing order (along with M CRIs), it is unclear why this additional set of rules is needed. | **Support/fine**: Tejas, IDC (open), Huawei/HiSi (open),  **Not support**: Google, Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, MediaTek, Xiaomi, CMCC (UE implementation), Lenovo/MotM, OPPO, ZTE, CATT, Spreadtrum, Intel, Apple, TCL, New H3C, |
| 2.7 | **Proposal 2.G**: For the Rel-19 CRI-based CSI refinement for up to 128 CSI-RS ports,select between the following priority functions:   * Alt1: * Alt2: * Alt3: No change to legacy , and, when configured with a multi-CRI report with M>1 CRIs and *reportConfigID* “”, UE does not expect to be configured with another CSI report with *reportConfigID* value from “” to “” while having the same parameter value “” “” and “” as the multi-CRI report “”   where   * *m =* 0 for non-*M* CRI based CSI reports (legacy CSI reports up to Rel-18), * *m =* 1 for *M* CRI based CSI reports. is the maximum number of CRIs configured for multi-CRI CSI reports not carrying L1-RSRP or L1-SINR   **FL assessment**: The proposal introduces additional priority rule for the (M-MR) CRIs. Whether this is needed or not can be discussed (currently unclear to the moderator). | **Support/fine**: Tejas (Alt1/2), Qualcomm (Alt3), MediaTek, Lenovo/MotM (Alt3), IDC, Samsung (ok), Huawei/HiSi (open),  **Not support**: Google, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, CMCC, OPPO, Fujitsu, ZTE, Spreadtrum, vivo, Ericsson, Apple, TCL, New H3C, |
|  |  |  |

Table 2B SLS results: issue 2

--

Table 2C Additional inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your inputs on each of the issues and, if applicable, proposals in TABLE 1A** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Issue 3 (WID objective 3): CJT calibration reporting for non-ideal synchronization and backhaul

Table 3A Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| **New issues** | | |
| 3.2.1 | **[119] Agreement**  For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration (CJTC) reporting, when linking CJTC Dd and Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI reports is configured with a joint trigger, the timeline (Z/Z’) is determined as Z/Z’ associated with the Rel-18 eType-II CJT, plus Drelax   * The value of Drelax is a UE capability, taken from {0, drelax}   + FFS: The value of drelax (>0), including whether it depends on SCS * For linking CJTC Dd and Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI, joint triggering is a separate UE feature group from separate triggering   **Question 3.B.4:** For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration (CJTC) reporting, when linking CJTC Dd and Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI reports is configured with a joint trigger, please share your view, if any, on the value of drelax (>0):   * Z1’ of table 5.4-2 in TS38.214 (corresponding to WB Type I CSI report with at most 4 ports): MediaTek * *Z2/Z2’:* ZTE * *:* ZTE * *Z1/Z1’:* ZTE   **FL assessment**: The FFS needs to be resolved | |
| 3.2.2 | **Proposal 3.B.2**: For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration (CJTC) reporting, when linking CJTC Dd and Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI reports is configured with a joint trigger, the UE does not perform DO compensation on the Rel-18 type II CJT CSI associated with TRP(s) that are either ‘out of range’ or whose 1-bit inside/outside indicator dn is reported as ‘outside’.  **FL assessment**: Since linkage assumes UE-specific PDSCH digital DO pre-compensation akin to Rel-18 Type-II CJT Mode-1, a proper use case would assume that the selection of NTRP TRPs already removes TRPs that result in dn=’outside’. So the need for this proposal is unclear. | **Support/fine**: MediaTek, Samsung, Xiaomi, NEC, Spreadtrum, vivo (open), Sharp, Sony, Apple,  **Not support**: Google, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, Lenovo/MotM, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, Fujitsu, ZTE, CATT, Rakuten, Huawei/HiSi, KDDI, TCL, |
| **From previous round(s)** | | |
