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## Introduction

The scope given in the Rel-18 NR Evolved MIMO WID pertaining to CSI enhancement is as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Study, and if justified, specify CSI reporting enhancement for high/medium UE velocities by exploiting time-domain correlation/Doppler-domain information to assist DL precoding, targeting FR1, as follows:    * Rel-16/17 Type-II codebook refinement, without modification to the spatial and frequency domain basis    * UE reporting of time-domain channel properties measured via CSI-RS for tracking 2. Study, and if justified, specify enhancements of CSI acquisition for Coherent-JT targeting FR1 and up to 4 TRPs, assuming ideal backhaul and synchronization as well as the same number of antenna ports across TRPs, as follows:    1. Rel-16/17 Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP targeting FDD and its associated CSI reporting, taking into account throughput-overhead trade-off |

## Summary of companies’ views

### Issue 1: Type-II codebook refinement for CJT

Table 1A Summary: issue 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 1.1 | [110bis-e] **Agreement**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding W2 quantization group, for each layer:   * Support the following: (Alt1) One group comprises one polarization across all N CSI-RS resources (*C*group,phase=1, *C*group,amp=2)   + FFS: Amplitude quantization table enhancement   + For the amplitude group other than the group associated with the SCI, the reference amplitude is reported * Working assumption: Alt3 is supported in addition to Alt1 (to be confirmed in RAN1#111)   + (Alt3). One group comprises one polarization for one CSI-RS resource with a common phase reference across N CSI-RS resources (Cgroup,phase=1, Cgroup,amp=2N)     - For each of the (2N–1) amplitude groups (other than the group associated with the SCI), the reference amplitude is reported * If the support Alt3 in addition to Alt1 is confirmed, only one of the two schemes will be a basic feature for UEs supporting Rel-18 Type-II CJT codebook   **Proposal 1.A.1**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, *revert* the following working assumption:   * Working assumption: Alt3 is supported in addition to Alt1 (to be confirmed in RAN1#111)   + (Alt3). One group comprises one polarization for one CSI-RS resource with a common phase reference across N CSI-RS resources (Cgroup,phase=1, Cgroup,amp=2N)     - For each of the (2N–1) amplitude groups (other than the group associated with the SCI), the reference amplitude is reported   **FL Note**: Just as what we did in RAN1#110bis-e, this has to be decided based on empirical evidence (i.e. SLS results). Per agreement this needs to be concluded in this meeting. Since the WA was made conditioned upon the benefit of Alt3 over Alt1   * If there is no confirmed benefit from Alt3 over Alt1 in the alleged scenarios (inter-site CJT, 500m ISD), the WA should be **reverted** (hence no support of Alt3). * Otherwise, **confirmed** as an agreement.   The available SLS results are summarized as follows for the alleged “missing” scenarios from Alt3 proponents in RAN1#110bis-e (500m ISD or larger, inter-site CJT):   * “Notable” (small in FL perspective) gain: Huawei (2-3% mean UPT), ZTE (0.2-1.2% mean UPT) * No demonstrable gain: Samsung, vivo | **Support/fine (want to revert WA):** vivo, Samsung, OPPO, MediaTek, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Apple, DOCOMO, Intel, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Sharp, Google, Sony, AT&T  **Not support (want to confirm WA)**: ZTE, Spreadtrum, CATT, LG, Huawei/HiSi, Lenovo, Fujitsu, NEC, Xiaomi, |
| 1.2 | **Agreement**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, *for mode-1*, down select (in RAN1#112) only one from the following schemes   * Alt1. The use of per-CSI-RS-resource FD basis selection offset (relative to a reference CSI-RS resource) for independent FD basis selection across N CSI-RS resources.   + Example formulation: where is the FD basis selection offset for CSI-RS resource *n* relative to a reference CSI-RS resource with , and is commonly selected across N CSI-RS resources * Alt2. independently selected across N CSI-RS resources (without any per-CSI-RS-resource FD basis selection offset)   For all the above alternatives, the legacy FD basis selection indication scheme is applied on each selected FD basis.  Note: Per previous agreements, the number of selected FD basis vectors (Mv/pv or M) is gNB-configured via higher-layer signaling and common across the N CSI-RS resources  **Proposal 1.B.1**:  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, *for mode-1*, support the use of per-CSI-RS-resource FD basis selection offset (relative to a reference CSI-RS resource) for independent FD basis selection across *N* CSI-RS resources, i.e. (example formulation) where:   * is commonly selected across *N* CSI-RS resources * is the layer-common FD basis selection offset for CSI-RS resource *n* relative to a layer-common reference CSI-RS resource with   + Therefore, (*N* – 1) FD basis selection offset values are reported   + Basic feature:   + Optional feature: * FFS: UCI design details, details on   **FL Note**: This proposal has been discussed for 5 meetings. To break the stalemate between Alt1 and Alt2 for mode-1 advertised for inter-site CJT where ideal sync/backhaul is nowhere attainable (which is true):   * Based on the presented results, it is observed by the FL that the 2 alternatives perform closely to each other in UPT vs overhead even for inter-site CJT. * Adding the optional feature (fractional offset with o4x oversampling) is an attempt to maximize the commonality with mode-2 while giving more freedom on FD basis selection from Alt2 (a further compromise between Alt1 and Alt2 – **acceptable to the main proponents of Alt2**)   *It is noted all companies who provide SLS results show benefit on Alt1 including the optional feature of fractional offset.* | **Proposal 1.B.1:**   * **Support/fine:** Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, IDC, Samsung, Intel, Sony, Apple, AT&T, NTT DOCOMO, CMCC, Fujitsu (ok though not liking the optional), Google (ok though not liking the optional), MediaTek (ok though not liking the optional), OPPO (ok though not liking the optional), Qualcomm (ok though not liking the optional), NEC (ok though not liking the optional), Spreadtrum ok though not liking the optional), Xiaomi (basic only), vivo (basic only), LG (basic only), Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (discuss optional) * **Not support**: CATT   **Supporters of 1.B.1 who can accept only when the optional feature is included:** Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Samsung, |
| 1.3 | [112] **Agreement**  On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, support linkage between the list of supported {*Ln*} combinations and list of supported {*pv,*} combinations via pairing each combination for {*pv,*} with at least one combination for {*Ln*}, for each *NTRP* value.   * FFS (by RAN1#112bis-e): The exact list of supported pairs/linkage, or restriction of {*Ln*} when paired to each of {*pv,*} * FFS (by RAN1#112bis-e): Whether/How to support configuration signalling for indicating the linkage * Note: While no additional codebook parameter will be introduced, the total number of SD basis vectors across CSI-RS resources can still be used as a criterion for choosing the supported pairs/linkage   **Proposal 1.C.1**: On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, only the following linkages are supported (marked ‘x’), for Rel-16 eType-II based   * For *NTRP* =1,   + fully reuse seven out of the eight Parameter Combinations from Rel-16 eType-II as indicated in the table below     - FFS (by RAN1#112bis-e): whether to add one more Parameter Combination for L=4 based on the legacy Rel-16 eType-II FD combo {½, ½, ¼, ¼; ½} or the agreed FD combo {½, ½, ½, ½; ½}, or not to add from the indicated seven below * For *NTRP* >1, only the following linkages are supported (marked ‘x’) * Note: Configured linkage(s) are associated with the configured value of *NTRP*, regardless whether the dynamic TRP selection (the dynamic change of *N* given *NTRP*) is configured. Also, the configured linkage(s) are valid for any dynamically selected SD basis and/or any dynamically selected CSI-RS resource (TRP). * FFS: UE feature/capability to support only a subset of linkages  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **NTRP** | **SD combo** | **FD combo {pv},** | | | | | | | {1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ¼ | {1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ½ | {1/4, ¼, 1/8, 1/8}, ¼ | {1/4, ¼, 1/8, 1/8}, ½ | {1/4, ¼, ¼, ¼}, ¾ | {1/2, ½, ½, ½}, ½ | | 1 | 2 |  |  | x | x |  |  | | 4 |  |  | x | x | x |  | | 6 w/ restriction |  |  |  | x | x |  | | 2 | {2,2} | x |  |  |  |  |  | | {2,4}  {4,2} | x |  |  |  |  |  | | {4,4} |  | x |  | x |  | x | | 3 | {2,2,2} | x | x |  |  |  |  | | {2,2,4}  {2,4,2}  {4,2,2} | x | x |  |  |  |  | | {4,4,4} | x | x | x | x | x | x | | 4 | {2,2,2,2} | x |  |  |  |  | N/A | | {2,2,2,4} | x |  |  |  |  | N/A | | {2,2,4,4} |  |  |  | x | x | N/A | | {4,4,4,4} |  | x |  | x | x | N/A |   **Proposal 1.C.1**:   * **Support/fine:** ZTE, Samsung, vivo, Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, AT&T, NTT DOCOMO, MediaTek, Intel, Google, NEC, CATT, CMCC, IDC, * **Not support**:   **FL Note 1**: The issue re FD combo and SD combo signaling/configuration in relation to linkages will be discussed in **later rounds** as a part of the following FFS. It is **NOT** in the scope of the above proposal.  FFS (by RAN1#112bis-e): Whether/How to support configuration signalling for indicating the linkage  **FL Note 2**: This proposal was discussed offline [1]. Below is the summary for companies who provided SLS results   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **NTRP** | **SD combo** | **FD combo {pv},** | | | | | | | {1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ¼ | {1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ½ | {1/4, ¼, 1/8, 1/8}, ¼ | {1/4, ¼, 1/8, 1/8}, ½ | {1/4, ¼, ¼, ¼}, ¾ | {1/2, ½, ½, ½}, ½ | | 2 | {2,2} | SS, HW | ZTE |  | ZTE |  |  | | {2,4}  {4,2} | SS, HW | HW |  |  | HW |  | | {4,4} | SS | SS, ZTE,  HW |  | SS, ZTE,  HW | SS | SS, ZTE, HW | | 3 | {2,2,2} | SS, HW, Ericsson, Nokia | ZTE, Ericsson, Nokia |  | ZTE | ZTE |  | | {2,2,4}  {2,4,2}  {4,2,2} | SS, HW | SS,  HW, Nokia | Nokia | HW, Nokia | HW | Nokia | | {4,4,4} | SS, Ericsson, Nokia | SS, ZTE, HW | Ericsson, Nokia | SS, ZTE, HW, Ericsson | SS, HW, Ericsson | SS, ZTE, Ericsson | | 4 | {2,2,2,2} | SS, ZTE, HW | ZTE |  | ZTE |  | N/A | | {2,2,2,4} | SS, HW | HW |  | SS | SS | N/A | | {2,2,4,4} |  | SS | HW | SS, HW | SS, HW | N/A | | {4,4,4,4} |  | SS, ZTE |  | ZTE, HW | SS, ZTE | N/A | | |
| **Proposal 1.C.3**: On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, for Rel-17 FeType-II based,   * Regarding the combinations {M, beta}, it is proposed to reuse the legacy as below, with restriction on M=2.  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **M** | **** | **Condition** | | 1 | ½ |  | | ¾ |  | | 1 |  | | 2 | ½ | N\_trp<=3, N\_L=1 | | ¾ | N\_trp<=3, N\_L=1 |  * Alpha\_n combinations for are derived from the Ln combinations for Rel-16 based refinement, where each entry in the combination is the nearest value of min{1, 2Ln/Pcsi-rs} to {1/2, ¾, 1}, .   + Note: no other dependency of combinations is introduced, such as dependency on Pcsi-rs.   + FFS: pruning on combinations   **Proposal 1.C.3**:   * **Support/fine:** Huawei/HiSi, Samsung, Nokia/NSB (but remove restriction N\_trp<=3, N\_L=1), CMCC, * **Not support**: | |
| [112] **Agreement**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, for Rel-16-based refinement, support *at least* the following combinations of {*Ln*} for the higher-layer-configured value of NTRP:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **NTRP** | **{Ln} combination** | | 1 | {2} | | {4} | | {6} (analogous to legacy, only for total # ports =32, rank 1-2, R=1) | | 2 | {2,2} | | {2,4}, {4,2} | | {4,4} | | 3 | {2,2,2} | | {2,2,4}, {2,4,2}, {4,2,2} | | {4,4,4} | | 4 | {2,2,2,2} | | {2,2,2,4} | | {2,2,4,4} | | {4,4,4,4} |   FFS: For *NTRP*>1, in addition to the supported combinations/permutations, whether to support at least one additional combination where at least one of the *Ln* values (*n*=1, …, *NTRP*) is 6  **Please share your view on adding another SD combination which includes at least one Ln=6.**   * **Support/fine:** Huawei/HiSi, NTT DOCOMO (when N=1), ZTE, NEC (when N=1), CATT, CMCC (when N=1) , vivo (as long as Ltot≤16) * **Not support/concern:** Samsung, Apple, MediaTek, LG, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Qualcomm, Intel, Xiaomi, AT&T, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Lenovo/MotM, Sony, Sharp, [Google]   **FL Note**: This was discussed offline [1]. | |
| 1.4 | [112] **Agreement**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding CBSR, at least for restricting SD basis selection, the legacy CBSR scheme is fully reused for each of the RRC-configured NTRP CSI-RS resources (resulting in CSI-RS-resource-specific SD beam group restriction)   * FFS: Whether amplitude restriction is CSI-RS-resource-common or specific, and soft vs hard restriction * FFS: Whether CBSR can be configured to be off for a CSI-RS resource   The same rank restriction is applied across NTRP CSI-RS resources  **Proposal 1.D.1:** On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding CBSR, amplitude restriction is CSI-RS-resource-specific.   * FFS: Whether CBSR is always configured for each CSI-RS resource or not   **Conclusion 1.D.2:** On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding CBSR for NTRP>1, there is no consensus in supporting the additional optional soft amplitude restriction. Therefore, only hard amplitude restriction (per CSI-RS resource, based on the legacy design) is supported.  **FL Note**: The proposal and conclusion were made based on the views below.  Note that the conclusion (1.D.2) is based on the fact/reality that there is no consensus hence the implication follows whether one can accept (cope with) reality (that no consensus means no support) or not.  **Amplitude restriction:**   * **Resource-common:** Apple**,** NTT DOCOMO (1st), MediaTek, Lenovo/MotM (Mode-2) * **Resource-specific:** Huawei/HiSi, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO (2nd), ZTE, Ericsson, Lenovo/MotM (Mode-1), NEC, CATT, Nokia/NSB, CMCC   **Amplitude restriction:**   * **Soft (optional per legacy):** Huawei/HiSi, Lenovo/MotM, Samsung, MediaTek (2nd), NEC, NTT DOCOMO,ZTE, Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB, * **Hard—only:** vivo, Intel, Xiaomi, Apple, Qualcomm, Ericsson, MediaTek (1st), OPPO   **No CBSR config option per resource?**   * **Yes:** Huawei/HiSi, NEC, Nokia/NSB * **No:** | **Proposal 1.D.1:**   * **Support/fine:** Huawei/HiSi, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO (2nd), ZTE, Ericsson, Lenovo/MotM, NEC, CATT, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, MediaTek (ok), LG * **Not support:** |
| 1.5 | [112] **Agreement**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding UCI omission, down-select between the following three alternatives (by RAN1#112-bis where n denotes the n-th CSI-RS resource):   * Alt1. Prio(,l,m,n)=() .N.RI.P(m)+N.RI.l(n)+N.n   + Note: This implies that CSI-RS resource is designated the highest priority * Alt2. Prio(,l,m,n)=2L’.Q(n).RI.N3+2L’.RI. P(m)+RI.l(n)+   + Note: This implies that CSI-RS resource is designated the lowest priority (after FD basis)   + Note: L’ denotes the max value of Ln from all selected N CSI-RS resources   + FFS: Q(n) maps the index n according to a rule, e.g., Q(n)=n, or Q(n)=0 if n corresponds to strongest TRP/SCI. * Alt3. Replace SD basis index *l* in legacy Prio calculation with , i.e., SD basis index over all resources: Prio(,l,m,n) = 2Ltot.RI.P(m)+ RI.+RI.l(n)+   FFS: FD permutation P(.) as Rel-16-analogous, or no permutation i.e. P(m)=m  **Proposal 1.E.1**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding UCI omission, support reusing the legacy UCI omission mechanism while (Alt3) replacing SD basis index *l* in legacy Prio calculation with , i.e., SD basis index over all resources: Prio(,l,m,n) = 2Ltot.RI.P(m)+ RI.+RI.l(n)+   * FFS: FD permutation P(.) as Rel-16-analogous, or no permutation i.e. P(m)=m   **FL Note**: This was discussed offline [1].   * Alt2 and Alt3 are almost equally supported * Based on the available SLS results, Alt2 results in larger performance loss over Alt3 upon UCI overflow * Alt2 opponents argue that since UE reporting of dynamic TRP selection is already supported, truncating CJT reporting to sTRP in case of UCI overflow is overkill and leaves NW with the least CSI for CJT operation (which is technically valid)   Alt1: Samsung, NTT DOCOMO (2nd), *Apple*, MediaTek, Nokia/NSB (2nd), *IDC*  Alt2: *ZTE, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI*, NEC, vivo (2nd), *Spreadtrum, OPPO, Qualcomm, CATT*, *Huawei/HiSi, Fujitsu*, Ericsson (2nd), *CMCC, Lenovo, Sony*  [1.E.1] Alt3: Samsung (2nd), NTT DOCOMO, MediaTek (2nd), LG, NEC (2nd), vivo, Intel, Xiaomi, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Google | **Proposal 1.E.1:**   * **Support/fine:** Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, MediaTek (P=m), LG, NEC, vivo, Intel, Xiaomi, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Google, AT&T, ZTE (ok, 2nd pref though 1st pref is Alt2), OPPO, Qualcomm (P=m), CMCC, IDC * **Not support (want Alt2)**: Huawei/HiSi, Spreadtrum, CATT, Lenovo/MotM, Fujitsu, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, |
| 1.6 | Next-level (pre-maintenance) details:   * Additional restrictions to K>1 CSI-RS resources (CMR), e.g. same slot, same RBs, adjacent slots, same DRX active window * Interference measurement (IMR) assumption for CSI calculation: one or multiple IMRs * PDSCH EPRE assumption for CQI calculation (which CSI-RS resource) * CPU allocation * Necessary of port indexing across CSI-RS resources * Configuration of (N1,N2) relative to per-resource CBSR (can be handled by RAN2, alternatively) | |

Table 1B Type II CJT: summary of observation from SLS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **SLS results** | | |
| **Issue #** | **Metric** | **Observation** |
| Huawei/HiSi | 1.1 | Mean UPT gain vs overhead | Observation 9: For inter-site CJT with large inter-site distance, Alt 3 (Cgroup,amp=2N) has better performance compared to Alt1 (Cgroup,amp=2). |
