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# Introduction

This summary contains background, proposals based on contributions and discussion points/proposals from moderator, according to the following:

[112bis-e-R18-NES-01] Email discussion on techniques in spatial and power domains by April 26 – Yi (Huawei)

* Check points: April 21, April 26

When preparing your input, please read the instructions in “Additional Guidelines for RAN1#112b-e Meeting Management” document in [R1-2302259](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302259.zip), about check points, input timing etc. Also the naming for uploaded document is as usual.

Please search ‘**FL5**’ for further comments and discussion. The feedback is expected by 2 hour prior to the GTW session of NES, i.e. **UTC 13:00 on Tue, 25 April**.

For information, the current online schedule for GTW1 for Week 1 is as follows (while if there is offline schedule per Chair’s further update, it will be added once decided):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Week 2** | | |
| **Monday**  UTC 12:00~15:00 | **Tuesday**  UTC 12:00~15:00 | **Wednesday**  UTC 12:00~15:00 |
| R18 Duplex (90min) . Dynamic TDD . SBFD . Evaluation  Rel-18 LP-WUS (35min)  Rel-18 XR (35min)  Rel-18 TEI (20min) | R18 MIMO (120min) . SRS (15 min) . UL precoding for  multi-panel  (15 min) . Unified TCI . SRI/TPMI for  8TX  R18 NES (60min) . Spatial/power  domain . Cell DTX/DRX | R18 Duplex (60min)  Rel-18 LP-WUS (45min)  Rel-18 XR (45min)  Rel-18 NES (45min) |

# Recommendations for GTW/offline

# Spatial element adaptation including beam management

The objective for spatial element adaptation is as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify necessary enhancements on CSI and beam management related procedures including measurement and report, and signaling to enable efficient adaptation of spatial elements (e.g. antenna ports, active transceiver chains) [RAN1, RAN2] |

The relevant agreements are excerpted as below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For the purpose of further discussions in RAN1 on NES spatial domain adaptations, consider the following cases   * Type 1: all antenna elements associated to a logical antenna port is disabled/enabled * Type 2: part/subset of antenna elements associated to a logical antenna port is disabled/enabled   **Agreement**  For spatial element adaptation, further study the following   * A1-1) Each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern   + FFS: Details on how the association is done * A1-2) Each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns   + FFS: Details on how the association is done * FFS: Details on the definition of “spatial adaptation patterns” |

By dividing the issues into separate subsections, companies’ proposals are excerpted for each and followed by FL questions/proposals.

3.1 Framework

**Company proposals**

[Huawei, HiSilicon]: Support MFTA as an efficient dynamic adaptation without UPT performance loss, where CSIs corresponding to multiple candidate spatial adaptation patterns and/or multiple power back-off values need to be available at gNB before gNB taking the adaption decision.

[vivo]: Design a unified framework for spatial elements adaptation and power offset adaptation.

[ZTE]: Same framework can be used for the enhancement on power domain and the enhancement on spatial domain.

[China Telecom]: Support the mechanism of UE dynamically measuring the CSI first then gNB making the decision for the spatial/power domain adaptation.

[Samsung]: Support joint operation of cell DTX/DRX and spatial/power domain adaptation techniques.

[ERTI]:

* For the purpose of discussion, consider the following use cases for Type 1 spatial element adaptation.
  + - Use case 1: Multi-CSI report based on virtual CSI-RS muting
    - Use case 2: CSI report based on actual CSI-RS muting
* Aim for a joint design for CSI enhancements considering both spatial element adaptation and transmit power adaptation.

[CMCC]: Joint adaptation of spatial domain and power domain configurations can be considered to avoid coverage loss.

[MediaTek]: Aim for a unified CSI enhancement for NES adaptations in spatial and power domains.

[LGe]: Both of the following two types are supported for NES spatial domain adaptation.

* + - Type 1: All antenna elements associated to a logical antenna port are disabled/enabled
    - Type 2: Part/subset of antenna elements associated to a logical antenna port are disabled/enabled

[AT&T]: Corresponding CSI is available at gNB before adaptation.

Also, regarding different implementations, some particular considerations are provided.

[FW]: no additional indication or signaling of the different implementations of the spatial adaptation is needed.

[vivo]: Enhancements on spatial elements adaptation and poweroffset adaptation need to be applicable to both type-1 shutdown and type-2 shutdown.

[Spreadtrum]: Type 2 is down-prioritized.

[Fujitsu]: The CSI related enhancement(s) for the support of type 1 spatial element adaptation and type 2 spatial element adaptation are considered and discussed separately.

**FL summary**

According the discussion and contributions, in order to identify necessary configuration for CSI-RS resource and CSI reporting, understanding what is expected by gNB from UE feedback and how efficiently it is reported, is the essential aspect. The choice between whether multi-CSI feedback is needed or single-CSI feedback is sufficient would lead to completely different framework and designs.

To determine whether multi-CSI needed, three companies (Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, vivo) bring simulation results for spatial domain adaptation and one company (OPPO) bring results for power domain adaptation, showing that there is benefit to do that, although (vivo/OPPO) consider the benefits of multi-CSI for spatial domain or power domain adaptation respectively is small compared to single-CSI feedback thus it is not justified for specification enhancements. One company (Apple) also quoted the TR results showing that single-CSI can have remarkable NES gain.

On one hand, in addition to the NES gain, the decision may also depend on whether performance loss (e.g. UPT) can be acceptable for one solution. On the other hand, whether UE complexity/overhead can be reasonably reduced or not may also be essential.

Regarding the former, as can be seen in the framework section as well as CSI feedback section, majority (15 companies) seems to consider that to enable multiple CSI(s) corresponding to multiple spatial adaptions available is critical for gNB proper decision. Regarding the UE complexity and overhead reduction, also a large number of contributions is discussing how to mitigate the impact.

Although more evaluations and views may be helpful, considering the timeline, decision is expected within this meeting and parallel discussion for other aspects including UE complexity/overhead reduction, necessary enhancements for configuration and reporting procedures should be continued along with possible branches. From specification perspective, the framework to be generalized should have the flexibility to allow both single-CSI and multi-CSI feedback operations. A first proposal is made as below, with proposals in later sections set to continue relevant discussion (e.g. whether it is based on a common CSI-RS resource etc.).

**P1**

**Enhancements for spatial and power domain adaptation support both single-CSI feedback corresponding to one adaptation and multi-CSI feedback corresponding to more than one adaptation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Support. We believe this would be a good tradeoff to support different NES techniques with different CPU requirements |
| vivo | We agree to support single CSI feedback for one spatial or power adaptation pattern.  For multi-CSI feedback, it should be first clarified whether multi-CSI feedback is in one CSI report or in multiple CSI report occasion.  We are fine to consider multi-CSI feedback in multiple CSI report occasions corresponding to more than one adaptation.  For multi-CSI feedback in one CSI report occasion, we still have concerns and it is too premature to support before addressing these concerns. Performance benefits on multi-CSI feedback regarding how many throughput and power saving gain can be achieved, how much UE complexity/overhead are increased should be carefully evaluated and clarified.  First, the NW ES gain from multi-CSI feedback in one occasion is limited. However, the complexity for UE and the overhead for a single report have to be greatly increased, compared to single-CSI feedback in one occasion. Instead, CSI report for different adaptation in different report occasions would not increase the complexity for UE and also be helpful for gNB to perform adaptation.  Second, the only benefit of multi-CSI feedback in one occasion is to improve the CSI accuracy, since gNB can acquire more than one CSI report in one reporting. However, in case of NW ES, the CSI accuracy would not be an issue since there could be low traffic load or low mobility UEs. Besides, gNB can also configure shorter CSI report periodicity for CSI feedback. |
| DOCOMO | We understand that multiple CSIs with different spatial/power assumptions could help gNB to take better adaptation decision.  But the definition of “single -CSI feedback” and “multi-CSI feedback” is not clear here. It should be further clarified before saying support or not. |
| OPPO | We are fine in principle for spatial domain, but as we stressed in our contribution, it would be good to make it clear by ‘one adaptation’.  On the other hand, for power domain, we still hold a conservative view. From our simulation results, it does not bring benefits. |
| Apple | We think it is necessary to define more clearly of what is single-CSI feedback and what is multi-CSI feedback and the implication behind. Does this only refer to gNB obtaining single or multiple CSI results before it makes final adaptation decisions, where these CSI results can be obtained in multiple reporting instances or does this specifically refers to reporting all the CSI results in one single reporting instance?  If it is the latter, we are not fully convinced by the necessity of the multi-CSI feedback in one reporting instance yet. As stated in our contribution, the single CSI feedback can already provide remarkable NES gain and the multi-CSI result was only provided by 3 sources in the TR and the same 2 sources in this meeting, while increases UE CSI computation load. Although some complexity reduction mechanisms are provided for the multi-CSI in one reporting instance to lower UE CSI computation complexity, however, according to the evaluation results provided, there will still be UPT loss compared with complete CSI feedback schemes, so it is hard to identify which is better, single CSI with complete CSI feedback or multi-CSI with compressed CSI feedback. Not to mention the various schemes to be determined on which of the quantities can be omitted and corresponding impact on UE complexity.  We consider it logical to start with the single adaptive case, which is to support CSI adaptation feedback with only single CSI in one reporting instance, while the multiple CSIs corresponding to multiple spatial adaptation patterns can still be feedback in a sequential way for gNB to make final adaptation. |
| FL | To vivo, Apple  As for the benefits of multi-CSI, perhaps more evaluations can help as said. But as also said in the summary part, decision is expected within this meeting considering the overall timeline, especially as I concern that relevant discussion may be suspended due to a pending decision on this – which seems already the case from your response to other relevant sub-topics. Noting that the potential schemes were present during SI and evaluations, if expected, should have been performed since the first WI meeting.  As for the clarification on the wording of multi-CSI, I will try to improve it after more views are received. |
| Spreadtrum | Dynamic adaptation on the current CSI framework may be sufficient. Current spec already support multi-CSI feedback. Enhancement on the current multi-CSI feedback needs to be justified. |
| ETRI | We support the proposal. It may be good to further clarify the meaning of single CSI feedback and multi-CSI feedback as DOCOMO commented. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal in principle.  In our opinion, both single CSI feedback and multi-CSI feedback have pros and cons considering the benefits in terms of energy saving/throughput performance and the UE complexity/UCI overhead. Thus, we need to consider and discuss the necessary enhancement(s) for both feedback approaches. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support.  It will be beneficial if UE report CSIs for different numbers of CSI-RS ports in advance so that gNB has more information about channel state of different number of ports. According to our results, multi-CSI report provides additional 17.36% ESG and less UPT loss compared with single CSI report. Hence, at least multi-CSI should be considered.  For single CSI feedback, it can be regarded as one special case of multi-CSI feedback, common frame can be considered.  Replies to other companies’ comments:  We are not convinced by the comments that UE complexity will be increased by multi-CSI reporting since it is already allowed by the spec to configure UE with multiple CSI for different purposes. On the contrary, we think the CSI computation can be reduced by exploit the high correlation of the precoding matrices of different spatial patterns.  High CSI accuracy is always needed for better scheduling, high resource efficiency, and NES, regardless of traffic load.  For the evaluation results in TR, it is clear that the cost of single CSI is significant degradation of system performance. However, when it comes to real implementation, system performance is also an important KPI. Unignorable performance loss will make the NES technique less attractive. Therefore, multi-CSI is needed to achieve a better tradeoff. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Clearly having multi-CSI feedback corresponding to more than one adaptation pattern enables the gNB to take better adaptation decision. However, we agree with DOCOMO that the definition of “single -CSI feedback” and “multi-CSI feedback” should be clarified before support or not support decision. And For that we propose:  **P1**  **Enhancements for spatial and/or power domain adaptation pattern, where each pattern correspond to one** TxRUs shutdown/non-shutdown pattern and/or one power back-off value(s),  **support ~~both single-CSI feedback corresponding to one adaptation and~~ multi-CSI ~~feedback~~ report(s) corresponding to more than one adaptation pattern. [ to enable the gNB to take efficient TxRUs and/or power adaptation decision(s).]**  We proposed to delete “**~~single-CSI feedback corresponding to one adaptation~~**” because our simulation, confirm the advantage of having multi-CSIs feedback. gNB decision using the availability of multi-CSI report(s) before the adaptation decision (named MFTA in our paper) ***can obtain 18.5% and 13.9% energy saving gain compared with AFTM (single CSI is for one spatial and/or power pattern is available before the shutdown decision), @30%RU without UPT loss in TDD and FDD cases, respectively.*** |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with P1 to support both single-CSI feedback corresponding to one adaptation and multi-CSI feedback corresponding to more than one adaptation. |
| MediaTek | **It is suggested to define spatial/power adaptation (pattern) before deciding this proposal.**  The relation between CSI report and the adaptation configuration is related to how we define a spatial/power adaptation (pattern). From companies’ contribution, it looks the association with CSI-RS resource configuration is commonly accepted (either one or multiple adaptation patterns can be associated to one CSI-RS resource configuration). When the association is defined, the relation between CSI report and spatial/power adaptation (pattern) can follow the principle between CSI report and CSI-RS resource configuration. |
| Futurewei | We support P1 but there are clarifications needed to understand what and how many of these spatial and power adaptation patterns before agreeing on this proposal right away. |
| Xiaomi | We share the similar view that the definition of “single-CSI feedback” and “multi-CSI feedback” should be clarified.  If it goes to the multi-CSI feedback in one CSI report, we are fine to support it. Nevertheless, efficient mechanisms should be studied to reduce the processing and reporting overhead. |
| CMCC | In general, we are fine with the proposal especially the part of unified design for both spatial and power domain enhancements. But as commented by other companies, the design of the CSI feedback is still under discussion. Different companies may have different understanding about that. |
| Samsung | Support |
| InterDigital | We support CSI report containing single feedback corresponding to one spatial domain adaptation. This is primarily to alleviate any complexities and latencies for processing multiple CSI at the UE. Also, as indicated by simulations from multiple companies, the benefit of having multiple CSI in single report is not clear.  As mentioned by companies, some clarification of multi-CSI feedback will be very useful. Similar to vivo, we are ok with providing multiple CSI in multiple reporting occasions where each report has CSI on one spatial domain adaptation. |
| Panasonic | We agree with DOCOMO and think it is better to have clearer clarification of single-CSI feedback and multi-CSI feedback before agreeing on supporting both. |
| Ericsson | To enable proper gNB decisions on power/spatial domain adaptation, we support multi-CSI feedback in one reporting instance, where the multiple CSIs correspond to multiple hypotheses on spatial domain adaptation patterns or PDSCH-to-CSI-RS offsets. |
| Qualcomm | We agree that RAN1 should agree on a framework to facilitate discussion and progress. However, we do not support the proposal in the current form due to the below reasons:   * It is not clear what “one adaptation” or “more than one adaptation” means.   + From our perspective, it is important to discuss the FFS from the last meeting that “FFS: Details on the definition of spatial adaptation patterns” since the spatial adaptation pattern (SAP) is expected to be involved in all discussions from CSI-RS resource/CSI report configuration to CSI reporting. * It is not clear what multi-CSI feedback means.   + We don’t think multi-CSI feedback needs to be called out explicitly. Instead, we can discuss that the UE may provide N CSIs associated with N spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ). Furthermore, we should discuss whether N CSIs are available before spatial domain adaptation of PDSCH (Type 1) and before spatial domain adaptation of CSI-RS/PDSCH (Type 2).   From discussion perspective, backward discussion starting from CSI feedback (in particular from undefined multi-CSI feedback) is very hard since we don’t know how CSI-RS resource/CSI report configuration looks like.  Hence, we suggest discussing in the following order:   * Definition of spatial adaptation pattern * CSI-RS resource configuration * CSI report configuration * CSI report based on CSI-RS resource configuration and CSI report configuration.   + Whether UE provides N CSIs associated with N spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ).   + Whether N CSIs are available before spatial domain adaptation   + Whether N CSIs are sent in a single CSI report or sent in separate CSI reports   Whether CSI reduction is necessary when N > 1. |
| LG Electronics | Even though P1 is a high-level proposal, single/multi-CSI feedback itself is not clear to us.  For spatial domain adaptation, does ‘multi-CSI feedback’ correspond to A2-2 in the previous agreement (i.e., One CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern)? |
| FL2 | This is to be combined with the discussion in section 3.2. |

Also, it seems to be the majority preference that both types as gNB implementations should be allowed for a network to enjoy the NES. What needs to be considered could be: whether the design has to be a common solution, which could be left to the discussion along with each type of shutdown as needed.

**P2**

**Specifications support CSI enhancements for network energy savings applicable for both types of spatial adaptation cases (as that agreed in RAN1#112).**

**FL2: The following was agreed on Monday. The above is closed.**

**Agreement**

Define necessary enhancements to support both types of spatial adaptation cases (as defined in RAN1#112) in Rel-18.