| 3.2.3 | **Proposal 3.B.3**: For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration (CJTC) reporting, when linking CJTC Dd and Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI reports is configured with a joint triggering carried on a same PUSCH (hence on a same slot), the UCI associated with the CJTC Dd is placed in the part of UCI as TS 38212 Table 6.3.1.1.2-13; the CSI part 1 of Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI is placed in the part of UCI as TS 38.212 Table 6.3.1.1.2-13 and the CSI part 2 of Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI is placed in the part of UCI as TS 38.212 Table 6.3.1.1.2-14   * The previously agreed UCI design and mapping order for CJTC Dd report are reused * The legacy UCI design, UCI mapping order, and UCI omission for the Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI are reused   **FL assessment**: This proposal is needed since joint triggering introduces a new PUSCH reporting format within 1 slot. | **Support/fine**: CMCC, Samsung (ok), Qualcomm (ok), NTT DOCOMO (ok), NTT CORP, Xiaomi, TCL,  **Not support**: Fujitsu, Huawei/HiSi, [OPPO], |
| 3.4 | **[118] Agreement**  For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration (CJTC) reporting, to facilitate UE-specific frequency offset pre-compensation on PDSCH by the NW, *decide*, by RAN1#118, whether to support configuring a UE (via RRC ignalling) to perform PMI calculation for the Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI report assuming pre-compensation using the UE-reported frequency offset (when ReportQuantity is ‘cjtc-F’). And if supported, whether any of the following is additionally supported or not:   * NW indicates the frequency offset value to be compensated for the Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI report, and/or * The two separately configured reports (i.e. Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI report and the CJTC frequency offset report) are always jointly triggered and carried on a same PUSCH (hence on a same slot) * The frequency offset value to be compensated is the latest reported fO before the DCI triggering the CJT CSI reporting   FFS: AP-CSI-RS can be configured for the Rel-18 eType-II CJT report  The above only applies when the CMRs do not share common QCL source for Doppler shift indication  **Proposal 3.D.1**: For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration (CJTC) reporting, to facilitate UE-specific frequency offset pre-compensation on PDSCH by the NW, support configuring a UE (via RRC signalling) to perform PMI calculation for the Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI report assuming pre-compensation using the UE-reported frequency offset (when ReportQuantity is ‘cjtc-F’), using the same mechanisms as that for UE-reported delay offset (when ReportQuantity is ‘cjtc-Dd’).   * This implies that all the supported sub-features associated with ReportQuantity = ‘cjtc-Dd’ linked to Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI are extended to ReportQuantity = ‘cjtc-F’ linked to Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI   **FL assessment**: The above issue needs some discussion. | **Support/fine**: vivo, Xiaomi, Fujitsu, Sony, Samsung, ZTE, Rakuten,  **Not support (NW implementation)**: Huawei/HiSi, MediaTek, CMCC, CATT, Nokia/NSB, Qualcomm, Lenovo/MotM, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, OPPO, Google, Spreadrum, Sharp, Intel, Apple, KDDI, TCL, New H3C, |
| 3.5.1 | **Proposal 3.E.1**: For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration (CJTC) reporting, when linking CJTC Dd and Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI reports is configured with two separate triggers, introduce a UE capability for the following:   * The UE capability is used to inform the NW on the maximum duration of 2 sec the UE can store the latest CJTC Dd report, measured from the transmission of the linked CJTC Dd report * When the UE does not report this UE capability, it is assumed that the UE can store a CJTC Dd report [indefinitely]   **FL assessment**: Wording is based on the outcome of Monday and Wednesday **OFFLINE** sessions in RAN1#118bis.  This is intended to avoid stale Dd report from being utilized. However, it can be argued that this can be handled via NW implementation. | **Support/fine**: Lenovo/MotM, ZTE, Qualcomm, vivo, Xiaomi, Huawei/HiSi, NEC, HONOR, Sharp, KDDI, MediaTek, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, Apple, Google, Spreadtrum, CATT, China Telecom, TCL, New H3C,  **Not support**: Intel, Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, |
| 3.5.2 | **Proposal 3.E.2**: For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration (CJTC) reporting, when linking CJTC Dd and Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI reports is configured with two separate triggers, when at least one of the NTRP reported delay offset (DO) values in a linked CJTC Dd report is ‘out of range’, the UE does not perform DO compensation on the triggered Rel-18 eType-II CJT CSI associated with TRP(s) that are ‘out of range’  **FL assessment**: Tuesday **OFFLINE** outcome in RAN1#118bis. | **Support/fine**: Huawei/HiSi, Qualcomm, Samsung, Ericsson, Sony, Lenovo/MotM, Xiaomi, NEC, HONOR, OPPO, Google, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, MediaTek, Spreadtrum, vivo (open), Sharp, Intel (ok), Sony, Apple, KDDI, New H3C,  **Not support**: Nokia/NSB, ZTE, IDC, CATT, Fujitsu, Rakuten, TCL, |