| 1.2 | Mean UPT gain vs overhead,  5% UPT gain vs overhead, | Observation 2: Regarding Alt1 for mode1, layer-specific FD offset with oversampling (over sampling factor 4) outperforms that w/o oversampling with 2~3% edge UPT gain, which has similar performance to Alt2.  Observation 3: Layer-specific offset (oversampling factor 4) has ~1% mean UPT gain and 3~5% edge UPT gain compared to layer-common offset (oversampling factor 4).  Observation 4: Both Alt2 and Alt 1 with layer-specific and oversampled FD offset outperforms mode2 (TRP-common Wf) with 2~3% mean UPT gain and 8~12% edge UPT gain. |
| 1.3 | Mean UPT gain vs overhead | For {Ln} combinations where each Ln equals 2, adding overhead by increasing pv and/or beta (such as {pv, beta} combo #3~#6) has no significant performance improvement compared with other {Ln} combinations.  For a given NTRP, the {Ln} combinations with at least one Ln=4 have similar performance-overhead tradeoff. It may be hard to select some of the pairs. Therefore, it is more reasonable to configure {Ln} and {pv, beta} pairs based on gNB implementation other than predefined pairs/linkage.  Observation 6: For {Ln} combinations where each Ln equals 2, adding overhead by increasing pv and/or beta has no significant performance improvement.  Observation 7: The uneven {Ln} combination and its permutations with the same Ltot (such as {2,2,4},{2,4,2}, {4,2,2}) should be treated as one combination, due to the same overhead and performance with proper gNB configuration.  Observation 8: Adding {Ln} combinations including Ln=6 does not increase the overhead and UE complexity as long as Ltot does not exceed the current maximum Ltot value, and can increase performance. |
| Others  (Rel-17 ParaComb) | Mean UPT gain vs overhead | As shown in Figure 7 for NTRP=3, it can be observed that {1, 1, 1} can be replaced by {1/2, 1, 1} and {1/2, ¾, 1} to achieve better performance. For NTRP=4 in Figure 8, {3/4,1,1,1} and {1/2, ½,3/4,1} outperforms {1,1,1,1} and {1/2, ½, ½, 1} respectively at performance-overhead trade-off. |
| Others (Rx info) | Mean UPT gain vs overhead,  5% UPT gain vs overhead, | Observation 11: The full channel feedback for CJT codebook by per-RX reporting can provide 5~10% gain for mean UPT and 18~35% gain for 5% UPT respectively. |
| ZTE | 1.1 | Avg UPT gain vs overhead,  5% UPT gain vs overhead | We observe that 0.2%~1.2% average UPT gain and 2.2%~12.1% cell-edge UE gain can be achieved using Alt 3 compared with Alt1. |
| 1.2 | Avg UPT gain vs overhead | In the case of TRP-common q3 for both, the average and cell-edge UPT gains of Alt2 over Alt1 can be observed while considering report overhead.  While introducing TRP-specific q3 (fractional) for Alt1, there are some performance gains and then performance gap over Alt2 can be reduced. |
| 1.3 | Avg UPT gain vs overhead | Ln=6 combination pairs for NTRP=2/3 can also show good performance under medium & high overhead; then considering the CSI report overhead is still acceptable, we prefer to have them as in the candidate list for SD-basis.  Then, clearly, pv = {1/2,1/2} combined with Ln={4,6} can provide good performance under medium & high overhead. |
| 1.5 | Avg UPT gain | That can be observed that, if going with Alt-2, n (n-th CSI-RS resource) should be taken as the most significant parameter (after FD basis), that is, fall-back to less co-ordinated TRP(s). That is beneficial for releasing some TRPs for serving other Ues, which is the reason why we observe some performance benefits for that. |
| Vivo | 1.1 | SE gain vs overhead | Alt3 shows negligible performance improvement over Alt1 for the scenario with 500m ISD and the high payload case of the scenario with 200m ISD.    Combining the payload and the SE gain, Alt1 outperforms Alt 3. |
| 1.2 | SE gain vs overhead | Alt 1 has slightly lower performance compared to Alt2, especially in the high-payload region.  Performance difference among the alternatives is small.  Layer-common Alt 1 has slightly lower performance compared to layer-specific Alt 1.  No considerable performance gain can be observed by introducing O3 for Alt 1 Wf selection in Mode 1. |
| Others (on R) | SE gain vs overhead | Some performance gains can be obtained for a larger *R*. However, there is a large increase on PMI payload as well. The performance-overhead curve of R=4 is not superior over R=2. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | 1.2 | Throughput gain and overhead | For inter-site scenarios, as the FD bases of the cooperating TRPs are not identical, selecting independent FD basis for all TRPs as in Alt 2 results in a best throughput-overhead trade-off compared to Alt 1. |
| Nokia/NSB | 1.2 | Throughput gain | In terms of throughput performance, Alt 1 shows about 1.3% and 3.5% gain in mean and cell edge throughput, respectively, over Alt 2, when using integer offsets, *i.e.*, no oversampling. This gain increases significantly with fractional offsets, *i.e.*, with oversampling, and is about 19% and 47% in mean and cell edge throughput, respectively, with an oversampling factor . |
| 1.3 | Average UPT gain vs mean overhead | We observe that for , the combination(s) with a single achieves most of the UPT gain of the combination with ,, but with smaller overhead and complexity.  For , we note that, with 16 ports per TRP, the combinations with achieve similar UPT-overhead trade-off as with . Therefore, we propose to keep the same restrictions and supported combinations as for Rel16, with applicable only for 32 ports. |
| Samsung | 1.1 | Average UPT gain vs overhead | There is no benefit of Alt3 over Alt1 shown in our SLS results for both mode 1 and mode 2 cases even in the inter-site inter-cell scenarios. |
| 1.2 | Average UPT gain vs overhead | Mode 1 with Alt 2 per-TRP SVD (the advocated lower complexity benefit for Alt2) incurs ~4% UPT loss (for the same PMI overhead) over Mode 2.  Overall, Mode 2 and Mode 1 with Alt 1 and Alt 2 using joint-SVD operation yield similar performance.  Mode 1 with Alt 2 needs additional UE processing to find per-TRP FD basis vectors for the case of joint-SVD operation, compared to Mode 2 or Mode 1 with Alt 1 – thereby resulting in higher UE complexity.  With TRP-common , Mode 1 Alt1 performs slightly better than Alt2, and Mode 1 Alt 1 and Mode 2 perform similarly.  With TRP-specific (additional spec impact to be needed), the performance of the both Mode 1 Alt1 and Alt2 can be improved and they yield a small gain (~2% average UPT gain) over Mode 2. Regardless, Mode1 Alt1 and Alt2 perform similarly. |
| 1.3 | Average UPT gain vs overhead | We support the offline proposal 1.C.1 as we have verified that the selected linkages yield good performance overall compared to other linkages and the overhead of them are well uniformly-spaced. |
| 1.5 | Average UPT loss w.r.t. paraComb | UCI omission with Alt3 is more beneficial than Alt2 in CJT operation. |
| MediaTek | 1.1 | Average UPT gain vs different paraComb | We observe that Alt 3 cannot provide consistent performance benefit over Alt 1. Further, the cost of this little performance benefit must be borne by the increased overhead of feeding back multiple reference amplitudes. Therefore, supporting quantization Alt 3 is not necessary. |
| 1.2 | Average UPT gain vs overhead | FD bases selection Alt 1 does not provide any performance benefit over Mode 2 at low to medium ISDs but provides 2~3 % average UPT gain at high ISD scenarios.  FD bases selection Alt 2 does not provide any performance benefit over Alt 1 at low to medium ISDs but provides 1~2 % average UPT gain at high ISD scenarios. |
| Ericsson | 1.2 | Average and cell-edge UPT vs overhead | The performance of Alt 1 depends on the oversampling factor for . In general, Alt.1 with provides higher throughput comparing to Alt 2. Also, the throughput difference between Alt 1 with and Alt 2 is quite small (~0-2%), except for where the difference at cell edge can be slightly larger. Given that Alt 1 has a lower overhead and lower specification impact, Alt 1 is preferred. In addition, *Alt.1 with*  seems to provide better performance gain |
| 1.3 | Average and cell-edge UPT vs overhead | Evaluated the performance of the six combinations with and for three TRPs. For , only combinations #1 and #2 may be supported, while for , all 6 combinations of may be supported. |

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your inputs on each of the issues and, if applicable, proposals in TABLE 1A** |
| Mod V3 | Small update on 1.C.1 based on offline input from Nokia and Samsung |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.B.1**  We can be OK with the proposal.  On more detail aspect for the range of :  In our view, a subset of the alphabet (e.g. a window) should be sufficient, since the delay difference across TRPs ignaling for CJT operation should not be large. This can be beneficial because the size of alphabet can be reduced (implying overhead can be reduced) especially when is large. Furthermore, for the case of Rel-17 based CJT codebook, the gNB performs beamforming (for delay compensation or channel shortening) on CSI-RS ports, where the beamforming can be designed to compensate for delay difference across TRPs assuming FDD partial reciprocity. In this case, the window size can be very small (e.g. around 4).  **Proposal 1.C.1**  Support.  We have serious concern on including for due to 1) the high UE processing complexity, and 2) worse performance than other combination using under a same Ltot constraint that we have observed in our SLS results.  **Proposal 1.E.1**  Support. No need to over-optimize for UCI omission that rarely happens, with a complicated solution such as Alt 2, which even performs worse than Alt 3 in our SLS evaluations. |
| Mod V7 | **No change** |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 1.B.1**:  We support the basic feature proposed in FL Proposal 1.B.1. We do not believe the optional feature of reporting fractional FD basis selection offset, i.e., . The issues we see with reporting reporting fractional FD basis selection offset are two-fold, 1) the significant UE computational complexity it introduces and 2) the reporting overhead needed, this is while the performance benefits of this feature seem to be limited. However, we are open to discussions if the companies in favor of this optional feature can help clarify how the two main issues raised here can be addressed specifically for larger values can be addressed.  **Proposal 1.C.1**:  Support.  Similar to Samsung we have strong concern on introducing for mainly due to the high UE processing complexity.  **Proposal 1.E.1:**  Fine, even though our first preference is Alt 1 we are fine with supporting Alt 3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Many thanks for the proposals and discussion on Rel-16 parameter combinations.  For rel-17 parameter combinations, the following is proposed for companies’ checking.   * For combinations {M, beta}, it is proposed to reuse the legacy as below, with restriction on M=2.  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **M** | **** |  | | 1 | ½ |  | | ¾ |  | | 1 |  | | 2 | ½ | N\_trp<=3, N\_L=1 | | ¾ | N\_trp<=3, N\_L=1 |  * For {alpha\_n} combinations, to simply the discussion, regarding the following FFS, it’s proposed to derive the {alpha\_n} combinations from Rel-16 {Ln} combinations we have agreed.   *FFS (by RAN1#112bis-e): Whether/how the supported combinations of {n} for Rel-17-based refinement are derived from the supported combinations of {Ln} for Rel-16-based refinement*  Proposal: Alpha\_n combinations for are derived from the Ln combinations for Rel-16 based refinement, where each entry in the combination is the nearest value of min{1, 2Ln/Pcsi-rs} to {1/2, ¾, 1}, .   * + Note: no other dependency of combinations is introduced, such as dependency on Pcsi-rs.   + FFS: pruning on combinations   **[Mod: Thanks, added as proposal 1.C.3]** |
| vivo | **Proposal 1.B.1**  We support the basic feature and have similar concern as MTK on having this optional feature (fractional offset) due to its high complexity. Further, its benefit is also not clear based on multiple companies’ evaluations including vivo’s. We also agree with MTK this issue is more serious for large N3 cases. At least for larger N3 values, we should seriously consider its burden to UE vendors.  **Proposal 1.C.1**  For NTRP=1, it is a same codebook as legacy Rel-16. Hence if we introduce a different codebook parameter for NTRP=1, it generally means we enhance the legacy codebook regardless of whether it is CJT scenario or not. We don’t support to revise legacy codebook parameters for NTRP=1.  [Mod: This will be discussed later in FFS once 1.C.1 is agreed. Your view seems to be the majority but there are companies having a different proposal. So we can address in later rounds.] |
| ZTE | **Proposal 1.A.1**  Regarding the WA, Alt3 should be supported in addition to Alt1 based on our evaluation result.  **Proposal 1.B.1**  We are fine with Proposal 1.B.1 as a compromise. From the transmission performance perspective, we have the following observations in our contribution:   * While introducing TRP-specific q3 (fractional) for Alt1, there are some performance gains and then performance gap over Alt2 can be reduced.   Therefore, we are open to further consider to indicate TRP-specific oversampling factor for FD bases in CSI report, in order to further handle a large delay difference for different TRP(s).  BTW, regarding the range of : we think the current suggestion from (e.g., from 0 to N3-1) the FL looks good as a general solution. In eTypeII, since we may not have TRP-indicator for reference TRP, when a given TRP is assumed as a reference, the positive or negative/opposite offset may be both possible. Our evaluation is based on the general range. Then, the bit overhead of FD-basis selection has been well saved, and considering that this parameter is just TRP-specific and layer-common. But, for R17-FeTypeII, we may be flexible.  **Proposal 1.C.1**  For NTRP=1, we suggest to add one more Parameter Combination for L=4 based on the agreed FD combo {½, ½, ½, ½; ½}, since it shows good performance in our simulation results. That can be assumed to replace the legacy FD combo {{½, ½, ¼ , ¼; ½}  In addition, we support new Ln=6 combinations for NTRP > 1, and some comparison results can be found in our simulation results. It is observed that there is a clear performance gain if having Ln=6 for NTRP > 1. As a compromise, we may consider NTRP={2, 3} as a starting point. Then, the following combination should be considered:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **NTRP** | **SD combo** | **FD combo {pv},** | | | | | | | {1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ¼ | {1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ½ | {1/4, ¼, 1/8, 1/8}, ¼ | {1/4, ¼, 1/8, 1/8}, ½ | {1/4, ¼, ¼, ¼}, ¾ | {1/2, ½, ½, ½}, ½ | | 2 | {6,6} |  | X |  | X |  | X | | 3 | {6,6,6} |  | X |  | X |  | X |   [Mod: We will address the above in later rounds]  **Issue 1.4**  Our views are added. Regarding CBSR on the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, we support to impose soft amplitude restriction based on specific resource, i.e., N CBSRs corresponding to N TRPs should be supported as a starting point. Since there are different channel conditions for different TRPs, the solution of N CBSRs per TRP can select the codewords for avoiding severe interference and impose restriction. In addition, for Rel-17 NCJT CSI, CBSR configuration is per TRP. In addition, we are not clear about no CBSR config option per resource, which needs further clarification.  **Proposal 1.E.1**  We support Alt2. In our understanding, once one information of a TRP is dropped as suggested in Alt2, it is natural for gNB to release one TRP for serving other Ues. The evaluation results can be found in our contribution.  **Issue 1.6:** Regarding the next level issues, we have the initial thoughts as follows:   * + Regarding additional restrictions on NZP CSI-RS resources, K NZP CSI-RS resources in the resource set can follow the specification in Rel-17 NCJT CSI, e.g., for Rel-17 NCJT with 2 TRPs, a pair of NZP CSI-RSs is required to be within at most 2 consecutive slots. For Rel-18 CJT, to our understanding, K NZP CSI-RS resources may be too much to be contained in the same slot, hence adjacent slots may be also applicable. Therefore, we suggest to reuse the specification in Rel-17 NCJT CSI.   + Regarding interference measurement (IMR) assumption for CSI calculation, we may use the legacy rule of K NZP-IMR for K CMRs, but for ZP-IMR, we think a single ZP-IMR is sufficient.   + Regarding PDSCH EPRE assumption for CQI calculation, the power offset of CSI-RS and PDSCH should be considered. Considering different TRP has different power boosting of CSI-RS and different MU scheduling scheme, the CJT CQI should be based on N power offsets between CSI-RS and PDSCH. Each of the N power offsets corresponds to one of N TRPs is power ratio between one CSI-RS resource and PDSCH corresponding to the ports of the one CSI-RS resource.   + Regarding CPU allocation, we think that it may be relevant to N (then a dedicated UE capability ignaling is also open to us). |
| Ericsson | On **Issue 1.4**, we support resource-specific amplitude restriction.  On **Proposal 1.B.1**, we support to keep the optional feature. While we understand the complexity issue raised by some companies, based on our results, the fractional offset with o4x oversampling is needed to get better performance-overhead tradeoff than Mode Alt 2. See our results below. |