* Note: This does not imply explicit definition in specifications for adaptation types.
* Note: This does not imply explicit specification changes are made for both cases

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | We are fine to continue discussing both types, however it is not yet clear to us whether Type 2 spatial adaptation would require specification impact. To be constructive, we are fine with either removing the word “Specifications”, or otherwise add an FFS on “Whether Type-2 spatial adaptation requires further specification support” |
| vivo | Agree |
| DOCOMO | As we see the necessity of both spatial adaptation types, the CSI enhancement of both of them is needed.  We support FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | We agree that both types need to be considered. However, the current specification does not seem to differentiate these two types. Whether the proposal suggests to do so? |
| Apple | We are fine to support both types, although we think type 1 is more friendly to both gNB and UE in terms of resource transmission and measurement. We also consider it necessary to support a common framework to support both types. |
| FL to Lenovo/OPPO | This proposal does not necessarily lead to specification definition of a type. It is to say that the enhancement should be workable for both types of implementations.  To clarify this point, ‘applicable’ is added. |
| Spreadtrum | Type-2 has too large spec impact, since analog beam shape is changed. |
| ETRI | We are generally fine with the proposal, but it may be better to study what is expected specification impact for Type 2 spatial element adaptation (seems not much discussed compared to Type 1) before agreeing this. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal.  Since type 1 and type 2 have different properties, the CSI enhancements for type 1 spatial adaptation and type 2 spatial adaptation can be discussed separately. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the Type 1 port muting, one CSI-RS resource can be configured to associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns (i.e., A1-2). It provides some benefits with less OH, more NES gain, etc. And these benefits should be considered in the resource configuration.  Therefore, if both types are supported, at least the measurement resource configuration should be separately discussed along with each type of shutdown. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal.  It would be good to aim at a common solution to cover both adaptation types (i.e., Type 1 and Type 2), meaning that the common solution with specification work covers the practical gNB implementation needs for both types. |
| MediaTek | Support the proposal.  Given different gNB implementation may apply a corresponding type of adaptation for NES, **a unified CSI enhancement ensures a unified implementation for UE to support both types of NES adaptations.** |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine to continue studying the specification impact of type 1 and type 2. However, we are wondering if a common framework is possible. At least the number of antenna ports changes for type 1, while keeps unchanged for type 2 with spatial adaptation. |
| CMCC | We support the proposal. As we commented in the last meeting, both type 1 and type 2 products can be observed for the deployment, then the enhancements applicable to both types should be supported. |
| Samsung | Support |
| InterDigital | Support FL’s proposal |
| Panasonic | We agree. |
| Ericsson | We agree that specifications should enable enhancements for both Type-1 and Type-2 adaptation; however, we do not think that Type-1 and Type-2 should be explicitly defined in specifications (e.g. existing spec enables type 1/2 implementations without referencing such terminology). Rather, the gNB would configure CSI reporting according to which adaptation type is used.  We think “CSI enhancements” is too broad. As commented by other companies, we think the specifications impact of Type-2 spatial domain adaptation seems to be quite minimal. We think the only thing missing from current specifications is a mechanism to configure the UE to report multiple-CSIs within a single CSI-ReportConfig (Alt 2-2 from last meeting). We understand that is a separate discussion. So for now, perhaps the following is appropriate wording:  **Specifications support ~~CSI~~ enhancements to facilitate ~~for~~ network energy savings for both types of spatial adaptation cases (as defined ~~that agreed~~ in RAN1#112).**  **FFS: whether/what CSI enhancements are needed.** |
| Qualcomm | As agreed last meeting that both types of adaptation are under discussion, let us further discuss both types to understand necessary specification impact. We don’t see the need of this proposal at this stage. |
| LG Electronics | Support. |

The following is set for digging more about joint operation of spatial domain adaptation and power domain adaptation, and these two with Cell DTX/DRX.

**Q1**

**What may need further consideration for**

* **joint operation of spatial domain adaptation and power domain adaptation**
* **joint operation of cell DTX/DRX and spatial/power domain adaptation?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | We prefer to defer this discussion due to lack of clarity of NES solutions on spatial, power domains as well as cell DTX/DRX |
| vivo | We support joint operation of spatial domain adaptation and power domain adaptation.  For joint operation of cell DTX/DRX and spatial/power domain adaptation, it should be discussed later after design of Cell DTX/DRX is more clear. |
| DOCOMO | The unified framework for joint operation of spatial and power adaptation is expected.  Regarding joint operation of cell DTX/DRX and spatial/power domain adaptation, it should be discussed after details of both enhancements are made. |
| Apple | Yes to the first bullet if type 2 is supported.  No to the second bullet, since these two do not need to be jointly operated, it will be clearer if the behaviors could be defined separately. |
| ETRI | We support the first bullet. Second bullet point can be discussed later after more progress is achieved in the two AIs. |
| Fujitsu | We support joint operation of spatial domain adaptation and power domain adaptation as they have commonality. Power domain adaptation can be seen as a special case of type 2 spatial element adaptation without the change of mapping relationship between spatial elements and logical antenna ports.  Regarding joint operation of cell DTX/DRX and spatial/power domain adaptation, it can be postponed after clear definition of cell DTX/DRX mechanism is made. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support the first bullet. Since both spatial domain adaptation and power domain adaptation are related to CSI enhancement, we prefer a joint operation of spatial domain adaptation and power domain adaptation.  For the second bullet, we think it can be considered when the mechanism of cell DTX/DRX is clear in RAN1/RAN2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For spatial domain and power domain, design of CSI framework can be in a unified way.  For cell DTX/DRX and spatial/power domain adaptation, the two features can be used by gNB independently. Thus, there seems no need to joint operation of these to avoid importing additional effort. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with both bullet points.  At current stage, we should first focus on the ‘spatial adaptation operation’ alone without necessarily considering joint operations, so that we are able to progress on defining the baseline operation.  NOTE: The question mark at the end of the 2nd-bullet point should be removed. |
| Futurewei | These are open issues for further discussions and hence there is no need to explicitly agree on this. |
| Xiaomi | We also support the first bullet. For the second bullet, it is premature to discuss that. Besides, we notice that the second bullet is also discussed in Session 9.7.2. Maybe redundant work should be avoided. |
| CMCC | Support the joint operation of spatial domain adaptation and power domain adaptation, considering the commonality of design and specification impact. And a joint operation could also be used to avoid coverage loss.  For the joint operation of cell DTX/DRX and spatial/power domain adaptation, it needs further discussion and clarification of the behavior of cell DTX/DRX. Then we can consider the combination of the two features. |
| Samsung | * 1st bullet point: Joint operation, e.g., a unified signaling, seems a natural design choice given that both adaptations are regarding CSI-RS resource and CSI report enhancements.   2nd bullet point: We’d better to wait and see how cell DTX/DRX is defined and then assess if a joint operation, e.g., a unified signaling, signaling handling rule, can be considered. |
| Panasonic | We are supportive on joint operation of spatial domain adaptation and power domain adaptation, which can take a higher priority. |
| **FL2** | As a clarification, the original question is more about to identify possible issues regarding a joint operation, compared to the discussion/design of each on it own. Although at least the first sub-bullet seems to gain majority support, it is not yet clear what needs to be resolved as an issue. Therefore, please continue your input if you have an issue to be discussed. Otherwise, this will not be recommended for conclusion/agreements. |
| **Lenovo2** | @FL: While we can move forward with joint operation of spatial and power domain enhancements, supporting joint spatial/power and Cell DTX/DRX would be challenging since this requires a joint agreement with agenda 9.7.2. Is it possible to coordinate with the FL for 9.7.2, or make a request to the chairman to provide guidance on a way forward? |
| **Nokia/NSB2** | The 2nd-bullet point was also touched upon in the FL summary discussions of AI. 9.7.2. We should avoid the duplicate discussions, and to have the discussions either in 9.7.1 or in 9.7.2.  Similar view as Apple, the Type-2 may require the joint considerations between spatial and power domain. And specifically, the 1st-bullet point relates to Q12. Firstly, we should have the Q12 to be clarified, then we could further discuss on what exactly needs to be done with the 1st-bullet point. |
| Ericsson 2 | In our view, spatial and power domains are separate features and should be operable independently even though there may ultimately be some common aspects. At this point, since the discussions (particularly in spatial domain with Type 1,2, etc) are still high-level, we prefer to consider these separately, but it is acknowledged there may be some common aspects that can be handled during the discussions (as needed) without unnecessarily complicating by considering joint operation.  Regarding joint operation between cell DTX/DRX and spatial/power domain, these are separate features and should be operable independently. RAN1 should first focus on defining functionality for the respective objectives - we do not prefer linking them pre-maturely. |
| **FL2e** | Given the input so far, the joint operation can be discussed later when more progress from both agendas is available. FLs will coordinate with each other to determine how to proceed it and if needed including ask for guidance from Chair.  For joint operation of spatial and power domain techniques, this can be considered along with Q12 is needed.  **Then the question is closed.** |

3.2 CSI feedback

The relevant agreements are excerpted as below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For spatial domain adaptation, further study necessary enhancements for multiple CSI(s) where each CSI corresponds to a spatial adaptation pattern, e.g.   * FFS: gNB indicates to UE which CSI(s) the UE shall report * FFS: the UE selects which CSI(s) are reported * FFS: multiple CSI(s) are reported in a joint CSI report * FFS: Overhead reduction for multiple CSI(s)   Note: UE complexity needs to be taken into account. |

**Company proposals**

[Huawei, HiSilicon]:

* For both Type 1 and Type 2, study and specify how the high correlation on CSI-RS beam can be exploited to reduce multiple CSIs calculation complexity and reporting overhead.
* For both Type 1 and Type 2, study and specify how the high correlation on PMI can be exploited to reduce multiple CSIs calculation complexity and reporting overhead.
* Support gNB configuring, and triggering if needed, multiple CSIs reporting.
* Support multiple CSIs reporting in one report with overhead reduction techniques based on shared CRI, shared PMI and differential CQIs. FFS details of the one report content.

[Nokia, NSB]:

* To minimize the CSI feedback overhead, discuss on the CSI report content, i.e., whether/how this report would be based on a subset selection from multiple spatial patterns by the UE.
* Discuss whether there is a need to differentiate the CSI report content depending on whether the spatial patterns have same or different number of spatial/antenna elements.
* Discuss CSI report feedback size reduction considering sub-band configuration adaptation to each spatial pattern.
* In the case where the UE is required to provide CSI report based on multiple (indicated) candidate spatial patterns, to reduce the burden at the UE, discuss whether/how the UE is allowed to skip evaluating some of the candidate spatial patterns based on some rules.
* Discuss how the CSI computation/derivation operation is impacted due to switching to a new spatial pattern, considering channel and interference measurements.

[vivo]: Support single-CSI report in one CSI reporting occasion. When CSI report configuration includes multiple sub-configurations, only one sub-configuration from the multiple sub-configurations is activated at one time.

[OPPO]: When UE is allowed to report part of the configured CSI reports, the rules for CSI selection need to be discussed and specified.

[Spreadtrum]:

* The adaptation of PMI/RI/CQI calculation and reporting is prioritized, and the adaptation of CRI/RSRP/SINR is down-prioritized or discussed separately.
* Multiple CSIs without compression can be supported as baseline, and multiple CSIs with compression needs to consider UE complexity reduction.

[CATT]:

* UE should be configured to perform multiple CSI measurements from each NZP CSI-RS resource for type-1 spatial domain adaptation.
* Multiple CSI reports associated with one NZP CSI-RS resource should be supported in Rel-18.
* gNB indication to UE on the selected CSI report (s) should be supported.

[Intel]:

* Consider supporting CSI feedback report(s) based on a hypothetical CSI-RS resource set, which may be a subset of the configured CSI-RS resource set and with a different power offset between CSI-RS and PDSCH.
* To reduce UE computational complexity burden, consider multi-CSI feedback enhancements that can leverage precoding matrix for one of the CSI feedback for another CSI feedback that correspond to a different subset of CSI-RS ports.

[Fujitsu]:

* For single CSI feedback, group-common L1 signaling should be considered to efficiently indicate the UEs of the CSI-RS resource/report update.
* For multiple CSIs feedback, UCI overhead and CSI processing complexity reduction is required. To achieve this, gNB selects the CSIs to be reported and indicates them to UE.
  + - Dynamic signaling is used for indicating UE of the CSIs need to be measured and reported

[ZTE]:

* Multi-CSI report should be considered for network spatial adaptation for energy saving.
* Reporting only one PMI with the largest number of ports for multiple CSIs report should be considered to reduce the UCI overhead.
* gNB can configure multiple bitmap candidates by RRC signaling, and use L1 signaling to select one or more from the multiple candidates.
* To reduce signaling overhead and guarantee performance, each bit in a bitmap corresponds to two ports with different polarization directions but in same position.
* Differential RI/CQI can be considered to reduce UCI overhead.

[InterDigital]: A CSI report contains CSI information associated with at most one spatial adaptation pattern. Support reporting of CSI based on dynamically indicated subset of antenna ports.

[Google]:

* The CSI feedback enhancement for spatial domain NES should be based on CSI measurement from one or more than one CSI-RS resources configured with the same number of antenna ports.
* Support the UE reports at least one CSI including the CRI(s) and corresponding CQI/RI/PMI measured based on the CSI-RS resource(s) indicated by the CRI(s).
* Support the CSI feedback enhancement for NES based on Rel-15 Type1 codebook, Rel-16 eType2 codebook and Rel-18 eType2 codebook refinement for CSI feedback for high/medium UE velocity and coherent joint transmission.

[Samsung]:

* Multi-CSI report is supported in which a UE derives multiple CSI reports from a single set of CSI-RS measurements for different hypotheses of CSI-RS mapping patterns, CSI-RS transmission powers, and PDSCH transmission powers.
* For multi-CSI reporting, a UE can be provided multiple CSI-RS resource mapping sub-configurations from a single set of CSI-RS measurement via CDM group level antenna port subset indication.
* For multi-CSI reporting, a UE can be provided multiple CSI-RS resource mapping sub-configurations from a single set of CSI-RS measurements via two-step indication: first in the CDM group level and then in the antenna port level within the indicated CDM groups.
* For multi-CSI reporting, a UE can be provided one or more of CSI report sub-configurations for a number of CSI-RS resource sub-configurations including parameters related to codebook configurations and/or CSI report quantities.
* For multi-CSI reporting, a UE is indicated by the serving gNB a set of CSI-RS resource sub-configurations for which the UE reports CSI.
* For multi-CSI reporting, further study the following payload size reduction schemes
  + - Differential/threshold-based reporting of CSI quantities such as CQI, L1-RSRP.
    - Reuse DFT basis set and differential/thresholding-based amplitude/phase coefficient reporting for multiple PMI reports of the same size or similar size.
* For multi-CSI reporting, support a mechanism for a UE to perform CSI measurement and reporting following UE-group-specific DCI indication. Otherwise, the UE skips multi-CSI reporting.

[CMCC]:

* Enhancements on adaptation of CQI, RI, or PMI calculation with spatial elements on/off.
* UE reports multiple CSIs with different antenna muting pattern assumptions in one CSI reporting.
* The multiple CSIs within the CSI reporting could be used for the recommendation of muting pattern to gNB.

[CEWiT]: gNB indicating to UE which CSI(s) the UE shall report is supported.

[MediaTek]: The CSI report for a spatial adaptation pattern contains common PMI and RI values but different CQI values corresponding to different candidate power offset values.

* + - FFS: Extension on UCI format
    - FFS: How to specify CPU occupation for generating the CSI report for a spatial adaptation pattern.

[LGe]:

* The following options can be considered to reduce the UE's CSI computational complexity and to find the optimal spatial or power adaptation patterns from the gNB perspective.
  + - Option 1: gNB indicates the spatial or power adaptation pattern(s) to be calculated and reported, and UE calculates and reports CSI information corresponding to indicated spatial or power adaptation pattern(s).
    - Option 2: gNB configures a specific condition/threshold (e.g., target CQI) to the UE in advance and UE calculates and reports only multiple CSI information corresponding to multiple spatial or power adaptation patterns only when the condition/threshold is satisfied.
* When multiple CSIs corresponding to multiple spatial or power adaptation patterns are reported as one CSI report, the following options can be considered to reduce feedback overhead.
  + - Option A: If there is a CSI content (e.g., RI) that remains unchanged across adaptation patterns, the CSI content (e.g. RI) may be included only once without including the CSI content for each adaptation pattern, and the remaining CSI contents for each adaptation pattern can be contained.
    - Option B: Based on the condition/threshold (e.g., CQI index) configured by the gNB, both wideband CSI and sub-band CSI information are included in the CSI report for the best performance (e.g., highest CQI) spatial or power adaptation pattern(s), and only wideband CSI information are included in the CSI report for other adaptation patterns.

[Apple]: For multiple CSI, support NW activation/triggering a single CSI report for one report instance under the multiple spatial adaptation pattern assumptions or power adaptation values.

[Qualcomm]: RAN1 only specifies joint CSI report for multiple CSIs if its CSI report overhead reduction is high compared to separate CSI reports.

* + - A separate CSI report for each CSI corresponding to a spatial adaptation pattern as baseline.
    - (in a separate proposal) Support CSI report based on a subset of CSI-RS resources configured in an CSI report setting

[AT&T]:

* Define different CSI reporting hypotheses for different levels of spatial dimensions which rely on the same RRC configuration
  + - For CSI resource configuration, a common CSI-RS resource/resource set is associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns
    - For CSI reporting, support joint reporting of multiple CSIs
      * Further study the need/benefit of overhead reduction
* Different CSI reporting hypotheses for different levels of spatial dimensions are defined by reusing the ZP-CSI-RS framework avoiding fundamental changes to the codebook structure and/or CSI-RS patterns
* Consider enhancements to the CSI reporting procedures for efficient reporting of different hypotheses for different levels of spatial dimensions

[Docomo]:

* The mechanism of multiple CSI(s) reported in a joint CSI report should be supported.
* The overhead reduction mechanism of following can be considered to reduce the CSI report payload.
  + - Reporting once if CSI contents are the same across reported CSIs.
      * E.g., reporting one CRI for CSIs with Type 1 adaptation.
    - Reporting a joint coded field
      * E.g., reporting a joint coded RI for CSIs with reduced number of CSI-RS ports.
    - Reporting the difference between CSIs.
      * E.g., reporting CQI difference across CSIs with power adaptation.
* The benefits of the mechanism of UE selecting CSI(s) to be reported should be further clarified.

