Companies are to share their inputs on the excel spreadsheet in /tsg\_ran/WG1\_RL1/TSGR1\_106-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1.4/RRC/ herein.

## Inputs on initial version

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table

Table 1 Inputs: Initial version

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Samsung | We think that the RAN2 Parent IE for these two RRC parameters can be further discussed. * If the “N CMR pairs” are configured under CSI-ReportConfig, then the configuration for “Two CMR groups” in a NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet can be referred by two CSI-ReportConfigs with different CMR pairs configurations.
* If “SharingCMR” is configured under CSI-ReportConfig, then the configuration for “Two CMR groups” in a NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet can be referred by two CSI-ReportConfigs with different SharingCMR configurations.
 |
| Lenovo/MotM | **Sub-feature “CSI-FDD”**- Regarding the parameter “paramCombination-r17”, we prefer including a note regarding the possible inclusion of R within the parameter combination, due to the dependence of R value on M, e.g., for M=1 only R=1 should be supported. Hence, we suggest the following update to the description:“Field describes supported parameter combination represented by (alpha, Mv, beta, R) with K1 = alpha\*P, and R (if multiple R values are supported) for Rel-17 Type II PS codebook**Sub-feature “CSI-mTRP”**- We share similar views as Samsung on the RAN2 parent IE for “N CMR pairs” and “SharingCMR”. In our understanding, the decomposition of CMRs into two groups, as well as CMR sharing are features of the M-TRP CSI-ReportConfig and not the NZP CSI-RS resource set. Hence, the RAN2 parent IE should be further discussed, or at least deferred to RAN2 assessment. |
| Ericsson | We prefer to use valueOfN (or numberOfFDBases/Taps) instead of numberOfN  |
| Nokia/NSB | MTRPWe are ok with letting RAN2 decide whether the parent IE for “N CMR pairs” and “SharingCMR” should be CSI-ReportConfig or NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet. However, a solution where all 3 CMR-related parameters (“Two CMR groups”, “N CMR pairs” and “SharingCMR”) are in the same IE seems preferable for the association of the M+N CSI-IM resources in CSI-IM-ResourceSet to measurement hypotheses.FDDRegarding “paramCombination-r17” we prefer to maintain the current description as it reflects more accurately the agreement. Any additional dependence/restriction with P, R can be introduced in the text without changing the definition of this RRC parameter.**Agreement**Support parameter combinations represented by (alpha, Mv, beta) with K1 = alpha\*P for Rel-17 PS codebookOther comments on parameter names:For consistency with RAN2 naming convention we suggest the following modifications:* “sharedCMR” instead of “sharedCMR”
* “csi-ReportMode” instead of “csiReportMode”
* “numberOfCSI-ForMode1” instead of “nrofCSIForMode1”

For better clarity we also suggest:* To use “numberOfSingleTRP-CSI-ForMode1” because the number of CSIs in Mode 1 is actually X+1
* “windowSizeN” or “valueOfN” sounds better than “numberOfN” because the latter suggests there are multiple “Ns”
 |
| Huawei (Mod) | @ Samsung @ Lenovo @ Nokia: Two Parent IEs for “SharingCMR” and “N CMR pairs” are revised at TBD so that we can discuss further whether they are linked to reporting setting or resource settting.* From my perspective, I do agree that they shall be in the same parent IE. But whether they are under CSI-ReportConfig or NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet may have different impact over UE implementation and potential RAN1 spec limitations thereafter. Let us discuss further in RAN1.

@ Lenovo @Nokia: For paramCombination-r17 description, I have used the text from the agreement. However, to avoid further discussion, I have simplied text and we can further update descriptions thereafter. @Ericsson: Thanks for suggestions. RRC names are updated accordingly.@Nokia: Thanks for suggestions. RRC names are updated accordingly. @All: if possible, please be free to make further suggestions/comments over RRC fields of R17 CSI enhancements in RAN1 106bis tdocs, for example for those TBD or descritions. I can prepare some FL updates asap after tdoc submission.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Inputs on version 01

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table

....