| NTT DOCOMO | On Issue 1.4, we support the soft restriction. Regarding resource-common or resource-specific amplitude restriction, although we showed support of resource-common restriction in the contribution, we’re also okay to support resource-specific restriction. Our view is added in the table above.  On Proposal 1.B.1, for the range of , we think the basic range is sufficient. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 1.B.1**.  We support the current proposal including the optional feature. Regarding the complexity issue, the fact that the fractional offset is proposed as optional is already a compromise to address these complexity concerns. Besides, the complexity burden in this case does not look as clear as, for example, in the case R=4. The offset is layer-common so it can be calculated by estimating a delay before layer-extraction and FD compression, in which case complexity is independent of . However, we understand there may be different implementations with different complexity costs, hence the compromise proposal of having the fractional offset as optional.  Regarding the extra overhead issue with the fractional offset, because the oversampling factor is 4 and the indication is layer-common, there are 2(N-1) extra bits compared to the basic feature, which is just 6 bits in the worst case of . Ours and other companies’ results show a clear benefit in throughput-OH tradeoff. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1.B.1**:  Though our preference is Alt.2, we can accept the proposal if most companies support it. However, regarding the value of , we don’t think both the basic feature and optional feature are needed to be supported. Oversampling would introduce additional complexity and overhead issue, and we think the basic feature is sufficient.  **Proposal 1.C.1**:  For *NTRP* =1, we don’t think any new combination in addition to legacy parameter combination is needed, which is not related to CJT transmission.  [Mod: Please check my comment for vivo and ZTE, we will discuss in later rounds]  **Issue 1.4:**  For amplitude restriction, we support hard restriction only.  **Proposal 1.E.1**:  We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | **Proposal 1.B.1:**  Making fractional rotation factor values as optional seems to have a little impact on the UE implementation.   1. The total PMI search complexity increase due to increased oversampling factor is not significant. 2. Number of bits required to indication of the rotation factor is not significant (2 bits per TRP). 3. Depending on RAN4 tests, UE can implement only integer rotation factor values search even if fractional values can be reported. UE can do decision on whether to consider the oversampling factor dynamically depending on CSI load (e.g., number of occupied CPUs) and timing constraints for the report.   So, we support only for mode-1 considering the above points.  **Proposal 1.C.1**  If linkage for {Ln} and {pv, beta} is introduce, we would like to clarify in the proposal if configuration of {pv,beta} per {Ln} combination for NL > 1 is supported or not. For example, the following note can be added.  Note: If multiple {Ln} combinations are configured, it is assumed that the configured {pv, beta} is applied to all the {Ln} combinations and all the {Ln} combinations shall support the configured {pv, beta} combination.  **[Mod: Per previous agreement, this is indeed the case in my understanding. But since there are companies proposing to go beyond the agreement, i.e. configuring multiple (pv,beta) we will discuss this in the next round once 1.c.1 is agreed. This is related to the 2nd FFS re linkage signalling]** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon V17 | **Issue 1.2**  Even though we prefer to layer-specific offset for Alt1 which can bring performance gain over layer-common case based on our SLS results in our tdoc, we are fine with **Proposal 1.B.1** as a compromise.  Regarding the range of for Rel-16-based enhancement, we believe the range in current FL’s proposal is needed considering the delay differences for various CJT scenario. Regarding the UE complexity, it’s worth to have a bit more complexity considering the performance improvement by fractional q3 shown by some companies’ evaluations. And it has been an optional feature to address the increased complexity. Regarding the overhead, since is layer-common and only need to be reported for N-1 TRPs, the overhead is minimal, only two bits increase compared to basic feature per TRP.  **Issue 1.3**   * We are fine with the supported linkages in **Proposal 1.C.1**. Re **Proposal 1.C.1**, we think below statement should be removed since the definitions of both Ln and M are different for Rel-16 and Rel-17 Type-II. For Rel-17-based enhancement, please refer to the proposal we have suggested in the previous comments.   + ~~For Rel-17 FeType-II based, fully reuse the eight Parameter Combinations from Rel-16 eType-II~~   [Mod: Good point since I also added proposal 1.C.3 for Rel-17, thanks for the catch]   * In addition, we support to add {Ln} combinations including Ln=6 for NTRP>1, i.e. {6,4}, {6,4,2} And {6,4,2}, which can achieve a better performance-overhead trade-off, and Ln=6 for single-TRP can also be used when UE selects one single TRP analogous to legacy Rel-16 Type II. Regarding the concern on high overhead and complexity, it is which affects the reporting overheads and UE complexity, other than the specific value of Ln. For example, {6,4,2} with *Ltot* = 12 can have similar NZCs reporting overhead and UE complexity as {4,4,4} with *Ltot* =12.      * On the FFS of for N\_TRP=1, we are supportive of L=4 based on the agreed FD combo {½, ½, ½, ½; ½}, as there has been one spare state in RRC signalling, it can be used for better flexibility and performance.   **[Mod: We will address those two points in later rounds]**    **Issue 1.4**  We support CSI-RS-resource-specific and soft CBSR analogous legacy Rel-16. The SD properties of different TRPs are different, even for co-located TRP with different oriented-boresights, so TRP-common amplitude restriction is unreasonable. And we support that CBSR can be off for a certain CSI-RS resource, since some TRPs may not have strong interference to adjacent TRPs, gNB should be allowed to not configure CBSR for such TRPs.  **Issue 1.5**  We support Alt2. As for CJT, the dimension of spatial domain or #antenna is increased, with the same number of UCI reporting, Alt 2 can have better precision/resolution in UCI reporting. As a result, for Alt1/3, imprecise PMI for multi-TRP channel may not achieve enough CJT benefits, and may even has a performance worse than single TRP. While Alt 2 can guarantee that the performance is better than single-TRP. |
| Fujitsu | **Proposal 1.B.1**:  Support the proposal in principle. On , we have similar views with MTK, vivo, DoCoMo and OPPO that the basic feature is sufficient.  **Issue 1.4:**  Regarding amplitude restriction, we also prefer hard restriction only.  **Proposal 1.E.1**:  We share the similar views with Huawei that Alt 2 is preferred for both CJT(NTRP>1) and single TRP(NTRP=1) scenarios.  **Issue 1.6:**  Regarding the next level issues for CQI calculation, we are fine with ZTE’s views that TRP-specific Pc ratio is one of solutions for CJT measurement hypothesis. However, TRP- specific Pc ratios might increase computational complexity and specs influence. Hence, another solution for separate Pc ratio for CJT can also be considered. For this solution, the definition of CSI-RS ports and PDSCH ports is consistent when the CMR is from one TRP and PDSCH ports are also from that TRP. Furthermore, the Pc ratio definition for Rel-17 NCJT can also be reused for CJT, which can reduce specs influence.  In addition, CSI reference resource definition also should be studied and discussed. In Rel-15/16 S-TRP, the UE should assume that PDSCH signals on antenna ports for ν layers would result in signals equivalent to corresponding CSI-RS, as given by  where  is a vector of PDSCH symbols and *v* is the number of PDSCH transmission layers, P is the number of CSI-RS ports and *W(i)* is the precoding matrix.  However, for Rel-18 CJT transmission, K CMRs in one resource set are transmitted from K TRP respectively while total PDSCH ports are from both TRPs. Thus, the current association with CSI-RS ports and PDSCH ports is not suitable for CJT measurement hypothesis, the enhancement for CSI reference resource definition for CJT measurement hypothesis should be discussed independently, and the dimensions on precoder or CSI-RS resource need to be further studied. |
| Mod V21 | **Minor revision on proposal 1.C.1 (wording only) and added proposal 1.C.3 for Rel-17 based** |
| Lenovo / MotM | **Issue 1.1:**  Support confirming the WA  **Issue 1.3:**  Do not support L=6  **Issue 1.4:**  Our preference is to support TRP-specific CBSR for Mode 1 for inter-site CJT, whereas for Mode 2, a common CBSR can be supported for all TRPs |
| Google | Proposal 1.A.1: Support  Proposal 1.B.1: We have concern on introducing the optional feature. We are not sure whether there is any performance benefit or not.  [Mod: Please check Table 1B and the respective Tdocs where all companies that provide SLS show the benefit of the fractional FD offset]  Proposal 1.C.1: Support  Proposal 1.E.1: Support |
| NEC | **Proposal 1.B.1**:  We prefer Alt 2, actually we think Alt 2 should be the basic feature per previous agreement on introducing Mode-1 if no further agreements achieved, while if majority companies support Alt 1 as basic feature, we are fine, then can we list Alt 2 as another optional feature or instead of oversampling?  [Mod: Sorry but this is already a compromise for the Alt2 proponents such as Huawei, ZTE etc. I note NEC as “fine” but for basic feature only. But no Alt2.]  **Proposal 1.C.1**:  Fine with the proposal.  And one thing we would like to clarify is whether NL combinations should correspond to a same value of NTRP or not?  In additional, we think the configuration/determination of SD combo and linkage with FD combo should be further discussed.  One example case is based on current supported values for SD (without L=6 if NTRP>1) and FD combo, in case of TRP selection with N=1, whether L=6 is still possible to be selected?  Another case is if FD combo corresponding to SD combo with NTRP is configured, and in case of TRP selection with N<NTRP, the same FD combo applied or another one which is supported in the table corresponding to N should be applied? For example, in case of NTRP=3, SD combo configured as {2,2,2} and FD combo configured as {1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ½, and if TRP selection with N=2, actually the SD combo turns to be {2,2}, while for this {2,2}, FD combo {1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ½ is not supported.  So we would like to add FFS on these issues.  **Updated Proposal 1.C.1**: On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, only the following linkages are supported (marked ‘x’), for Rel-16 eType-II based   * For *NTRP* =1,   + fully reuse seven out of the eight Parameter Combinations from Rel-16 eType-II as indicated in the table below     - FFS (by RAN1#112bis-e): whether to add one more Parameter Combination for L=4 based on the legacy Rel-16 eType-II FD combo {½, ½, ¼, ¼; ½} or the agreed FD combo {½, ½, ½, ½; ½}, or not to add from the indicated seven below * For *NTRP* >1, only the following linkages are supported (marked ‘x’) * Note: NL combinations correspond to a same value of *NTRP*. * FFS: In case of *NTRP* >1, whether/how L=6 can be selected in case of TRP selection with N=1 * FFS: How to determine FD combo in case of TRP selection with N < *NTRP*   [Mod: Please read my comment for Intel above. This will be discussed in later rounds. There is no need to add a bunch of FFSs here 😊]  **Issue 1.4**:  We support resource specific CBSR and soft amplitude restriction, our position also added. |
| CATT | **Issue 1.1:**  Support to confirm the WA.  **Issue 1.2:**  Do not support proposal 1.B.1. The proposal changes the definition of mode-1, that the selected FD bases across TRPs are not independent any more.  **Issue 1.3:**  Ok with proposal 1.C.1.  **Issue 1.4:**  Support resource-specific amplitude restriction.  **Issue 1.5:**  Support Alt2. |
| Mod V28 | **No revision on proposals** |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 1.B.1**  Generally fine to compromise to Alt1 now, but still have issue with fractional (O3), even as optional UE feature.  We suggest to re-consider O3 with standard impact:   * Firstly, from companies’ evaluation, fractional shows negligible gain over integer : 1% to 3% (ZTE, Samsung, HW, E//); * Secondly, this is “ugly”: Mode-1 FD selection itself is already an optional UE feature, then fractional brings an additional layer: Optional of optional. * Thirdly, this is not “refinement” of Rel-16 (analogous to **no** beam-specific g3={0,…,O3-1}) * Last but not least, UE complexity as mentioned also by other UE vendors (vivo, OPPO, MTK, Fujitsu) – UE implementation burden/overhead is not as easy as 2-bit report overhead per TRP.   Therefore, propose to remove fractional part   |  | | --- | | * ~~Optional feature:~~ |   **Proposal 1.C.1**  One issue seems to not have been confirmed.  Following legacy, only one PC (linkage) should be configured, i.e. UE is not supposed to switch b/w linkages, e.g. based on TRP selection (per previous agreement).  For example, if the yellow-highlighted linkage x with NTRP=3 is configured and UE report a selection of 2 TRPs, UE is not supposed to switch to cyan x, but still follows the configured {pv,beta}   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 2 | {2,2} | x |  |  |  |  |  | | ... |  |  |  |  |  |  | | ... |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 3 | {2,2,2} | x | x |  |  |  |  |   Besides, although still not the time to discuss UE feature, we want to express our worry regarding too many linkages (currently total 22 for NTRP={2, 3, 4})  Therefore, suggest to add two notes to this proposal   |  | | --- | | * For TRP selection (per previous agreement), UE is not expected to switch b/w linkages * FFS UE feature report to support a subset of the linkages |   [Mod: Good point, added the bullets but I reworded the 1st to capture your point better]  **Proposal 1.E.1**  Totally agree with some company’s comments that this is “over-optimize for UCI omission that rarely happens”  FD permutation is exactly over-optimized for this scenario.  [Mod: Fully agree too 😊]  In addition, even if UCI omission happens, almost all infra vendors just discard the partial report, according to our info.  Although our preference is Alt2, we can compromise to Alt3 if the FFS is confirmed as no permutation  [Mod: Added and fully agree]   |  | | --- | | * ~~FFS: FD permutation P(.) as Rel-16-analogous, or~~ no permutation i.e. P(m)=m | |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 1.B.1**:  Although our first preference is Alt2, we can accept Alt1 with basic feature since there’s majority support. Regarding the optional feature for , we don’t think it’s a compromise between Alt1 and Alt2. We have similar concern as MTK. The increased UE complexity will make it less possible to be implemented.  [Mod: Optional means it is up to the chipset vendor whether to implement or not. So you don need t worry whether the optional feature is less or more likely to be implemented especially since you don’t like it 😊 So the logic of your “concern” is rather strange. Anyway, the companies have compromised to make it optional even if they could push to make it basic as well based on their SLS results. I hope the “concerning” companies can be reasonable for progress. Else, we would simply conclude no consensus on mode-1]  **Issue 1.4**:  We think resource-specific amplitude restriction is the only reasonable solution. Even for intra-site case, it is possible that for different TRPs, SD bases with the same index may point to different areas.  We are fine to keep soft restriction as optional, which follows the legacy Type II codebook. If majority companies prefer hard restriction only, we are also OK not to support it.  Regarding CBSR configuration for a subset of TRP, we don’t think the configuration flexibility is necessary.  **Proposal 1.E.1**:  We agree with the assessment from ZTE and Huawei. UCI omission per TRP can help gNB to recover precoding matrix from at least one TRP. If UCI omission is performed as Alt3, it is highly possible that UCI parameters corresponding to one TRP will be split into two groups and dropped partially. The remaining UCI parameters corresponding to the TRP cannot be used and will cause resource waste.  [Mod: It seems the only SLS results available show that Alt2 is worse than Alt1/3] |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 1.C.3**  We are supportive of this proposal in principle, but we would like to suggest to remove the restriction for M=2. The configuration M=2 helps against delay estimation uncertainty at the gNB and to reduce the number of RS ports. These justifications apply to the case as well. Besides, we don’t think there is a significant difference in complexity between and , in fact if a UE can choose to report only N=3 best TRPs it has a complexity restriction  Typo: “for Rel-17 FeType-II based”  [Mod: Thanks]  **Issue 1.4**  We think it makes sense for CBSR for CJT to be resource-specific because in general different beam restrictions are applicable to different TRPs based on their location and different interference conditions. We are also ok to support soft CBSR as long as Rel-16 formulation is reused. We also support the possibility to configure CBSR off for some CSI-RS resources because it simplifies configuration in case where only a subset of TRPs need to be restricted.  In summary, our preferences are:   * Resource-specific * Soft (optional) is ok if Rel16 formulation is reused * Support CBSR off for some resources   It may also be worth clarifying that CBSR is not supported for CJT based on Rel17 FeType-II because of course the gNB has control on spatial beams applied to CSI-RS ports |
| CMCC | **Issue 1.2:**  Our first preference is Alt2, but if majority could support Proposal 1.B.1, then we are also fine with it considering it has been a compromise.  **Issue 1.3:**  Support proposal 1.C.1 and proposal 1.C.3.  And for the proposal 1.C.3, we suppose we are discussing Rel-17 FeType-II based codebook, so we think the main bullet of this proposal should be “On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, for Rel-17 FeType-II based”.  [Mod: Thanks’  **Issue 1.4:**  Support resource-specific amplitude restriction. The power characteristic is different, resource-common restriction is not reasonable.  **Issue 1.5:**  Our first preference is Alt2. Considering UCI omission may not happen very frequently, we can go with Alt3 as simple extension of legacy rule. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1.B.1  Our first preference is Alt 2. If majority companies prefer Alt 1, we can compromise to support it. But we have concern on the optional feature which may cause high UE complexity and high feedback overhead.  [Mod: See my comment for Spreadtrum and I hope companies can be more reasonable]  Proposal 1.C.1:  We prefer to reuse the legacy combinations for *NTRP* =1 and not to introduce any new combinations. While for *NTRP* >1, we prefer not to support Ln=6 which will cause high UE complexity.  Issue 1.4:  We support resource specific amplitude restriction with hard only.  Issue 1.5  We are fine with the proposal and prefer FD permutation P(.) as Rel-16 -analogous.  Issue 1.6:  For IMR assumption, we suggest to configure more IMRs corresponding to different TRP selection by UE for one CMR.  For K>1 CSI-RS resource configuration, we share view with ZTE. At least two slots should be supported when there are too many CSI-RS resources (e.g., 3 or 4 ) and each resource with too many ports(e.g., 24, 32 ports) , since one slot cannot accommodate these resource. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | **Proposal 1.B.1**: Ok with the proposal, but we prefer some discussion on the optional feature.  **[Mod: Thanks, please my comment for Spreadtrum. It’s already a compromise]**  **Proposal 1.E.1**: We prefer Alt 2 |
