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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 | [112bis-e] **Agreement**  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   **Proposal 1.B.2**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, *for mode-1*, the layer-common reference CSI-RS resource is fixed to the first of the N selected CSI-RS resource(s)  **Question 1.B**: The only pending UCI design detailed issue is the reference CSI-RS resource . Three proposals have been mentioned. Please share your preference (with technical justification of the benefits):   * Alt1. Fixed to the first of the N selected CSI-RS resource(s) * Alt2. Selected by the UE and signalled together with the (N-1) FD window offsets * Alt3. Derived from SCI(s) (note: SCI is layer-specific while this reference is layer-common)   **MOVED TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2** | **Proposal 1.B.2:**   * **Support/fine:** ZTE, Samsung, NEC, vivo, NTT DOCOMO, OPPO, Intel, MediaTek, CMCC, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Huawei/HiSi, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/MotM, Ericsson, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, LG, Spreadtrum, Fujitsu, * **Not support:**   **Alt1 (fixed):** ZTE, Samsung, NEC, vivo, NTT DOCOMO, MediaTek, CMCC, Lenovo/MotM, LG  **Alt2 (signalled):** NEC,  **Alt3 (derived from SCI):** |
| 1.3 | [112bis-e] **Agreement**  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 * ….  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **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 |  | | … |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   **Question 1.C.5**: Please share your view on the following alternatives for the FFS point on Parameter Combination for NTRP=1 with technical justification (much preferably backed with SLS):   * Alt0 (default outcome if no consensus between Alt1 and Alt2). Not adding another Parameter Combination in addition to the agreed seven * Alt1. Add a combination based on the legacy Rel-16: L=4 and FD combo {**{pv};** {½, ½, ¼, ¼; ½} * Alt2. Add a combination with L=4 and FD combo {**{pv};** {½, ½, ½, ½; ½}   **FL Note:** Alt0 is the default outcome if there is no consensus on this.  **Conclusion 1.C.5**: On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, for *NTRP* =1, there is no consensus in adding another Parameter Combination on top of the already agreed seven Parameter Combinations.  Note that the conclusion (1.C.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.  **MOVED TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2** | **Alt0:** NTT DOCOMO, OPPO, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, LG  **Alt1:** vivo, Xiaomi, Lenovo/MotM,  **Alt2:** ZTE (same as dynamic TRP selection from NTRP=2/3), CMCC, Samsung |
| [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   [111] **Agreement**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding the SD basis selection, for a configured value of *NTRP*, a set of *NL* combinations of values for {*L*1, ..., *LNTRP*} is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signaling   * When *NL*>1, the selected combination of values for {*L*1, ..., *LNTRP*} is reported in CSI part 1 using an indicator, selected from the *NL* configured combinations   + *NL* =1 is one of the supported candidate values   …  In regard to whether several FD combos can be configured for a UE, the following agreement clearly precludes this because:   * Wording “the value” implies singular, not plural * If >1 FD combo values can be configured as a part of the configured linkages, it allows dynamic (UE selection and reporting) FD combo selection which violates the agreement (gNB-configured by RRC configuration)     [112] **Agreement**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, for Rel-16-based refinement, support at least the following combinations of {pv,} from where *the value* of {*pv,*} is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signaling:  …  Therefore, to allow configuring multiple FD combos in relation to SD and linkages, the group would have to revert a previous agreement (not advisable in such a late stage).  **Conclusion 1.C.4**: (**for clarification**) On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, no additional configuration signalling for indicating the linkage is needed. Per previous agreements (RAN1#111 and 112):   * “The [single] value of {*pv,*} is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signalling” * “[The] set of *NL* combinations of values for {*L*1, ..., *LNTRP*} is gNB-configured via higher-layer (RRC) signalling”   Such configuration shall be according to the supported/agreed linkages.  **Agree with FL clarification of previous agreements**: ZTE, Samsung, vivo, NTT DOCOMO, [OPPO], Intel, CMCC, Qualcomm, MediaTek, Lenovo/MotM, Huawei/HiSi, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, LG, Spreadtrum, Fujitsu,  **Not agreeing with FL clarification of previous agreements**: [NEC], [Xiaomi]  **FL Note**: This conclusion is clarification in nature, clearly implied from previous agreements  **MOVED TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2** | |
| [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  **Conclusion 1.C.2:** On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, for Rel-16-based refinement, for *NTRP*>1, in addition to the supported SD combinations/permutations, there is no consensus on supporting at least one additional combination where at least one of the *Ln* values (*n*=1, …, *NTRP*) is 6  **FL Note**: This was discussed offline [1] and the current situation   * **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   Note that the conclusion (1.C.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.  **MOVED TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 1, ENDORSED** | |
| 1.4 | [112bis-e] **Agreement**  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   **Proposal 1.D.3:** On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding CBSR, the first of the NTRP configured CSI-RS resources must be configured with CBSR, while the remaining (NTRP –1) configured CSI-RS resources can be optionally configured with CBSR  **FL Note: No CBSR config option per resource? (No company seems to have concern on this)**   * **Yes:** Huawei/HiSi, NEC, Nokia/NSB * **No:** | **Proposal 1.D.3:**   * **Support/fine:** Huawei/HiSi, NEC, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Qualcomm, Huawei/HiSi, LG, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Samsung, vivo, Fujitsu, CMCC, OPPO * **Not support (configure all):** [MediaTek, Ericsson, Lenovo/MotM] |
| 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)   **FL Note**: The only available SLS results (Samsung) show that Alt3 performs slightly better than Alt2 upon UCI omission  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, Sony, Apple, Huawei/HiSi (ok, although still prefer Alt2), Fujitsu (ok, although still prefer Alt2), Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (ok, although still prefer Alt2), Spreadtrum (ok, although still prefer Alt2) * **Not support (want Alt2)**: CATT, Lenovo/MotM, |

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). |
| 1.3 | 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. |
| 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. |
| 1.3 | 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. |
| Nokia/NSB | 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. |
| 1.3 | 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. |
| Ericsson | 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** |
| Samsung | **Question 1.B**  In our Tdoc, we proposed to limit the range for the FD offset. In this case, Alt2 would be the best solution in terms of overhead. However, since the agreed version of Alt1 includes the full range for FD offset, the benefit of Alt2 is reduced. In addition, Alt3 doesn’t work since SCI (as mentioned) is layer-specific. Given the situation we are ok with Alt1 in principle. However, there is no need for using the resource ID as the criterion for fixed reference. Using   should suffice. No need to determine reference CSI-RS resource by the UE, since the precoder is the same regardless of reference CSI-RS resource index  . If Alt1 is revised as such, we are fine with Alt1.  [Mod: OK]  **On Conclusion 1.C.2**: (**for clarification**) “On the Parameter Combination of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, no additional configuration signalling for indicating the linkage is needed. …”  We agree that the conclusion is simply according to the existing agreements. BTW, the proposal numbering should be fixed. There are two conclusions in Issue 1.2 with duplicated numbering 1.C.2.  **Question 1.C.5**  Support Alt0.  **Proposal 1.D.3**  We prefer to follow the legacy framework, i.e., CBSR is always configured for each of the CSI-RS resources. We think configuring CBSR can be beneficial to handle interference in the CJT network, since mTRP capable of CJT operation can be aware of interfering links for its serving UEs. |