[Ericsson]:

* When a UE receives DCI indicating a trigger state with multiple sub-configuration indicators, the UE transmits one CSI report including CSI results corresponding to each of indicated sub-configurations.
* When a UE receives DCI indicating a trigger state including only one sub-config indicator, the UE measures and reports CSI according to the indicated sub-configuration only.

[Fraunhofer]:

* With a UE set to measure CSI corresponding to 1 different (subsets of the available antenna ports in the array) spatial domain patterns at the gNB, it should be configured to report for CSI(s), where the value of can be either configured by the network or can be fixed in the specifications.
* Regarding the option for letting the UE select which CSI(s) are reported, in order to enable the UE to make such selection effectively, the UE should be configured with sufficient information from the gNB so as to take certain NES requirements into account, in addition to the UE performance.
* RAN1 to discuss mechanisms to enable UEs to perform beam measurement and efficient reporting to meet NES requirements while maintaining sufficient link gains.

**FL summary part 1**

If single-CSI feedback only is supported, as preferred by [vivo, Spreadtrum, Apple, Fujitsu, InterDigital], the possible enhancement is to determine which exact CSI-RS resource for UE channel measurement and report. There seems no enhancement needed from CSI feedback perspective.

If multi-CSI feedback is supported, following up questions could be

* whether gNB can indicate to UE which CSI(s) the UE shall report. From UE complexity/report overhead reduction perspective, there are benefits to do so and gNB has the responsibility to decide which ones to use. In case the supported number of adaptation patterns is not large, a gNB may also not use such indication. Around 9 companies (including CATT, LG, Fujitsu, FW, ZTE, SS, E//, CEWiT and Panasonic) support this approach.
* whether the UE is allowed to select which CSI(s) to report. Impact on UE complexity/report overhead can be minimized. However, it can be questionable on whether gNB would have sufficient information to perform adaptation. Around 2 companies (including LG, CATT) support this approach while 2 companies (including OPPO, Fraunhofer) also want to discuss further along this direction, if certain rules can be conditioned for ensuring the performance.
* whether multiple CSI(s) are reported in a joint CSI report. Similar benefits as the first approach, particular with the motivation to further reduce the overhead/UE complexity as in a joint CSI report. Around 10 companies (including Huawei/HiSi, Intel, ZTE, MTK, LGe, AT&T, Docomo, Samsung, Fraunhofer, E//) support this approach while few companies consider this only if benefits are sufficient (Qualcomm (only if overhead reduction is significant)).

Based on the above, it seems at least the first and third approach can be combined with flexibility of gNB to use.

**P3**

**If multi-CSI feedback is supported, also support multiple CSI(s) are reported in one report with overhead and/or UE complexity reduction techniques**

* **gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Support. Can we add another note on whether the UE can select the subset of CSI(s) it shall report? |
| vivo | Similar comment as P1. It should be clarified that whether multi-CSI feedback is reported in one or different occasions.  Performance benefits on multi-CSI feedback regarding how many throughput and power saving gain, how much UE complexity and overhead reduction can be achieved should be carefully evaluated and clarified first. After there are more evaluation results and analyzes to show clear benefit, whether and how to support overhead reduction/UE complexity reduction can be discussed later. |
| DOCOMO | As multiple CSI reports needs large payload size for CSI reporting, the multiple CSIs reported in one joint CSI report with further overhead reduction methods is an efficient way for NES operation from operators’ point of view.  For the mechanism of UE selects CSI(s) to be reported, from our consideration, the complexity of UE measurement is not reduced as the UE may need to measure all the configured CSIs before selecting the CSI to be report. How the UE to select the reported CSI(s) to help the gNB to take the adaptation decision should be further clarified.  We support FL’s proposal with following slight update.  **~~If multi-CSI feedback is supported, also s~~Support multiple CSI(s) are reported in one report with overhead and/or UE complexity reduction techniques**  **gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report.** |
| OPPO | UE complexity is fairly important to be considered. The netowrk may configure multiple patterns and if the UE is required report all, the UE complexity will not be affordable. From our viewpoint, we should also discuss the maximum number of CSI to be reported in one CSI reporting. The suggested P3 does not set a maximum limit and leave gNB to optionally allow UE to report subset of CSI. This is risky from UE point of view.  For the overhead reduction, we think that this can be discussed later after the maximum number of CSI to be reported in one CSI reporting is concluded. |
| Apple | We need to understand the intention clearly, we think this has the implication that single CPU will be counted for the multiple CSIs, which is unacceptable for us even with the overhead and/or UE complexity reduction. As we have stated in P1, it is unclear which is better, single CSI with complete CSI feedback or multi-CSI with compressed CSI feedback, so it is too early to discuss on this part yet. We could focus on the single CSI or multiple CSI in multiple reporting instances first. |
| FL to vivo/Apple | The ‘if’ condition is added particularly for continuing the discussion.  From FL perspective, a decision within this meeting is needed or at least other relevant work should not be suspended. |
| Spreadtrum | Multi-CSI feedback is supported in current spec. whether we need to reduce UL resource overhead and UE complexity is to be justified. MIMO topic has done many things to reduce UL resource overhead and UE complexity. What can we do further should be asked at first? |
| ETRI | Okay to support overhead reduction techniques assuming that CSI overhead will be problematic in multi-CSI feedback. For the complexity reduction part, it may or may not be achievable depending on detailed feedback schemes. So we prefer to put FFS for the complexity reduction. |
| Fujitsu | We share the same view as vivo that the benefit of multiple CSI(s) in one report needs to be well evaluated first. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support.  Based on our evaluation, it can be observed that providing sufficient CSI information corresponding to different spatial patterns/power offset values at the same time is beneficial to assist NW dynamic adaptation without sacrificing the UPT performance. Therefore, multi-CSI feedback in one report should be supported for spatial/power domain adaptation. And OH/UE complexity reduction is also helpful for this enhancement to make it more useful.  According to our evaluation, since there is high correlation between the precoding matrices of different ports, the CSI OH can be compressed. Based on the evaluation results in Table 5 in our contribution, it can be seen that reporting a common PMI can reduce about 65% OH of PMI.  Table 5 Payload of PMI reporting   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Scheme | Payload of wideband PMI reporting | Payload of subband PMI reporting | Total payload | | Report one PMI | 10(bits) | 18(bits) | 28(bits) | | Report multi-PMI | 10+10+8=28(bits) | 18\*3=54(bits) | 82(bits) |   In addition to that, dynamic indication of CSI report subsets can be optionally considered. In this case, the dynamic indication should not be limited to select only one subset. Indication of multiple subsets of CSIs should be also considered to exploit the benefits of multi-CSI feedback in one report. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the main part.  For the bullet, the motivation of gNB indicating subset of CSI(s) to report is not very clear for us. Why gNB needs some CSIs at some point and needs some other CSIs at another point? From our perspective, gNB needs all CSIs to do the shutdown decision and scheduling decision. If only a subset of CSI(s) is reported by UE, gNB cannot do proper shutdown (due to the lack of all CSIs) which resulting in performance loss and less energy saving gain. Hence, we propose the following modification  **P3**  **If multi-CSI ~~feedback~~ report(s) is supported for NES adaptation before the adaptation decision, ~~also~~ support multiple CSI(s) are reported in one report with overhead and/or UE complexity reduction techniques**   * **~~gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report.~~** |
| Nokia/NSB | We don’t support proposal 3 in its current form.  In our view, there are two main approaches that should be considered:   * Approach 1: UE is configured to select X (such as 1 or 2, etc.) spatial patterns, from a set of indicated candidate spatial patterns, for which the UE reports the corresponding CSI(s) to the gNB e.g., in an UL reporting occasion. * Approach 2: UE only reports CSI for one spatial adaptation in an UL reporting occasion from a set of indicated candidate spatial patterns.   P3 seems to condition the support the above approaches to the support of multi-CSI feedback in one UL reporting occasion.  In addition, in our view Approach 1 provides enough knowledge for the gNB to make suitable spatial adaptation decision, without the need to have CSI for every single candidate pattern.  Furthermore, we think, Approach 1 and/or Approach 2 could be further considered as both would allow reduced UL overhead (up to gNB decision). And the approach where the UE is always required to report CSI for all indicated candidate patterns would result in high UL overhead.  The aspect on UE complexity reduction could be discussed, if still needed, after discussing and concluding whether to support Approaches 1 and/or 2. |
| MediaTek | Support and think overhead and UE complexity reduction is best based on the same design. For example, sharing RI and PMI for spatial adaptation patterns also allows UE to reduce CSI calculation complexity. On the other hand, due to the dependency of PMI on RI, sharing PMI while requiring re-evaluation of RI may bring limited UE complexity reduction, which is less preferred. In this regard, joint design consideration is suggested:  **If multi-CSI feedback is supported, also support multiple CSI(s) are reported in one report with joint overhead and~~/or~~ UE complexity reduction techniques**  **gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report.** |
| Futurewei | We consider this agreement can be deferred once we have clarification what these multi-CSI correspond to. |
| Xiaomi | We share the similar comment as P1. Efficient mechanisms should be studied to reduce the processing and reporting overhead. |
| CMCC | We are generally fine with the proposal. Since if multiple CSI feedbacks are contained in one CSI report, the connection or the correlations between different configurations or assumptions can be used for the overhead reduction. Of course the detailed solutions and analysis are needed for making the decision. |
| Samsung | Support |
| InterDigital | As mentioned in Q1, clarification of multi-CSI feedback is needed before discussing further on the related details. We also share similar concern as raised by Apple.  From our understanding, “whether gNB can indicate to UE which CSI(s) the UE shall report” can apply for both single CSI feedback and multi-CSI feedback, depending on whether the indication of the CSI associated with a spatial adaptation is done via semi-static or dynamic signaling. |
| Panasonic | We think P3 should be discussed after P1, considering the P3 has many details still to be clarified. |
| Ericsson | While we agree that multiple CSI(s) should be reported in a one reporting instance, we think it is too early to agree on overhead reduction and/or UE complexity reduction techniques.  Regarding overhead, for aperiodic CSI reporting on PUSCH, for example, it may not be motivated to reduce overhead as there are not the same overhead restrictions as on PUCCH. Hence, we think overhead reduction techniques, if needed, should be FFS, taking into account the channel carrying the CSI feedback (PUSCH or PUCCH).  Regarding UE complexity, as a baseline we think that if the UE is triggered to report N CSIs, then N CPUs would be consumed as in current spec, hence it is not essential to specify UE complexity reduction approaches. Practically speaking, how would they even be specified? It seems like a detailed UE procedure would be difficult to agree on given that actual CSI computation details could vary for different implementations  We think overhead reduction and UE complexity reduction should be decoupled and discussed separately. It was already agreed in last (“Note: UE complexity needs to be taken into account.”).  Suggested update:  **P3**  **If multi-CSI feedback is supported, ~~also~~ at least support multiple CSI(s) are reported in one report without overhead ~~and/or UE complexity~~ reduction techniques**   * **gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report.** * **FFS: Support of multiple CSI(s) reported in one report with overhead reduction techniques** * **FFS: whether/how to reduce UE complexity** |
| Qualcomm | Please see our reply in P1. We C&P some related suggestion below.  From discussion perspective, backward discussion starting from CSI feedback (in particular from undefined multi-CSI feedback) is very hard since we don’t know how CSI-RS resource/CSI report configuration looks like.  Hence, we suggest discussing in the following order:   * Definition of spatial adaptation pattern * CSI-RS resource configuration * CSI report configuration * CSI report based on CSI-RS resource configuration and CSI report configuration.   + Whether UE provides N CSIs associated with N spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ).   + Whether N CSIs are available before spatial domain adaptation   + Whether N CSIs are sent in a single CSI report or sent in separate CSI reports   Whether CSI reduction is necessary when N > 1. |
| LG Electronics | Support in general, but still the definition of ‘multi-CSI feedback’ is not clear though. From the gNB’ perspective, it is beneficial to support multiple CSI(s) in one report to find the optimal spatial or power adaptation patterns. If the supported number of adaptation patterns is large, a method of reducing the candidate number of spatial or power adaptation patterns is needed in order to reduce the amount of CSI information to be calculated and reported. In this case, it is possible to consider a method in which the gNB indicates the CSI corresponding to the spatial or power adaptation pattern to be calculated and reported directly to the UE. |
| FL2 | For single-CSI vs multi-CSI, I’m not sure how much benefits can be viewed as sufficient given the discussion so far and companies preference. It is not too early rather a bit late if not to decide this still. For progress, ‘if’ is set to allow more considerations. However, it is encouraged to think about whether it is something RAN1 cannot agree on, or it is one configuration tool that should be allowed in specification and up to network/UE vendors to choose support or not.  For single-CSI case, possibly gNB indication can also be used as one company point out.  For multi-CSI case, if not to report them in one report, which means UE needs to report the CSI separately for each pattern in multiple occasions. This either consumes more DCI indication/triggering, or overhead, and UE power consumption. It is not clear whether under multi-CSI any benefits can be observed with separate reporting. However there can be more explanations to elaborate this.  Considering that overhead reduction and UE complexity are topics with interest and with FFS/Note already from last meeting, there is no need to repeat them if the agreement is not to confirm such FFS nor concrete solutions. We can always discuss those separately.  **P3-rev1**  **Support a framework that enables a UE to provide *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ) in one report**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report** * **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| China Telecom | We are generally fine with Pe-rev1. And actually, we don’t think reporting the CSI separately for multi-CSI should be supported since we can’t see the benefits of such mechanism compared with reporting multiple CSIs in one report. |
| DOCOMO2 | We support the updated proposal.  Such framework may also be applied for power adaptation. So, we suggest the update of this and other wordings as follow if I understand the FL’s motivation correctly.  **Support a framework that enables a UE to ~~provide~~ report *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ) in one report**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which ~~subset of~~ N CSI(s) the UE shall report** * **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.**   **FFS how the framework applied for power adaptations** |
| ZTE,Sanechips2 | Support.  We don’t see the benefit of report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI. The UE complexity is same as report multi-CSI in one report, but it costs more signaling overhead, more energy for both gNB and UE.  Therefore, we think multi-CSI in one report should be supported. For multi-CSI in separate report, it can be FFS.  For the update suggested by DOCOMO, we are okay. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **P3-rev1**  **Support a framework that enables a UE to provide *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of [Huawei: L is the maximum of spatial adaptation patterns?]) in one report**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report**   **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.**  We are OK with P3-rev1 for this time. **But we support N>1 at least.**  Some companies (VIVO, Inter digital) support multiple CSIs in multiple CSI reporting occasion. In such approach the actual UE complexity and UL payload is equals to the multiple CSIs in one reporting occasion (without any UL payload and complexity reduction enhancement).  In addition, for multiple CSIs reporting in multiple CSI reporting occasions, in order to get multiple CSIs, gNB needs to persistently transmit multiple triggering/indicating signaling and then results in large L1/L2 signaling overhead. |
| InterDigital | The updated proposal is more inclusive, and we are generally ok with the current form, although we support **N=1**.  Regarding UE complexity, it is not clear to us how reporting multi-CSI in one report results in the same complexity as reporting one CSI in one report. The amount of CSI processing at UE can increase when reporting multi-CSI in one report (e.g. number of calculated CSI is multiplied for a single report configuration).  When reporting multi-CSI in single reporting occasion, if the UE is reporting at least CQI and RI for each spatial adaptation pattern, the overhead is also expected to increase proportionally. Clearly there is a tradeoff between complexity and overhead when considering single-CSI vs. multi-CSI, and we think it is important to strive for a solution that balances the tradeoff. |
| ITRI | We can support P3-rev1 in principle.  At least L=1 (single CSI case) should be supported.  For L>1 (multi-CSI case), we should down-select the following options:   * Option 1: separate CSI report for multi-CSI * Option 2: one CSI report for multi-CSI   FFS: If Option 2 is supported, UL payload size for CSI reporting should be discussed. |
| Qualcomm2 | Assume CSI report config has SAPs, and each pattern has NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement. The UE shall need to compute CSIs in total. Main question: how should “UE to report N CSIs associated with N spatial adaptation patterns” be interpreted? There could be two different interpretations:   * Interpretation 1: UE reports one CSI for each SAP. In particular, UE shall select one CSI to report for an SAP. * Interpretation 2: UE reports N CSIs out of CSIs.   From our perspective, we think Interpretation 1 should be pursued and some clarification is needed in the proposal.  We don’t support 2nd bullet of the proposal with the following reasons:   * For periodic CSI reporting, the bullet means that gNB may use L1/L2 signaling to request a subset of CSIs. If this is the case, why does not gNB trigger SP or AP CSI reporting? * For aperiodic CSI reporting or semi-persistent CSI reporting, gNB can trigger a state with CSI report config having N spatial adaptation patterns using existing triggering mechanism. Hence, no new indication is necessary.   Hence, we propose the following **update**:  **For an CSI report config with N spatial adaptation patterns, Support a framework that enables a UE to ~~provide~~ report *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ) in one report and one CSI for each spatial adaptation pattern.**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **~~gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report~~** * **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.** |
| Lenovo2 | We support the main paragraph of the proposal as well as the first bullet. For the second bullet, we prefer to include the possibility of UE selection of the N CSIs. Can we consider the following wording?  **For a CSI report config with N spatial adaptation patterns, Support a framework that enables a UE to ~~provide~~ report *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ) in one report**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **~~gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report~~** * **FFS: whether the *N* CSIs are indicated by gNB or selected by UE** * **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.** |
| Intel | We are generally ok with main bullet and 1st sub-bullet.  As for the 2nd sub-bullet, we have a question on what would happen if the gNB does not indicate/trigger. The sub-bullet describes the indication/trigger being optional, which we don’t understand well.  If the gNB does not indicate/tigger what is the expected UE behavior?  (1) UE does not report multiple CSIs and only report 1  (2) UE can pick and choose any hypothesis from N CSIs and report any value  (3) something else  It would be good if “optionally indicate/trigger” could be clarified the proponents. Also, it needs to be discussed whether N CPUs would be counted as in current spec for reporting N CSIs or not. |
| Xiaomi | We support the content of main bullet and first sub-bullet.  For the second sub-bullet, the motivation of gNB indication/triggering is not clear to us.  For the third sub-bullet, we do not see any benefits compared with one CSI report with N CSIs.  In addition, the signalling overhead for the third sub-bullet is another issue. |
| Nokia/NSB2 | First, we share similar view as QC that it would be better to first define spatial adaptation pattern, CSI-RS resource configuration, CSI report configuration, and the interaction between those, etc. This would make the discussion clearer, instead of rushing to a conclusion here before having a somewhat clear idea on the overall baseline framework and operation.  Regarding multi-CSI case, to our view:   * UEs report the CSI separately for each pattern in multiple occasions is a workable solution based on legacy framework. We agree that the overall ES potential may not be good as multiple CSI feedbacks in one UL occasion case. But from specification perspective, it may require much less spec impact. * Thus, we propose, the UEs report the CSI separately for each pattern in multiple occasions can be considered as a baseline solution. And we may further discuss how it can be operated with Periodic, Semi-periodic, and Aperiodic ways. * And further enhancement with better ES gain can be pursued with multiple CSI feedbacks in one UL occasion case   We thus suggest the following updates on P3-rev1:  **For reporting multiple CSIs associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns, consider at least one of the following options:**   * **Option 1: UE reports each CSI in a separate CSI reporting occasion.**   + **FFS: gNB indication/triggering, considering different reporting types (such as aperiodic and semi-persistent).** * **Option 2: UE reports *N* CSIs in one CSI reporting occasion, where (FFS: value of )**   + **FFS: gNB indicating/triggering the UE to report *N* CSIs in one CSI reporting occasion, considering different reporting types (such as aperiodic and semi-persistent).**   + **Note: This doesn’t preclude using more than one reporting occasion, e.g., *N1* CSIs in one CSI reporting occasion and *N2* CSIs in a next CSI reporting occasion.** * **FFS: whether the UE could be configured to select CSI(s) to report under Option 1 and/or Option 2.** |
| ETRI | We support the proposal and prefer Qualcomm’s version which further clarifies the relation between CSIs and spatial adaptation patterns. |
| Fujitsu2 | For the main bullet, the definition of L is not clear. In our understanding, L is the number of configured spatial adaption patterns. For the second sub-bullet, it seems that gNB indicating CSIs to be reported is only considered in multi-CSI. In our opinion, it is applicable to both single-CSI and multi-CSI. Besides, the word ‘optionally’ seems redundant. We propose the following update:  **Support a framework that enables a UE to provide *N* CSIs associated with *N* out of *L* configured spatial adaptation patterns in one report where (FFS: value of ) ~~in one report~~**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **gNB can ~~optionally~~ indicate/trigger to UE which CSI or subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report**   **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.** |
| Apple2 | We share the similar view as QC and Nokia and as stated in our comment to P1, We think it is necessary to define more clearly of what is single-CSI feedback and what is multi-CSI feedback and the implication behind.  We think Nokia’s proposal to consider UEs report a single CSI separately for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple reporting instances can be considered as a baseline solution. And the enhancements related P/SP/AP CSI/CSI reporting should be defined clear enough before we rush to support the joint multiple CSI reporting in one reporting instances. |
| Samsung2 | Agree with FL2 summary and the revised proposal with the following reasons:   * Multiple CSI in separate reports vs. single multi-CSI report   + Multiple CSI in separate reports can be achieved in the current specification by configuring a UE with multiple separate CSI reports. With this approach, it is assumed that the UE will separately perform CSI-RS measurements for each of the resources linked with multiple separate CSI reports. Also, as pointed out by FL, separate multiple DCI triggering messages need to be sent out by the gNB for the case of A-CSI report. From UE perspective, this approach requires a UE to transmit UCI multiple times in separate occasions, which will consume more power by the UE and the UL resource.   + Single multi-CSI report should aim for deriving multiple CSI from a single set of CSI-RS measurements such as for subsets of antenna ports from the given set of antenna ports or for different power control offset values. In contrary to the former approach, this approach requires single triggering message, single CSI-RS resource measurements, and provides opportunities to further reduce UCI overhead in one message as multiple CSI reports are highly correlated as they are derived from a single set of measurements.   + Given the majority support and for the progress, it is preferable to first agree in principle to support multi-CSI report rather than keep debating on the sufficiency of the overhead reduction gain. Procedurally, once multi-CSI report is agreed in principle, discussions on the overhead reduction schemes will follow naturally with proper consideration on the CPU counting method.   The following is a revised proposal for the sake of progress and also refinement of wording.  **P3-rev1**  **Support a framework that enables a UE to provide *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns from *L* sub-configurations provided to the UE, where , in one report.**   * **FFS: whether/how the gNB indicates to UE the number *N* and the corresponding subset of *N* configurations from *L* sub-configurations.** * **FFS: UCI overhead reduction scheme and scaling for CPU counting** * **Note: When *L*=1, it is single CSI report as in the legacy system.** * **Note: , where is defined by specification or per UE capability.** |
| vivo | We disagree that a decision can be made without clearly justified benefit just because it could be too late for progress. Any enhancement needs to be considered only when sufficient benefits are shown by evaluation. Currently there are limited companies providing evaluation results for multi-CSI. As pointed out by some companies, performance benefit of multi-CSI is small compared to single-CSI, and also according to the TR in SI single-CSI can have remarkable NES gain.  Note that multi-CSI would cause the complexity for UE have to be greatly increased. It is highly encouraged the proponent companies who support multi-CSI provide more evaluation results to justify there could be sufficient benefit and why it is necessary.  Before the performance benefit is clearly justified, we suggest to focus on the design for adaptation based on N spatial adaptation patterns in different report occasion, i.e., single CSI report for different spatial adaptation patterns in different report occasions.  Regarding the proposal, we suggest to clarify how the N CSIs are reported and separate the different options.  **P3-rev1-new**  **For the framework that enables a UE to provide *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ) in M report, consider the following options or combination of the options**   * **Option 1: UE to provide *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where in M report, M = N** * **For each report, UE provide single CSI associated with one spatial adaptation pattern** * **Note: this is single CSI in a report** * **Option 2: UE to provide *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where in M report, M = 1** * **For each report, UE provide CSI associated with N spatial adaptation pattern** * **Note: this is multi-CSI in a report** * **Option 3: UE to provide *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where in M report,** * **For each report, UE may provide CSI associated with one or multiple spatial adaptation patterns** * **Note: this is hybrid single CSI and multi-CSI in different reports** * **For each option, gNB can indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report** * **FFS how to down-select** |
| LG Electronics2 | We are OK with the updated proposal and also think that multi-CSI in one report is beneficial to gNB for finding optimal spatial or power adaptation patterns. However, multiple CSI reporting is not always necessary, and to reduce the signaling overhead and computation complexity of UE, we can consider gNB to indicate/trigger subsets of CSIs to be reported to UE. In that sense, we prefer not to have FFS for the second sub-bullet, but we can accept the version revised by Lenovo2.  Regarding the definition of single-CSI and multi-CSI, our view is that the definition is related to how many N CSIs (associated with N spatial adaptation patterns) are actually reported and not related to how my K CSIs (associated with K spatial adaptation patterns) are configured with a CSI report config. With this understanding, we propose the following modification on top of Lenovo2’s version.  **For a CSI report config ~~with N spatial adaptation patterns~~, Support a framework that enables a UE to ~~provide~~ report *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ) in one report**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **~~gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report~~** * **FFS: whether the *N* CSIs are indicated by gNB or selected by UE** * **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.**   **Note: The CSI report config can be configured with more than N spatial adaptation patterns.** |
| Ericsson 2 | We have similar concerns on the 2nd sub-bullet as raised by Qualcomm, Intel, and others, and we prefer to remove it. We are okay with Qualcomm’s revised proposal, although our preference would be to remove the FFS bullet since we think the main benefit of multi-CSI comes from reporting the CSIs in one reporting instance.  **P3-rev1 (revised)**  **For an CSI report config with N spatial adaptation patterns, Support a framework that enables a UE to ~~provide~~ report *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns where (FFS: value of ) in one report and one CSI for each spatial adaptation pattern.**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **~~gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which subset of CSI(s) the UE shall report~~**   **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.** |
| CMCC2 | We are fine with the P3-rev1. Compared with multiple CSI reporting, single reporting with multiple CSIs have obvious benefits saving the UE power and the physical resources of the cell. For the issue that whether gNB or UE can select the sub set of CSIs for reporting, we think gNB selection should be the baseline. For the mechanism of UE selection, we would be open for further discussion and more details. We don’t think the UE selection based solution cannot work, but more details are needed. |
| **FL2e** | @Docomo  It is preferred to leave the possibility that gNB can indicate a subset of N CSIs instead of always N CSIs. This can include single-CSI case and allows more gNB flexibility.  @Huawei/HiSi  The L stands an upper bound of number of CSIs that can be supported by UE or a configuration thereby N is a subset of L configured patterns.  @InterDigital/ITRI  The complexity comparison from Huawe/ZTE is for separate report vs joint report under the assumption that a UE anyway needs to report multiple CSIs. If the UE only needs to report one CSI (upon gNB request/configuration), the complexity is different. Therefore, the proposal is also to say, in case multiple CSI is to be reported (this does not necessarily to be spelt out since single-CSI will be only in one report), regarding reporting them separately or jointly, the latter seems beneficial.  @QC  For periodic CSI reporting, the gNB does not need to trigger anything. That’s the reason why it says gNB can ‘optionally’ trigger the report. For A-CSI reporting, I agree existing mechanism can apply. There could be two things to consider: if the DCI triggered CSIs can be smaller than N? The original proposal is intended to say Yes. If the existing mechanism is efficient? If enhancements for reduction of UE complexity or report payload can be considered, it would be good. Therefore, the sub-bullet was kept.  @Intel, xiaomi  As for the ‘optionally indicate/trigger’, please also see my response to Docomo, QC. It counts for A-CSI reports and also allows for both single-CSI and multi-CSI, at gNB needs. When gNB does not have such indication, my understanding is that a UE will report what it is configured to do (without L1/L2 signalling), for example, report *N* CSIs if *N* patterns are configured. But this can be further discussed after the support of the framework is settled.  I agree the need of discussion for CPUs. I think there are already several proposals mentioning this.  @Nokia/NSB, Apple  As said in the beginning, including for the discussion in P1, resource configuration/report configuration and CSI report is closely coupled. If multi-CSI feedback is not supported and only single-CSI is supported, there is no need to discuss potential enhancement for ‘report configuration’ since there won’t be joint report anymore.  Further, resource configuration is already parallel proceeding including spatial adaptation pattern in Q10. It is preferred you also have your input there.  Regarding a baseline operation, this touches the discussion point very well as FL also asks.  Having said above, if one or part of the N CSIs can be reported in one report, from L configurations, functionally, gNB can also indicate each of the multiple CSIs to be separately reported, as if a baseline similar to what Nokia is proposing.  @Fujitsu  Thanks for the question. My original formulation of L is the total number that can be supported by UE. Then N is configured value and gNB may indicate the UE to report a smaller value than N (which can be 1, thus single-CSI). Now you have another formation, and let me modify.  Please see my previous response on why ‘optionally’ is there.  @Lenovo, LGe, Ericsson, all  According to my observations, introduction of gNB L1/L2 signalling gains clearly more support than UE selection of CSI(s). To be inclusive “gNB optionally” was added. However, given many FFS raised for gNB indication now, it is FFS.  @vivo  Progress is a reasonable consideration point however it is the benefits shown in all results including vivo support this direction. Thus, I don’t consider it is “too early” and consider it is “a bit late” if even a discussion was deferred for multi-CSI as previously observed in some responses. The divergence between you and other majority seems to be how much more benefits in how many scenarios can be viewed as sufficient. On this point, perhaps companies can think about it and I don’t have a good value.  Having said above, I think the current proposal still include all cases you want.  **P3-rev2**  **For a CSI report config, support a framework that enables a UE to report *N* CSIs in one report where the *N* CSIs are associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns from *L* sub-configurations (where ) and each CSI corresponds to each spatial adaptation pattern.**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **Note: When L=1, it is single CSI report as in the legacy system.** * **Note: , where is defined by specification or per UE capability.** * **FFS: gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which CSI or (subset of) CSIs the UE shall report** * **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.** * **FFS: UCI overhead reduction scheme and scaling for CPU counting** * **FFS how the framework applied for power adaptations.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO3 | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Before agreeing a single option, we should list the possible options which are comparable. Hence, we share the similar view as Nokia, vivo and other companies. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| LG Electronics3 | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO2 | We are fine with this proposal. We also suggest that in next step we first agree on the concrete value of L and N before discussing the necessity of overhead reduction. |
| MTK2 | Support P3-rev2 with some revisions for clarification: 1) One CSI is based on one CSI report sub-configuration and, as agreed in RAN1#112, one sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern. 2) How N is selected from L still require FFS, although gNB selection is suggested by FL. Accordingly, please kindly check the following update:  **P3-rev2 (MTK revision)**  **For a CSI report config, support a framework that enables a UE to report *N* CSIs in one report where the *N* CSIs are ~~associated with~~ based on *N* ~~spatial adaptation patterns from~~ out of *L* CSI report sub-configurations (where ) and each CSI corresponds to ~~each~~ one distinct spatial adaptation pattern.**   * **For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.** * **Note: When L=1, it is single CSI report as in the legacy system.** * **Note: , where is defined by specification or per UE capability.** * **FFS: How to select N out of L sub-configurations, including gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which CSI or (subset of) CSIs the UE shall report** * **FFS whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.** * **FFS: UCI overhead reduction scheme and scaling for CPU counting**   **FFS how the framework applied for power adaptations.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips3 | We are okay with the proposal in principle.  We share similar views with MTK that the relationship of L sub-configurations VS N CSIs/spatial adaptation patterns is unclear, especially considering “gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which CSI or (subset of) CSIs the UE shall report” is FFS. With this FFS, we think the baseline is L=N. And N<L is FFS which is included in the fourth bullet.  Some suggestions are in green.  **P3-rev2**  **For a CSI report config, support a framework that enables a UE to report *N* CSIs in one report where the *N* CSIs are associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns from *L* sub-configurations (where N=L≥1 ) and each CSI corresponds to each spatial adaptation pattern.** |
| InterDigital | We are ok with P3-rev2, with one suggested change. Given the clarification provided by FL to Docomo, QC, we think FFS can be removed from the following bullet:   * **~~FFS:~~ gNB can optionally indicate/trigger to UE which CSI or (subset of) CSIs the UE shall report** |