| AT&T | Apologies for being late on this!  **Issue 1.1:** Support to confirm the WA  **Issue 1.2:** Support **Proposal 1.B.1**  **Issue 1.5:** we are ok with **Proposal 1.E.1** |
| InterDigital | Proposal 1.C.1  Support  Proposal 1.E.1  Support |
| Mod V39 | **Added a note and FFS for 1.C.1 per QC comment. Other editorial changes.**  **Added proposals for CBSR 1.D.1/2** |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 1.D.1:** Eventhough this is not our first prefernce, for the sake of progress we are ok to support this proposal.  **Proposal 1.D.2:** Support |
| ZTE | Proposal 1.D.1: Support.  Proposal 1.D.2: Not support. Firstly, considering that we may have N\_TRP=1 case, the soft-CBSR should be supported straightforwardly. Then, for >1 case, we prefer to reuse the legacy function.  [Mod: Please check the FL note on 1.D.2 regarding the relation between conclusion and reality]  Proposal 1.E.1: Not support for the update. Clearly, if P(m) is assumed as most significant parameter, we need to reuse the legacy function of P(m)=pi(m).  [Mod: OK. Reverted to the FFS version for P] |
| Samsung | **On Proposal 1.D.1 and Conclusion 1.D.2:**  Although we prefer CSI-RS-resource common soft amplitude restriction for CBSR, we can be OK with the proposal for progress. We however would like clarify that the legacy CBSR mechanisn is still reused, implying that the number of bits per CSI-RS resource for CBSR remains the same as legacy, but we have a hard restriction when Ntrp > 1, i.e., the UE is not expected to be configured with 01 and 10 in amplitude restriction (the wording 214).    On Cocnlusion 1.D.2, we suggest to add and additional sentence on the legacy as below, since we don’t see any reason to differentiate it from the legacy for the case of .  “On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding CBSR, , there is no consensus in supporting the additional optional soft amplitude restriction. Therefore, only hard amplitude restriction (per CSI-RS resource, based on the legacy design) is supported .” And the legacy (optional soft restriction) is supported when .  [Mod: Since companies opposing soft amp restriction haven’t explicitly expressed their views on NTRP=1, your proposed 2nd sentence in the conclusion rewording is factually INVALID so I will not add that. We can check whether they can accept soft for NTRP=1 in later rounds. I added “NTRP>1” in the conclusion for now] |
| NEC | **Proposal 1.C.1:**  Regarding the note added to proposal 1.C.1, we think it should be further discussed. If a configured linkage is associated with NTRP, regargless dynamic TRP selection, there will be some NOT supported linkage occured. Taking the example mentioned by QC, if the yellow-highlighted FD combo x with NTRP=3 is configured and UE report a selection of 2 TRPs, if UE still use FD combo x, it means SD combo {2,2} and FD combo x should also be one supported linkage with {2,2}.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 2 | {2,2} | x |  |  |  |  |  | | ... |  |  |  |  |  |  | | ... |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 3 | {2,2,2} | x | x |  |  |  |  |   So we would like to make it FFS at this stage.  **Updated Proposal 1.C.1**: On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, only the following linkages are supported (marked ‘x’), for Rel-16 eType-II based   * For *NTRP* =1,   + fully reuse seven out of the eight Parameter Combinations from Rel-16 eType-II as indicated in the table below     - FFS (by RAN1#112bis-e): whether to add one more Parameter Combination for L=4 based on the legacy Rel-16 eType-II FD combo {½, ½, ¼, ¼; ½} or the agreed FD combo {½, ½, ½, ½; ½}, or not to add from the indicated seven below * For *NTRP* >1, only the following linkages are supported (marked ‘x’) * FFS: How to determine FD combo in case of TRP selection with N < *NTRP*   + E.g.1: A configured linkage is associated with the configured value of *NTRP*, regardless whether the dynamic TRP selection (the dynamic change of *NTRP* given *NTRP*) is configured. (The configured linkage is supported by any SD basis with dynamic TRP selection)   + E.g.2: A linkage is associated with the value of *N* (*N* <=*NTRP*) in case of dynamic TRP selection. (The one from supported linkage corresponding to SD basis with dynamic TRP selection will be applied) * FFS: UE feature/capability to support only a subset of linkages   **[Mod: Per the previous agreement below, E.g.2 is invalid since it is against the agreement that the FD parameter in the linkage is for a given NTRP, not N. So I cannot add E.g.2 and your proposed FFS. I fixed the typo NTRP to N in 1.C.1 (please check)]** |
| LG | **On Proposal 1.A.1:**  We don’t support Proposal 1.A.1. and the workding assumption should be confirmed. The CJT gain mainly comes from cell edge, where RSRP difference among multiple TRPs is not significant, so cell edge gain should be taken into account. 10% cell edge gain which is observed in ZTE’s contribution is sufficient to confirm the working assumption. If companies have concern on implementation complexity we are fine with making it an optional feature.  **Proposal 1.B.1**:  Support the proposal in principle even though our preference is Alt 2. On , we have similar views with MTK, vivo, DoCoMo, Fujitsu and OPPO that the basic feature is sufficient.  **Proposal 1.D.1:**  Support the proposal.  **Conclusion 1.D.2:**  Support.  **Issue 1.6:**  **Additional restriction on K CSI-RS**  If those CSI-RS are distributed in different slot, there is possibility that UE measures each CSI-RS with random phase rotation and it is not able to report correct phase coherence information among K CSI-RS resources, which is essential part of coherent JT. Also, there is UE side buffering issue when K CSI-RS resources are far distributed in time. A similar issue was discussed in Rel-17 NCJT CSI-RS configuration and the restriction of the same slot or 1 slot difference between two CSI-RS for NCJT was agreed. We can start discussion from reusing the legacy restriction.  **IMR**  On NZP CSIRS IMR, we think this is mainly for MU-MIMO interference measurement. However, in our view, C-JT + MU-MIMO is very unlikely to schedule in practice so that there is no need to optimize NZP IMR configuration for CJT. On ZP IMR, we think one IMR is sufficient.  **CPU allocation**  UE side TRP selection was agreed and it has an impact on CSI processing complexity. Since selecting N TRPs among NTRP increases UE complexity, UE needs more CPUs. Even though UE is not mandated to calculate all CSIs for multiple transmission hypotheses, it does not preclude full search UE implementation. For given N and NTRP with full search UE, there are NTRPCN hypotheses and if one CPU is used for each hypothesis NTRPCN CPUs are needed, and if UE can select N value as well more CPUs are needed. Note that in Rel-17 NCJT, X CPUs are occupied for each NCJT hypotheses, where X is reported by UE capability. In order to reduce complexity for TRP selection, some restriction for candidate combination for N TRPs should be considered. For example, gNB can semi-statically configure N value and UE selects N out of NTRP for a given N.  **port indexing across CSI-RS resources**  The CJT codebook is applied on the aggregated channel from multiple CMRs so how to order the port index across CMRs should be further discussed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For proposal 1.C.1, we have several questions on the note.   * If with TRP selection, only one {pv, beta} is used, then there will be more linkages are supported compard to the proposal. It seems inconsistent with the FFS, and the combinations not in current agreements are supported.   [Mod: Not true. Only the ones from the proposal. Please check the latest version]  Several examples are below. As a result, the linkage and SD/FD combo that discussed has no limitation at all.   * + If UE supports one {{1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ½ } and {2,2,2} TRP linkage, but not support this {{1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ½ } and {2,2} linkage (the combination not in the table), then if UE selects two TRPs, then the result of linkage will be beyond the UE capability.   [Mod: This cannot happen per previous agreement]   * + For combinations {2,2,4,4}-{{1/4, ¼, 1/8, 1/8}, ½}, if UE selects the 1st, 3rd, 4th TRPs, the resultant combination will be {2,4,4}-{{1/4, ¼, 1/8, 1/8}, ½}, which is not supported in previous agreement and current proposal. * To avoid potential inconsistence between agreements, either we should allow the combinations not in previous agreements supported, or these combinations should not be selected by UE selection.   For proposal 1.D.1, it seems to force gNB configure the CBSR for all TRPs, we propose a modification as below:  **Proposal 1.D.1:** On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding CBSR, amplitude restriction is optionally configured as CSI-RS-resource-specific.  [Mod: Added FFS since this issue hasnt received much input]    For conclusion 1.D.2, we don’t support it. As soft amplitude restriction is more useful and flexible for TypeII codebook, we support to reuse legacy way to support it.  [Mod: Please check the FL note on 1.D.2 regarding the relation between conclusion and reality. Whether you support/like the conclusion or not doesn’t change the reality of no consensus and its outcome] |
| Mod V51 | **Minor revision per inputs.** |
| AT&T | **In our last feedback, there was a typo, please find the correction below**  **Issue 1.1:** Support to revert the WA |

### Issue 2: Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium UE velocities (with time/Doppler-domain compression)

Table 3A Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2.1 | [112] **Agreement**  …   * X=2 and   + The 1st CQI is associated with the first/earliest slot of the CSI reporting window (slot *l*) and the first/earliest of the *N*4 **W**2 matrices, and   + The 2nd CQI is associated with the middle slot of the CSI reporting window (slot *l*+*WCSI*/2) and the (*N*4 /2)-th**W**2 matrix   + FFS: Whether/how to include CQI overhead reduction for X=2   **Proposal 2.A.1**: For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, when a UE is configured with X=2 for CQI calculation and reporting, the 2nd CQI is located in UCI part 2  **Proposal 2.A.2**: For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, when a UE is configured with X=2 for CQI calculation and reporting, the 2nd CQI includes 4-bit wideband CQI and 2-bit sub-bands CQIs calculated independently from the 1st CQI  **Proposal 2.A.3**: For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, when WCSI>1, if a UE supports X=2 for CQI calculation, the value of X (either 1 or 2) is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signalling  **FL Note**: This topic was discussed OFFLINE [1]   * 2.A.1: based on legacy approach for 2nd CQI * 2.A.2: SLS results show performance loss with fully differential CQI. Differential wideband CQI on the other hand only offers 1-4bit saving which is negligible. * 2.A.3: implied but need an agreement to ratify | **Proposal 2.A.1:**   * **Support/fine**: Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, vivo, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Intel, Xiaomi, CATT, Nokia/NSB, Fujitsu, ZTE, Ericsson, CMCC, Sony, Sharp, NEC, MediaTek, Huawei/HiSi, Google, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, IDC, LG * **Not support**: Lenovo/MotM, Qualcomm   **Proposal 2.A.2:**   * **Support/fine**: Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, vivo, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Qualcomm, Intel, Xiaomi, Nokia/NSB, Fujitsu, Ericsson, IDC, CMCC, Sony, CATT, Sharp, Apple * **Not support**: MediaTek, Huawei/HiSi, Lenovo/MotM, Google, NEC, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, LG   **Proposal 2.A.3:**   * **Support/fine**: Samsung, MediaTek, Ericsson, Intel, Fujitsu, OPPO, Lenovo/MotM, Google, CATT, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, IDC, LG * **Not support**: |
| 2.2 | [112] **Agreement**  For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, regarding the bitmap(s) for indicating the locations of the NZCs, down-select one from the following alternatives (no later than RAN1#112bis-e):   * Alt1. *Q* different 2-dimensional bitmaps where each bitmap reuses the legacy design i.e. the size of the bitmap for each selected DD basis vector is 2*LMv* * Alt3A: A single 2-dimensional bitmap of size to report the selected pairs of FD basis vector and DD basis vector and a single 2-dimensional bitmap of size for indicating the location of the NZCs, where each row corresponds to a selected SD basis vector and each column corresponds to one of the selected pairs of FD basis vector and DD basis vector. * Alt4. A bitmap that includes bits associated with the set of {(, ,)} with , where is the threshold that can be configured by gNB, , and denotes a reference SD basis index and a reference FD basis index and a reference DD basis index associated with SCI, respectively.   Nokia/NSB, Samsung, vivo, and ZTE raised concerns that, in their understanding, Alt3A violates previous agreements for “Q different two-dimensional bitmaps” and/or common DD basis selection across SD/FD basis pairs and hence, to some extent, objective 1 of the WID.  [112] **Agreement**  For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, regarding the down-selection of bitmap(s) for indicating the locations of the NZCs (in RAN1#112bis-e), the following is used as a guidance for evaluation:   * Following the agreed EVM, use “UPT vs. overall overhead (including CQI and PMI)” to compare across alternatives, assuming *at least* FTP1 traffic model and Rel-16 Parameter Combinations (L, beta, pv) * Use only the supported codebook parameter values (e.g. Q, K, m, d, delta, N4) * Companies are to state their assumptions on UE-side prediction (e.g. ideal or realistic, CSI-RS type, CSI-RS overhead calculation in relation to UPT, assumptions on *WCSI* and *l*) and the use of rank adaptation   **Proposal 2.B.1:**  For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, regarding the bitmap(s) for indicating the locations of the NZCs,   * When the UE is configured with Q=1: for each layer, one 2-dimensional bitmap of size-2LM reusing the legacy design is used * When the UE is configured with Q=2: for each layer,   + Basic feature: two 2-dimensional bitmaps, each of size-2LM reusing the legacy design for each of the two selected DD basis vectors, are used   + Optional feature, if the following down-selection succeeds: down-select from the following two alternatives in RAN#112bis-e:     - Alt3A: A single 2-dimensional bitmap of size to report the selected pairs of FD basis vector and DD basis vector and a single 2-dimensional bitmap of size for indicating the location of the NZCs, where each row corresponds to a selected SD basis vector and each column corresponds to one of the selected pairs of FD basis vector and DD basis vector.     - Alt4’: Q different bitmaps are supported for each layer, each of the Q bitmaps corresponds to DD basis q = 0 or 1.       * For each polarization, each of the Q bitmaps contains bits included in a set of SD basis and FD basis pairs , satisfying , where         + ,         + is the SD basis indicated by SCI         + Two polarizations have same set of in the bitmap   **FL Note**: This topic was discussed OFFLINE [1]. At least one Alt3A proponent argues that Alt4’ is different from the agreed description of Alt4, hence violating a previous agreement. Likewise, at least 3 companies argue that Alt3A violates previous agreement on “Q 2D bitmaps”. Regardless, the majority view is Alt1. | **Proposal 2.B.1:**   * **Support/fine**: ZTE, vivo, Huawei/HiSi, NTT DOCOMO, Spreadtrum, Fujitsu, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, CMCC, MediaTek, Apple, Qualcomm, Ericsson, OPPO, Google, CATT, CMCC, Xiaomi, IDC, [Intel], * **Not support**: Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, |
| 2.3 | [112] **Conclusion**  On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, there is no consensus on including another non-UCI Doppler codebook parameter as a variable in the list of supported Parameter Combinations.   * Note: This implies that other non-UCI Doppler codebook parameters will be a part of RRC configuration (either explicit or implicit)   **Proposal 2.C.1**: For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities based on Rel-16 eType-II regular codebook, at least the following Parameter Combinations are supported   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | |  | |  |  | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | | 4 (\*) | 1/2 | 1/4 | 1/2 | | 4 (\*) | 1/4 | 1/4 | 3/4 | | 6 (\*) | 1/4 | -- | 1/2 | | 6 (\*) | 1/4 | -- | 3/4 |   (\*) Note: From legacy. For L=6, the same restriction and UE optionality as legacy apply   * FFS (by RAN1#112bis-e): Select at most 3 additional Parameter Combinations from the list below  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | |  | |  |  | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/2 | | 2(\*) | ¼ | 1/8 | ¼ | | 2 (\*) | ¼ | 1/8 | ½ | | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 4 (\*) | ¼ | 1/8 | 1/4 |   (\*) Note: From legacy.   * FFS: UE feature/capability to support only a subset of Parameter Combinations   **FL Note**: Since the legacy framework is used for Parameter Combination and Q=2 is the only supported value, it seems reasonable to fully reuse the legacy Parameter Combinations. However companies show that replacing some legacy combinations with new ones (lower pv and beta) yield better performance. The proposals are based on the SLS from Huawei, ZTE, CATT, Intel, Nokia, and (to some extent) Samsung | **Support/fine:** vivo, ZTE, OPPO, CATT, MediaTek, Intel, Fujitsu, Google (if majority), NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, CMCC, Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, [Huawei/HiSi], Samsung, [Nokia/NSB (prefer legacy only)], [LG (legacy only)]  **Not support:** CATT (separate tables depending N4), |