| NEC | **Question 1.B:**  Regarding Alt 1, we think it should be the first selected CSI-RS in case of TRP selection configured, otherwise, the first configured CSI-RS may not be selected, and then all N selected CSI-RS need a FD offset.  We are fine with either Alt 1 or Alt 2.   * Alt1. Fixed to the first selected CSI-RS resource in case of TRP selection configured or first configured CSI-RS resource otherwise (lowest CSI-RS resource ID} * Alt2. Selected by the UE and signalled together with the (N-1) FD window offsets * Alt3. Derived from SCI(s) (note: SCI is layer-specific while this reference is layer-common)   [Mod: OK, please see revision]  In addition, we think the previous agreement is mainly discussed based on refinement based on Rel-16 Type II codebook, does it also applied to refinement based on Rel-17 codebook? If so, we think the framework is OK for Rel-17 codebook, while the range of may need further discussion, actually depends on whether network can obtain the delay offsets across TRPs, even if the reciprocity is not that perfect, a small range of seems sufficient, especially when only one SRS is transmitted towards all CJT TRPs.  FFS: the range of in case of refinement based on Rel-17 port selection codebook.  **[Mod: Since the agreement of the range of values isn’t conditioned, this FFS would require us to revert the agreement. So I cannot add this]**  **Conclusion 1.C.2** (**for clarification**):  Firstly, we’d like to clarify that NL combinations should correspond to a same value of NTRP or can correspond to different values of NTRP?  [Mod: NL and NTRP are independently configured, but for a given NTRP value, the allowed values of NL depend on the configured FD combo value supported linkages. For example, let’s take NTRP=3, based on the agreed linkages, for the 1st and 2nd FD combo values, NL can range from 1 to 5 (since 5 linkages are supported), but for the 3rd, 4tf, 5th, and 6th FD combo values, only NL=1 is possible]    Then, we don’t think all NL combinations should be configured with a same set of {pv, beta}, each one of NL combination can link with one {pv, beta} from supported ones.  [Mod: As said this clearly violates the agreement that FD combo value is RRC configured by gNB since the UE would end up selecting one out of several possible FD combo values]  At least for some configuration of NL, it’s impossible to configure a same set of {pv, beta}, for example, NTRP=2 in following, if NL combinations are configured as {2,4} (any permutation) or {2,2} and {4,4}, it’s impossible to configure same {pv,beta}. If we make the conclusion, it will exclude such kind of NL combination configuration (in other words, {2,4} (any permutation) or {2,2} and {4,4} can not be configured together), which is quite restricted, similar issue exists in case of NTRP=3.  [Mod: But that’s what we agreed on ☹]  And we don’t think different values of {pv,beta} linked with different combinations of NL combinations revert previous agreements, RRC configuration is one level, and which {pv, beta} applied corresponding to selected SD combo is another level.  [Mod: Please check my explanation above. The wording of the previous agreements are quite clear]   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 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 |   **Proposal 1.D.3**  Support. |
| ZTE | **Issue 1.2:** A fixed one is sufficient, considering that the reference CSI-RS resource is layer-common. BTW, for the Alt1, the current description is confusing (seems the first from NTRP CSI-RS?). Clearly, it should be from the N selected CSI-RS resource.   * Alt1. Fixed to the first ~~configured~~ CSI-RS resource from N CSI-RS resources (lowest CSI-RS resource ID}   [Mod: Revised, thanks for the good suggestion]  **Issue 1.3:** Support Alt2. Considering dynamic TRP selection from NTRP=2/3 to 1 TRP by the UE selection, it seems unnecessary to have additional FD combo for NTRP=1 from gNB/UE complexity perspective (especially, Alt2 outperforms Alt1 per SLS evaluation).  **Conclusion 1.C.2:** Support    **Proposal 1.D.3:** The current wording is confusing. Does it mean that “CBSR can be **optionally configured**, for each of the NTRP configured CSI-RS resources”? |
| vivo | **Question 1B**  Alt 1. Fine with ZTE’s edit as well.  **Question 1C5**  We support to use legacy parameter combination. N\_TRP = 1 is same as legacy codebook. We don’t see the reason not to use legacy parameters.  **Conclusion 1.C.2** (linkage)  OK  **Conclusion 1.C.2** (Ln=6, the proposal index may be a typo, should be 1.C.3?)  OK  **Proposal 1.D.3**  Based on the current RRC framework, N1-N2 is also determined based on CBSR configuration. If all the resources do not have CBSR configuration, N1-N2 is unknown. Hence we don’t support this proposal.  CodebookConfig-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  codebookType CHOICE {  type2 SEQUENCE {  subType CHOICE {  typeII-r16 SEQUENCE {  n1-n2-codebookSubsetRestriction-r16 CHOICE {  two-one BIT STRING (SIZE (16)),  two-two BIT STRING (SIZE (43)),  four-one BIT STRING (SIZE (32)),  three-two BIT STRING (SIZE (59)),  six-one BIT STRING (SIZE (48)),  four-two BIT STRING (SIZE (75)),  eight-one BIT STRING (SIZE (64)),  four-three BIT STRING (SIZE (107)),  six-two BIT STRING (SIZE (107)),  twelve-one BIT STRING (SIZE (96)),  four-four BIT STRING (SIZE (139)),  eight-two BIT STRING (SIZE (139)),  sixteen-one BIT STRING (SIZE (128))  },  typeII-RI-Restriction-r16 BIT STRING (SIZE(4))  },  typeII-PortSelection-r16 SEQUENCE {  portSelectionSamplingSize-r16 ENUMERATED {n1, n2, n3, n4},  typeII-PortSelectionRI-Restriction-r16 BIT STRING (SIZE (4))  }  },  **[Mod: You raised a good point. Perhaps one compromise is that at least for one resource, CBSR shall be configured. I’ll wait for more inputs]** |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Question 1.B**  Alt1 is simple and clear. Support ZTE’s revision.  **Question 1.C.5**  Alt0 is our first preference.  **Conclusion 1.C.2 (for clarification)**  Support.  **Conclusion 1.C.2**  OK.  **Proposal 1.D.3**  The proposal is not clear to us. The signalling itself should be there, right?  **[Mod: Please check the revision, but it seems the proposal isn’t agreeable. I may revise it later]** |
| OPPO | **Question 1.B:**  We are fine with ZTE’s update on Alt.1  **Question 1.C.5:**  Support Alt0. We don’t think a new combination is needed.  **Conclusion 1.C.2:**  Just for clarification: Does the conclusion mean that the configured NL combinations should be linked to the same value of {*pv,*} indicated by gNB based on the agreed linkage?  [Mod: Correct]  For example, for NTRP=2, {4,4} cannot be indicated together with any other combinations.  [Mod: {4,4} can only be configured together with the 2nd, 4th, and 6th FD combo values. And in this canse, yes, it is only {4,4} that can be configured]  **Conclusion 1.C.2** (Ln=6)  Support  **Proposal 1.D.3:**  Support to configure CBSR for all the CSI-RS resources. |
| Mod V9 | **Added proposal 1.B.2 and revised proposal 1.D.3**  **Conclusion 1.C.2 (Ln=6) is moved to email endorsement 1** |
| MediaTek | **Question 1.B**  Support Alt 1. Ok with as well, as suggested by Samsung.  **Question 1.C.5**  Prefer Alt 0. We don’t we need additional combinations.  **Proposal 1.D.3**  Support in principle. Similar view as Samsung. |
| CMCC | **Issue 1.2**  Prefer Alt1 and support **Proposal 1.B.2**.  Considering we have agreed the range of , then the potential overhead reduction in Alt2 over Alt1 already disappears. And the FD basis is layer common, Alt3 is not reasonable.  **Issue 1.3**  Support Alt2.  **Conclusion 1.C.2:**  Support both the two Conclusion 1.C.2.  **Proposal 1.D.3:**  Prefer to configure CBSR for all the resources. |