**FL3e**

The following is agreed on Wed. session.

**Agreement**

For a CSI report config with *L* sub-configuration(s), support a framework that enables a UE to report *N* CSI(s) in one reporting instance where the *N* CSI(s) are associated with *N* sub-configuration(s) from *L* (where ) and each CSI corresponds to one sub-configuration.

* For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.

A couple of remaining issues.

• At least the case of N=L is supported.

• Maximum value of N and L are subject to UE capability

• FFS: Whether/How to select N out of L, including how to trigger/indicate/activate CSI reports corresponding to N out of L spatial adaptation patterns

• FFS: whether a UE can also report each CSI in separate CSI report for multi-CSI.

• FFS: CSI report overhead reduction scheme and scaling for CSI processing related parameters (e.g., CPU counting, CSI-RS resource counting)

• Including if such scheme is needed

• FFS: how the framework applied for power adaptations.

For the UE capability related discussion, I would like to take it later. Since we are not yet clear on the relation between N and L, for example if in the end there is only the case N=L, then there is no need to mention both of them everywhere.

For the FFS about CSI report overhead reduction and scaling, there is another ongoing proposal in tagged with FL3.

As for the last FFS, although it is valid point, FL would like to also take it a bit later, probably together with the discussion of joint operation, and/or for the case when we discuss power change of CSI-RS in another proposal.

Let’s start with the simplest case for each operation.

@All several revisions are also provided for reference based on recent comment.