| 2.4 | [110bis-e] **Agreement**  For the Rel-18 Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, support the following codebook structure where N4 is gNB-configured via higher-layer signaling:   * For N4=1, Doppler-domain basis is the identity (no Doppler-domain compression) reusing the legacy *, ,* and *, e.g.* * For N4>1, Doppler-domain orthogonal DFT basis commonly selected for all SD/FD bases reusing the legacyand *,* e.g.   + Only Q (denoting the number of selected DD basis vectors) >1 is allowed   + TBD (by RAN1#110bis): whether rotation is used or not   + FFS: identical or different rotation factors for different SD components   + FFS: Whether *Q* is RRC-configured or reported by the UE   Note: Detailed designs for SD/FD bases including the associated UCI parameters follow the legacy specification  FFS: Whether one CSI reporting instance includes multiple and a single and report.  **Proposal 2.D.1**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocity, regarding CBSR, a single SD beam group restriction per legacy design is used,   * FFS: Whether amplitude restriction is summed across FD bases for each DD basis, *or* summed across FD and DD bases, or applied per DD unit   FFS: Whether the legacy (optional) soft amplitude restriction is also supported or only hard amplitude restriction is supported  **FL Note**: There seems to be no reason to use DD-basis-specific CBSR since DD basis is commonly selected for all SD/FD bases | **Support/fine**: Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, Samsung, MediaTek, Fujitsu, OPPO, Lenovo/MotM, Google, NEC, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, IDC, LG, Huawei/HiSi,  **Not support**: |
| 2.5 | [112] **Agreement**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, regarding UCI omission, down-select between the following three alternatives (by RAN1#112bis-e where q denotes the q-th DD basis vector):   * Alt1. Prio(,l,m,q)=2L. Q.RI.P(m)+Q.RI.l+Q.q   + Note: This implies that DD basis is designated the highest priority * Alt2. Prio(,l,m,q)=2L.S(q).RI.N3+2L.RI. P(m)+RI.l+   + Note: This implies that DD basis is designated the **lower priority** (after FD basis)   + FFS: S(q) maps the index q according to a rule * Alt3. Prio(,l,m,q)=2L.RI.Mv.q + 2L.RI.P(m)+ RI.l +    + Note: This implies that DD basis is designated the **least priority** * Alt4. Prio(,l,m,q)=2L.P(m).RI.Q+2L.RI.S(q)+RI.l+   + Note: This implies that DD basis is designated with lower priority (after SD basis) and higher priority (before FD basis)   + FFS: S(q) maps the index q according to a rule   FFS: FD permutation P(.) as Rel-16-analogous, or no permutation i.e. P(m)=m  q=0,…,Q-1  **Proposal 2.E.1**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, regarding UCI omission, support reusing the legacy UCI omission mechanism with (Alt3) the following priority function: Prio(,l,m,q)=2L.RI.Mv.q + 2L.RI.P(m)+ RI.l +  where P(m) = m   * Note: This implies that DD basis is designated the least priority * FFS: Details on the location of the new UCI parameters in G0/1/2   **FL Note**: | **Proposal 2.E.1:**   * **Support/fine:** ZTE (P(m)=m), Spreadtrum, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (P=m, S=q), Intel, Xiaomi, LG, Samsung, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Fujitsu, OPPO, Google, CATT, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Huawei/HiSi * **Not support:** vivo, Lenovo/MotM,   **Alt1:** IDC, Xiaomi, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, NEC, Lenovo/MotM  **Alt2:** Huawei/HiSi, OPPO,Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (P=m), CATT (S=q)  **Alt3:** ZTE (P(m)=m), Spreadtrum, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (P=m, S=q), Intel, Xiaomi, LG, Samsung, MediaTek, Qualcomm,  **Alt4:** vivo, Xiaomi,NEC |
| 2.6 | Next-level (pre-maintenance) details:   * PDSCH EPRE assumption for CQI calculation (relative to which CSI-RS, UE assuming one Pc) * Additional restrictions on NZP CSI-RS resources * CPU allocation (one for each or all CSI-RS resources) * Whether to support 2-stage PDCCH triggering (CSI-RS then CSI) for Type-II Doppler | |

Table 3B Type II Doppler: summary of observation from SLS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **SLS results** | | |
| **Issue #** | **Metric** | **Observation** |
| Issue # 2.1 | | | |
| Samsung | 2.1 | UPT vs overhead | There is no benefit with Alt1.2/1.3 (differential w.r.t. the 1st CQI) over Alt1.1 (independent of the 1st CQI) |
| Issue # 2.2 | | | |
| Huawei | 2.2 | UPT vs overhead | Alt.3A has better UPT vs. overhead tradeoff than Alt.1. |
| ZTE | UPT vs overhead | ***On Alt1 vs 4’***  In addition, we evaluate the performance on average UPT vs overhead between Alt1, Alt4\_1 based on d=3 and Alt4\_2 based on d=5 in Figure 2. Parameter combination is shown in Table2. There are some performance benefits in the case of low-overhead region in Figure 2. However, serious performance loss is observed in SLS on Alt4 both d=3 and d=5 in Figure 2 in high-overhead region.  ***On Alt3A***  For Alt3A, we have the concerns that Alt3A may violate previous agreements for “Q different two-dimensional bitmaps”, to some extent. Then, we provide SLS simulation in Figure 2 with Alt3A\_1 based on S = 0.5\*MQ and Alt3A\_2 based on S = 0.75\*MQ. It is observed that, with sufficient small parameter (e.g., S =0.5\*MQ) for reducing value of S, there are some performance benefits in the case of low CSI report overhead. |
| Vivo | UPT vs overhead | * Under Q=2 and legacy CB parameter combinations (pv, beta, L), Alt 4’ UPT-overhead curve outperforms Alt 1 and Alt 3A. * For lower overhead or ideal prediction, for each (pv, beta, L) configuration, Alt 4’ can save about 50 bits for each layer with nearly no performance loss. * The benefit from Alt 4’ in terms of performance is even clearer in high overhead and real prediction. Alt 4’ can address the issue of coefficient unreliability caused by prediction error. * Alt 3A does not provide better performance-overhead trade-off than Alt 1. |
| OPPO | UPT vs overhead | Alt3A can reduce 10% overall overhead without UPT loss. |
| Fraunhofer | UPT vs overhead | Alt 3A with results in feedback overhead saving of 48 bits, 160 bits and 84 bits for parameter combinations 1-4, 5 and 6, respectively, compared to Alt 1 with negligible loss in performance.  For Alt 3A, using S = 0.5MQ results in a similar average UPT to that of Alt 1 with large feedback overhead saving. |
| CATT | UPT vs overhead | The average throughput versus bitmap overhead is shown in Figure 1. Based on the simulation results, it is observed that Alt3A has negligible performance loss compared with Alt1 with less bitmap overhead. |
| Intel | UPT vs overhead | * Performance degradation of up to 0.8% in average UE throughput and up to 2% for cell-edge UE throughput is observed for Alt3A comparing to Alt1. * 48 bits can be saved for configurations with M = 4 and 84 bits for configuration with M = 7 for Alt3A comparing to Alt1 |
| Samsung | UPT vs overhead | * Alt3A and Alt1 are similar in UPT vs overhead trade-off for all of avg. UPT, 50% UPT, and 5% UPT. * For any (UPT, overhead) achieved by Alt3A, there is a similar (UPT, overhead) achieved by Alt1 * Alt4’ can improve UPT vs overhead trade-off |
| MediaTek | UPT vs overhead | NZC indication by Alt 3A can provide 50~60 bits overhead saving compared with Alt 1 with <1 % performance loss.  NZC indication by Alt 4 and D = 3 can achieve similar performance as Alt 1 without significant overhead saving.  NZC indication by Alt 4 and D = 2 degrades in performance especially at higher parameter combinations, due to forcing zero coefficients in certain SD, FD positions. |
| Qualcomm | Separate UPT, and overhead | For Type-II-Doppler, Alt1 2-stage (MQ+2LS)-bit bitmap (Alt3A) achieves similar average throughput as 2LMQ-bit 3D bitmap, while overall feedback overhead can be reduced by more than 10% (659 to 575 bits). |
| Ericsson | Separate UPT, and overhead | Bitmap alternative Alt1 with reporting of only non-empty DD bitmaps is close to Rel-16 Type-II implementation in complexity and is a simpler reporting format |
| Issue # 2.3 | | | |
| Huawei | 2.3 | UPT vs overhead | The following values paraComb achieves the best UPT vs overhead trade-off:   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *paramCombination-Type II doppler* |  |  | |  | |  |  | | 1 | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/2 | | 2 | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 3 | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/2 | | 4 | 4 | 1/4 | 1/8 | 1/4 | | 5 | 4 | 1/4 | 1/8 | 1/2 | | 6 | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | | 7 | 6 | 1/4 | 1/8 | 1/2 | | 8 | 6 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | |
| ZTE | UPT vs overhead | Based on SLS results, the following is proposed   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | |  | |  |  | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/8 | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/8 | | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 3/4 | | 4 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | | 6 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | | 6 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 3/4 | |
| OPPO | UPT vs overhead | We evaluated R16 and R17 parameter combination, where AP CSI-RS overhead is not considered. For R17 parameter combination, legacy parameter is good. For R16, we used and there is no any significant gain for large K0, which imply legacy parameter combination can be reused for N4 > 1 |
| CATT | UPT vs overhead | Based on our simulation results, we identified several Parameter Combinations that offer a good tradeoff between performance and overhead. As a result, we recommend using the Parameter Combinations outlined in Table 2    Table 2 Codebook parameter configurations for *L*, and   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *L* |  | |  | |  |  | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/2 | | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/2 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/8 | 1/2 | | 4 | 1/2 | 1/4 | 1/2 | | 6 | 1/8 | - | 1/2 | | 6 | 1/4 | - | 1/2 | |
| Intel | UPT vs overhead | * Parameter combinations {p1,2, beta} = {1/8, 1/4}, {1/8, 1/2}, {1/4, 1/2}, {1/4, 3/4} provide good performance/overhead tradeoff considering both average and cell-edge UE throughput |
| Nokia | UPT vs overhead | * For Type-II-Doppler, for average and cell-edge UPT gain over Rel-16 Type-II increase with overhead, for the same parameter combinations. * For Type-II-Doppler, cell-edge UPT gain over Rel-16 Type-II tend to be noticeably higher than average UPT gain. |
| Samsung | UPT vs overhead | Different (smaller) beta than legacy (beta=1/8)   * Smaller than legacy can be beneficial * Weak coefficients increase overhead, but don’t provide UPT gain (🡪 beta can be small) |

Table 4 Additional inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your inputs on each of the issues and, if applicable, proposals in TABLE 3A** |
| ZTE | **Issue 2.3**  FYI, our contribution R1-2303893 is uploaded in revision of R1-2302418 for AI 9.1.2 CSI. To be more specific, in Section 2.1.7, we provide further evaluation results and recommended parameter combination for Rel-16 regular eType-II codebook on the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities.  In our updated contribution R1-2303893, we have the following results and proposed combination. In short, we prefer to update the legacy CSI parameter combination(s) accordingly. Then, if having Pv~{1/8,1/16}, {1/2,1/2} and more cases of L=6, directly approving the reuse of legacy table may be too rush. So, as what we did for CJT, we prefer to review the candidate parameter combination (especially for the case that the number of DD-basis = 2).    Regarding parameter combination selection for the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, the following entries should be supported.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | |  | |  |  | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/8 | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/8 | | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 3/4 | | 4 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | | 6 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | | 6 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 3/4 |   [Mod: Thanks for providing SLS results. I updated ZTE position (new combos + 2 last legacy combos) and wait for other comments] |
| Mod V3 | **No change** |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.A.3: support; a minor comment: X=2 is possible only when W\_CSI>1  **Proposal 2.A.3**: For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, when W\_CSI>1, if a UE supports X=2 for CQI calculation, the value of X (either 1 or 2) is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signalling  [Mod: Thanks]  Proposal 2.C.1   * Clarification question: is this common understanding that we will have one single table for both N4=1, Q=1 and N4>1, Q=2?   [Mod: Right, there is no technical reason to have N4-dependent Parameter Combos]   * If yes, then our preference is to reuse the legacy table for both. So, we can only accept the last three legacy combinations.   [Mod: From the submitted SLS results, the proposed table in 2.C.1 seems to perform better than legacy. Could you explain any other technical reason why we should stick with legacy (other than N4=1)? Besides the proposed table has 3 legacy combos ]   * For N4>1, Q=2 case, however, we are open to consider some scaling (c) in order to reduce overhead associated with #NZC or/and bitmap size. For ex: the scaling c=1/2. For ex: we can scale or .   [Mod: This seems to imply N4-dependent Parameter Combination regardless whether the same table is used or not. Let’s see what other say]  **Proposal 2.D.1**: typo, On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities ~~CJT mTRP~~,  [Mod: Thanks]  **Proposal 2.E.1**: support |
| Mod V7 | **Revised proposal 2.C.1 based on further look into the submitted SLS results** |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.A.1:**  Support  **Proposal 2.A.2:**  Not support. We believe reporting differential CQI for X=2 can be beneficial in terms of overhead reduction. We propose to support differential CQI for at least the WB CQI values which can lead to up to 4-bit overhead reduction without performance degradation.  **Proposal 2.A.3:**  Support.  **Proposal 2.B.1:**  We don’t believe two separate bitmap designs for NZC locations is needed and we should strive to have a unified design. However, if companies strongly believe overhead reduction is needed specifically for Q = 2, then based on the simulation results provided in our contribution (R1-2303328), Alt 3A can deliver superior performance compared to Alt 4’ with same or lower overhead.  **Proposal 2.C.1:**  Support.  Regarding questions raised in the comments by Samsung on whether we need different parameter combination for and values, we strongly oppose having parameter combination, which is a function of the doppler parameters, due to two main reason 1) we do not see any technical merit why different parameter combination are needed 2) the additional UE complexity and design optimization which needs to be done for having multiple parameter combinations.  **Proposal 2.D.1**:  Support  **Proposal 2.E.1**:  Support |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.B.1**  OK with the proposal.  We support Alt 4’ at least for higher overhead regime, e.g., parameter combinations with L=6. Based on evaluation results from multiple companies including vivo, Alt 4’ shows better overhead-performance trade-off at least for these configurations. In real prediction, prediction error exists, which impacts the performance and coefficient reliability a lot. If the coefficients are freely selected by UE, prediction error will cause UE to select some weak coefficients which looks large due to prediction error. Thus to have restriction pattern on UE’s coefficient selection is beneficial to increase the reliability of NZC selection.  **Proposal 2.C.1**  We would like to note that L=6 is optional which is same as legacy. Hence we suggest to revise the note as following.  *“(\*) Note: From legacy. For L=6, the same restriction and UE optionality as legacy apply”*  **[Mod: Thanks, good point]**  **Proposal 2.D.1**  To understand this proposal better, does it mean from signaling perspective, the legacy CBSR signaling is reused, and we would further select one from the following options for UE behavior?   * For each DD basis, a same average power restriction per SD basis is applied, or * An average power restriction over all FD bases and all DD bases is applied.   **[Mod: Correct]**  **Proposal 2.E.1**  For the comparison between Alt 3 and Alt 4, we need to consider we only have Q=2, and Mv is relatively larger, e.g., 4, 7, etc in typical configurations. If we follow Alt 3 and drop a half of coefficients, it will appear that only DD basis 0 is reserved, and thus we end up with a flat precoder in time domain. The time-varying information is totally lost. However, if we follow Alt 4, coefficients corresponding to a half of FD basis are dropped, but Mv/2 FD bases are reserved. Thus we can still keep some frequency-selective information in the final CSI. Considering this, we still think Alt 4 is better than Alt 3. |
| ZTE | **Proposal 2.C.1**  Considering that L=6 may be optional and only relevant to a given number of port, we think {L=4, Pv={1/2,1/2}, Beta=1/2} should be supported in addition. Also, CATT may have similar preference on legacy {L=4, Pv={1/2,1/4}, Beta=1/2}. We can be flexible for either way considering that they may have similar performance.  **[Mod: OK, added the legacy one 😊]**  **Issue 2.4**  We support amplitude restriction is summed across FD and DD bases, if a single CBSR configuration applies to all the Q DD bases. Considering that the range of variation during the predicting CSI window is small, calculation amplitude restriction across FD bases for each DD bases may be unnecessary. Further, we support soft amplitude restriction is up to UE analogous to Rel-16.  [Mod: We will discuss in later rounds]  **Proposal 2.E.1**: support  **Issue 2.6:** Regarding the next level issues, we have the initial thoughts as follows:   * + Regarding PDSCH EPRE assumption, for CQI calculation based on a set of NZP CSI-RS resources, we suggest to have the same *powerControlOffset* for each NZP CSI-RS resource in the set of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement, which is the assumed ratio of EPRE when UE derives CSI feedback and takes values in the range of [-8, 15] dB with 1 dB step size. Then, regarding AP CSI-RS burst, further considering that all measurement is based on assumption that CSI-RS ports with same port index in the respective resource are the same, which CSI-RS is based on may not be essential. Either one should be fine.   + Regarding additional restrictions on NZP CSI-RS resources in the AP-CSI-RS resource set, K NZP CSI-RS resources in the resource set should share the same CSI-RS ports. Further, one NZP/ZP-IMRcan be configured, instead of K NZP/ZP-IMR.   + Regarding CPU allocation, we concern that only one CPU for all CSI-RS resources may NOT be suitable to complete CSI prediction and reporting due to more computational complexity for time domain compression compared with legacy CSI. |