| Qualcomm | **Question 1.B**  OK  **Question 1.C.5**  Alt 0  Besides, since we agree that UE is not supposed to jump over different PCs/linkages, we don’t even need spec impact for NTRP=1 in Rel-18 CJT PMI section (e.g. a new 5.2.2.2.x in 214), but rather let it be as it is in Rel-16 eType-II  **Proposal 1.C.4**  Fine with this proposal.  We identify that there is a small issue (a hole) in previous agreement regard value of NL   |  | | --- | | **Agreement (RAN1#112)**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, only support NL ={2,4} as additional candidate values to NL=1.   * FFS: Additional restriction(s) depending on the configured value for NTRP |   Based on the new PC agreement on Monday, only NL ={2,3} is possible  [Mod: Based on the current agreement, the number of **supported** linkages with different {Ln} combos is given as follows   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **NTRP** | **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 | 3 | 2 |  | | 2 | 3 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 1 | | 3 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 2 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | N/A |   Therefore, the current agreement that N\_L={1,2,4} works fine. Note that N\_L=4 or even 2 is not always possible for any FD combo value. It depends on the number of supported linkages for that FD combo value]  **Proposal 1.D.3**  Agree with this proposal, since for the agreed hard-restriction-only, this proposal simply means all SD beams can be allowed |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 1.B.2:**  Support.  **Q 1.C.5**  We are fine with Alt 1 or Alt 0.  **Conclusion 1.C.4**  In this case, there will be some restriction. E.g., for *NTRP*=3, only *NL* =2 can be configured with either two combinations of {2,2,2,2} and {2,2,2,4} or two combinations of {2,2,4,4} and {4,4,4,4}. But some cases such as two combinations of {2,2,2,4} and {2,2,4,4} can’t be configured together. Similar problem for *NTRP*=2, i.e., {4,4} can’t be configured together with other combinations.  [Mod: Yes there will be restriction as explained above to NEC and OPPO. That is indeed the reason for agreeing on linkages, i.e. to restrict so that UE complexity is reduced by not supporting too many combos as Qualcomm said repeatedly.]  I’m not sure about that ‘If >1 FD combo values can be configured as a part of the configured linkages, it allows dynamic (UE selection and reporting) FD combo selection which violates the agreement (gNB-configured by RRC configuration)’ is common understanding or not, since even multiple FD combo values are configured, it is also indeed configured by RRC configuration. And ‘the value’ can also be understood as for each SD combo, not for all SD combo.  [Mod: It is quite clear that if multiple linkages are RRC configured, this implies that the UE has to select one linkage for the CSI reporting. Remember we have ruled out reporting multiple hypotheses in one report long time ago. Hence, the only possibility with multiple linkages is for the UE to select one linkage and indicate it in the report, i.e. dynamic UE selection. If all the configured linkages share the same FD combo value, this is fine. This simply implies dynamic {Ln} selection which we have agreed to support. But if some of the configured linkages have different FD combo values, this can only imply that the UE has to dynamically select one out of multiple FD combo values – which violates the agreement.  This is quite clear and I hope it is now understood]   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **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.D.3**  We would like to clarify the meaning of ‘optionally’, what is the difference between it and ‘configured or not’? Actually, N1-N2 can be known if any one of CSI-RS resource is configured with CBSR since each of the CSI-RS resources has a same number of CSI-RS ports.  **[Mod: Good point, please check my response to vivo on this issue]** |
| Intel | **Proposal 1.D.3:**  Considering the comment from vivo, it seems that it simply removing the CBSR configuration is not the solution here. However, the RRC can be modified to have separate N1/N2 configuration even if the CBSR configuration is absent. So, we support the proposal. |
| Mod V15 | **No revision** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For issue 1.2, support proposal 1.B.2.  For issue 1.3, support Alt 2, it’s preferable to select from FD combo we have agreed for CJT.  For conclusion 1.C.4, we are fine with it.  For conclusion 1.C.2 (Ln=6), we don’t think this is needed. From our simulation results, combinations with {Ln=6} can achieve a better performance-overhead for large #antennas, e.g., 32. Regarding the concern on high overhead and complexity, it is which affects the reporting overheads and UE complexity, not a specific value of Ln.  For 1.D.3, we support that the CBSR can be optionally configured for each TRP. For a TRP, if the surrounding TRPs are all in the cooperating set, then there’s no need to configure CBSR for it again. We are fine to at least configure one CBSR to address Vivo’s concerns.  **[Mod: I revised the proposal along this line]** |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 1.B.2**  Support. It is well known that these FD offsets are circular over their interval of definition and a common offset across all TRP ports does not change the precoder. So, any fixed reference TRP will do, and no additional indication is needed.  We suggest adding a small clarification to avoid different interpretations, e.g. that the first is in order of RSRP  fixed to the first**, i.e., lowest resource ID,** of the N selected CSI-RS resource(s)  **Conclusion 1.C.4**  Support. We share the same understanding as FL in that a single value of the parameters {,} is configured as per legacy, whereas combinations of {} can be configured  **Question 1.C.5**  Alt0 is preferred. Based on our SLS results, we don’t think we need either of the proposed points besides the already agreed {¼, ¼, ¼, ¼}, ¾.  **Proposal 1.D.3**  We support this proposal. The exact RRC signalling solution can be left to RAN2 to design, or as suggested by FL we can provide a simple solution as follows:  .. for , configured CSI-RS resources can be optionally configured with CBSR  The main reason for this proposal, in our view, is to reduce the RRC signalling. For example in Type-I extension for NCJT in Rel17 there are 2 different CBSR settings, one for each CMR Group, because only 2 TRPs/TRP groups are supported. But for Type-II-CJT, RRC signalling is very high for with 139\*4=556 bits needed just to configure CBSR for the case.  [Mod: Revised the proposal along this line] |
| Ericsson | On issue 1.2:   * we support Proposal 1.B.2   On issue 1.3:   * On Question 1.C.5, we prefer Alt 0 * Ok with Conclusion 1.C.4   On issue 1.4:   * We think configuring CBSRs for all N\_TRP TRPs is simpler. So we don’t support proposal 1.D.3. |
| Lenovo/ MotM | **Issue 1.2:**  Fine with proposal 1.B.2  **Issue 1.3:**  **Question 1.C.5:** Prefer Alt1 to maintain legacy design for NTRP=1  **Conclusion 1.C.4:** OK with the conclusion    **Issue 1.4:**  Regarding Proposal 1.D.3, the per resource CBSR is reasonable for inter-site CJT (different restrictions due to different beam correspondence), whereas resource-common CBSR is reasonable for intra-site CJT (same restriction due to same beam correspondence). Our preference is to associate resource-common CBSR with CB Mode 2 (which in our understanding is more aligned with intra-site CJT) |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | **Proposal 1.B.2.** Support |
| Mod V22 | **Revised proposal 1.D.5 per vivo, Huawei, and Nokia comments (suggested middle ground by FL sometime ago).**  **@Those having concern on 1.D.5, please check the revised proposal** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.B.2**  Support.  **Proposal 1.C.5**  There is a typo on our previous input for this proposal. We support Alt2.  **Proposal 1.D.5**  We are still not OK with this proposal. In our view, the overhead is not an issue given that hard amplitude restriction is supported and the CBSR is anyway configured via RRC, where the max overhead is reduced to (64+11)x4 = 300 bits, which is already comparable to Rel-17 NCJT CBSR 139x2= 278 bits.  We agree with intel’s view though. Since N1-N2 is common across CSI-RS resources, it can be separated out from the CBSR parameter (or information element).  **Proposal 1.E.1**  Support.  We have performed additional SLS simulations on this issue using the agreed parameter combinations for with , where 1, 2, and 3 in x-axis of the figure below correspond to {1/8, 1/8, 1/16, 1/16}, ½, & {1/4, ¼, 1/8, 1/8}, ½ & {1/2, ½, ½, ½}, ½, FD combos, respectively.  We considered:   * Intra-site Inter-cell scenario (16 ports per TRP) * NTRP=2 configured for Alt1/2/3 with UCI omission, where Alt2 can fall back to sTRP transmission with UCI omission. * After UCI omissions, alt1/2/3 have the same (or similar) payload in the average sense during the simulation for fair comparison.   As we can see in the result, Alt1/Alt3 yield similar performance but Alt2 performs worse since the benefit of CJT becomes degraded when prioritizing NZC amplitudes associated with sTRP. This is due to the similar reason for what we have seen in our previous SLS results comparing the cases of .  On FFS, we prefer to keep legacy FD permutation, but not have a strong view on it. |
| LG | **Our position is updated in Table 1A.** |
| ZTE | **Proposal 1.B.2**  One minor question: what’s the meaning of “first” of the N selected CSI-RS resource(s). We do not have strong preference, but some further clarification may be needed for making the corresponding proposal clear. Maybe, we can use the legacy wording of “lowest CSI-RS resource ID” as Nokia proposed (“in the order of RSRP” seems not to be needed).  **Proposal 1.B.2**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, *for mode-1*, the layer-common reference CSI-RS resource is fixed to the first**, i.e., lowest resource ID,** of the N selected CSI-RS resource(s)  [Mod: That’s my original proposal but companies have issue since RRC spec 331 as of now doesn’t use any ordering rule for CSI-RS resource ID. So “first” here simply means the first (on the list) among the N CSI-RS resources selected out of the N\_TRP configured CSI-RS resources. If further clarification is needed, this can be handled later. For now this is the best we can do, i.e. the reference is fixed]  **Proposal 1.D.3**  Thanks for clarification. Our first preference is to provided CBSR per resource(s), but, for saving RRC overhead, we can be flexible, if having majority companies support. |