**FL3e P3-remaining-1**

**For multi-CSI feedback, at least**

* **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L is supported**
* **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N=L CSIs report.**

**Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N=L=1.**

**FL3e P3-remaining-1-rev1**

* **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L is supported**
* **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger N=L CSIs report.**
  + **FFS: For the case with no overhead/report payload reduction, the CPU occupation and active CSI-RS counting is scaled with N**
  + **FFS: the case with overhead/report payload reduction.**
  + **FFS: For semi-persistent (and periodic) CSI reporting, gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., *N1* CSIs in one reporting occasion and *N2* CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. (where *Ni* < *L*)**
  + **FFS: whether to consider multiple CSI reporting occasions triggered with one aperiodic CSI report trigger.**
* **FFS: whether L for Periodic/ Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting is same or different, considering e.g. PUCCH overhead.**
* **Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.**

**FL3e P3-remaining-1-rev2**

**For periodic multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of N=L is supported.**

* **FFS: whether to support UE to report N<L CSI(s) by gNB configuration or by UE selection based on certain conditions**

**Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO4 | Generally support the proposal.  But I am wondering whether the L for SP/A-CSI could be different compared to that of P-CSI. So I suggest the following update.  **For multi-CSI feedback, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L is supported** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N=L CSIs report.** * **FFS: whether L for Periodic/ Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting is same or different.**   **Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N=L=1.** |
| Intel | Ok with proposal. Also ok with Docomo’s addition. |
| Xiaomi | Fine to discuss N=L situation first and support the proposal in general. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. With minor modification in red.  **FL3e P3-remaining-1**  **For multi-CSI feedback with L=N, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L is supported** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N=L CSIs report.**   **Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N=L=1.** |
| ZTE,Sanechips3e | Okay with the suggestion by HW, it is clearer. |
| ETRI | Support the proposal. |
| Apple3e | We understand the motivation to support multi-CSI feedback is to provide enough CSIs for gNB to make the spatial adaptation decision. It is noted that the single CSI with N=1 and L>1 can also provide L CSIs for gNB to make final spatial adaptation decisions with lower reporting overhead, and simpler CSI computation. The benefit of multi-CSI with N=L>1 over single-CSI with N=1 and L>1 is not clear enough.  It is shown in R1-2303910 that the performance gain for multi-CSI feedback with N=L=2 over single-CSI feedback with N=1 and L=2 is marginal.  For the multi-CSI results provided in TR, e.g. R1-2211903 where the multi-CSI feedback with N=L=4 is compared with single CSI feedback with N=1 and L=2(if I understand correctly), it is not obvious that the gain comes from multi-CSI since L is different in the two cases, so the gain may come from the fact that there are more number of port reductions in the simulated multi-CSI case.  For another multi-CSI result in TR, R1-2210858, the comparison is between multi-CSI feedback with N=L>1 and single CSI feedback with N=L=1.  We also understand the intention for the study on overhead/payload/complexity reduction schemes to reduce reporting overhead and simplify UE CSI computation, which according to our understanding, will further decrease performance benefit of multi-CSI over single CSI with N=1 and L>1.  With the above said, we would like to reiterate that supporting single CSI with N=1 and L>1 should be discussed with at least the same priority (if not higher) with multi-CSI with N=L>1. Multi-CSI with overhead reduction is a next step only with performance gain over single CSI with N=1 and L>1 crystal clear enough.  For the sake of progress, we could live with supporting AP CSI with N=L under the condition that CPU occupation and active CSI-RS counting is scaled with N. For P/SP CSI, considering the overhead on PUCCH, we do not see the need to rush to support it.  For the point regarding CPU occupation, sorry for raising it multiple times, but we consider it important to be tied together to safely support of multi-CSI feedback.  Therefore, we would like to propose the following changes to the current proposal:  **For multi-CSI feedback, at least**   * **FFS: for Periodic/Semi-persistent CSI reporting, the case of N=L is supported** * **for ~~Semi-persistent/~~Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger~~/indicate/activate~~ N=L CSIs report.**   + For the case with no overhead/report payload reduction, the CPU occupation and active CSI-RS counting is scaled with N   + FFS the case with overhead/report payload reduction.   **Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N=L=1.** |
| Nokia/NSB3 | We are fine with DOCOMO’s suggestion. But we think that the proposal still doesn’t account for our previous input on reporting CSIs using different CSI report occasions. We thus suggest the following updates, for which the justification is provided further below:  **For multi-CSI feedback, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L is supported** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N=L CSIs report.**   + **For semi-persistent (and periodic) CSI reporting, gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., *N1* CSIs in one reporting occasion and *N2* CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. (where *Ni* < *L*)**   + **FFS: whether to consider multiple CSI reporting occasions triggered with one aperiodic CSI report trigger.**   **Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N=L=1.**  A few observations on why we suggest the additions in red, to enable acquiring L CSIs through different reporting occasions:   * Semi-persistent reporting could be seen as a multi-shot aperiodic CSI report as the gNB can trigger a semi-persistent report on PUSCH instead of triggering multiple aperiodic CSI reports on PUSCH in order to reduce the PDCCH overhead. Otherwise, we could also consider enhancing the existing aperiodic CSI report trigger. * When several/many CSIs are reported in the same UL reporting occasion, the corresponding CPUs are still not released before the report is sent. Since the UE is capable of max X (simultaneously) occupied CPUs (considering all configured cells), where X may not be sufficiently large, this may be problematic. |
| Fujitsu4 | We are fine with Huawei’s update. |
| Qualcomm3e | We don’t see clear/strong motivation to separately discuss the case for P/AP/SP CSI reporting. The version discussed online is sufficient. If companies still prefer discussing related AP/SP CSI triggering, we can have **FFS**.   * **At least the case of N=L is supported.**   + **FFS: whether enhancement to aperiodic and/or semi-persistent CSI reporting is necessary** |
| FL/Huawei | @Apple  On behalf of Huawei: Could you explain that: to report total N CSIs, how reporting them in N reports can have lower overhead than reporting them in one report with/without compression? Or can be with less total computation than later case, less gNB indication/configuration signaling overhead, or less time for gNB performing final proper adaptation?  For the single-CSI feedback case you referred above in TR, it refers to the case of adaptation first then measure or using one CSI assumed for multiple adaptation. The simulation results in SI and comparison is reasonable as single-CSI is the legacy approach, and there is no need for comparison of multi-CSI with separate reports vs. with one joint report at SI stage. But I’m curious about the answer since you stated it is better and actually I’m a bit unsure whether we are talk about the same single-CSI feedback (or multi-CSI with separate reports?).  As FL: discussion priority is the same at my side. Both single-CSI and multi-CSI are on the table for discussion/agreement from the beginning even though majority has a preference. N=1 and L>1 is a special case as in N < L, and now they are equally discussed. However, please note that it is much simpler and reasonable to take the majority view as potential way forward. If your proposal and modification obtain sufficient support, there is no reason for me not to take it.  @Nokia/NSB  In the case of N<L, there is one note saying that gNB can trigger N in one report which also means (L-N) CSI(s) can be in a separate report. I thought it means a gNB indicate multiple report instances, and essentially, N can be for example 1 such that gNB trigger separate reports respectively, same as the baseline you proposed. Now with what modified, I see you are considering something different.  Please feel free to modify and if others are ok, I’m fine. For this proposal (remaining-1), I’d like to start with the simplest case as said. |
| Lenovo3e | - For CSI reporting, there are four different types: periodic, semi-persistent on PUCCH, semi-persistent on PUSCH, and aperiodic. Is it possible to differentiate between SP on PUSCH and SP on PUCCH due to differences in overhead scarcity between the two?  - Our preference is not to support reporting N>1 CSIs over periodic or semi-persistent CSI reporting on PUCCH, at least it must be made clear that a maximum value of L=N=2 is considered.  - Can we also discuss the means of indication of N, L? For periodic, semi-persistent reporting on PUCCH, if only N=L is supported, then indicating L as part of the CSI report config IE suffices, whereas for aperiodic, semi-persistent reporting on PUSCH, L must be part of the CSI report config IE where the L sub-configurations are defined, but the indication of value of N (N≤L) needs to be further discussed, e.g., via DCI or otherwise |
| CATT | We support the proposal FL3e P3-remaining-1 |
| Futurewei | Support FL proposal. We don’t support revisions that prioritize periodic over semi-persistent and aperiodic. Without decision on the size of L, which could be large, periodic reporting would incur possible large overhead, possibly without much benefit. |
| Samsung3e | From the agreement made during Wed. online session, it is clear that the case of ***N=L*** is already included in the range of . Also, the current way of structuring the proposal FL3e P3-remaining-1 and FL3e P3-remaining-2 by branching the cases of N=L and N<L may arise some concern on which case to agree first, given potential consequential down-selection of one case over the other. However, we see the value of branching proposals to different report types as they have different activation/triggering mechanisms and this divide-and-conquer approach may help the progress.  We thus propose to reformulate the proposal FL3e P3-remaining-1 and FL3e P3-remaining-2 as follows:  **Proposal 1**  **For periodic multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of N=L is supported.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to report N<L CSI(s) by gNB configuration or by UE selection based on certain conditions**   **Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.**  **Proposal 2**  **For semi-persistent/aperiodic multi-CSI feedback, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N≤L CSI reports.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to select N CSI(s) based on certain conditions (Note: In this case, the N subset selection from L is by UE, not by gNB indication.)** * **FFS: L1/L2 signaling for gNB triggering/indication/activation of N≤L CSI reports.**   **Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.** |
| LG Electronics4 | We are OK with P3-remaining-1 (also fine with Huawei’s revision), with the assumption that P3-remaining-1 and P3-remaining-2 have the equal priority. |
| FL | @Lenovo  The consideration for PUCCH payload is also mentioned by DCM. With that the last FFS serves.  For differentiation of SP- and A-CSI, it is still possible with the current framework and with the FFS added from Nokia. But note that there is also preference to remove all the details. At this stage let’s take what may be agreeable by majority.  The meaning of L/N may be further clarified for N<L case, since they are identical for N=L case. |
| FL3-fri | Please continue and one can choose from the below proposals for modification.  **P3-remaining-1**  **For multi-CSI feedback, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L is supported** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N=L CSIs report.**   **Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N=~~L=~~1.**  **P3-remaining-1-rev1**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L is supported** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger N=L CSIs report.**   + **FFS: For the case with no overhead/report payload reduction, the CPU occupation and active CSI-RS counting is scaled with N**   + **FFS: the case with overhead/report payload reduction.**   + **FFS: For semi-persistent (and periodic) CSI reporting, gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., *N1* CSIs in one reporting occasion and *N2* CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. (where *Ni* < *L*)**   + **FFS: whether to consider multiple CSI reporting occasions triggered with one aperiodic CSI report trigger.** * **FFS: whether L for Periodic/ Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting is same or different, considering e.g. PUCCH overhead.** * **Note: The case of N=~~L=~~1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.**   **P3-remaining-1-rev2**  **For periodic multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of N=L is supported.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to report N<L CSI(s) by gNB configuration or by UE selection based on certain conditions**   **Note: The case of N=~~L=~~1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.** |
| China Telecom | We support the proposal FL3e P3-remaining-1 |
| Ericsson 4 | We have below suggestions.   * We think P3-remaining-1 should also include the N <L case instead of separating it out into P3-remaining-2. * Regarding N<L, as we explained in the GTW, a gNB does not need to always trigger CSIs for all hypotheses from a CSI report config – thus requesting CSIs for a subset/one of the hypotheses should also be included, e.g., for triggering a CSI report corresponding to a single pattern after the gNB has performed spatial adaptation. * Suggest adding “for a CSI report config” in main text since N, L refer to settings for a CSI report config. * We also point out that single CSI feedback also corresponds to the cases of N = 1 with L > 1 (at least for aperiodic/semi-persistent), hence we suggest modification of the last bullet   Updates as shown below.  **FL3e P3-remaining-1-Eupdate**  **For multi-CSI feedback , for a CSI report config, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L and N < L is supported** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N=L and N < L CSIs report.**   **Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N=1 ~~N=L=1~~.** |
| DOCOMO5 | Thank you for the revision.  For the **FL3e P3-remaining-1-rev2** , we can support it. |
| ZTE,Sanechips4 | Following suggestion is added.  **FL3e P3-remaining-1-rev2**  **For periodic multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of N=L is supported.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to report N<L CSI(s) by gNB configuration/indication/activation or by UE selection based on certain conditions** * **FFS: L1/L2 signaling for gNBindication/activation of N≤L CSI reports.**   **Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.** |
| Apple3e-add | Reply to FL  Regarding the performance gain, I’m also curious on the comparison and that’s why I try to find from existing results for comparison, which were listed in our previous comment.  By lower reporting overhead, I’m referring to the reporting overhead in each reporting instance if you consider P/SP CSI report, which N CSI(s) versus L CSI(s). By simpler CSI computation, UE could spread the CSI counting over a longer period of time instead of squeezing the multiple CSI results in a short period. Regarding the gNB indication/configuration signalling overhead you mentioned, a most simple way is that once configured, UE will sequentially report those L CSIs, thus there are no additional signalling needed. Of course this is just an example with details can be further discussed. Regarding the time for gNB adaptation, I think this actually is gNB implementation issue and also depends on the traffic and UE moving. |
| Vivo3 | We share the same view as Ericsson that P3-remaining-1 should also include the N <L case instead of separating them out into two proposals.  For N=1 and L>1 case, we are not sure whether this refers to single-CSI or multi-CSI case (can we make a conclusion for this case to avoid confusion?). However, we think this case should be supported, since the complexity is lower compared to N>1 case and performance benefit has been identified by evaluation in SI. We don’t see any critical problem for N=1 and L>1 case, so it should be included in the proposal.  For N>1 and L>1 case, we can further discuss how to report the N CSIs. |
| FL | @vivo  It seems so that there could be some confusion now about the terminology. It seems we can assume N=1 as single-CSI and modify other proposal slightly. Or, we can simply continue the discussion around the value of L, N.  From FL perspective, the design of 1=N<L can be part of the design of 1<N<L as discussed in the P3-remaining-2. The issue is whether we can agree on support N<L or not, as you can see in each case, N=1 is included. |
| LG Electronics5 | We prefer to handle the cases N=L and N<L at once. In that sense, our preference is FL3e P3-remaining-1-rev2, and we suggest the following for more clarity on top of ZTE’s version.  **FL3e P3-remaining-1-rev2**  **For periodic CSI reporting with a CSI reporting config ~~multi-CSI feedback~~, at least the case of N=L is supported.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to report N<L CSI(s) by gNB configuration/indication/activation or by UE selection based on certain conditions** * **FFS: L1/L2 signaling for gNB indication/activation of N≤L CSI reports.**   **Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback and the case of N=L>1 corresponds to multi-CSI feedback.** |
| MTK3-fri | If jointly viewing P3-remaining-1 and P3-remaining-2, P3-remaining-1 can focus on the case N=L. From online discussion, we have the impression **L can be large in order to include all possible adaptation candidates**. Considering periodic CSI reporting is typically based on PUCCH, it would be risky to agree support of N = L without knowing how large L can be. In this regard, the following updated proposal looks more reasonable to move forward:  **FL3e P3-remaining-1 (MTK update)**  **For multi-CSI feedback with N=L, at least**   * **Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting is supported** * **FFS: Whether/what limit on value of L for the support with periodic CSI reporting**   **Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1** |
| Xiaomi | Prefer **P3-remaining-1-rev2.** Justtoreply Ericsson4’s view about adding “for a CSI report config” in the main bullet, we think current version is fine as previous agreement has limited the N, L in to one CSI report config.  **Agreement**  For **a CSI report config** with *L* sub-configuration(s), support a framework that enables a UE to report *N* CSI(s) in one reporting instance where the *N* CSI(s) are associated with *N* sub-configuration(s) from *L* (where ) and each CSI corresponds to one sub-configuration.   * For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI. |
| ZTE,Sanechips5 | @Apple  Thanks for quoting our evaluation results in Tdoc R1-2211903. We would like to clarify that the single CSI report in our evaluation is N=1, L=1. Furthermore, in our Tdoc submitted this meeting, we provided evaluation results of N=1, L=2 (dynamic switch between these two spatial patterns via the current reported CSI and data package). In both cases, the NES gain from multi-CSI (N>1) is larger than single CSI (N=1).  Based on our evaluation/observation, the NES gain from multi-CSI is that N can be larger than 1, instead of L>1. Only with N>1, it can provide sufficient information for gNB to perform dynamic TxRU adaptation according to the CSI and traffic arrivals of all the UEs in the cell without/with minimal UPT performance loss. For single CSI reporting (N=1), gNB has no information about the CSI of other antenna configurations and it has bare information to assist spatial domain adaptation, so gNB will miss some chances/occasions to transmission data with properly reduced antenna.  So in summary, we think sufficient evaluation results have been provided in last meeting and this meeting to show additional NES gain from multi-CSI with N=L>1 compared with single CSI with N=1 and L>1.  Regarding whether to prioritize enhancements on any one of P/SP/P CSI reporting, we don’t think it is needed. Each of the CSI report type has its pros and is well applied in the current deployment. For this topic, we need to make sure the enhanced technique is universal enough to provide more chances for NES.  So we don’t think we need to add “FFS” to any of P/SP/P CSI reporting.  For this proposal, we prefer the following update + FL3e P3-remaining-2-rev2;  Or the **P3-remaining-1** +**FL3e P3-remaining-2-rev1;**  **FL3e P3-remaining-1-rev2**  **For periodic multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of N=L is supported.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to report N<L CSI(s) by gNB configuration/indication/activation or by UE selection based on certain conditions** * **FFS: L1/L2 signaling for gNBindication/activation of N≤L CSI reports.**   **Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.** |
| Nokia/NSB | @FL, on your comment “In the case of N<L, there is one note saying that gNB can trigger N in one report which also means (L-N) CSI(s) can be in a separate report. I thought it means a gNB indicate multiple report instances, and essentially, N can be for example 1 such that gNB trigger separate reports respectively, same as the baseline you proposed. Now with what modified, I see you are considering something different.”:  The previous Note is not fully clear as it states about triggering (L-N) CSIs in another report. Specifically:   * It was not clear whether N-L should only be seen as one example or what. * It’s not clear what is the implication of the Note on e.g., semi-persistent CSI reporting, specifically whether the different CSI reports in different report occasions are triggered using the same trigger or not. In our view, given that the CSIs correspond to a same CSI report config., it makes sense to have a same trigger to enable e.g, *N1* CSIs in one report and *N2* CSIs in another report, etc. where *Ni* >=1. This way of spreading of the L CSIs is better than ‘squeezing’ all the L CSIs in the same report (as also pointed out by Apple) and doesn’t increase the DL control overhead.   Thus, we would still prefer **P3-remaining-1-rev1.**  In addition, although we would be fine with Ericsson’s suggestion to also include the case N< L in the proposal, we are not sure if this would simplify the discussions and or make it more complicated.  Furthermore, we would be open to **P3-remaining-1-rev2** as well, where the UE performs selection of CSIs to report. |
| Intel | We prefer **FL3e P3-remaining-1-rev2.**  We are Ok with E/// update as well |
| Qualcomm3-fri | First of all, we don’t see the need to classify multi-CSI vs. single-CSI in the discussion. In addition, observing discussions in both **P3-remaining-1** and **P3-remaining-2**, we think it is better to jointly discuss both.   * We observed that some companies wanted to support N < L for P CSI. We think that this is not improving efficiency of adaptation. We provided some related comment earlier. Below are some more details:   + Some discussed that UE reports L CSIs while N CSIs are only needed 🡪 This wastes UE resource/complexity in computing/reporting unimportant/unnecessary (L-N) CSIs. Furthermore, note that P CSI is only sent over PUCCH. Hence, due to limitation of PUCCH, many CSIs may not be sent over it.   + Some discussed to have UE select N out of L 🡪 This is not efficient from UE resource/complexity in computing/reporting unimportant/unnecessary (L-N) CSIs.   + Some discussed to have gNB indication on which N sub-configurations UE needs to report CSIs 🡪 This will require new L1/L2 signaling 🡪 gNB needs to consume more NW power for this signaling. Furthermore, such signaling may turn out just like L1/2 signalling triggering AP/SP CSI. Since we are supporting AP/SP CSI, why do we duplicate it?   Therefore, only N = P should be supported.   * We’re fine with supporting AP/SP CSI for and thinking that discussion on how to handle “N-L remaining CSIs” in **P3-remaining-2** seems unnecessary. Furthermore, we don’t support “FFS whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions”   + UE selects N CSIs to report: As we discussed above, this is not efficient from UE resource/complexity in computing/reporting unimportant/unnecessary (L-N) CSIs.   + “based on certain conditions”: This is not clear and we doubt that the conditions are easily identified/ensured.   Having said that, below is our proposal for both **P3-remaining-1** and **P3-remaining-2.**  **Proposal P3-remaining**   * **For periodic CSI reporting, only N = L is supported** * **For aperiodic CSI reporting or semi-persistent CSI reporting, gNB can request UE to report N CSIs (where ) in one reporting instance.**   + **FFS: details on how gNB requests N CSIs.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are open to support any alterative. However, we don’t agree the baseline with multiple reporting occasions is simpler. From UE complexity and CPU occupation perspective, without further enhancements, all schemes are the same as L times is scaled, not N. Given that, at least, we think N=L should be support.  The difference between N=L and N<L is that, the latter can reduce the UE report payload at least for the triggered occasion. If that is pursued, report overhead reduction techniques should be agreed. Note this is at the cost of gNB signaling overhead increase, while we agree with its benefits in terms of flexibility. Thus, we are also positive. |
| CEWiT | Following suggestion is added.  **FL3e P3-remaining-1 (update)**  **For multi-CSI feedback, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L and N < L is supported** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N=L and N < L CSIs report.** * **FFS: L1/L2 signaling for gNBindication/activation of N≤L CSI reports.**   **Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N=1 ~~N=L=1~~.** |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the proposed changes to **P3-remaining-1-rev2** by LGE |
| Ericsson 5 | We do not support P3-remaining-1-rev2 – aperiodic CSI reporting should be prioritized or considered first/together.  For P3-remaining-1, our previous comments and suggested updates hold (updates in blue below). From previous agreement, we already have definition for discussion purposes of the single and multi CSI feedback and hence no need to repeat.  **FL3e P3-remaining-1-Eupdate2**  **~~For multi-CSI feedback ,~~ for a CSI report config, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L and N < L is supported** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N=L and N < L CSIs report.**   **~~Note for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N=1 N=L=1.~~**  For P3-remaining-1-rev1, we suggest below updates (in blue)   * elevating the FFSes to main bullet. * As expressed earlier, both N=L and N<L should be considered together. * CPU occupation and CSI-RS counting needs to be considered for all cases. * Multiple CSI reporting occasions are triggered using semi-persistent DCI already, and so the last 2nd FFS bullet should be removed.   **P3-remaining-1-rev1 – Eupdate**  **For a CSI report config**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, the case of N=L and N < L is supported** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger N=L and N < L CSIs report.** * **FFS: For ~~the case with no overhead/report payload reduction,~~ the CPU occupation and active CSI-RS counting is scaled with N** * **FFS: the case with overhead/report payload reduction.** * **FFS: ~~For semi-persistent (and periodic) CSI reporting,~~ ~~gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report~~ how/what CSIs are reported in different reporting occasions, e.g., *N1* CSIs in one reporting occasion and *N2* CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. (where *Ni* < *L*)** * **~~FFS: whether to consider multiple CSI reporting occasions triggered with one aperiodic CSI report trigger.~~** * **FFS: whether L for Periodic/ Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting is same or different, considering e.g. PUCCH overhead.** * **~~Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.~~** |
| Apple3-Fri | Thanks ZTE for the further clarification. Then I think the concern is still the same, if I understand correctly, the results in R1-2303985 for the multi-CSI results is with N=L=4 is compared with single CSI feedback with N=1 and L=2, it is not obvious that the gain comes from multi-CSI since L is different in the two cases, so the gain may come from the fact that there are more number of port reductions in the simulated multi-CSI case.  We cannot agree to support periodic multi-CSI feedback with N=L, considering increased reporting overhead on PUCCH. If N=L is to be agreed, should be agreed on PUSCH first.  For the N<L case, we would like to state that our understanding is that this case could also provide L CSIs in total for the NW, the only difference is that N CSI(s) will be reported in each instance. |