| Ericsson | support **Proposal 2.A.3**  Support **Proposal 2.E.1** |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.A.3：**Fine.  **Proposal 2.B.1：**Fine.  **Proposal 2.C.1:**  Could any company clarify how to determine M and K0 under the new table for N4=1 and N4>1?  [Mod: This depends on the bitmap outcome too. This issue is still pending/open]  **Proposal 2.D.1**: OK  **Proposal 2.E.1**: OK |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.A.3:**  Support  **Proposal 2.B.1:**  In order to avoid two different features which have the same functionality, can we try to support one value for a given parameter combination. E.g., for pv = 0.25, Alt1 is supported while for pv = 0.5 Alt3A or Alt4 is supported without the UE capability?  **Proposal 2.C.1:**  Support  **Proposal 2.D.1:**  In our view if the principle from the legacy CBSR is reused, summation of amplitude across DD and FD vectors shall be assumed.  [Mod: We will discuss in later rounds]  **Proposal 2.E.1:**  Support |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with all the proposals. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 2.A.2**  Not support. We support differential CQI for X=2 considering overhead reduction. At least the WB differential CQI should be supported which can save up to 4-bit without performance loss and extra spec workload.  **Issue 2.2**  For **Proposal 2.B.1,** we believe that more CSI overhead is caused by introducing DD basis, so bitmap reduction should be considered for Q=2. For the optional feature, more discussion may be needed on when optional feature is used, hence, we proposed the following modification:  **Proposal 2.B.1:**  For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, regarding the bitmap(s) for indicating the locations of the NZCs,   * When the UE is configured with Q=1: for each layer, one 2-dimensional bitmap of size-2LM reusing the legacy design is used * When the UE is configured with Q=2: for each layer,   + Basic feature: two 2-dimensional bitmaps, each of size-2LM reusing the legacy design for each of the two selected DD basis vectors, are used   + Optional feature ~~(for higher CSI overhead, FFS: definition)~~, if the following down-selection succeeds: down-select from the following two alternatives in RAN#112bis-e:   + …   We support Alt 3A as many companies’ results have shown a good overhead reduction. The bitmap of Alt3A MQ+2LS can be expressed as Q bitmap, . Hence, we don’t think there is any violation of the previous agreement. We can also be fine with Alt 4’ as it also provides overhead reduction compared to Alt 1.  **Proposal 2.C.1:**   * We are also fine to consider separate table for N4=1, Q=1 and N4>1, Q=2, as from evaluations they favour different parameter combinations. * If single table is used, then for N4>1, Q=2, we support smaller value of ({1/4, 1/2}) considering CSI overhead. Hence, we don’t support the following highlight parameter combinations with . For L=4, a combination with pv={1/8, 1/16}, beta = 1/2 would be more preferable to fill the gap between the third row and the fourth row.  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | |  | |  |  | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/2 | | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | | 4 (\*) | 1/4 | 1/4 | 3/4 | | 6 (\*) | 1/4 | -- | 1/2 | | 6 (\*) | 1/4 | 1-- | 3/4 |   [Mod: Please check the revision with one more L=4 legacy added per ZTE comment, which should also address our point]  **Proposal 2.D.1:**  We think this proposal needs some further discussion. For legacy, the CBSR is to limit the potential interference at any time. If simply summed across FD bases and DD bases, then there’s probability that at some time unit the interference is larger than the restriction although the average interference is till lower. As a result, the CBSR may lose its functionality.  Therefore, we support amplitude restriction in each time unit, not simply averaging over the Doppler domain. And more details to simplify average coefficient amplitude restriction in each time unit can be considered to simplify the complexity at UE side.  [Mod: Actually this part is FFS. So the proposal itself shouldn’t be an issue for you. Please check my comment for vivo]  **Proposal 2.E.1**: Support.  **Issue 2.6**  Considering the increased complexity due to CSI prediction and multi-slots PMI calculation, there can be several options, one option is CPU allocation enhancement, another option is to refine the time domain of reference resource.  The time domain of reference resource is defined to ensure that the UE has sufficient time to calculate and reporting CSI. In current spec, for AP CSI reporting, the value of *nCSI\_ref* is not directly related to the number of resources. However, for measurement of Doppler information, UE has to measure multiple occasions or multiple resources, which increases UE complexity. Therefore, the time domain of reference resource needs to be refined. |
| Mod V21 | **Added one more legacy combo for 2.C.1** |
| Lenovo / MotM | **Issue 2.1:**  Support Proposal 2.A.3, prefer further discussion on Proposal 2.A.2. Given Proposal 2.A.1, it is preferred that a common WB CQI for both windows to be reported in CSI Part 1  **Issue 2.2:**  We agree with Intel, it is preferrable to support the two bitmap designs for two different parameter combinations, e.g., Alt 3A overhead reduction is better for smaller *β* values. However we understand if vendors prefer one design as a basic feature. We also prefer to remove *“if the following down-selection succeeds”* to ensure at least one of the two options (Alt3A and Alt4) is supported  [Mod: Please check offline summary where this was added since it is quite clear that the down selection of this optional eco-bitmap optimization fails. So I won’t remove this.]  **Issue 2.4:**  Support Proposal 2.D.1. The CBSR should be applied separately for each DD basis vectors and not across DD basis vectors, since different DD basis vectors correspond to different precoders applied at different time slots.  **Issue 2.5:**  For Q=2, assuming that the non-zero coefficients are evenly distributed across the two W2 matrices and half the non-zero coefficients are omitted, Alt3 implies that the coefficients corresponding to the second W2 matrix are fully omitted, which in our opinion beats the purpose of high/medium speed CB design. I would appreciate the comments of Alt3 proponents on that  [Mod: It is the intention from Alt3 proponents since the 2nd DD component is assigned the lowest priority. Not sure what clarification you need from them 😊] |
| Google | Proposal 2.A.1: We think the first CW of the second CQI should be in UCI part 1, which follows current design principle. But if majority is ok with the proposal, we can accept it.  [Mod: Thanks. Please note that since Type-II CSI only extends to RI=4, only 1CW is supported. So there is no second CW for CQI x=1 or CQI x=2]  Proposal 2.A.2: In our view, for the second CQI, the UE does not need to report the 4-bit wideband CQI, or the UE can report a differential 2-bit wideband CQI.  Proposal 2.A.3: Support.  Proposal 2.B.1: OK.  Proposal 2.C.1: We failed to see the necessity for the new parameter combinations. According to some simulation results in AI/ML based CSI, some combinations for eType2 CSI with higher overhead does not actually help for performance. But if majority is fine, we are also ok.  [Mod: I tend to agree with you that legacy is just fine. But 4 companies showed in their SLS otherwise ☹]  Proposal 2.D.1: Support  Proposal 2.E.1: OK |
| NEC | **Proposal 2.A.1**  Support.  In addition, we think further discussion on which group in UCI part 2 should 2nd CQI be located is needed.  **Updated Proposal 2.A.1**: For the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities, when a UE is configured with X=2 for CQI calculation and reporting, the 2nd CQI is located in UCI part 2  FFS: Details on the location of 2nd CQI in G0/1/2  **[Mod: Please check proposal 2.E.1 where your proposed FFS will be a part of the discussion since the 2nd CQI is a new UCI parameter]**  **Proposal 2.A.2**  We also prefer differential values for the 2nd CQI. At least we can apply all 2 bits for wideband and subband CQI for X=2.  **Proposal 2.D.1**  Generally fine. In addition, we think the amplitude restriction should be applied per N4 unit.  **Updated Proposal 2.D.1**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocity, regarding CBSR, the legacy CBSR scheme is *fully reused* where a single CBSR configuration applies to all the Q DD bases (resulting in common SD beam group restriction for all DD bases),   * FFS: Whether amplitude restriction is summed across FD bases for each DD basis, *or* summed across FD and DD bases * FFS: Whether amplitude restriction is applied per unit   Note: This implies that the legacy soft amplitude restriction is reused  [Mod: OK] |
| CATT | **Issue2.1(Proposal 2.A.1/2/3):**  Support.  **Issue2.2(Proposal 2.B.1):**  OK with the proposal. One thing to clarify is that, if we fail to down select the two alternatives unfortunately, none of them are supported. To make it clear, we propose the following wording revision:   * Optional feature, if the following down-selection succeeds: down-select at most one from the following two alternatives in RAN#112bis-e:   [Mod: Please check my comment to Lenovo: repeated here: [Mod: Please check offline summary where this was added since it is quite clear that the down selection of this optional eco-bitmap optimization fails. So I won’t remove this.]  Regarding the optional feature, we prefer Alt3A. Because Alt3A has negligible performance loss compared with Alt1 with less bitmap overhead.  **Issue2.3(Proposal 2.C.1):**  We have similar views with Huawei. Separate table for (N4,Q)=(1,1) and (>1,2) can be considered. If only one table is used, we don’t support =3/4 considering the worse performance and overhead tradeoff. We prefer new {L=4, Pv={1/8,1/16},=1/2} and legacy {L=4,Pv={1/4,1/8},=1/2}.  **Issue2.4(Proposal 2.D.1):**  Fine with the proposal.  **Issue2.5(Proposal 2.E.1):**  OK with the proposal. |
| Mod V28 | **Some minor revision on proposals per inputs** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support **Proposal 2.C.1**, **Proposal 2.D.1**, **Proposal 2.E.1.** |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 2.A.1 to .3**: Fine  **Proposal 2.C.1**:  For small overhead region, for beta=1/16 for wideband PMI (based on N3=13 in EVM), even its motivation is questionable.  Therefore, suggestion to this proposal   |  | | --- | | * FFS UE feature report to support a subset of the linkages |   [Mod: OK but replace linkage with PC]  **Proposal 2.D.1**  A little unclear about how legacy is “fully reused,” and how can legacy soft amplitude restriction with no DD be reused  If “legacy” is just purposed to say common SD beam, we suggest the following editorial change:   |  | | --- | | **Proposal 2.D.1**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocity, regarding CBSR, ~~the legacy CBSR scheme is~~ *~~fully reused~~* ~~where~~ a ~~single CBSR configuration applies to all the Q DD bases (resulting in~~ common SD beam group restriction for all DD bases~~)~~,   * FFS: Whether amplitude restriction is summed across FD bases for each DD basis, *or* summed across FD and DD bases, or applied per DD unit   ~~Note: This implies that the legacy~~ FFS: soft amplitude restriction ~~is reused~~ |   [Mod: Thanks, your rewording is so much better]  **Proposal 2.E.1**: OK |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.A.1/2.A.2/2.A.3**:  Support all the proposals above.  **Proposal 2.B.1:**  Although we prefer basic feature only, we are OK have one optional feature for Q=2.  **Proposal 2.D.1**:  Support.  **Proposal 2.E.1**:  Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposals 2.A.1, 2.A.2, 2.A.3**  Support  **Proposal 2.C.1**  Our preference is to fully reuse Rel16 parameter combinations. Based on our results for Q=2, we don’t see a problem with excessive overhead. In the current proposal, it seems the combinations with L=2 are not useful for because the max NNZC would be too small to see any gain over Rel16  **Proposal 2.D.1**  Support  **Proposal 2.E.1**  Fine |
| CMCC | Support **Proposal 2.A.1/2/3**, **Proposal 2.B.1**, **Proposal 2.C.1**, **Proposal 2.D.1**, **Proposal 2.E.1.** |
| Xiaomi | Support these proposals |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | **Proposal 2.A.1**: Support  **Proposal 2.A.2**: We still prefer differential CQI reporting of the 2nd CQI.  **Proposal 2.A.3**: Support  **Proposal 2.B.1:**  We support Alt 3A as the UPT-overhead trade-off is much better for Alt 3A for all parameters combinations compared to Alt 1. Also, Alt 1 and Alt 3A have the same design and can be described simply as follows:  For both Alt 1 and Alt 3A, the bitmap for each q-th DD component is given by 2LSq for all q = 1,2  For Alt 1, Sq = M,  For Alt 3A, Sq <= M and S1+ S2= S  The selected S1 and S2 are reported by the bitmap of length MQ.  Since Alt 3A outperforms Alt 1 in terms of both overhead saving and UPT gain, we prefer Alt 3A.  **Proposal 2.C.1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.D.1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.E.1**: Support. |
| InterDigital | **Proposals, 2.A.1, 2.A.2, 2.A.3**  **Support**  **Proposal 2.B.1**  **Support**  **Proposal 2.D.1**  **Support** |
| Mod V39 | **Minor revision on 2.C.1 (added FFS) and 2.D.1 (better rewording from Qualcomm, same content)** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.C.1**   * Based on simulation results (included in revised Tdoc, R1-2303901), we do see some benefits with lower pv or lower beta value. But, such combinations are small in number. So, we think that most of the legacy combinations can be reused, and 1-2 new combinations (with lower pv or beta) can replace 1-2 legacy combinations. * Also, since the same table will be supported for both N4=1 and N4>1, we don’t support replacing all or most of the legacy combinations (since legacy combinations should be supported for N4=1). * So, we can’t support the 1st three new combinations with pv=1/8, and prefer to replace them with legacy. We can support the two new combinations (4th and 5th in the proposal). We support the last 4 combinations from legacy.  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  |  | | ~~2~~ | ~~1/8~~ | ~~1/16~~ | ~~1/4~~ | Do not support | | ~~2~~ | ~~1/8~~ | ~~1/16~~ | ~~1/2~~ | Do not support | | ~~4~~ | ~~1/8~~ | ~~1/16~~ | ~~1/4~~ | Do not support | | 2 | ¼ | 1/8 | ¼ | Legacy | | 2 | ¼ | 1/8 | ½ | Legacy | | 4 | ¼ | 1/8 | ¼ | Legacy | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | support | | 4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/2 | support | | 4 (\*) | 1/2 | 1/4 | 1/2 | Legacy | | 4 (\*) | 1/4 | 1/4 | 3/4 | Legacy | | 6 (\*) | 1/4 | -- | 1/2 | Legacy | | 6 (\*) | 1/4 | -- | 3/4 | Legacy |   **[Mod: Check the revised version where only the last 6 are proposed to be agreed and <=3 more will be down selected from a candidate of 6 PCs (3 from legacy and 3 from my previous FL proposal]** |
| ZTE | **Proposal 2.C.1:** Support the latest version from the moderator. Per our evaluation, the small Pv value of {1/8, 1/16} should be supported as suggested in the proposal (at least for the case of Q=2).  **[Mod: We will down select the controversial part in later rounds]** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.A.1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.A.2**: Not support.  In our view, reporting 2nd WB CQI is useless, because 1st and 2nd WB CQI must be the same since WB CQI is already averaged in wide frequency domain. Without 2nd WB CQI reporting, 4 bits can be saved.  **Proposal 2.A.3**: Support.  **Proposal 2.C.1**: Not support.  We have similar view with Samsung and Nokia. Supporting legacy value only is sufficient.  [Mod: Please check the revised proposal]  **Proposal 2.D.1**:  Our preference is to support separate CBSR for each DD basis but we can live with the current proposal.  **Issue 2.6:**   * **PDSCH EPRE assumption for CQI calculation (relative to which CSI-RS, UE assuming one Pc)**   powerControlOffset of the K AP CSI-RS resources, which is power offset of PDSCH RE to NZP CSI-RS RE, should be the same since the K AP CSI-RS resources are configured for the same channel measurement.   * **CPU allocation (one for each or all CSI-RS resources)**   Since the K AP NZP CSI-RS resources are burst CMRs for the same channel, CPU relaxation is needed. According to current specification, L CPUs are occupied when L AP CSI-RS are configured for AP CSI reporting but given that the K CSI-RSs show the same antenna port, one CPU may be enough.  In addition, CSI processing time relaxation is needed because UE should predict channel for N4 future time instances and calculate corresponding future PMIs. Legacy Z and Z’ is not sufficiently large enough considering the additional complexity. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For proposal 2.B.1, considering the benefits of overhead reduction, we support to adopt one of Alt 3A or Alt 4’, considering the Alt 3A/4’ has the same functionality, supporting only one of them is enough.  For proposal 2.D.1, the main proposal is still confusing to us as a common SD beam group restriction across all DD bases implies that the restriction is performed per DD basis, which is not aligned with the “summed across FD and DD bases” or “applied per DD unit” in the FFS part. so we propose the following modification, which is also the same the original intention to follow the legacy configurations.  **Proposal 2.D.1**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocity, regarding CBSR, a single ~~common~~ SD beam group restriction as legacy ~~across all DD bases~~ is used,   * FFS: Whether amplitude restriction is summed across FD bases for each DD basis, *or* summed across FD and DD bases, or applied per DD unit * FFS: Whether the legacy (optional) soft amplitude restriction is also supported or only hard amplitude restriction is supported   For proposal 2.E.1, we can also be fine with it. |
| Mod V51 | **Revised proposal 2.C.1 (only 6 out of previous 9 are proposed, only <=3 will be selected from 6 candidates)** |