| Mod V26 | **Added conclusion 1.C.5.**  **The following are moved to EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2: proposal 1.B.2, conclusions 1.C.2/1.C.4/1.C.5.** |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 1.B.2**: We prefer Alt1. For Alt2, the benefit is not clear.  **Conclusion 1.C.4**: Support.  **Proposal 1.D.3:** Considering the majority view, we are fine with the additional flexibility of CBSR configuration for a subset of TRPs. |
| Fujitsu | **Proposal 1.B.2:** Support it, and we are also fine with Nokia’s clarification for the first CMR.  **Conclusion 1.C.5:** Fine  **Conclusion 1.C.4:** Support    **Proposal 1.D.3**: Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For proposal 1.B.2, we are fine with current proposal, we are also fine with revision from ZTE.  For proposal 1.D.3, we support current FL’s proposal. In CJT, in most cases, the TRPs with most interference have been included in the cooperating set, gNB doesn’t need to configure CBSR for such TRPs. Note that CBSR per TRP is up to 139 bits, thus up to ~400 bits for 3TRPs, which is a large size for UE configuration and re-configuration. This is a unnecessary waste of downlink resources.  For issue 1.5, we believe Alt 2 can have a better performance which can guarantee a better performance than single-TRP and can have higher resolution with reduced #antennas. Despite this, we can accept proposal 1.E.1 for progress, and the UCI omission is not a typical case. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 1.D.3**  Thanks for clarification. Our first preference is to configure CBSR for all the resources, but considering the intention is RRC overhead reduction, this proposal could be supported without extra cons, then we can support it. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1.D.3:**  Though our preference is CBSR per resource, we can accept the proposal considering the possible RRC signaling overhead reduction. And maybe we need similar clarification as in Proposal 1.B.2 on “the first of the NTRP configured CSI-RS resources”. |
| Mod V32 | **No revision in proposals** |
| CATT | **Proposal 1.B.2**  Fixed value is sufficient, so we are generally fine with the proposal. We share similar view as Nokia and ZTE that the ‘first’ is not very clear. We suggest the following revision.  **Proposal 1.B.2**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, *for mode-1*, the layer-common reference CSI-RS resource is fixed to the first entry of associated *nzp-CSI-RS-Resources* selected by UE in the corresponding *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet.*  **Question 1.C.5**  Open to adding the combo in either Alt1 or Alt2.  **Conclusion 1.C.4**  Ok with the clarification.  **Proposal 1.D.3**  Support the proposal. |
| AT&T | **Proposal 1.B.2: Support**  **Conclusion 1.C.4: Agree with the clarification**  **Question 1.C.5:** **Our preference is Alt1 and we are ok with Conclusion 1.C.5**  **Conclusion 1.C.5: we are ok** |
| Sony | **Proposal 1.D.3**  Support. |
| vivo | **Proposal 1.D.3**  We think the simplest way is gNB always configure CBSR. If gNB wants to allow the selection of all the FD bases, it can simply turn on all of them in CBSR. Hence benefit to make CBSR of some resources optional is not clear to us. It seems only benefit is RRC overhead reduction, which is not essential in our view.  But we think from functionality perspective, the current proposal 1.D.3 works. Hence we won’t be too picky about it. The only thing is it needs to be clarified that if CBSR of one particular resource is absent, it means no restriction for the SD basis selection. Thus we propose,  On the Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP, regarding CBSR, the first of the NTRP configured CSI-RS resources must be configured with CBSR, while the remaining (NTRP –1) configured CSI-RS resources can be optionally configured with CBSR   * Note: if CBSR of one particular resource is absent, it means no restriction for SD basis selection for the resource. |

### 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.2 (V1)**: 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.2 (V2)**: 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 2-bit wideband CQI and 2-bit sub-bands CQIs   * The 2nd (differential) wideband CQI is defined relative to the 1st wideband CQI, reusing the alphabet from the legacy 2-bit differential CQI table * The 2nd (differential) sub-band CQIs are calculated relative to the 2nd (differential) wideband CQI, reusing the alphabet from the legacy 2-bit differential CQI table   **Proposal 2.A.2 (V3)**: 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 1-bit wideband CQI and 2-bit sub-bands CQIs   * The 2nd (differential) wideband CQI is defined relative to the 1st wideband CQI, reusing the alphabet from the legacy differential CQI table corresponding to 00/01 * The 2nd (differential) sub-band CQIs are calculated relative to the 2nd (differential) wideband CQI, reusing the alphabet from the legacy 2-bit differential CQI table   **FL Note**: This topic was discussed OFFLINE [1]   * From SLS results, it seems UPT vs overhead performance between v1 and v2 is almost none. At the same time v2 offers 2 bits 😊 of “overhead saving” | **Proposal 2.A.2**  **V1:**   * **Support/fine**: Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, vivo, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Qualcomm, Intel, Xiaomi, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, IDC, CMCC, Sony, CATT, Sharp, Apple * **Cannot accept**:   **V2:**   * **Support/fine**: MediaTek, Huawei/HiSi, Lenovo/MotM, Google, NEC, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Fujitsu, * **Cannot accept (additional complexity with no measurable gain)**: Samsung, ZTE, Intel, Spreadtrum,   V3:   * **Support/fine**: LG * **Cannot accept (additional complexity with no measurable gain)**: Samsung, ZTE, Intel, Spreadtrum |
| 2.2 | [112bis-e] **Agreement**  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   **Proposal 2.B.2:**  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=2: for each layer, as an optional feature, only in high overhead regime (i.e. paraComb(s) with )   + Two-level bitmap for each layer,   + The first level selects , q=0,1 from M bases and is reported using a bitmap of length MQ bits, where S = + is RRC configured or fixed, and is the number of selected FD bases for DD basis q determined by the UE.   + For q-th DD component, the second level uses the distance metric to only include the bits around SCI selected from , bits per pol as follows:     - For each polarization, the second level bitmap contains bits included in a set of SD basis and selected Sq basis pairs , satisfying , where       * + ,         + is the SD basis indicated by SCI         + Two polarizations have same set of in the bitmap.   + FFS: Values of S, D and paraComb(s)   **FL Note**: | **Proposal 2.B.2:**   * **Support/fine:** Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, vivo, Samsung (ok), Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSi, CMCC, * **Cannot accept:** ZTE, Fujitsu, OPPO,   **Optional Q=2**   * **Alt3A**: Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, NEC, ZTE, OPPO, Intel, MediaTek, Lenovo/MotM, Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, * **Alt4’**: vivo |
| 2.3 | [112bis-e] **Agreement**  ….   * Select at most 3 additional Parameter Combinations from the list below  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | |  | **Companies’**  **views** | |  |  | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | **Support/fine**: ZTE, Huawei/HiSi  **Not support**: Qualcomm | | 2 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/2 | **Support/fine**: ZTE  **Not support**: Qualcomm | | 2(\*) | ¼ | 1/8 | ¼ | **Support/fine**: Samsung, vivo, OPPO, Qualcomm, MediaTek, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, LG  **Not support**: | | 2 (\*) | ¼ | 1/8 | ½ | **Support/fine**: Samsung, vivo, OPPO, Qualcomm, MediaTek, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, LG  **Not support**: | | 4 | 1/8 | 1/16 | 1/4 | **Support/fine**: ZTE, Huawei/HiSi  **Not support**: Qualcomm | | 4 (\*) | ¼ | 1/8 | 1/4 | **Support/fine**: Samsung, vivo, OPPO, MediaTek, Huawei/HiSi, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, LG  **Not support**: Qualcomm |   (\*) Note: From legacy.  **Question 2.C**: Please share your view in the above table  **FL Note**: As suggested by vivo in ROUND 0, the most natural grouping would be Alt1 (legacy) with combos 3, 4, 6 vs Alt2 (new) with combos 1, 2, 5. | |