If more flexibility is perused, the following proposal may also address some of other preference to enable UE report part of CSIs in separate reports and/or report instances.

**FL3e P3-remaining-2**

**For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**

* **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report L CSI(s)** 
  + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions**
* **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**
  + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions**
  + **Note 1: this means gNB can also trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with (L-N) CSIs.**

**Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.**

**FL3e P3-remaining-2-rev1**

**For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**

* **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report N CSI(s) by gNB triggering/indication/activation**
* **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**
  + **Note 1: this doesn’t preclude gNB can trigger/indicate/activate in other reporting instance(s) with multiple CSIs from the (L-N) CSIs.**

**Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.**

**FL3e P3-remaining-2-rev2**

**For semi-persistent/aperiodic multi-CSI feedback, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N≤L CSI reports.**

* **FFS: whether to support UE to select N CSI(s) based on certain conditions (Note: In this case, the N subset selection from L is by UE, not by gNB indication.)**
* **FFS: L1/L2 signaling for gNB triggering/indication/activation of N≤L CSI reports.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO4 | Support the proposal with typo update if I understand correctly.  **For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report ~~L~~ N CSI(s)**    + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions**   + **Note 1: this means gNB can also trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with (L-N) CSIs.**   **Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.** |
| FL | @DCM  This is not a typo, since in the agreements, L is the configured value. For the case N=L, there is no difference. For the case N<L, then L is the one configured value and N has not been present unless given by the first FFS. If there is no FFS, the L is assumed for UE to report (functionally, it is multiple CSIs, just with a different notion of L instead of N, which should be fine). |
| Intel | Ok with proposal. |
| Xiaomi | If that is not a typo, then it indicates N=L situation for periodic CSI reporting, which is opposite of the main bullet. The main bullet only defines N<L situation. In this case, we suggest to remove the content of first bullet, i.e., for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report L CSI(s), and discuss it in Proposal **FL3e P3-remaining-1.**  Besides, we are confused of the relationship between Proposal **FL3e P3-remaining-1** and Proposal **FL3e P3-remaining-2**. Are we discussing different situations separately? Or we are trying do down select one of them? |
| CEWiT | N is useful for reduction in UE capability and UL resource consumption. Also, based on dynamic requirements at the BS e.g. channel conditions, traffic requirements, the BS may decide dynamically to seek reports of lesser number of sub-configurations than the total one. Hence for periodic and SPS case to have N<=L, indication from gNB is needed. So we suggest the following update.  **For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, ~~support the UE report L CSI(s)~~**    + **~~FFS: whether to~~ support UE to report N CSI(s) out of L CSI(S) by gNB configuration/indication or UE selection, or based on certain conditions** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions**   + **Note 1: this means gNB can also trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with (L-N) CSIs.**   **Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| ZTE, Sanechips3e | Based on FL’s reply to DCM, it seems that if there is no difference with FL3e P3-remaining-1 if N=L (or different notion of L instead of N) .  We think the FL3e P3-remaining-2 needs to focus on something different. So for periodic if N<L, it can be due to gNB activates N CSIs out of L CSIs. One benefits is to reduce the OH of RRC reconfiguration to update the periodic CSI reporting.  Furthermore, we don’t think report N CSI(s) by UE selection is needed. As companies commented before, the benefits of CSI enhancement is to make sure gNB can have sufficient CSI information. And UE has no idea of the DL traffic, gNB’s preference to adaptation, or other Ues’ traffic/CSI, the benefit of UE selects N CSI(s) to report is unclear.  Regarding the Note 1, we think another CSI (if triggered) may include any of the (L-N) CSIs. Some update on the wording is suggested .  To the end, the suggested following update is ..  **For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report ~~L~~N CSI(s) by gNB triggering/indication/activation**   + **~~FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions~~** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **~~FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions~~**   + **Note 1: this ~~means~~ doesn’t preclude gNB can ~~also~~ trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with multiple ~~(L-N)~~ CSIs from the (L-N) CSIs.**   **Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.** |
| ETRI | Generally fine with the proposal. We think ZTE’s version is clearer. |
| Apple3e | Thanks FL for the proposal and as we stated in the comment for **FL3e P3-remaining-1**, this case is as fundamental as multi-CSI with N=L.  With N<L, we consider it necessary to determine clear which N CSI(s) will be reported in one reporting instance, so we propose the following changes:  **For single or multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report L CSI(s)**    + **FFS: ~~whether~~ how to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions**   + **Note 1: this means gNB can also trigger/indicate/activate ~~another CSI report~~ (L-N) CSIs in other reporting instance(s).**   **~~Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.~~** |
| Nokia/NSB3 | Again, we think that the proposal still doesn’t account for our previous input on reporting CSIs using different CSI report occasions. We thus suggest the following updates, for which the justification is provided further below:  **For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report L CSI(s)**    + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions**   + **Note 1: this means gNB can also trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with e.g., (L-N) CSIs.**   + **For semi-persistent (and periodic) CSI reporting, gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., *N1* CSIs in one reporting occasion and *N2* CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. (where *Ni* < *L*)**   + **FFS: whether to consider multiple CSI reporting occasions triggered with one aperiodic CSI report trigger.**   **Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.**  Same as our input on FL3e P3-remaining-1, we here provide a few observations on why we suggest the additions in red, to enable acquiring L/N CSIs through different reporting occasions:   * Semi-persistent reporting could be seen as a multi-shot aperiodic CSI report as the gNB can trigger a semi-persistent report on PUSCH instead of triggering multiple aperiodic CSI reports on PUSCH in order to reduce the PDCCH overhead. Otherwise, we could also consider enhancing the existing aperiodic CSI report trigger. * When several/many CSIs are reported in the same UL reporting occasion, the corresponding CPUs are still not released before the report is sent. Since the UE is capable of max X (simultaneously) occupied CPUs (considering all configured cells), where X may not be sufficiently large, this may be problematic.   On the Note 1, we think that (L-N) should only be given as an example.  Given that for the periodic CSI reporting the UE is required to report L CSIs, we are not sure if this would need to be covered under FL3e P3-remaining-2 as this proposal is more considering N<L which is essentially suitable for aperiodic and semi-persistent CSI reporting types. |
| Fujitsu4 | We share the same view as Xiaomi and ZTE that if UE report L CSI(s), then it becomes the same as FL3e P3-remaining-1. Even for periodic CSI report, we can consider gNB indicates N out of L CSIs to be reported without the need for reconfiguration. We prefer ZTE’s version. |
| Qualcomm3e | We don’t support this proposal. We should have further study for the case N < L. The motivation for this case was not clear/convinced although we heard some explanation during online discussion.  For this we propose an alternative proposal:  **FL3e P3-remaining-2**   * **FFS: case with N < L** |
| Lenovo3e | We do not support including Note1, since reporting the N-L remaining CSIs needs further study with respect to overhead, complexity and gain, and moreover it appears to us this can be achieved via implementation, e.g., triggering the first N CSIs in the first occasion, and then trigger the remainder L-N CSIs in subsequent occasions. We are OK to keep it FFS for now in case proponents would like to elaborate more on the need to support that.  Similarly, we prefer to keep the FFS corresponding to UE-based selection of the N CSIs, which can be discussed as an alternative |
| CATT | We support Proposal FL3e P3-remaining-2 |
| Futurewei | Support both the FL texts or ZTE’s proposed revisions. |
| Samsung3e | As suggested in our response to ‘FL3e P3-remaining-1’, we propose to reformulate the proposal FL3e P3-remaining-1 and FL3e P3-remaining-2 as follows:  **Proposal 1**  **For periodic multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of N=L is supported.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to report N<L CSI(s) by gNB configuration or by UE selection based on certain conditions**   **Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.**  **Proposal 2**  **For semi-persistent/aperiodic multi-CSI feedback, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N≤L CSI reports.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to select N CSI(s) based on certain conditions (Note: In this case, the N subset selection from L is by UE, not by gNB indication.)** * **FFS: L1/L2 signaling for gNB triggering/indication/activation of N≤L CSI reports.**   **Note: The case of N=L=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback.** |
| LG Electronics4 | We strongly prefer to support single-CSI or multi-CSI feedback **with N<L**. If gNB configures a CSI report config containing two sub-configurations corresponding to 32-port and 16-port, and if gNB turns off 16 antenna ports, CSI corresponding to 32-port is not useful in this case. With this regard, considering CSI overhead and UE complexity, it would be definitely beneficial to support feedback with N<L.  Regarding the details of P3-remaining-2, we are also confused since reporting L CSIs for P-CSI is contradictory with the main bullet saying N<L. So, we are OK with ZTE’s version on that part but we still think FFS parts can be kept, as follows.  (On top of ZTE’s version)  **For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report ~~L~~N CSI(s) by gNB triggering/indication/activation**   + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions**   + **Note 1: this ~~means~~ doesn’t preclude gNB can ~~also~~ trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with multiple ~~(L-N)~~ CSIs from the (L-N) CSIs.**   **Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.** |
| FL3-fri | Please continue and one can choose from the proposal for modification.  @Ericsson  L-N is just an example.  And it is not typo for UE report L instead of N since for periodic reporting there may be no further configuration for UE to report N instead of the configured value L. However, the FFS under that allows such possibility.   * for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report N ~~L~~ CSI(s)   + FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions   This does not against the agreements since the agreements enable a framework applied generally. In the specific case, only L is possible (if FFS does not come up with a solution) for P-CSI and N is possible for SP/A-CSI. There is nothing broken.  **P3-remaining-2**  **For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report L CSI(s)**    + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions**   + **Note 1: this means gNB can also trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with (L-N) CSIs.**   **Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.**  **P3-remaining-2-rev1**  **For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report N CSI(s) by gNB triggering/indication/activation** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **Note 1: this doesn’t preclude gNB can trigger/indicate/activate in other reporting instance(s) with multiple CSIs from the (L-N) CSIs.**   **Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.**  **P3-remaining-2-rev2**  **For semi-persistent/aperiodic multi-CSI feedback, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N≤L CSI reports.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to select N CSI(s) based on certain conditions (Note: In this case, the N subset selection from L is by UE, not by gNB indication.)** * **FFS: L1/L2 signaling for gNB triggering/indication/activation of N≤L CSI reports.** |
| China Telecom | We support Proposal FL3e P3-remaining-2. And version from ZTE is also fine for us. |
| Ericsson 4 | We suggest below updates, but we think a better approach is to merge this with P3-remaining-1.   * Note 1 should be removed – it is not clear why another report is restricted to L-N only. * 2nd bullet, 1nd subbullet : suggest to remove this FFS since the baseline should that gNB control how many reports the UE shall make, so we are not sure why it is UE selection? * 1st bullet : Like DoCoMo, we wonder if L is a typo – intention was N CSI(s)?   Suggested updates below:  **FL3e P3-remaining-2 Eupdate**  **For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report N ~~L~~ CSI(s)**    + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **~~FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions~~**   + **~~Note 1: this means gNB can also trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with (L-N) CSIs.~~**   **Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.** |
| DOCOMO5 | For the **FL3e P3-remaining-2-rev2** , although we think that UE determination on which CSI(s) to be reported is not an efficient way for gNB to take appreciate adaptation decision, we can support the proposal to leave it as FFS. |
| Vivo3 | We think N=1 in case of L>1 should be also supported. As commented for proposal **FL3e P3-remaining-1**, these two proposals need to be merged such that we can stick to a common framework per agreement in last GTW.  Instead using “single-CSI” or “multi-CSI” that may cause confuse, can we just focus on how to report N reports for L>1 patterns, N=1 or N>1. So we suggest to remove “multi-CSI feedback” in the main bullet and just clarify the case of N and L. |
| FL | @vivo  It works for me. But let’s hear more views before I change the main bullet. |
| OPPO | For P3-remaining-2 the first bullet, it is not clear how it differs from P3-remaining-1, except for the FFS point. It seems to say for period CSI reporting, the UE should report L CSI regardless the configured N value is.  Also, for note 2, we have a different understanding. We see this case as multi-CSI reporting.  Last but not the least, for periodic CSI reporting, do we already have an agreement to say that if network configures a CSI reporting with N=L>1. Could this configured reporting be dynamically switch to N<L? This is because if I understand the proposal correctly, it seems to point to this direction, instead of only talking about UE semi-statically report N CSI out of L. Thus, we suggest to clarify whether the proposal implies such dynamic switching, and if so we better draw an agreement first. |
| CMCC4 | Thanks for FL’s updates.  For **FL3e P3-remaining-2,** we understand the motivation of UE report of L CSI(s).  For **FL3e P3-remaining-2-rev1,** it introduces more flexibilities for the periodic reporting. We are open to further discussion. We have no problem if the 1st bullet of **FL3e P3-remaining-2** can be combined with the revision 1.  For the UE based CSI selection, the proponents should elaborate more details and the benefits. Usually the content of CSI feedback is determined by the gNB. |
| LG Electronics5 | As commented above, we prefer P3-remaining-2-rev2 and suggest following updates.  **P3-remaining-2-rev2**  **For semi-persistent/aperiodic CSI reporting with a CSI report config ~~multi-CSI feedback~~, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate N≤L CSI reports.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to select N CSI(s) based on certain conditions (Note: In this case, the N subset selection from L is by UE, not by gNB indication.)** * **FFS: L1/L2 signaling for gNB triggering/indication/activation of N≤L CSI reports.**   **Note: The case of N=1 corresponds to single-CSI feedback and the case of N>1 corresponds to multi-CSI feedback.** |
| Spreadtrum3 | We prefer E///’s version, since we think periodic/semi-persistent/aperiodic CSI report can use all the same framework. |
| MTK3-fri | **The revision by Ericsson** looks reasonable for us to support. Given the volume for Semi-static/Aperiodic CSI reporting is larger, only selection mechanism by gNB indication should be sufficient. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer ZTE’s version. Even with periodic CSI reporting, the gNB can trigger N CSIs reported by UE. |
| ZTE, Sanechips5 | We think periodic multi-CSI can also support N<L CSIs.  Support **P3-remaining-1+** **FL3e P3-remaining-2-rev1**, or **FL3e P3-remaining-1-rev2** updated from ZTE, Sanechips4 + **FL3e P3-remaining-2-rev2.**  @OPPO  As CMCC4 replied, for periodic CSI reporting, dynamic switching can increase the flexibility of multi-CSI reporting/decrease UE complexity. Thus, we think dynamic indicates N CSIs report is needed.  For the term single-CSI and multi-CSI, we think it is clearly defined in the previous agreements, i.e., depending on whether N is equal to or larger than 1. We don’t think more modification is needed.   * For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI. |
| Fujitsu5 | We prefer Ericsson’s version. Our understanding is that N is the number of CSIs reported by a UE and L is the number of CSI report configurations. We still do not see the logic why UE reports L CSIs when N<L. If it is beyond UE’s capability to report all the CSIs corresponding to L configurations, and not any solution (e.g., gNB indication or based on some conditions) is adopted, the UE will most likely not report any CSI. |
| Nokia/NSB | Similar to our input on the other proposal, and since we are also open to consider UE selection of CSIs, we prefer P3 **P3-remaining-2** considering the following updates mainly to further elaborate on the Note 1.  Actually, even for the case N<L, we think that with e.g., semi-persistent CSI reporting, given that the CSIs correspond to a same CSI report config., it makes sense to have a same trigger to enable e.g, *N1* CSIs in one report and *N2* CSIs in another report, etc. where *Ni* >=1. This way of spreading of the L CSIs is better than ‘squeezing’ all the L CSIs in the same report (as also pointed out by Apple) and doesn’t increase the DL control overhead.  **P3-remaining-2**  **For multi-CSI feedback with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report L CSI(s)**    + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate N CSIs report**   + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions**   + **Note 1: this means gNB can also trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with e.g., (L-N) CSIs.**   + **FFS: For semi-persistent (and periodic) CSI reporting, gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., *N1* CSIs in one reporting occasion and *N2* CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc.**   + **FFS: whether to consider multiple CSI reporting occasions triggered with one aperiodic CSI report trigger.**   **Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.** |
| Intel | We prefer **P3-remaining-2-rev2**  Ok to merge with P3-remaining-1 as well |
| Qualcomm3-fri | Please see our comment in P3-remaining-1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with QC that at least, N=L discussed in FL3e P3-remaining-1 should be support. However, we are open to consider the cases N<L as long as N>1. |
| CEWiT | We support **P3-remaining-2-rev1** |
| InterDigital | We are fine with **P3-remaining-2-rev1 or P3-remaining-2-rev2.**  For **P3-remaining-2-rev2**, we share similar view with DOCOMO on the following “FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions”. We are OK if either remove it to keep it as FFS. |
| Ericsson 5 | FL3e P3-remaining-2, we have below suggestions based on FL comments – we suggest to use M for periodic CSI as there seem to be some proponent suggesting dynamic indication/triggering for periodic also – so not necessary that all L CSIs have to be reported. And as commented earlier N=L and N < L should be considered together.  **FL3e P3-remaining-2 Eupdate2**  **For ~~multi-CSI feedback~~ CSI reporting with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report M ~~L~~ CSI(s)**    + **FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by gNB configuration or UE selection, or based on certain conditions**   + **FFS: value of M** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate report of N CSIs ~~report~~**   + **~~FFS: whether to support UE to report N CSI(s) by UE selection or based on certain conditions~~**   + **~~Note 1: this means gNB can also trigger/indicate/activate another CSI report with (L-N) CSIs.~~**   **~~Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.~~**  For P3-remaining-2-rev1, below are our suggested updates (in blue).  **P3-remaining-2-rev1**  **For ~~multi-CSI feedback~~ CSI reporting with N<L, at least**   * **for Periodic CSI reporting, support the UE report N CSI(s) by gNB indication**    + **FFS: triggering/indication/activation** * **for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB can trigger/indicate/activate report of N CSIs**   + **Note 1: this doesn’t preclude gNB can trigger/indicate/activate in other reporting instance(s) with multiple CSIs from the (L-N) CSIs.**   **~~Note 2: for single-CSI feedback, the above applies to N= 1.~~**  For P3-remaining-2-rev2, below are our suggested updates (in blue).  **P3-remaining-2-rev2**  **For semi-persistent/aperiodic ~~multi-~~CSI feedback, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate report of N≤L CSI ~~reports~~ indication of the N subset selection from the L sub-configurations.**   * **FFS: whether to support UE to select N CSI(s) based on certain conditions (Note: In this case, the N subset selection from L is by UE, not by gNB indication.)**   **FFS: Additional L1/L2 signaling for gNB triggering/indication/activation of report of N≤L CSI ~~reports~~.** |