### Issue 3: TRS-based reporting of time-domain channel properties (TDCP)

Table 5A Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 3.1 | [112] **Agreement**  For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, for TDCP measurement and calculation, by RAN1#112bis-e, decide between the following alternatives:   * Alt1. Fully reuse legacy TRS * Alt2. Study enhancements on TRS (e.g. periodicities)   Note. If there is no consensus on Alt2, Alt1 is the default outcome  **Proposal 3.A:**  For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, for TDCP measurement and calculation,   * KTRS ≥1 TRS resource set(s) can be configured in the CSI reporting setting when ReportQuantity is ‘tdcp’   + Note: the TRS resource set(s) configured for TDCP report do not impact or impose any new requirements on the UE behavior when processing TRS used as QCL type A/D source for reception of PDxCH. * No further spec enhancement on TRS is supported * [All the TRS resources in the configured resource set(s) share the same RE locations] * FFS: Whether to add further restrictions on the TRS resource set(s) on, e.g. QCL relationship, power control, [RE location], slot offset between TRS resource set(s), relation with resource set used for legacy usage   **FL Note**: This topic was discussed OFFLINE [1] | **Proposal 3.A:**   * **Support/fine:** Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Fujitsu, ZTE, Ericsson, CMCC, Lenovo/MotM, Sony, Qualcomm, Mavenir, vivo, MediaTek, NTT DOCOMO, [Google (add same RE location constraint)], Intel, Xiaomi, Sharp, NEC, Spreadtrum, LG * **Not support:** |
| 3.2 | Normalized amplitude quantization:   * Alt1: Fully reuse Rel-16 eType-II W2 amplitude quantization * Alt2: Partial reuse of Rel-16 eType-II W2 amplitude quantization (be specific) * Alt3: Completely new (be specific)   **Proposal 3.B.1**: For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, regarding the quantization of wideband normalized amplitude value,   * At least the following size-*Q* quantization alphabet is supported: where   + TBD: supported value(s) of *N* (e.g. or a larger value), *Q*, s (e.g. ½, ¼, 1/8, …), whether a center threshold is also supported (and if so, higher-layer configured) * FFS: Whether different schemes can be supported for different use cases   **FL Note**: This topic was discussed OFFLINE [1] | **Proposal 3.B.1:**   * **Support/fine:** Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Fujitsu, ZTE, Ericsson, CMCC, Sony, Google, Qualcomm, Mavenir, vivo, MediaTek, NTT DOCOMO, OPPO, Intel, Xiaomi, Sharp, Lenovo/MotM, Spreadtrum, LG, * **Not support:** |
| Phase quantization:   * Alt1: Fully reuse Rel-16 eType-II W2 phase quantization * Alt2: Partial reuse of Rel-16 eType-II W2 amplitude quantization (be specific) * Alt3: Completely new (be specific)   **Question 3.B.2**: Please share your view re wideband phase quantization for Y>1 | **1 bit (early late – due to DLL):** Ericsson, Google,  **3 bits:** ZTE  **4 bits:** Lenovo/MotM, Intel,  **Adaptive (depending on delay value):** Samsung |
| 3.3 | [112] **Agreement**  For aiding gNB determination of codebook switching and SRS periodicity with the Rel-18 TRS -based TDCP reporting, support reporting quantized wideband normalized amplitude/phase of the time-domain correlation profile with Y≥1 delay(s) as follows:   * Basic feature: Y=1 with delay≤ Dbasic symbols, only wideband quantized normalized amplitude is reported   + FFS: Candidate values for delay * Optional feature: Y=1 with delay>Dbasic symbols and Y≥1, wideband quantized normalized amplitude and phase for each delay are reported   + For Y>1, the phase can be configud to be absent for all the Y delays   + TBD: Whether the value of Y is configurable or following the delays from the configured TRS resource   + TBD: Candidate value(s) for Y>1 * FFS: Value of Dbasic   **Question 3.C**: Please share your view re supported Y values (for Y>1), Dbasic, and delay values  **Proposal 3.C.1:** For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, regarding the value of parameter Y, in addition to Y=1, support Y=2, 3, 4, [7]  **Proposal 3.C.2:** For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, support the following D (delay) values where Dbasic is equal to [2]/[5] slots   * [At least for inter-burst measurement] 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 slots | **Dbasic:**   * **1 slot:** MediaTek, Lenovo/MotM, Google, IDC * **2 slots:** Samsung, Google, Qualcomm, IDC * **4 slots:** OPPO * **5 slots:** ZTE, Samsung (2nd), Ericsson (2nd), OPPO, Fujitsu, Lenovo/MotM, Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi, * **10 slots:** Ericsson   **Y>1:**   * **2,4 (max):** Samsung, MediaTek, Google * **7:** ZTE * **3:** Ericsson, Google, ZTE * <4: Lenovo/MotM   **Delays:**   * **Inferred from CSI-RS slot offset:** Intel, Samsung * **4,14,18 symbols for intra-burst:** Google * **1,2,3,4 slots for inter-burst:** Google * **5 slots:** Qualcomm(UE optional) * **Multiple of 5 slots:** ZTE, Fujitsu * **Multiple of 1 slot:** Ericsson |
| 3.4 | [112] **Agreement**  For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, regarding the value of parameter Y for Y>1, down-select from the following alternatives:   * Alt1. The value of Y is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signalling * Alt2. The value of Y follows the delays from the configured TRS resource * Alt3. The value of Y is UE-selected and reported   The value of Y is a UE capability  **Proposal 3.D**: For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, regarding the value of parameter Y for Y>1, the value of Y is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signalling  **Question 3.D**: Please share your view re the signalling/configuration of Y | **Proposal 3.D:**   * **Support/fine:** Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, Google, vivo, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Ericsson, LG * **Not support:** Lenovo/MotM, Samsung, Xiaomi,   **Alt1:** Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, Google, vivo, OPPO, Fujitsu,  **Alt2:** IDC, Huawei/HiSi, NEC  **Alt3:** Lenovo/MotM, Xiaomi, Samsung |
| 3.5 | [112] **Agreement**  For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, the priority of the CSI report(s) associated with TDCP reporting is down-selected from the following alternatives:   * Alt1. Lower than other CSI reports * Alt2. Same as CSI report(s) not carrying L1-RSRP or L1-SINR * Alt3. Higher than other CSI reports * Other alternatives are not precluded   **Proposal 3.E**: For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, the priority of the CSI report(s) associated with TDCP reporting is lower than other CSI reports  **FL Note**: | **Proposal 3.E:**   * **Support/fine:** Samsung, Intel, ZTE, Ericsson, OPPO, Fujitsu, Google, Spreadtrum, Sony,Apple, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, * **Not support:** vivo (Alt2), Huawei/HiSi (Alt2), Lenovo/MotM (Alt2), Xiaomi (Alt2), LG (Alt2)   **Alt1:** ZTE, Spreadtrum, Sony, Google, Samsung, Apple  **Alt2 (no spec impact):** vivo,Sony, Lenovo/MotM, Xiaomi,  **Alt3:** IDC,Lenovo/MotM, LG, |
| 3.6 | Next-level (pre-maintenance) details:   * How to determine SCS for Z’ * CPU allocation | |

Table 5B TDCP: summary of observation from simulation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **SLS results** | | |
| **Issue #** | **Metric** | **Observation** |
| ZTE | 3.2 | UPT vs speed,  use case = SRS periodicity | *Amplitude quantization scheme*  outperforms and with higher DL throughput in the use case of SRS periodicity determination.   1. 1   *Phase quantization scheme q1 outperforms q0 and q2 with higher throughput in the use case of SRS periodicity determination* |
| OPPO | 3.2 | SE vs UE speed, use case: T1/T2 CB switch | *Observation 2: The threshold of codebook switching is close to 1, and R16 amplitude is coarse for TDCP reporting.* |
| Xiaomi | 3.1 | Switching accuracy vs delay | *Observation 1: Two TRS resource sets with delay 5 slots can obtain better TDCP measurement.* |
| Nokia | 3.2 | UPT vs UE speed, use case: T1/T2 CB switch | By comparing the performance gains in 1ms delay scenario and 10ms delay scenario one can notice that codebook with N=41 shows best performance, while all other codebooks lead to preferring Type-II too often, what is explained by the fact that highest quantisation level is still is not high enough for 1ms delay correlation profile calculation. But in case of 10ms delay (see Figure 15) codebook with N=20 shows best performance, and N=41 shows very poor performance.    Performance degradation of Type-I/Type-II switching with noisy TDCP measurements does not increase for shorter delays. |
| Mavenir | 3.3 | Doppler spread vs UE speed | Observation 2. 20-slot delay has shown worse accuracy. Delay <= 5 slots can ensure the estimation for time variation of channel. 5-slot delay is better for smaller UE velocity (<=30km/h), whereas 1-slot delay is suitable in scenario of higher velocity. |
| Samsung | 3.2 | UPT vs UE speed, use case: T1/T2 CB switch | *For T1/T2 CB switch based on threshold = 0.86, and Y=1*   * *3-bit R16-based quantization is sufficient*   + *1-v^2 is the best at low speed (<=10kmph)*   + *1-v is good overall* * *4-bit/5-bit doesn’t offset any gain over 3-bit*   *Based on LLS evaluations,*   * *The BLER performance of un-quantized and 1st 8 levels from Rel-16 legacy 4-bit reference codebook is almost same*   *Based on LLS evaluations,*   * *The BLER performance with 16-PSK for phase quantization is least, provides close match with un-quantized performance* * *QPSK has highest BLER among 3 phase quantization methods.* |
| MediaTek |  | UPT vs speed, use case: T1/T2 CB switch | If are the quantization levels from E-Type amplitude quantization, then using for TDCP quantization offers better quantization performance compared to for TDCP values well below 1. |
| Ericsson | 3.1 | UPT vs UE speed, use case: T1/T2 CB switch | In Figure 15 ,we show the performance of time correlation-based switching between CSI Type I and CSI type II for 100MHz bandwidth for small correlation delays, without averaging over time and with averaging over ten consecutive measurement occasions. In both cases we see that there is a significant improvement in performance when averaging over time is done. |
| 3.2 | UPT vs UE speed, use case: T1/T2 CB switch | In the simulations in Figure 8 and Figure 9 we see the performance for the quantization schemes for s equal to ½, 1/3, ¼ and 1/8 for a correlation delay of 5 slots and 3 slots. We see that higher granularity (i.e. smaller s) gives better performance but the difference is small, less than one percent in throughput  …  Thus, we confirm that at least for the use case of CSI Type I - Type II switching, already the granularity is sufficient.  For TDCP amplitude, an upper limit of 0.995 for the quantization range needs to be considered. |
| 3.3 | UPT vs speed, use case: T1/T2 CB switch | For case with TRS colliding with PDSCH, a delay of 84 symbols gives the best performance at low SNRs.  For case with TRS colliding with PDSCH, a delay of 36 symbols gives good performance at medium to high SNRs.  For case with TRS colliding with TRS, a delay of 140 symbols is needed for good switching performance. |

Table 6 Additional inputs: issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your inputs on each of the issues and, if applicable, proposals in TABLE 5A** |
| Samsung | **Question 3.B.2**:   * We prefer to reuse legacy as much as possible. However, depending on the delay values, the phase can be concentrated around +1 or -1. So, the range of values need to be adaptive according to delay values. For ex: where is #bits for phase quantization, and is scaling to adapt the range of phase values. The value of depends on the delay values.   **Question 3.C**:   * Dbasis: support 2 slots, or 5 slots (2nd preference) * Delays: support Y smallest delays based on the periodicity/offset of TRS resource set configurations   **Question 3.D**:   * Support Alt3. For given Y, all Y correlation values may not need reporting due to small amplitude (e.g. below the quantization noise). The UE should be allowed to report the value of y<=Y.   **Proposal 3.E**: support |
| Mod V7 | **No change** |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 3.A:**  Support.  Regarding the FFS bullet on restrictions, we believe the TRS resource set(s) used for a TDCP report should be configured with the same TCI state ID, subcarriers bandwidth, RE locations, powerControlOffset and powerControlOffsetSS values across all resources. If the mentioned restrictions are not enforced the can directly impact the performance and usefulness of the agreed TDCP metric.  **Proposal 3.B.1:**  Support.  **Question 3.C:**  Regarding Y values, we believe the max Y value should be capped to four, i.e.,  Regarding delay value, our preference is to limit the value to 4 slots, any value above 4 slots is highly susceptible to aliasing problem, as we discussed in our contribution (R1-2303328). |
| vivo | **Proposal 3.E**  We are wondering whether there is any reason to select a certain priority for TDCP compared with other CSI reports? Anyway we have the report ID to distinguish the priority of different CSI reports other than L1-RSRP/SINR. If a certain NW wants to give lower priority for TDCP report, NW can just assign TDCP a larger report ID. Therefore, if we follow Alt 2, there is no specification impact at all.  **Issue 3.4**  We support to configure Y in RRC separately. |
| ZTE | **Question 3.B.2:**  Regarding the range-adaptive phase quantization scheme, the range should be also relevant to the direction of UE velocity. More specifically, as the delay increases, the phase may varies from 0 to 2 or 0 to -2, depending on the direction of UE velocity or equivalently the sign of the dominant Doppler shift.   * + In the formula , if k is set as 2, the quantization range is 0 ~ , but the phases may concentrate within 0 ~ -. Hence, we propose that UE should report a 1-bit indicator indicating whether the phase varies from 0 to 2 or 0 to -2 as the delay increases, and use different quantization schemes (or different quantization ranges) based on the indicator.   From our perspective, finer granularity should be set for phases corresponding to small delays in slow-speed scenarios, because:   * Both the behaviors of changing SRS periodicity and switching codebook happen in slow-speed scenarios (≤30 km/h); * Due to phase consistency problem at UE side, phases corresponding to smaller delays have better accuracy.   However, finer granularity should be set around 0 or 2, depending on the direction of UE velocity. Therefore, we propose to use the following phase quantization scheme in our contribution:  where “mode” is the indicator indicating whether the phase varies from 0 to 2 or 0 to -2 as the delay increases.  Consider other companies’ proposals, we propose the following proposal for discussion:   * UE reports a 1-bit indicator indicating whether the phase varies from 0 to 2 or 0 to -2 as the delay increases, and use different phase quantization schemes based on the indicator. * FFS: Specific phase quantization schemes based on the indicator.   **Question 3.C:**  Considering the FFT length is usually one of {2, 4, 8}, and the channel correlation corresponding to zero delay is equal to 1 and does not need to be reported. Therefore, the candidate values of Y should be {1, 3, 7}  Based on previous simulation results provided by a plurality of companies, the proper selections of Y and corresponding delays are   * Y = 1, delay = 5 slots (i.e., Dbasic = 5 slots); * Y > 1, delays = {5, 10, ..., 5Y}.   **Question 3.D:**  Support Alt 1. If either Alt 2 or Alt 3 is adopted, a plurality of restrictions are needed to ensure Y and the corresponding delays can be properly selected at UE side. This certainly increases the spec complexity. Compared to Alt 2 and Alt 3, Alt 1 is more straightforward and simpler.  **Support Proposal 3.E.**  **Issue 2.6:** Regarding the next level issues, we have the initial thoughts as follows:   * Regarding the time line of TDCP reporting, we prefer to define (Z, Z’) = (Z2, Z2’) as a baseline, where (Z2, Z2’) are defined in clause 5.4 in [TS 38.214]. And we can further study whether (Z, Z’) should be associated with UE capability, e.g., (Z, Z’) = (Z2 + Q, Z2’ +Q), where Q is a UE capability. * Apparently, the computational cost of TDCP measurement is relevant to Y. Therefore, for a TDCP report, the number of occupied CPUs OCPU should be determined by Y in our initial thought. |
| Ericsson | **Question 3.C**:   * We prefer Dbasic=10 slots since that is needed for the TRS colliding with neighbor cell TRSs scenario, but we are open to compromise and settle for Dbasic=5 slots if 10 slots is deemed to complex for the UE. If Dbasic=5slots, then up to 10 slots should be supported based on additional UE capability. * We think Y=3 could be useful to cover a large range of UE velocities * We think the correlation delay should be flexibly configurable up to the maximum value. This is needed to handle different TDD frame patterns and also to avoid collisions with other RSs.   **Question 3.D**:   * We want Alt1. The value of Y is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signalling. This is most straightforward. Only the gNB knows what the measurement will be used for so the gNB needs to configure Y. To make it implicit based on the configured TRSs would be unnecessary complicated and could open up for ambiguities.   **Proposal 3.E:**   * We are fine with the proposal 3.E that the priority of the CSI report(s) associated with TDCP reporting is lower than other CSI reports   **Question 3.B.2**:   * We agree with Samsungs that the phase of the autocorrelation is either close to 0 or pi. However, whether the phase is close to 0 or pi can’t be known beforehand since it depends not only on the correlation delay but also on the UE speed/doppler spread. We think this could be handled by using one bit for the sign (or equivalently a 0 or pi radians phase offset), and then some additional bits for an additional small phase. We think the sign could be useful, but we don’t know what the phase could be used for. The phase is related to the odd moments of the Doppler power spectrum, i.e. to how asymmetric the Doppler power spectrum is. This could possibly be useful for some use-case, but since we don’t know of any ourselves it would be nice to hear what companies have in mind. |
| OPPO | **Question 3.C**:  We support Dbasic = 4 or 5 slots and delay based on the periodicity/offset of TRS resource set configuration  **Question 3.D**:  Alt1 is preferred.  **Proposal 3.E:**  Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | **Question 3.D**  We support Alt.1 as robust and simple design.  **Proposal 3.E:**  Support |