| 2.4 | [112bis-e] **Agreement**  On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocity, regarding CBSR, a single SD beam group restriction per legacy design is used from signalling perspective,   * 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   **Question 2.D**: Please share your view on the two FFS points  **~~Proposal 2.D.1~~**~~: On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocity, regarding CBSR, amplitude restriction is summed across all FD and DD bases~~  **Conclusion 2.D.2**: On the Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocity, regarding CBSR, there is no consensus in supporting the additional optional soft amplitude restriction. Therefore, only hard amplitude restriction (based on the legacy design) is supported.  **FL Note**: the conclusion (2.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.  **MOVED TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2** | **Proposal 2.D.1**   * **Support/fine:** NEC, ZTE, Samsung, vivo, MediaTek, CMCC, Ericsson, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI * **Not support:** Qualcomm, Huawei/HiSi   **Def of amplitude restriction:**   * **Per DD basis:** Lenovo/MotM * **Per DD unit:** Qualcomm**,** Huawei/HiSi(summed across SD/FD basis) * **Summed across DD bases:** NEC, ZTE, Samsung, vivo, MediaTek, CMCC,   **Hard-only vs soft amplitude restriction:**   * **Hard-only:** Apple,vivo,OPPO, MediaTek, CMCC, Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia/NSB, * **Hard + soft:** NEC, ZTE, Samsung, Lenovo/MotM |
| 2.5 | **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**:  **MOVED TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 1. ENDORSED** | **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, Apple * **Not support:** vivo (Alt4), Lenovo/MotM, |

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** |
| Samsung | P 2.A.2: support V1. V2 is worse than V1 in terms UPT vs overhead tradeoff, as shown in our contribution (copied below). Besides, the overhead saving tiny. We therefore can’t accept V2.  ***Observation 11****: there is no benefit with Alt1.2/1.3 (differential w.r.t. the 1st CQI) over Alt1.1 (independent of the 1st CQI)*  Figure 11  Issue 2.2   * We are open to discuss this scheme only in high overhead regime, with the condition that they don’t break precious agreement (which 3A does). * Besides, if this down-selection succeeds, we prefer to use existing optional feature such as paraComb with L=6, and not to introduce another optional UE capability.   Issue 2.3: support legacy combinations  Issue 2.4:   * the legacy restriction is on each SD beam, and is kind of avg. restriction since we sum over FD. The same principle can simply be extended, i.e., by summing over FD and DD. * Support legacy Hard+soft (optinal) restriction   P 2.E.1: support |
| NEC | **Proposal 2.A.2**  Support V2.  **Issue 2.2**  Support Alt 3A.  **Question 2.D**  Support amplitude restriction summed across DD bases.  Support hard+soft amplitude restriction.  Support amplitude restriction applied per DD unit. |
| ZTE | **Proposal 2.A.2:** Not support V2. The corresponding solution seems too complicated while considering only 2 bits are saved.  **Issue 2.2:** Our first preference is no additional optional feature. As a compromise, we may be flexible for Alt3A, considering that its performance is stable.  **Issue 2.3:** Our preference is provided based on our evaluation results.  **Issue 2.4:** The physical logic of per DD basis for amplitude restriction is unclear to us, and we support “summed across DD bases”. Then, both hard and soft amplitude should be supported.  **Proposal 2.E.1:** Support. |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.A.2**  We support V1. The benefit of V2 is not clear to us.  **Issue 2.2**  We support to down-select to Alt 4’.   * + Performance: Based on our evaluation, Alt 4’s outperforms Alt 1 esp. under the lower and higher overhead region. For medium overhead region, Alt 4’s and Alt 1 are similar. However, Alt 3A does not provide benefit over Alt 1 in any region.   + Spec impact: Alt 4’ does not impact other parts of the CSI reporting procedure except the bitmap itself. However, Alt 3A needs further enhancement on UCI omission and grouping as a new bitmap (the first level bitmap) is introduced. Alt 4’ can fully reuse the legacy design, i.e., the coefficients and bitmap can be divided into two parts mapped into group 1 and group 2 based on K-NZ reported in part 1. Further, the simplified Alt 3A requires extra report to indicate S1 and S2 in part 1.   + Alignment with previous agreements: Alt 4’ has exactly Q bitmaps which is strictly aligned with previous agreements. However, even the simplified Alt 3A requires a first-level bitmap to select S1 or S2 from M FD indices, so in total 2Q different bitmaps are reported.   Based on the above, Alt 4’ is better than Alt 3A in any of these aspects in our view. Therefore, we support to select Alt 4’ as the optional feature.  **Issue 2.3**  We support to reuse the three legacy parameter combinations.  **Issue 2.4**  We support hard only and a same restriction for each of the two DD bases.  **Proposal 2.E.1**  We would like to copy our comments in round 0 here. Hope proponents reply this time.  *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.* |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.A.2:** Still prefer V1. While we respect companies’ evaluation, we think it would be important for this feature to enable NW know the exact channel quality in the future resource. CQI is very informative for that purpose. Limiting the range of 2nd CQI might be a strong restriction on the usecase of this feature. We’re not sure if 2-bit overhead deserves such a risk.  **Issue 2.2:** We appreciate the discussion so far. We are open for either direction on the optional feature.  **Proposal 2.E.1:** Support. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.A.2:** support V1.  **Issue 2.2:** we support Alt3A for its simplicity.  **Issue 2.3:** prefer the legacy parameter  **Issue 2.4:** support hard restriction as basic feature.  **Proposal 2.E.1**: OK |
| Mod V9 | **No revision, waiting for more inputs**  **Proposal 2.E.1 is moved to email endorsement 1** |
| MediaTek | **Issue 2.2**  We prefer to have the basic feature only. We do not need extra optional feature for a bitmap design. However, based on our simulation Alt 3A has superior performance so if an optional design was to be chosen we prefer Alt 3A.  **Issue 2.3**  Prefer to reuse the legacy parameter combinations  **Issue 2.4**  CBSR intends to limit interference in the spatial domain only. So, we support amplitude restriction summed across FD and DD bases. We prefer hard restriction only. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.A.2**  Support V1 for simplicity.  **Issue 2.4**  Support amplitude restriction is summed across FD and DD bases.  Prefer hard restriction only. |
| Qualcomm | **Question 2.C**  Prefer legacy PCs with L=2  For PCs with L=4, given we already have enough agreed PCs with L=4, and it exceeds legacy total 8, we don’t support  Updated our preference in the table  **Question 2.D**  Prefer hard-only for the second FFS (and thus the first FFS is no issue)  But still want to input some thought for the first FFS (soft CBSR)   * Per-DDbasis makes no sense * Across all DD basis basically means power restriction of averaging over time – not sure how this kind of time-average interference limitation is useful to certain network deployment * Per-DDunit is the only kind of theoretically making-sense option. However, given that PMI can’t ensure a constant power for each DD unit (normalized as single-SCI across all DD bases (thus all DD units), per previous agreement) – it would be complicated to specify the soft power limitation of some certain beams   To summarize, we support hard-only. |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.A.2:**  We have concern on V2 since it has complicated design without significant difference in overhead.  **Issue 2.2:**  We have slight preference for Alt3A.  **Issue 2.4:**  We support hard amplitude restriction due to simplicity. |
| Mod V15 | **Added proposal 2.D.1 and conclusion 2.D.2** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For issue 2.1, we still prefer V2.  For issue 2.2, we support Alt 3A as it has the best performance and overhead reduction among the alternatives. We are also be fine with Alt 4’ as 2nd preference, since it also has the benefits of overhead reduction compared to basic feature.  Regarding the comments of UCI omission on Alt 3A, as each reported NZC is still related to a SD basis, a FD basis and a DD basis, there’s no problem to reuse the current UCI omission for priority calculation. For the first bitmap, it can be just put into group 1, and no further effort is needed.  For issue 2.3, we prefer to support row #1, #5, #6, based on our simulation results. Updated our preference in the table.  For issue 2.4, in 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 still lower. As a result, the CBSR may lose its functionality. Therefore, we support summed across FD and DD bases per DD unit.  If conclusion 2.D.2 is approved, does it mean proposal 2.D.1 will be dropped?  **[Mod: Ah yes, you are correct, thanks]** |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 2.A.2**  Support V1. We don’t see any need to shave off 2 bits from the second CQI with the risk of lower CQI quality  **Question 2.D**  FFS2. Our preference is to support hard CBSR only. Soft CBSR is not very effective when amplitude restriction is applied on coefficients after 2 DFT operations.  FFS1. In our understanding this FFS is only applicable to soft CBSR, because hard CBSR only affects the choice of SD bases in W1.  [Mod: You are correct. Then proposal 2.D.1 is not needed]  **Conclusion 2.D.2**  Support |