| 3.6 | **[117] Agreement**  For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration reporting, regarding the applicable type(s) of the configured NTRP NZP CSI-RS resources/resource sets when ReportQuantity is ‘cjtc-P’ (DL/UL phase offset),   * all the ‘CSI-RS for CSI’ resources within each resource set follow the legacy pre-Rel-19 rules of CSI-RS resources associated with a same resource set * all the resources across the NTRP CSI-RS resources/resource sets are configured with the same bandwidth   **Proposal 3.F**: For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration (CJTC) reporting, when *ReportQuantity* is *‘cjtc-P’* (DL/UL phase offset), the NTRP P/SP CSI-RS resources are configured within X={1,[2]} slots, without DL/UL switching in between the NTRP resources, where X=1 implies that the NTRP resources are configured within a same slot, and X=2 implies that the NTRP resources are configured within two adjacent slots.  **FL assessment**: This is analogous to legacy CMR behaviours for Rel-17 NCJT and Rel-18 Type-II CJT.  **[From JD] This proposal may be helpful to identify NTRP CSI-RS occasions linked to a latest SRS occasion for reference antenna port determination.** | **Support/fine**: Qualcomm, OPPO, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, Nokia/NSB, Apple, Huawei/HiSi, Google, Mediatek, Xiaomi, vivo, Sharp, KDDI,  **Not support**: Samsung, Ericsson, ZTE, CATT, Fujitsu, Intel, TCL (X=1), |
| 3.7.1 | **Proposal 3.G.1:** For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration reporting, support joint Dd + phase offset (PO) reporting as follows:   * Only wideband (=1) PO is supported * No further optimization of CSI reporting format, e.g. configurability of not reporting {dn} * The UCI parameters are captured in the table below   *When ReportQuantity is ‘cjtc-Dd-P’ (joint Doffset+d and PO)*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Parameter | Details/description | | nref1 | Reference TRS resource set index for Doffset+d, based on the ordering from RRC configuration:  bits | | nref2 | Reference TRS resource set index for PO, based on the ordering from RRC configuration: bits | | {Dn,offset,  n=0, 1, …, NTRP – 1 n≠nref1} | Delay offset for CSI-RS resource set n:  bits | | {dn,  n=0, 1, …, NTRP – 1, n≠nref1 } | 1-bit inside/outside indicator for CSI-RS resource set n: bits | | {POn ,  n=0, 1, …, NTRP –1, n≠nref2} | Wideband phase offset for CSI-RS resource n:  bits |  * The UCI mapping order is as follows:   + nref1,   + nref2,   + {Dn,offset, n=0, 1, …, NTRP – 1, n≠nref} ordered from the lowest to highest CSI-RS resource set ID,   + {dn, n=0, 1, …, N TRP – 1, n≠nref} ordered from the lowest to highest CSI-RS resource set ID   + {POn, n=0, 1, …, NTRP – 1, n≠nref} ordered from the lowest to highest CSI-RS resource ID,   **FL assessment**: This proposal (from RAN1#118) is an optimization since each can be reported separately. | **Support/fine:** Qualcomm, Sony, Samsung (ok), Google, ZTE, Fujitsu, Sony, Ericsson (open), Apple,  **Not support**: Huawei/HiSi, MediaTek, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, NEC, Intel, TCL, Huawei/HiSi, Xiaomi, IDC, Sharp, KDDI, CMCC, ETRI, OPPO, Apple, vivo, New H3C, Nokia/NSB, Spreadtrum, TCL, Lenovo/MotM, Rakuten, |
| 3.7.2 | **Proposal 3.G.2:** For the Rel-19 aperiodic standalone CJT calibration reporting, support reporting, as a new ReportQuantity in one CSI reporting instance and one CSI Reporting Setting, L1-RSRPs associated with the configured NTRP CSI-RS resources and the following CJT calibration report type:   * ReportQuantity is ‘cjtc-Dd’ (delay offset)   The legacy L1-RSRP is fully reused, where the L1-RSRP associated with nref is the reference for the other (NTRP-1) differential L1-RSRP(s)   * The NTRP CRI(s) are not reported   **FL assessment**: This proposal (from RAN1#118) is an optimization primarily for TRP selection (which utilizes both RSRP and CJTC report).  As a possible compromise, the proposal is limited to Dd only to add NW to select TRP with only one CSI Report Setting.  @Those not supporting or against: please check if this helps 😊 | **Support/fine:** NEC, NTT DOCOMO, NTT CORP, Lenovo/MotM (low priority), Samsung, Sony,  **Not support**: ZTE, Xiaomi, Fujitsu, Ericsson, Apple, Huawei/HiSi, OPPO, TCL, ETRI, New H3C, Google, Nokia/NSB, vivo, Sharp, Intel, KDDI, Spreadtrum, TCL, China Telecom, CMCC, IDC, Rakuten, |