**Q2**

**If multi-CSI feedback is supported, do you consider**

* **whether certain rules or conditions can be used for UE to select CSI(s)**
* **if so, please elaborate what rules or conditions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | UE can select CSI(s) to report based on performance, e.g., CQI. The selection criteria can also be left for UE implementation |
| Spreadtrum | According to current CSI feedback framework, UE just calculates CSI and feeds back to gNB. The autonomous selection of CSI to report is new UE behavior. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The benefits of selecting one or more CSI(s) report by UE are unclear. Some comments are  gNB cannot get enough CSI(s) and may not be able to dynamically adapt antennas with a tradeoff between NES gain and UPT performance.  UE still needs to calculate CSI(s) for all spatial adaptation pattern(s), UE complexity cannot be reduced.  UE has no clue about the gNB implementation for NES. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes, this falls under the Approach 1 we listed in our input on P3 above.  For the selection approach from a set of candidate spatial patterns, we foresee two main cases (to be considered separately and/or jointly):   * Case 1: When the spatial patterns in the set of candidate patterns have same number of (active) spatial/antenna elements. In this case, there is practically no difference in power/energy saving level (from network Tx perspective) between the different spatial patterns. One way for pattern selection would be to follow similar logic as for CRI (*CSI-RS resource indicator*) down-selection in Rel-15, by basically letting the UE select one preferrable pattern based on UE implementation.   + Other than UE implementation, it’s also possible to let the gNB configure criteria for the selection, such as ones related to rank, RSRP or CQI, etc. * Case 2: When the patterns in the set of patterns have different number of (active) spatial/antenna elements. In this case, different spatial patterns may have different power/energy saving levels. Hence, UE would need to report a pattern(s) with best power/energy saving while fulfilling one or more criteria related with performance constraint, such as minimum rank. |
| CMCC | We share a similar view as Spreadtrum that UE only report the CSI based on gNB’s configuration. Whether a UE selected CSI or which kind of selection the UE can make should be further discussed. |
| Samsung | No. |
| **FL2** | Nokia listed two cases that may be used for UE selection for which cases the performance may still be ensured.  **PQ2**  **Further study**   * **whether UE can select CSI(s) to report when the spatial patterns in the set of candidate patterns have same number of (active) spatial/antenna elements.** * **Whether gNB can configure certain rules or conditions for UE selection of CSI(s) when the patterns in the set of patterns have different number of (active) spatial/antenna elements** |
| China Telecom | We don’t think the UEs should be supported to select CSI(s) to report. Even the different CSIs have the same number of spatial/antenna elements, the CSI-RS are different, which means gNB wants to know the information with all of such spatial patterns. And since the final decision should be made by gNB, we don’t think there is a need to support selecting CSI(s) to report. We don’t think the mechanism that gNB configuring certain rules for UE to select the CSI is needed, since the gNB can trigger/indicate the UE which CSIs to be reported directly(described in P3), |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | For the first bullet, legacy spec supports that UE reports one CSI of one resource in multiple resources with the same pattern. The difference between legacy specification and the enhancement should be clarified.  For the second bullet, as we commented in 1st round, the benefit is unclear. gNB cannot get enough CSI(s) and UE complexity cannot be reduced. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK to further study it.  However, from our perspective, UE selecting CSI(s) reporting means gNB’s shutdown decision is affected by UE’s CSI(s) selection criteria. So, UE’s CSI(s) selection criteria should consider the same factors that the DL traffic and actual transmission situation as gNB. However, due to the UE has no knowledge about DL traffic, it is difficult for UE to select the best shutdown pattern(s) for gNB, especially in extreme case that only one CSI is selected by UE. |
| **CEWiT** | No, this may cause lack of CSI information at the BS and also the UE still needs to calculate all the CSIs. Hence the selection should be indicated by the BS. |
| ITRI | In our perspective,  • For the 1st bullet, system performance should be simulated if UE selects CSI(s) to report. Moreover, CSI-selection criteria for UE should be discussed.  • We can discuss the 2nd bullet if the 1st bullet is agreed to be supported; otherwise, the 2nd bullet should not be discussed. |
| Qualcomm2 | * The 1st bullet is unclear since the spatial adaptation pattern/sub-configuration is not defined yet. We strongly suggest RAN1 discuss/define it. For example, for Type 1 adaptation, if the spatial adaptation pattern/sub-configuration includes a codebook configuration and resources with the same number of CSI-RS ports as that in the codebook, we can focus on discussion/interpretation on CSI reporting as we discussed in P3. * We don’t support 2nd bullet. For a spatial adaptation pattern (from our perspective), it should be up to UE to select which CSI to report. |
| Lenovo2 | We are OK to study. Agree with ZTE, the UE selecting (and reporting) CSIs from multiple CSI corresponding to multiple CSI-RS resources is already supported in legacy behavior, so we don’t see an issue. |
| Intel | In general, we do not think UE should pick and choose spatial patterns. Not only it puts extra burden at the UE, there needs to be extra specification effort to define CSI feedback fields that allow gNB to figure out which spatial patterns were selected, and if UE does not provide feedback for the spatial patterns that gNB is primarily interested in, the whole CSI report becomes useless.  The most straightforward thing would be to have UE simply follow gNB instructions all the time.  The alternative to this would be have the UE figure out optimal spatial patterns (which might be difficult since optimality may not be just based on throughput). This also means UE may need to compute more CSI feedback only to report back few of them. Dimensioning the extra UE complexity for such operation is going to be quite difficult.  In short, while do not object to having the study, we think there are far more draw backs for allowing the UE to be able to select spatial patterns then the potential benefits it brings. |
| Xiaomi | We share the similar view with Intel. Generally, the CSI of different adaptation patterns are different. Extra spec work may be needed to help gNB to figure out the corresponding adaptation pattern for the reported CSI. It should be determined by gNB configuration. |
| ETRI | For first bullet, we don’t think it is beneficial for UE to select a CSI across spatial patterns when they have same number of spatial/antenna elements.  For second bullet, UE-selected CSI can be further studied, but at this moment we think the rule for selection can be predefined in the specification, not to be provided by gNB. |
| Fujitsu2 | Currently, we do not see the benefit of UE selecting CSI(s) to report. First, it can only reduce the UCI overhead but not the UE complexity as UE still needs to calculate all the CSIs. Second, what a UE selects are the optimal ones from its perspective, without the knowledge of traffic load and transmission situation, it is hard to say that what the UE selects can be consistent with what the base station wants in perspective of network energy saving. However, we are open to it if the benefit is confirmed. |
| CATT | We don’t see the need to have UE selection of CSI reports to enable gNB achieving network energy saving. |
| Apple | Not at the moment, this is an optimization enhancement and potentially increases UE computation complexity. |
| Samsung2 | We disagree to let UEs to select CSI(s) to report in multi-CSI report.  First of all, the objective of CRI reporting as described by Nokia and our objective here are two different things. The Case 1 described by Nokia, which is the case of a CSI-RS resource set containing multiple CSI-RS resources with identical number of antenna ports, is mainly for Tx beam selection purpose, e.g., different beam directions or different combinations of TRPs for NC-JT, etc. However, the objective of multi-CSI report is to provide a gNB assistance information to facilitate its SD adaptation decision from multiple candidate adaptation patters with reduced capability.  If a UE selects CSIs to report, the gNB do not have a control over the exact set of information that it wants to gather for its SD adaptation decision making. Also, as the gNB’s SD adaptation applies to all the UEs in the cell, the gNB may want to obtain assistance information from a group of UEs. If multiple UEs select CSIs corresponding to arbitrary sets of SD adaptation patterns, which are differ from one to another, such information may not be best utilized by the gNB for its decision making.  Defining a rule/condition for a UE selection of CSIs is also not straightforward as different SD adaptation patterns mostly correspond to reduced capability of operations by gNB, e.g., reduced number of antenna ports, reduced transmission power, etc. |
| LG Electronics2 | We think that there is a risk in terms of the operation of the gNB to have the UE directly select the CSI corresponding to the spatial or power adaptation pattern to be calculated and reported on its own. |
| Ericsson 2 | The CSI reporting format, payload, etc should be up to gNB configuration – we think it should be clear that there shall be no blind detection at the gNB e.g. of the CSI reporting format/payload, contents, etc due to any of such approaches being studied. In practice, a gNB scheduler must take feedback from multiple UEs/multiple CSIs from one UE into account when making scheduling decisions – thus, we think the approach suggested in the first bullet of just leaving the selection up to UE implementation does not seem appropriate – at least the framework under which such selection is being considered needs to be discussed first. |
| CMCC2 | We are fine to further study. Currently, the behavior of UE selected CSIs are not very clear to us. |
| Spreadtrum2 | It seems optimization, so it can be further studied. |
| OPPO | The ultimate goal is to give sufficient information for gNB about the CSI. Thus, gNB has a better place to select the subset. If we want to go with a rule determined by UE, we suggest a rule that allows the UE to report uniformly all the subsets can be considered. |
| FL3 (combined to **P3-remaining-2**) | There are 4 companies open to study but seems a clear majority disagree with the direction. It is suggested to further revisited it in future, if sufficient benefits are presented and acked by more companies. |
| Panasonic | In general, we are open to study the UE selection with same priority of triggering/indicating by gNB, if multi-CSI is supported. |
| Lenovo3 | While we understand UE selection may not be the first preference for some companies, however we believe further discussion is needed, for the following reasons:  1. UE selection of the reported CSI has been supported in legacy design for NCJT, and therefore the study and specification (if needed) can be done with reasonable effort. Moreover, reporting a subset of the CSIs based on UE selection significantly reduces the UCI overhead compared with reporting all configured CSI(s)  2. @Huawei/Samsung: I understand your point, however, in some scenarios, the gNB may configure the UE with N CSI sub-configurations corresponding to reduced spatial dimensions, e.g., activation of only one of N identical panels (or antenna groups), where the network would need the UE assistance to select the best antenna group and report its corresponding CSI. In such scenario, UE selection of the best CSI would suffice.  2. @Ericsson: under UE selection, UCI format and payload can still be characterized by the network, since the value of N is network-configured, whereas the selection of N out of L CSI(s) is done by the UE. The same format can be used if the number of ports across the N spatial adaptation patterns is the same. Alternatively, any discrepancy in the payload size corresponding to the N selected CSI(s) would be in Part 2 of the CSI report, which can have a variable size that is indicated/inferred in CSI report Part 1 |
| Samsung3 | Once again we disagree UE selection of reported CSI with the reasons provided in Samsung2. The scenario described in Lenovo3, i.e., UE selecting one panel from N identical panels, is not a main use case of NES as there is no difference in terms of NES gain, and the provided logic is more from UE perspective for the problem of network decision making. The main use case shall be testing the impact of different levels of reduced capability at the network to UEs cell-wide. From network perspective, how is it useful in its SD decision making if different UEs report different best panels? If there are sufficient number of UEs, statistically speaking, activating any panel, e.g., panel #1 vs. panel #2, doesn’t make any different in terms of cell-wide UE experience and NES gain. |
| FL | View for this question can be further provided in the table following **P3-remaining-2** |

**\*Week 2 start\***

**Agreement**

For a CSI report config with *L* sub-configuration(s), support a framework that enables a UE to report *N* CSI(s) in one reporting instance where the *N* CSI(s) are associated with *N* sub-configuration(s) from *L* (where ) and each CSI corresponds to one sub-configuration.