| Ericsson | On issue 2.2, we prefer Alt 3A.  On issue 2.3, ok to use legacy grouping Alt1 (legacy) with combos 3, 4, 6  On issue 2.4, support Proposal 2.D.1 and support conclusion 2.D.2. |
| Lenovo/ MotM | **Issue 2.2:**  Similar views to MediaTek, prefer a single solution (Alt3A), but as a compromise we are OK to support Alt1 (basic) and Alt3A (optional) for small β values.    **Issue 2.4:**  [Conditioned on Conclusion 2.D.2 being dropped] For Proposal 2.D.1, averaging the CBSR metric across DD in Proposal 2.D.1 does not guarantee that CBSR is applied to each of the Q’ precoding matrices that would be derived from the CSI feedback. We therefore prefer per DD index CBSR |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | **On Issue 2.2**, our first preference is Alt 3A.  Our second preference is the following combined proposal which is an outcome of some offline discussions with the proponents of Alt 4’.  **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=2: for each layer, as an optional feature, only in high overhead regime (i.e. paraComb(s) with )   + Two-level bitmap for each layer,   + The first level selects , q=0,1 from M bases and is reported using a bitmap of length MQ bits, where S = + is RRC configured or fixed, and is the number of selected FD bases for DD basis q determined by the UE.   + For q-th DD component, the second level uses the distance metric to only include the bits around SCI selected from , bits per pol as follows:     - For each polarization, the second level bitmap contains bits included in a set of SD basis and selected Sq basis pairs , satisfying , where       * + ,         + is the SD basis indicated by SCI         + Two polarizations have same set of in the bitmap.   + FFS: Values of S, D and paraComb(s)   [Mod: Thanks for the compromise effort. I added this as proposal 2.B.2 now]  **On issue 2.4**, we support proposal 2.D.1 |
| Mod V22 | **Proposal 2.D.1 is not needed due to conclusion 2.D.2, hence proposal 2.D.1 is now removed.**  **Added proposal 2.B.2 🡪 please take a look** |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.B.2: we did see some UPT vs overhead gain with Alt4’, especially in high overhead regime. This proposal introduces FD basis reporting per DD basis . This addresses our concern on the violating the agreement with Alt3A (i.e. to have two different bitmaps for two DD bases). So, we can OK with it for progress and close this 3-4 meeting long debate, especially since it is optional.  P 2.D.1: we think the contentious issue is Q=2, but, for N4=1, the legacy amp restriction should be supported. It is strange that a UE supports soft restriction for Rel.16 T2 but not for Rel. T2 Doppler, if a UE supported both Rel.16 and 18 codebooks. Besides, if NW needs to switch from Rel. 16 to Rel. 18, and had CBSR configured for Rel.16, but suddenly impose no restriction for Rel.18, we are not sure interference profile can change that dynamically.  Re conclusion 2.D.2, based on above, we think amp restriction for N4=1 should be supported.  **[Mod: I fully understand that this is your preference but it’s crystal clear there is no consensus on this]** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.A.2 (V2):**  If 10(/11) is reported for 2nd WB CQI, which means offset level ≥ 2 (or ≤-1) according to legacy alphabet, gNB cannot know exact value (or even range) of 2nd SB CQI. For example, if 10 is reported for both 2nd WB/SB CQI, range of 2nd SB CQI is unclear. To address this issue, we can reuse 1bit legacy alphabet corresponding to 00/01 for 2nd WB CQI. Our 1st preference is no reporting 2nd WB CQI but the following is acceptable to us.  **Proposal 2.A.2 (V2)**: 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 ~~[2]~~1-bit wideband CQI and 2-bit sub-bands CQIs   * The 2nd (differential) wideband CQI is defined relative to the 1st wideband CQI, reusing the alphabet from the legacy ~~2-bit~~ differential CQI table corresponding to 00/01 * The 2nd (differential) sub-band CQIs are calculated relative to the 2nd (differential) wideband CQI, reusing the alphabet from the legacy 2-bit differential CQI table   [Mod: Since this quite differs from V2, I added a V3 for this version for online discussion]  **Issue 2.3**  Prefer to reuse the legacy parameter combinations  **Issue 2.4**  Support Conclusion 2.D.2 |
| ZTE | **Proposal 2.B.2:** Thanks for providing compromise solution. But, to be honest, it is too complicated, and some further justification may be needed. Since we already have a basis feature, we really need this complicated one? Then, from our perspective, we can NOT accept the proposal 2.B.2.  **Proposal 2.D.1/2.D.2:** In our views, “sum across DD bases” is much aligned with legacy procedure, and if not having that, even for sTRP, we may lose this functionality of soft interference mitigation. Then, for N4=1, we think the soft amplitude should remain.  **[Mod: I fully understand that this is your preference but it’s crystal clear there is no consensus on this]** |
| Mod V26 | **Added V3 for proposal 2.A.2.**  **The following are moved to EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2: conclusion 2.D.2** |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.A.2:** We prefer V1 for simplicity. V2 requires additional spec. effort on defining the differential wideband CQI.  **Proposal 2.B.2:** No strong preference, fine with majority.  **Conclusion 2.D.2**: Support the conclusion. |
| Fujitsu | **Proposal 2.A.2:** We still prefer V2.  **Proposal 2.B.2:** We have similar views with ZTE that the current version is too complicated. If optional feature must be chosen one, we prefer Alt 3A only.  **Issue 2.4:** We support Proposal 2.D.2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For issue 2.2, we think Alt 3A can have the best performance and simpler, so our 1st preference is still Alt 3A. We can be fine with proposal 2.B.2 to move forward. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.A.2:** We still prefer V1.  **Proposal 2.B.2:** We don’t have strong preference for the optional feature. The new proposal seems too complicated, but we can go with it if it is majority view.  **Conclusion 2.D.2**: OK. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.A.2:** We prefer V1.  **Proposal 2.B.2:** We think Alt.3A can provide best performance, and we don’t need such a complicated solution as optional feature. We can also accept not to agree on either one considering we have already agreed on the basic feature. |
| Mod V32 | **No revision** |
| Xiaomi | **Issue2.1**  Support proposal 2.A.2(V1).  **Issue2.2**  We share same view with ZTE and Fujitsu. We support Alt3A and do not like to introduce too much complexity for such overhead reduction. Otherwise, only basic feature is remained.  **Issue2.3**  For N4=1, we support legacy parameter combination. Considering there is only one table for N4=1 and N4>1, we prefer legacy parameter combination in the table.  **Issue2.4**  We support hard and soft amplitude restriction. We are fine with conclusion 2.D.2 for the sake of progress. |
| CATT | **Issue2.1(Proposal 2.A.2)**  Support V1.  V2 introduces additional complexity and the saving is only two bits.  **Issue2.2**  Support Alt3A as the optional feature. The combined proposal is too complicated, we do not support it.  **Issue2.3**  We prefer combos 1, 5, 6 based on our simulation results. Our preference is updated in the table.  **Issue2.4**  Support Conclusion 2.D.2. |