| Fujitsu | **Question 3.C**:  Sorry for making misunderstandings, we also support Dbasic = 5 slots.  For the value of Y, although we prefer Y> 5 for better performance, but we can accept multiple candidate values (<5 & >5) suggested by ZTE.  **Question 3.D**:  Since we have supported Y is a UE capability, Alt1 is more straightforward.  **Proposal 3.E:**  Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | **Regarding Question 3.C:** On the candidate delay values, it should be noted that different time correlation delays may be needed due to different TDD frame structure. So, we think for the basic feature, the supported delay values should be from 1 slot to Dbasic slots with granularity of 1 slot (e.g., if Dbasic = 5 slots, then candidate delay values of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 slots should be suppoted.  For the optional features, candidate delay values should be from 1 slot to Dmax slots with granularity of 1 slot.  **Regarding Question 3.B.2:**  We have a question to ZTE. It seems to us that you assume that the UE has perfect knowledge of the transmission frequency of the TRS from the gNB. Is this true? If so, is the intention to tighten the requirements on the gNB and UE clocks with many orders of magnitude compared to the current RAN4 requirements?  The complex time correlation as estimated by the UE is strongly dependent on the UE clock used (or equivalently on the reference frequency used). A change of the frequency of the oscillator used as UE clock, results in a phase rotation of the estimated time correlation:    The clock of the gNB and the clock of the UE are so imprecise that the estimated phase of the time correlation becomes completely useless if the UE clock is used as a reference as it is (for a quantitative analysis, see our contribution R1-2303783).  This problem can be ‘solved’ by the UE tuning it’s oscillator to the signal received from the gNB. This means, however, that the UE clock is affected by the Doppler shift of the received signal. As a result the phase of the time correlation estimate will not have the strong linear dependence on delay and UE speed that ZTE mention in their response. UE tuning to the Doppler shifted received signal removes this strong linear dependence.  Before deciding on a quantization scheme for the phase of the time correlation, it’s necessary to clearly define the clock frequency the UE should use in estimating the phase. Is it a clock tuned to the received signal or is it a new high performance clock which should be used by the gNB and the UE, with corresponding new extremely tight performance requirements in RAN4? In our view it should be the clock tuned to the received signal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Question 3.D:  We prefer Alt1, the value of Y is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signalling.  Proposal 3.E:  We prefer Alt2. We don’t think it is an important issue to distinguish the priority between TDCP with other CSI reports. As Vivo mentioned, the priority can be configured by gNB with different reportConfigID, which is more flexible and no spec impact. |
| Mod V21 | **Added proposal 3.D based on majority view** |
| ZTE | **Regarding Question 3.B.2:** Thank you so much for E///’s question to us.  In short, we think the frequency compensation (tuned to the received signal) should be assumed, but the central Rx frequency (after fine sync) should be stable in UE side. That means that, from the perspective of centrical frequency, if having a bias of 1220Hz in terms of Doppler shift offset + oscillator impact, the UE may compensate the majority bias (like 1200Hz) and there is still some resident (e.g., 20 Hz). From the estimating of relative Doppler shift/spread, the key issue is to describe the relative or spread information (i.e., relative shift or Doppler spread from 1120Hz to 1320Hz is almost the same as -80Hz to 120Hz, in our views, e.g., for determining SRS periodicity or codebook switching). Therefore, the improvement of phase quantization seems to be needed for Doppler spread/relative shift estimation in gNB side (that is also mentioned by Samsung, if our understanding is correct). Then, the bias/resident is definitely relevant to UE velocity, delay, etc., and then we tend to agree that the UE have some more information. |
| MediaTek | After further offline discussion and clarification, we would like to update our proposal for the **Dbasic value to 1 slot.** |
| Lenovo / MotM | **Issue 3.1:**  Support Proposal 3.A  **Issue 3.2:**  OK with Proposal 3.B.1 given the majority support, however we prefer to keep candidate q values as part of FFS along with N, s values  Regarding Question 3.B.2, we appreciate the good discussion from Samsung, Ericsson and ZTE. Samsung and Ericsson’s arguments are clear to us, however ZTE’s comment about “compensating the majority of bias” is not clear, so we prefer if more discussion is allowed for companies to express their views.  **Issue 3.3:**  Regarding Question 3.C, we support Y≤4. We also prefer if Dbasic values is configurable to multiple values including {1,5} slots, where for Y>1 the delay value is y.Dbasic for the yth autocorrelation value, y=1,…,Y  **Issue 3.4:**  We prefer a UE-assisted value of Y (Alt3) based on the measured autocorrelation by the UE  **Issue 3.5:**  Since one use case of the TDCP report is to help determine the codebook type for future CSI reports, it is preferred to have higher, or at least the same priority as other CSI reports not carrying L1-RSRP |
| Google | Proposal 3.A: We think the restriction is needed. During the offline discussion, no company raised concern on the restriction of RE location, but the discussion was about the spatial domain configuration. We suggest changing the last sub-bullet as follows:   * **The TRS resource sets share the same configuration of RE location for each TRS resource**   + **FFS: other restrictions, e.g., QCL relationship, power offset, and so on**   [Mod: Added that bullet in brackets reworded. Please check. We can see if this is agreeable. If so, it is also better for progress 😊]  Proposal 3.B.1: Support  Question 3.B.2: In our view, the phase is useless, since the phase continouty is not guranteed. We think 1-bit is enough.  Question 3.3: Y = {1, 2, 3, 4}. Dbasic = 1 or 2 slots (depending on the supported TRS structure). Delay values = {4, 14, 18} symbols for intra-burst TDCP and {1, 2, 3, 4} TRS offset for inter-burst TDCP.  Question 3.D: Support Alt1. UE has no information how gNB would use this. So it is better that this is configured by the gNB.  Proposal 3.E: Support |
| NEC | **Proposal 3.A:**  Fine with the proposal. Considering the delays for TDCP reporting, we think the offset between TRS resource sets also needs further discussion.  **Updated Proposal 3.A:**  For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, for TDCP measurement and calculation,   * KTRS ≥1 TRS resource set(s) can be configured in the CSI reporting setting when ReportQuantity is ‘tdcp’   + Note: the TRS resource set(s) configured for TDCP report do not impact or impose any new requirements on the UE behavior when processing TRS used as QCL type A/D source for reception of PDxCH. * No further spec enhancement on TRS is supported * FFS: Whether to add further restrictions on the TRS resource set(s) on, e.g. QCL relationship, power control, RE location, slot offset between TRS resource set(s), relation with resource set used for legacy usage   [Mod: OK] |
| Mod V28 | **Minor revision on 3.A per inputs**  **Added 3.C.1 on Y values** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support **Proposal 3.D, and Proposal 3.E** |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 3.A.1, 3.B.1:** OK  **Question 3.C**  We understand the motivation of longer delay for use case like codebook switch.  But still, the incremental memory cost is expensive – note that this is buffering the raw demodulations of FD-dense TRS.  For smaller delay like 1 slot, it is still beneficial for some use case like DMRS time density (although more limited use cases), and it is friendly to UE since existing TRS processing also require this – no incremental cost  Therefore, as a basic UE feature, we **propose Dbasic=2 slots**  Besides, modified a little bit on our view of delay value captured by FL  **Proposal 3.C.1**  2 or 3  **Proposal 3.D**  One motivation for UE-selective report a quantity smaller than configured Y is, sometimes some certain pair of resources may be unavailable for certain delay (lag).  But this can be resolved by report invalid value e.g. zero-autocorrelation  Therefore, we prefer the simplest Alt1, based on that **invalid or zero-autocorrelation can be reported**  **Proposal 3.E**  May need clarification: Lower priority means larger value of pri( ) function? If yes, we are OK |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 3.A:**  We can support the proposal.  **Proposal 3.B.1**:  We can support the proposal.  **Proposal 3.D**:  Support the proposal for simplicity.  **Proposal 3.E**:  Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 3.A**  Support. Basically the idea is that the additional periodic TRS(s) used for TDCP share the same time and frequency domain configurations (except for slot offset) with a “legacy” periodic TRS. Regarding the QCL assumption, one possibility is to configure the additional periodic TRS(s) used for TDCP as QCL-ed with a “legacy” periodic TRS.  **Question 3.C**  Regarding D­basic our preference is 5slots  Regarding the delay(s), we think these can be inferred by the slot offset of the TRSs if and it can be assumed 1slot if the report setting is linked to a single TRS (in this case the TRS resource set has 4 resources)  Regarding the supported values of Y, we think 2,3,4 or a subset of these values is sufficient  **Proposal 3.D**  Fine, although we think the value Y may be inferred by the number of TRS(s) linked to the reporting setting  **Proposal 3.E**  Support |
| CMCC | **Proposal 3.D**  Support.  **Proposal 3.E**  Support. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 3.A:**  Support. We also think the restriction on the location of TRS resource is necessary.  **Proposal 3.B.1:**  In principle, we are fine with the proposal. According to observation, it is feasible that is applied to aid gNB determining the switching of Type I and Type II codebook. But, for determining SRS periodicity, we think it is not good method to obtain accurate quantization amplitude.  **Question 3.C:**  For value Dbasic, we think 5 slots is suitable value.  For delay, it depends on the slot offset between TRS resource set. The candidate value belongs to [1,5] slots.  According to our simulation results, larger value Y can help to estimating more accurate Doppler shift. We think Y=7 or 8 is a suitable value.  **Question 3.D**  We support Alt3. according to UE speed and the calculated the quantization amplitude, it is not necessary to report all values. For example, if the quantized amplitude is zero, it is not necessary to report. Accordingly, the phase does not need to report as well.  **Issue 3.5**  We support Alt2. TDCP reporting is used to aid gNB switch Type I and Type II codebook or determine SRS periodicity, which is applied to data schedule. For other CSI reporting not carrying L1-RSRP or L1-SINR, it is also used to data schedule. From this perspective, they should have the same priority. |
| InterDigital | **Proposal 3.B.1**  Support  **Question 3.C**  In the last meeting agreement, Dbasic was defined as the number of symbols, not sure why now we are considering slots. In our view, in a high Doppler scenario, the lag for correlation measurement does not need to be too long as the channel is expected to vary at a sufficiently high rate. Besides, an unnecessary long lag has some implications on the UE memory usage by forcing it to hold samples for an unreasonably extended period of time. Therefore, a Dbasic in the range of 1 or 2 slots should be sufficient. |
| Ericsson | **Regarding Proposal 3.B.1:**  We are ok with the proposal. But we have a question **@Lenovo/MotM** regarding the change they proposed to make candidate values of q FFS. According to the proposal, a size-Q quantization alphabet is used. Then, there will be 2Q codepoints in the alphabet. It is quite natural then that q=0,1, …, 2Q-1 where each q value corresponding to one of the 2Q codepoints. Since your suggestion is to make the range of q FFS, could you explain how else to choose the range of q that results in 2Q codepoints?  [Mod: You raised a good point. I’ll add that back then]  **Regarding Question 3.B.2:**  @ ZTE Thank you for the quick reply. Great that you agree that the phase reporting should be based on UE frequency compensation to the RX frequency. We think it would be good to capture this in an agreement. It could be formulated in different ways but maybe the following note would do:   * note: the average frequency of the received signal is used as reference frequency when estimating the time correlation.   Ok with **Proposal 3.C.1**, although we think a value of Y=7 may be a bit high.  Support **Proposal 3.D**. |
| Mod V39 | **Minor revision per inputs**  **Added proposal 3.C.2 of delay values. I have narrowed down the candidates of Dbasic between 2 and 5 slots based on companies’ preferences (which are scattered everywhere 😊)** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 3.B.1**:   * same Question as E///, with Q bits, the range has to be 0,1,…2^Q-1 @Lenovo: are your proposing a function, e.g. Q(q), where q=0,1,…,2^Q-1? If so, why Q(q)=q is not sufficient? And what is Q(q) if you propose it? * Based on our simulation results (in updated Tdoc 2303901), N>2^Q-1 is needed to low speed or small delay. So, we suggest include in the TBD subbullet.   + TBD: supported value(s) of *N* (e.g. ),   **[Mod: OK but rephrased your suggestion to “e.g. 2^Q-1 or a larger value” since the above formulation is confusing]**  **Proposal 3.D**: we still think a value (where is gNB-configured) can be reported by the UE, since all Y correlation values may not need reporting, for example, for a low speed UE or small delay values associated with Y delay. So, suggest to add the highlighted bullet below.  **Proposal 3.D**: For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, regarding the value of parameter Y for Y>1, the value of Y is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signalling,   * UE can report a value   **[Mod: This addition seems to contradict the main bullet since Alt1 and Alt3 in the current formulation exclude each other. With the above formulation, Y becomes the maximum value which is not the intention of Alt1. So I will not add the bullet since it won’t be agreeable to the majority]** |
| Lenovo / MotM | **Proposal 3.B.1:**  **@EE/SS**  To illustrate on our comment, for Q=4, s=1/2, N=2Q-1, the codebook of values is:  {0.9945 0.9922 0.9890 0.9844 0.9779 0.9688 0.9558 0.9375 0.9116 0.8750 0.8232 0.7500 0.6464 0.5000 0.2929 0}.  Clearly, most of the codebook values are centered around 0.9, e.g., the difference between the first and fourth values is only 0.01, which includes significant redundancy in our opinion. This issue can be resolved via supporting smaller values of s, however this would reduce the largest value of the amplitude codeword, e.g., at s=1/8, Q=4, and N=2Q-1, the largest amplitude value of the codebook is 0.73. Given that, our preference is to further study the values of q, s, and N, to ensure the following three criteria are met:   * + - 1. The largest autocorrelation value of the codebook is close to 1       2. The majority of the codeword values are greater 0.5       3. The codeword values greater than 0.5 are not too concentrated around the largest codeword value   Based on our analysis, the proposed q=0,…2Q-1 may not be able to achieve the first and third criteria simultaneously, and hence we prefer to keep q values FFS for now. I am not sure if Samsung’s proposal to support N>2Q-1 (while keeping q the same) can help resolve this issue, we can probably discuss that in the meeting. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 3.C.2:** Not support. As agreed previously, **Dbasic**  by definition is only applicable to basic feature so we don’t understand why there are two values of [2] and [5] slots associated with **Dbasic** . We believe, **Dbasic** should be defined as a single value, preferably 1-slot. For the sake of progress if companies have strong opinion on making **Dbasic** larger, we can at most compromise to 2-slots. It should be noted that **Dbasic** has a significant impact on UE sample buffering capability and is which is extremely costly for the UE.  We are fine with **D** (delay) having multiple values; however, we do not agree with the range proposed. We believe the range should be capped at the smaller value, i.e., 4 slots. The system benefits of introducing any value higher than 4 slots is questionable as it will be impacted by the Aisling phenomenon. |
| ZTE | **Proposal 3.A:** The restriction may be relevant to time-domain behaviour of K TRS. We are open to capture the bracket, but we need to have a note of clarifying that P+AP TRS and P+P TRS should be supported (otherwise, the current spec restriction in Section 5.1.6.1.1 in TS 38.214 seems sufficient).  **Proposal 3.B:** The range of q is relevant to the support value(s) of N. If having “”, the N should be . Otherwise, the candidate value of “0” does not make sense in the typical case.  **Proposal 3.C.2:** The range of D, we do not need to clarify inter-burst or intra-burst measurement which is just relevant to TRS configuration. For instance, we may have two TRS bursts ({n, n+1}, {n+2, n+3} slot), in which we may configure Y=3 and D=1. Therefore, we have the following general description. Alternatively, just remove “[at least for inter-burst measurement]”:  **Proposal 3.C.2:** For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, support the following D (delay) values where Dbasic is equal to [2]/[5] slots   * ~~[~~Regardless of inter/intra-burst measurement~~]~~ 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 slots   **Regarding Question 3.B.2:** Thanks for E///’s reply. We are open to have a note (even though we do not have a clear proposal), but it should be the estimate of average frequency is used as reference (in the multi-path channel, the central frequency-estimate residence can NOT be avoided). Then, the estimation (freq-sync) is performed based on TRS/SSB measurement.   * note: the actual estimate of average frequency of the received signal is used as reference frequency when estimating the time correlation. |
| LG | **Proposal 3.A: Support**  **Proposal 3.B.1: Support**  **Proposal 3.D: Support**  **Proposal 3.E: Not Support**  Since TDCP is used to determine CSI configuration, it make sense for TDCP to have higher priority than CSI report. So, our preference is Alt 3. However, as a compromise, we are also fine with Alt 2 in which gNB determines and configures the priority between CSI and TDCP by using reporting ID. |
| Mod V51 | **Minor edit on 3.B.1 per Samsung comment** |
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