|  |  |  |

Table 3B LLS/SLS results: issue 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **SLS results** | | |
| **Issue #** | **Metric** | **Observation** |
| ZTE | 3.4 | Cell-edge and average UPT gains | SLS throughput results for non-compensated CJT and UE-specific DO/FO pre-compensated CJT  *It is observed in the figure of SLS results that, UE-specific FO pre-compensation CJT (130.26% performance for cell-edge UE, 107.77% performance in average) outperforms non-pre-compensated CJT (100% performance for cell-edge UE, 100% performance in average) and DO pre-compensated CJT (127.18% performance for cell-edge UE, 106.61% performance in average), and both DO and FO pre-compensated CJT provides the best performance (156.41% performance for cell-edge UE, 117.81% performance in average).* |
| Qualcomm | 3.7.1 | Relative UPT gain vs DL SNR | A graph of different types of data  Description automatically generated with medium confidence  Performance comparison between PO+delay/TAE and subband phase with MRT-precoded CSI-RSs (left figure) and non-MRT-precoded CSI-RSs (right figure)  *From the SLS results, the following observations can be made:*   * *For MRT-precoded CSI-RSs, Opt1 (wideband/initial PO + delay/TAE) outperforms Opt2 (subband PO) for the case of all 16 subbands (which is with massive UCI overhead).*   *For non-MRT-precoded CSI-RS), the benefit of Opt1 (wideband/initial PO + delay/TAE) over Opt2 (subband PO) is reduced.* |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 3C Additional inputs: issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your inputs on each of the issues and, if applicable, proposals in TABLE 3A** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# References

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | RP-242394 | Revised WID: NR MIMO Phase 5 | Samsung (Moderator) |
| 2 | R1-2409587 | Moderator Summary for OFFLINE discussion on Rel-19 CSI enhancements | Moderator (Samsung) |
| 3 | R1-2409371 | CSI enhancements | MediaTek Inc. |
| 4 | R1-2409378 | Discussion on CSI enhancements | ZTE Corporation, Sanechips |
| 5 | R1-2409428 | On 128 CSI-RS ports and UE reporting enhancement | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| 6 | R1-2409432 | CSI enhancements for Rel. 19 MIMO | Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI |
| 7 | R1-2409460 | Further Details on Rel-19 Enhancements of CSI | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 8 | R1-2409505 | Discussion on CSI enhancements | CMCC |
| 9 | [R1-2409589](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_119/Docs/R1-2409589.zip) | Views on Rel-19 CSI enhancements | Samsung |
| 10 | R1-2409630 | Discussion on CSI enhancements | Spreadtrum, UNISOC |
| 11 | R1-2409674 | Remaining issues on Rel-19 CSI enhancements | vivo |
| 12 | R1-2409747 | CSI enhancements for MIMO | Intel Corporation |
| 13 | R1-2409761 | CSI enhancements | Tejas Networks Limited |
| 14 | R1-2409793 | Views on R19 MIMO CSI enhancement | Apple |
| 15 | R1-2409851 | Discussion on CSI enhancements | NEC |
| 16 | R1-2409889 | Further discussion on Rel-19 MIMO CSI enhancements | Xiaomi |
| 17 | R1-2410657 | Views on NR MIMO CSI enhancements Phase 5 | CATT |
| 18 | R1-2409970 | Discussion on CSI enhancements | Lenovo |
| 19 | R1-2410040 | CSI enhancements | TCL |
| 20 | R1-2410054 | Discussion on Rel-19 CSI enhancements | Fujitsu |
| 21 | R1-2410109 | CSI enhancements for Rel-19 MIMO | OPPO |
| 22 | R1-2410154 | CSI Enhancement for NR MIMO | Google |
| 23 | R1-2410176 | Discussion on CSI enhancements | HONOR |
| 24 | R1-2410220 | Further views on CSI enhancements | Sony |
| 25 | R1-2410303 | Discussion on Open Issues of CSI Enhancement | Rakuten Mobile, Inc |
| 26 | R1-2410667 | CSI enhancement for NR MIMO Phase 5 | Nokia |
| 27 | R1-2410353 | Remaining issues on CSI enhancements for large antenna arrays and CJT | Ericsson |
| 28 | R1-2410382 | Discussion on CSI enhancements | NTT DOCOMO, INC., NTT CORPORATION |
| 29 | R1-2410436 | CSI enhancements | Sharp |
| 30 | R1-2410472 | CSI enhancements for >32 ports and UE-assisted CJT | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 31 | R1-2410549 | Discussion on CSI enhancements for NR MIMO Phase 5 | KDDI Corporation |
| 32 | R1-2410586 | Discussion on CSI enhancements | NICT |
|  |  |  |  |