| Sony | **Proposal 2.A.2:** We prefer V1 for simplicity.  **Issue 2.2**: Again, for simplicity and considering that the down-selection is for an optional feature in high overhead regime, we prefer Alt3A. |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.B.2**  Although our first preference is Alt 4’, we can support the compromised proposal.   * The current 2.B.2 is built based on Alt 3A, and it addresses our technical concern on the original Alt 3A. The original Alt 3A aims to reduce overhead, but it still uses free NZC selection from UE side. This causes issues due to prediction error in real prediction. Prediction error impacts the final performance a lot. (Companies use same argument to defend Alt 3 in Type II Doppler UCI omission in a previous agreed proposal.) Hence if the coefficients are freely selected by UE, prediction error will cause UE to select some weak coefficients which look large due to prediction error. In Proposal 2.B.2 from FHG, the second bitmap uses a restriction pattern on UE’s coefficient selection, which means the coefficients around SCI after cyclic remapping are selected. It is beneficial to increase the reliability of NZC selection. This is also shown in multiple companies’ simulation results, e.g., [5][19]. * Some companies raised concern on the complexity of proposal 2.B.2. We would like to clarify the UE complexity is not higher than the previous Alt 3A. With S0 and S1 determined, the pattern and size of the bitmap are determined, as other than S0 and S1, only RRC parameters impact the bitmap pattern and bitmap size. Further, as the size of the 2nd-level bitmap reduces, the UE buffer size to store the bitmap and non-zero coefficients is also reduced. Hence the UE complexity is actually lower than Alt 3A. |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.B.2:**  We appreciate efforts of the proponents of the optional feature to find a compromised solution.  However, we do not support Proposal 2.B.2. As it was also mentioned by other companies the proposal itself is complicated. It is harder to understand this proposal comparing to Alt3A not mentioning the solution with single bitmap (Alt1). We don’t like the idea to have additional constraints for coefficient selection to reduce the prediction error for the reported PMI. The issue of prediction error performance is very important, but it should be addressed in other ways including prediction performance monitoring (proposed in our tdoc), UE implementation and/or RAN4 tests. |

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

Table 5A Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 3.1 | [112bis-e] **Working assumption:**  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   **Question 3.A**: Please share your view on the bracketed text from Google  **Proposal 3.A.2**: For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, for TDCP measurement and calculation, confirm the following working assumption as an agreement with the following change   * 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   OK to remove bracket from 3rd bullet?   * Yes: NEC, ZTE, vivo, NTT DOCOMO, OPPO, MediaTek, CMCC, Qualcomm, Huawei/HiSi, Nokia/NSB, Google, Ericsson, Lenovo/MotM, Samsung, Spreadtrum, Fujitsu * No:   **MOVED TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2** | |
| 3.2 | [112bis-e] **Agreement**  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   **Question 3.B**: Please share your views on the TBD points (N, Q, s, and whether a configurable center threshold should be supported)  N value(s):   * 2^Q-1: Qualcomm (0 included), Ericsson * 2^Q: ZTE, MediaTek, Lenovo/MotM, Fujitsu * Larger than 2^Q-1: Samsung, Nokia/NSB   Q value(s)   * 3: Samsung, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/MotM, Fujitsu, * 4: ZTE * 5: MediaTek, Ericsson   S value(s):   * ¼, 1/3, ½, 2/3, ¾: Samsung, Nokia/NSB * ½ for Q=3: ZTE, Lenovo/MotM, Fujitsu * ¼ for Q=4: ZTE * for Q=5: MediaTek * 1/3, ¼ with Q=5: Ericsson   Configurable center:   * Yes: Samsung, Nokia/NSB, * No: ZTE, MediaTek, Lenovo/MotM, Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, Fujitsu   **FL Note**: | |
| 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   **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   * FFS: Whether Y=7 is also supported   **MOVED 3.C.1 TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2.**  **CONTINUE DISCUSSION ON 3.C.2 HERE**  **Proposal 3.C.2:** For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, Dbasic is equal to 2 slots   * Support the following D (delay) values: 4 symbols, 1 slot, 2 slots, 3 slots, 4 slots, 5 slots * Working assumption: Support the following D (delay) values in a separate UE Feature Group: 6 slots, 10 slots   FFS: Applicability of each D value candidate for different SCS values and/or other parameters (e.g. Y, quantization) | **Proposal 3.C.1:**   * **Support/fine:** Samsung, NEC, ZTE, vivo, NTT DOCOMO, OPPO (no 7), Intel (no 7), MediaTek (no 7), CMCC, Qualcomm (no 7), Nokia/NSB (no 7), Ericsson, Lenovo/MotM, Spreadtrum, Fujitsu * **Not support:**   **Proposal 3.C.2:**   * **Support/fine:** NEC (remove 4), ZTE (include 10), vivo, NTT DOCOMO, MediaTek (6 in brackets), CMCC, Qualcomm, Ericsson (keep 6), Samsung, Spreadtrum, Fujitsu * **Not support:** |
| 3.4 | **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   * Note: whether value 0 can be reported for a given delay will be decided separately (i.e. this proposal is not intended to preclude amplitude value 0)   **FL Note**: The note (albeit obvious and not precluded by any means – since this is related to the alphabet design in issue 3.2) was added per Samsung request  **MOVED TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 1. ENDORSED** | **Proposal 3.D:**   * **Support/fine:** Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, Google, vivo, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Ericsson, LG, Apple, Samsung, OPPO * **Not support:** Lenovo/MotM, Xiaomi, |
| 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   **Conclusion 3.E**: For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, there is no consensus on specifying a new priority rule. Therefore, the priority of the CSI report(s) associated with TDCP reporting is the same as CSI report(s) not carrying L1-RSRP or L1-SINR  **FL Note**: While Alt2 seems to result in the least spec effort, this may not work since TDCP is a stand-alone report and can collide with regular CSI reports and co-multiplexing isn’t always an available option.  At the same time, as vivo argued, it is true that this could be left to NW implementation (hence UE may assume that collision is an error case)  **MOVED TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2** | **Proposal 3.E:**   * **Support/fine (based on Alt1, spec impact):** Samsung, Intel, ZTE, Ericsson, OPPO, Fujitsu, Google, Spreadtrum, Sony, Apple, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, MediaTek, Spreadtrum, * **Not support (want Alt2, no spec impact: ”***Same as CSI report(s) not carrying L1-RSRP or L1-SINR***”):** vivo, Huawei/HiSi, Lenovo/MotM, Xiaomi, LG |

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 | Q 3.A: it is still unclear; do we have such restrictions in legacy TRP resource set configurations?Also, are we talking about TRS resources in one or across multiple sets  [Mod: Not sure what’s not clear for you. It simply says that RE locations are aligned across TRS resources. Nothing to do with TRP here. This is to reduce UE complexity in measurement]  Q3.B: we support   * N > 2^Q-1, which is needed for low speed or low delay values, as shown in our revised contributions. For example, N can be from {6, 8,12,16,20,24,28} depending on delay values. * Q=3 is sufficient for a target MSE = 0.1%, if N is chosen properly, as shown in our revised Tdoc (2303901). * s can be from this set [1/4, 1/3,1/2, 2/3, ¾]. * We are open to discuss configurable center, and perhaps it can be merged with a configurable N value   3.C.1: support  P 3.D: support with Note the below   * Note: whether value 0 can be reported for a given delay will be decided separately (i.e., this proposal does not preclude 0 value for the amp)   [Mod: OK] |
| NEC | **Question 3.A**  We are fine to remove the bracket, which can simplify the calculation. Other FFS issues will be discussed in next meeting? We are also fine to leave it when discussion on other FFS issues.  [Mod: Hopefully this meeting if companies don’t fight too much 😊]  **Proposal 3.C.1:**  Support  **Proposal 3.C.2:**  We don’t think 4 symbols delay is a useful value, the delay is too small for correlation calculation. Other values are fine. |
| ZTE | **Issue 3.1**  We are fine with the bracketed contents. However, regarding the TRS resources for TDCP measurement, it is better to clarify in the main bullet that P+P TRSs and P+AP TRSs are supported, because channel correlations corresponding to inter-burst delays (e.g., 5 slots) smaller than the minimum periodicity of TRS (10 slots) are expected to be reported.  [Mod: I’ll address this in the next round. This is a separate issue from 3.1, please do not digress]  **Issue 3.2**   * N: N should be set as 2Q rather than 2Q – 1. If N = 2Q – 1 is adopted, there exists a quantization value of 0 corresponding to q = 2Q – 1. Apparently, the quantization value of 0 is useless. * Q and s: We propose to define a plurality of fixed combinations of Q and s (e.g., 2 combinations), and one of the combinations can be used to quantize the amplitude according to the use case, delay, and UE speed. From our observation, the proper combinations of Q and s are {(Q = 3, s = ½), (Q = 4, s = ¼)}. BTW, a 5-bit quantization alphabet is quite redundant. * Center threshold: NOT support. A proper quantization alphabet can be generated by adjusting the value of Q and s. Configuring such a center threshold is unnecessary.   **Issue 3.3**   * **Proposal 3.C.1:** We are generally fine with the proposal. But we want to emphasis that Y = 7 is beneficial for the estimation accuracy of Doppler spectrum/ Doppler shift at gNB side. * **Proposal 3.C.2:** * We think Dbasic = 2 slots is a too tight restriction. We understand other companies may hold concerns on the buffering issue. However, a larger delay value is indeed needed in slow-speed scenarios. * Then, for candidate value of ’10 slot’, it seems quite essential and justified by several companies’ input. Per our evaluation, it can be used for the scenario of UE speed of <30 km/h. It should NOT be excluded that some UE have the capability to support a large delay value. Therefore, we think it is better to have the candidate value of ’10 slot’.   **Issue 3.4**  Support the main bullet of proposal 3.D.  Regarding the FFS, even though there could be an invalid estimate of channel correlation for a given delay (as a motivation of this sub-bullet), the corresponding amplitude should be reported as “invalid” or “reserved”. ‘0’ means to be orthogonal (quite wired and also seems impossible for real field channel correlation within a given duration), if our understanding is correct.  [Mod: The FFS is simply an almost meaningless statement that the proposal has nothing to do with preluding amplitude 0. Since Samsung, for whatever reason, seems extremely and strangely sentimental about adding this almost meaningless (hence harmless 😊) note, let’s keep it there so we can move on. Likewise, this note does NOT imply that value 0 will NOT be excluded. This is actually a separate discussion related to issue 3.2. So please don’t make an unnecessarily big deal out of this almost meaningless request from Samsung.  Save your energy in debating Samsung for value 0 when the time comes later for issue 3.2]  **Issue 3.5**  Support proposal 3.E. |
| vivo | **Issue 3.1**  OK with the text in brackets.  **Proposal 3.C.1**  OK  **Proposal 3.C.2**  Generally OK. But it needs to be clarified the number of symbols or slots is defined based on one particular SCS (e.g., 15kHz) or regardless of SCS. The legacy TRS configuration is defined with mini-second as the time unit.  **Proposal 3.D**  OK  **Proposal 3.E**  We don’t support. It is clear there is no specific reason to define such priority, and gNB can flexibly assign report ID to adjust the priority. Further, we don’t even see the need to have such agreement, as Alt 2 means no spec impact and it works fine. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Issue 3.1**  We are fine with the bracketed contents.  We support **Proposal 3.C.1** and **Proposal 3.C.2:** |
| OPPO | **Issue 3.1:**  Does the same RE locations refer to the same subcarriers and the same symbol index (but different slots)? If that is the intention, we are fine.  **Proposal 3.C.1**  Fine for 2,3,4.  **Proposal 3.D**  Fine  **Proposal 3.E**  We are fine with the proposal. Alt.2(up to gNB configuration) is also fine to us. |
| Mod V9 | **Some revisions**  **Proposal 3.D is moved to email endorsement 1** |
| MediaTek | **Question 3.A**:  Its ok, to remove the bracket.  **Question 3.B:**  **Configurable centre**: Do not Support. This is very far from legacy quantization techniques, its unclear how the gNB/UE will even know how to determine what value the threshold will be around. Unnecessary complexity for a simple quantization procedure.  **Q value(s):** Based on our simulation, 5 bit quantization is the right balance between overhead and performance.  **N value(s):** 2^Q  **S value(s):** for Q=5:  **Proposal 3.C.1:** we do not support t value of 7 for Y.  **Proposal 3.C.2:** We would prefer to value 6 also in square brackets, i.e.,  **Proposal 3.C.2:** For the Rel-18 TRS-based TDCP reporting, support the following D (delay) values where Dbasic is equal to 2 slots   * + 4 symbols, 1 slot, 2 slots, 3 slots, 4 slots, 5 slots, [6 slots, 10 slots]   FFS: Applicability of each D value candidate for different SCS values  **Proposal 3.D**: We do not think the note is needed, why is amplitude values being discussed in this proposal?  **Proposal 3.E**: Support |
| CMCC | **Issue 3.1**  OK to remove the blanket for calculation simply.  **Issue 3.1**  Support **Proposal 3.C.1** and **Proposal 3.C.2.** |
| Qualcomm | **Question 3.A**  OK with the contents in brackets.  **Question 3.B**  The difference b/w N=2^Q-1 or 2^Q is, whether zero-autocorrelation can be reported (since maximum q is 2^Q-1).  In our view, zero-AC can be seen as an invalid value report, and invalid report is necessary, since sometimes there can be no available pair of resources for certain configured delay.  Either N=2^Q-1 (thus zero-AC is there), or a specific invalid AC value in quantization table, can be OK with us.  No strong view with other issues of this question 3.B  **Proposal 3.C.1**  Prefer no 7  **Proposal 3.C.2**  OK |
| Mod V15 | **Added proposal 3.A.2 to confirm WA with removed brackets**  **Revised proposal 3.C.1 based on comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Issue 3.1, we are fine to remove the brackets.  Issue 3.2, we don’t think the configurable center is needed. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 3.A.2**  Support  **Question 3.B**.  Our preference is:    * In our simulation results we see this fixed bitwidth is enough to provide high accuracy * s we are fine with the proposed candidate value set * we support a configurable centre threshold and are open to discuss configuration solutions to achieve this   **Proposal 3.C.1**  Ok. On the FFS our preference is not to support 7 |
| Ericsson | On issue 3.1, ok with proposal 3.A.2  On issue 3.2, based on our results, we can support the following combinations:   * , , * , ,   We do not think the configurable center is needed. So we do not support configurable center. For selecting s, Q, and N, we think it is better to define some combinations, and we can then downselect a combination based on evaluations.  [Mod: I tend to agree]  On issue 3.3:  We support proposals 3.C.1.  We support 3.C.2, and prefer to keep 6 as is (without brackets). |
| Lenovo/ MotM | **Issue 3.1:**  OK to support proposal 3.A.2 without the brackets  **Issue 3.2:**  Support Q=3, N=2Q, and s=1/2, no center threshold configured.  Suggest to consider combinations of Q, N and s values, since the parameters are co-dependent  **Issue 3.3:**  **Proposal 3.C.1:** Support, do not prefer Y=7 but OK to keep as FFS  **Proposal 3.C.2:** Can the moderator/proponents explain how D is computed for Y>1? Would it be a multiple of Dbasic?  Suggest consider combinations of Q, N and s values {Q,N,s}, since the parameters are highly co-dependent when determining the quantization codebook  [Mod: OK, added this on the FFS]  **Issue 3.5:**  We prefer Alt2 or Alt3. Since the TDCP report helps identify the codebook type, and since it is based on additional (K) TRS transmissions, it is more reasonable to associate it with the same (or higher) priority compared with legacy CSI reports |
| Mod V22 | **Minor revision on 3.C.2 on the FFS**  **Re issue 3.5, I am considering revising proposal 3.E to Alt2 since this would be the default outcome if there is no consensus. Vivo’s argument that this could be left to NW implementation and hence considered an error case is valid. I’ll wait for more inputs.** |
| Samsung | P 3.A.2: OK  P 3.C.1/2: OK |
| LG | Issue 3.5: Proposal 3.E  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 fully reusing legacy priority equation. Then, gNB determines and configures the priority between CSI and TDCP by using reporting ID. |
| ZTE | On issue 3.C.2, and prefer to keep 10 as is, i.e., without brackets. As in the sub-bullet, it may be relevant to SCS (at least, if SCS=30KHz, we need to have 10 slot). In our views, for such case, there should not be aliasing issue.  Re Issue 3.5, we do not have strong preference, and can be flexible for vivo’s suggestion. |
| Mod V26 | **Replaced proposal 3.E with conclusion 3.E.**  **The following are moved to EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2: proposal 3.A.2, 3.C.1, conclusion 3.E** |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 3.A.2**: Support to have the sub-bullet on RE locations.  **Proposal 3.C.1/2**: OK.  **Proposal 3.E**: Support. |
| Fujitsu | **Issue 3.1:** OK to remove bracket from 3rd bullet.  **Issue 3.2:**  Similar views with Lenovo that we also prefer Q=3, N=2Q, and s=1/2, no center threshold configured.  **Proposal 3.C.1 and 3.C.2:** Support  **Conclusion 3.E:** Fine |
| Mod V32 | **Revised proposal 3.C.2 per inputs** |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 3.A.2**  Support  **Question 3.B**  We have similar view with Ericsson. It depends on simulation evaluation to determine which values are supported for these candidate values or parameter combination.  For N values, we think 2^Q-1 should be included. It is possible the amplitude equals to zero for low speed or small delay. Such amplitude does not report.  For center, we think it does not need to be configure, since gNB is hard to decide which value as a center is suitable.  **Proposal 3.C.1:**  According to our observation, Y=7 can be supported for estimating accurate Doppler shift.  **Proposal 3.C.2:**  Support and we are open for D=6 or 10 slots.  **Conclusion 3.E**  Support |
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