* For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI.
* For Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate report of N≤L CSIs where N>=1
* The maximum value of N and L are subject to UE capability
* Further study how to address/minimize additional UE complexity

The following bullet was objected by Apple and vivo

* For Periodic CSI reporting, at least the case of N=L is supported where N>=1

For the above agreements and the remaining issues, it may be good to treat them as per CSI reporting types.

For periodic CSI report, it is widely used in commercial networks with respect to its use cases and benefits of signaling overhead, and there seems to be strong willingness that at least NES should be possible on top of P-CSI report. Since that, the proposal discussed online for at least support of the case of N=L, as a common agreeable part, makes sense as it does not rely on further configuration/indication as simplicity and maintenance of current mechanism (from signaling and report perspective), while N<L can be beneficial from UE payload reduction perspective (if not to report remaining L-N CSIs in other instances) while specification impact could be the need of additional signalling/configuration or rules for determine the N that is smaller than L. FL considers it is not productive to debate on the performance in terms of e.g. UPT given what has been clarified.

Once again let me try to collect the concern if

**FL4-p-Q1**

**For Periodic CSI reporting, support .**

**Please elaborate your preference/concerns and what might be the compromise, considering the use case, benefits, impact on UE complexity aspects.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | | **Comments** | | |
| Lenovo | | Support N=L only  Periodic CSI reporting is fully RRC-triggered, there is no clear motivation on why we would need to trigger two different parameters N, L (only one parameter N, where N=L, suffices).  Further discussion is needed on maximum N value, in our opinion N=1,2 only should be supported | | |
| LG Electronics6 | | Support FL4-p-Q1. In our view, always reporting L CSIs is inefficient and redundant particularly when gNB turns off some of antenna ports, and it is obvious that this observation is applicable not only to SP/AP-CSI reporting but also to P-CSI reporting. In that sense, we support the proposal. | | |
| DOCOMO6 | | We support the proposal.  N<L is necessary in the realistic operation even for periodic CSI reporting.  For example, if 2/4/8 port CSIs are configured by periodic CSI reporting, and gNB is operating with 8-port now and gNB would like to know whether it can switch to 4 port, then gNB could trigger CSIs of 4 and 8 port. In this case, 2 port CSIs may be useless for the gNB. If it enables such flexibility to report N < L, feedback overhead can be saved. | | |
| Apple | | We understand that gNB wants to have multiple CSIs corresponding to different adaptation patterns to adapt its transmission, and the benefit of N=L>1 with no overhead reduction over N=L=1 has been shown. If N=L with no overhead reduction is to be supported, the CPU occupation scaling with N. However, For CSI report on PUCCH, the overhead and CSI computation of the multi-CSI report will be a huge burden for NW and UE.  Now we have two directions to solve the above problem, one is to support N=L CSIs with reporting overhead reduction, the other is to support N<L CSIs in each instance but a total of L CSIs can be reported in multiple instances. According to our understanding, the benefit of N=L over N<L when both can provide L CSIs for gNB was not well shown and with the consideration for reporting overhead reduction by sharing some common reporting quatities, the performance benefit of N=L will further degrade.  Supporting N<L, where UE could report a total of L CSIs in multiple instances, will provide a simple solution to reduce reporting overhead and simplifies UE CSI computation. Furthermore, based on Lenovo and some other companies suggestions on supporting N=1, 2 only, if only N=L is supported, we don’t see much benefit of such enhancement. With the support of N<L, more CSIs could be reported without increasing UE complexity or reporting overhead in each instance. We believe this will also provide more flexibility for NW and lower NW UL overhead.  Regarding the comment on additional triggering or indication, we think this could be handled by pre-determined rules for how the reporting pattern would be like, thus no additional signaling would be needed. Regarding the spec effort, we don’t see this would require more complicated discussions than determining which of the many quantities (cri/PMI/RI/CQI/L1-RSRP, etc) can be reduced and the potential impact on CPU occupation.  As a compromise, we could support the proposal with the following update  For Periodic CSI reporting, support .   * For N<L, support reporting a total of N or L CSI(s) with details FFS. | | |
| Intel | | Support.  We don’t see a need to differentiate SP/A CSI with P CSI. In fact, the same complexity burden exist for SP/A CSI and P CSI. If 1 <= N <= L is feasible for SP/A CSI, the same should apply for P CSI. | | |
| Lenovo – Re | | Can proponents of N<L for periodic reporting explain the triggering method of both N, L, i.e., where do the triggered N, L, values appear?  Periodic reporting is RRC-triggered (no MAC-CE or DCI triggering is supported for periodic reporting). There is no clear motivation to trigger both L, N in the same RRC configuration message, only triggering L suffices. Further clarity is needed here | | |
| vivo | | First, we would like to confirm that with this proposal supported, all the cases including N=1&L=1, N=1&L>1, N>1&L>1&N<=L would be supported. Is that the correct understanding?  Second, we prefer N=1 and L>1 to be supported for P-CSI. The motivations are as follows.   1. With N=1, UE only needs to perform N=1 CSI processing and reporting in one reporting instance. This is just the same criteria as legacy UE behavior. So the UE complexity does not have to be increased. 2. With L>1, UE can report CSIs corresponding to L spatial adaptation patterns in separate reporting instances, such that gNB can also acquire CSIs corresponding to all the L spatial adaptation patterns. 3. Performance for N=1 and L>1 case has been evaluated in the SI phase by SLS. It can be seen there is sufficient energy saving gain for N=1 and L>1.   Regarding how to report N=1 CSI from the L sub-configurations, we think both predetermined by RRC or indicated by L1/L2 signaling can be considered. For example, when L sub-configurations are configured by RRC, each sub-configuration is configured with an index. UE can report CSIs for the sub-configurations in order of the index in different periodicities. Or, it can be configured by RRC to determine the reporting sequences, e.g., {sub-configuration 1, sub-configuration 2, sub-configuration 3,…}. For P-CSI, it is also beneficial to introduce L1/L2 signaling to indicate with N CSI to be reported for flexibly adaptation.  Third, we think in the end the UE capability to support N>=1 reports corresponding to L>=1 sub-configurations (L>=N) needs to be carefully determined. The value of N to be reported needs to be separately from the value of L.  Regarding N>1&L>1&N=L, we understand that with N=L>1 CSI report in one reporting instance, more accurate CSI information can be obtained by gNB and gNB can perform spatial adaptation based the CSI. However, as we commented before, it would impose much increased complexity at UE side, since UE has to perform L CSI processing and reports in one reporting instances, which is L times as legacy UE processing for CSI, especially when the value of L is large.  Above all, our preference is to agree on N=1&L>1 which has no UE complexity issue. For the sake of progress, as long as N<L&L>1 is also supported so that N=1&L>1 can be used as one of the configurations for spatial adaptation and N=1&L>1 will be one of the UE capability, we can accept for 1<=N<=L.  We suggest the following update for the proposal.  **FL4-p-Q1**  **For Periodic CSI reporting, support .**   * **Maximum value of N reported by UE capability starts from 1.** | | |
| Nokia/NSB | | For the straightforward manner, it is to report N CSI reports corresponding N patterns in every periodic CSI reporting occasion. **But then the question is, are there enough PUCCH capacity to carry such N CSI reports in each reporting occasion?**  If the PUCCH capacity is not enough to carry large number of N CSI reports, we understood that, some companies want to further discuss the CSI overhead reduction, and try to ‘squeeze’ N CSI reports in one reporting occasion. But that requires quite large spec impact. Also, from UE complexity point of view, the UE may require to parallel process and measurement of N CSI sub-configurations, it is unclear how much benefits it can be achieved with such CSI overhead reduction.  As alternative, N CSIs can be reported in multiple P reporting occasions, e.g. each reporting occasion may correspond to one or more of the CSI sub-configurations/configurations. And specifically, for each reporting occasion corresponds to one CSI sub-configurations, it is the same as the legacy framework. From UE complexity point of view, it does not require to perform parallel processing of the N CSI sub-configurations, instead the UE may conduct the processing and CSI sub-configuration measurement in sequential manner in each reporting occasion, and the CSI overhead reduction with large spec impact can be avoided.  Therefore, based on the above thinking, and **to further address the issue on minimize the UE complexity and spec impact,** **in case PUCCH capacity in each reporting occasion is not large enough to carry N CSI reports**, we have the following re-wording proposal of FL4-p-Q1  **FL4-p-Q1**  **For Periodic CSI reporting, support .**  **In case PUCCH capacity in each reporting occasion is not large enough to carry N CSI reports**   * N CSI sub-configurations can be reported in multiple occasions, where N=1 or N>=1 in each of the reporting occasions. | | |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | | Support.  First of all, we would like to emphasize that periodic CSI is widely used in current network. Moreover, multi-CSIs in one reporting is beneficial for network energy saving with minimal UPT loss. Therefore, it is important to support periodic multi-CSIs in one report in NES feature.  Regarding whether to additionally support N<L periodic CSI, we see the motivation of supporting it for OH reduction. We can consider it for NES.  Meanwhile, even N<L is considered, the UE complexity and UL signaling overhead can still be reduced via common/differential RI/PMI/CQI with the help of high correlation of precoding matrices.  Therefore, we support the proposal to move forward. | | |
| Xiaomi | | Support the proposal and share the similar view with LG that reporting N (N<L) should also be supported to better suit different reporting situations. | | |
| Futurewei | | Support. The spec don’t need to have differentiated support between SP/A and Periodic CSI. As for the UE complexities consideration, it should be applied for all cases as well. | | |
| CATT | | The periodic CSI report is for gNB to receive the UE long-term slow/shadow fading channel state information of different antenna patterns. Thus, all values of L should be reported (N=L). The short term fading information could be the selective number of patterns for link adaptation through SP-CSI or A-CSI reports. Thus, N=L should be supported for periodic CSI and N<L should be FFS. | | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | | From our point of view, at least N=L should be supported for Periodic CSI reporting. It is clear for us that multiple CSI report occasions will be needed to have the L report available at the gNB before taking an adaptation decision also it clear to us that the values of N and L has limits and cannot be infinitely large. Hence, we agree with N<L and even the case N=1.  Although, we prefer that the range of N is higher than 1 (at least 2), because the higher the value of N the better it is for report overheard reduction which is agreed to be studied in a previous agreement. However, if the value of N=1 is not excluded in other agreements then we agree to keep it as a possible value.  Periodic CSI reporting has existed since the beginning of NR and LTE, and this is because of its obvious advantages: 1) It does not require dynamic triggering/activation; 2) The reports arrive at the gNB in timely manner (if no channel condition degradation happens) which enable relatively more accurate link adaptation and better gNB scheduling decisions.  Hence, from our point of view, NES gNB supporting periodic CSI reporting is a **must** and NES UEs supporting periodic reporting does have any additional burden nor are require to support something that they did not support in the first place (No need for a new feature for periodic CSI reporting).  Finally, disabling periodic CSI reporting for NES gNB and relying on SP-CSIs or AP-CSIs will increase the network energy consumption because the NES network (gNBs) is obliged to use DCIs and/or MAC CEs.  @ APPLE, we noticed that we are on the same regarding some aspects like  “We understand that gNB wants to have multiple CSIs corresponding to different adaptation patterns to adapt its transmission, and the benefit of N=L>1 with no overhead reduction over N=L=1 has been shown.”  And we noticed that, similar to us, you are willing to compromise. However, we notice that your proposal   * For N<L, support reporting a total of N or L CSI(s) with details FFS.   is not consistent with your comment  “Supporting N<L, where UE could report a total of L CSIs in multiple instances, will provide a simple solution to reduce reporting overhead and simplifies UE CSI computation.”  Could you please explain more on why “N or L” in your proposal? should not be L based on your above comment in yellow?  Could you please explain, maybe you did but I did not see it, what will be wrong with your argument if we added the modification in **green**?  Supporting N<**=**L, where UE could report a total of L CSIs in one or multiple instances, will provide a simple solution to reduce reporting overhead and simplifies UE CSI computation.  Should not we have the same benefits of “simple solution”, “reduce reporting overhead” and “simplifies UE CSI computation”?  @VIVO, we noticed that we are on the same page regarding the following aspect  “Regarding N>1&L>1&N=L, we understand that with N=L>1 CSI report in one reporting instance, more accurate CSI information can be obtained by gNB and gNB can perform spatial adaptation based the CSI.”  However, based on the points you raised in your replies in “Second…”, we noticed the following  If we define as the timing window between the **first** CSI-RS (out of L resources/sets that will be used of measurements for NES) until the last time the **last** report of L is received by the gNB. and we consider that both cases (Case1: N=1 and Case2: N=L) have the same value of , then your claims in 1) and 2) are wrong. If same value of is assumed then reporting N out of L individually cannot beat reporting L out of L, both in term of complexity and report overhead reduction. Actually, in this case, L report has the superiority in term of overhead reductions and UE allowed time to process.  Now regarding 3) claiming that SI phase by SLS has shown **sufficient energy saving** gain for N=1 and L>1.is not objective, accurate, nor agreeable. And we will analysis this point based on your own contribution R1-2303910**.**  **We don’t think “the performance gain for multi-CSI feedback with N=L=2 over single-CSI feedback with N=1 and L=2 is marginal” is not objective conclusion. Because:**  1) The shutdown decision in R1-2303910 is based on the traffic load and UE RSRP. It should be noted that the multiple CSIs we discusse contains RI, PMI and CQI, which are used for better shutdown decision in our simulations. The so-called “multiple CSIs scheme” in R1-2303910 is different from our scheme (contains RI, PMI and CQI), and has a lower NES gain than that of our scheme.  2) In R1-2303910, if the UE only reports N=1 CSI for one reporting instance, it means the UE get CSIs for all shutdown patterns in different slots and it most likely means also that the time window used in your simulations will be higher than the one which could be used for N=L>1. In this case, it is more likely that the gNb will use historic CSIs for shutdown decision. And this could be one reason why you did not see “**marginal”** performant gain. Additionally, due to the time varying characteristic of the channel during window , it makes gNB cannot get a proper shutdown decision based on the historic CSIs.  **And then, we further show some more analysis between multiple CSIs scheme and single CSI feedback: N=L>1**  A) Compared to N=1, the performance of N=L will not be impact by using historic CSIs. Due to higher value of .  B) gNB does not need to frequently transmit multiple L1/L2 trigger signals. Then, there is no extra energy wasted for L1/L2 singling transmission and gNB can get more time to go into sleep.  C) For N=L case, the payload of multiple CSIs can be further compressed. Obviously, N=1 case cannot do this.  D) In N=1 case, in order to reduce impact of using historic CSIs, gNB need to configure a relatively short period. One way is the UE reports all CSIs in N=1 case during the same period of time as N=L case same . Then, in N=1 case, the CPU occupation time for one CSI is compressed. For example, if UE reports 4 CSIs in one reporting instance every 10 slots in N=L case, that means in N=1 case UE needs to report one CSI every 2.5 slot. And in this case, more burden on the UE It seems UE cannot calculate one CSI in this short time.  Finally, based on the above, and as a compromise, we propose to add in red  For Periodic CSI reporting, support .   * For N<=L, support reporting a total of L CSI reports in one or more report instances with details FFS. | | |
| OPPO | | We support **FL4-p-Q1**  When N<L, this provides the solution to address the overhead issue, as well as the UE complexity issue, with the extreme case being N=1.  When N=L, this provides more efficient and quick CSI info.  The proposal covers these two ways and thus should be supported. | | |
| InterDigital | | Support **FL4-p-Q1.**  We are fine N<L, with preference being N=1 and L>1 for periodic CSI, for ensuring legacy level UE complexity.  For periodic CSI reporting for N<L case, we agree with the views provided by Apple and vivo, and also do not see the need to introduce additional triggering/indication. | | |
| Qualcomm4 | | We do not support the proposal. We share the same view and question as Lenovo.  As we discussed earlier, aperiodic CSI reporting is the most efficient procedure for efficient adaptation. In other hand, periodic CSI reporting is not efficient due to RRC based configuration. Whether CSIs are reported at the same reporting instance or in different instance, it does not really improve adaptation efficiency. Furthermore, for reporting CSIs at the same reporting instance, PUCCH is limiting factor – short PUCCH is not an option while long PUCCH may not also work. It should be noted that for Type II CSI, long PUCCH can only carry Part I of CSI.  Given AP/SP CSI reporting is supported, diverse views from companies and limited meeting time with many FFS to be sorted out, we are fine if the following conclusion is made:   * **No consensus in RAN1 to support periodic CSI reporting in R18** | | |
| Samsung4 | | We are fine to support . Note, however, that we think the network would normally configure N=L, if we rule out UE autonomous selection of reports less than L. | | |
| Fujitsu6 | | Support.  Enabling N out of L CSI reporting is a simple approach to reduce UCI overhead and UE complexity. Especially for P CSI reporting and SP CSI reporting on PUCCH, where the requirement for the number of bits that can be transmitted is more stringent. | | |
| Ericsson 6 | | Regarding Proposal FL4-p-Q1, we think this should at least not lead to new PUCCH format discussion and that the value of L should be small for periodic reporting, such as Lmax = 2 so that the impact can be kept minimal. | | |
| China Telecom | | We support the proposal FL4-p-Q1.  Though not efficient enough, but support 1≤N≤L can help gNB fully understand the channel condition of the potential adopted ports and make the decision with best performance. And just because it is not efficient enough, we do need to make the best configuration and decision every time. We share the similar view as Intel and Futurewei that support it for P-CSI doesn’t increase extra complexity compared with A/SP-CSI. And we are fine with HW’s modified version of the proposal. | | |
| Apple-r | | Thanks Huawei for the new proposal. To clarify your question on “N or L”, our preference is L, however, according to some companies comments before, I though what they would support is reporting a total of N CSI(s) for N<L case, so I proposed to support both, maybe I should have used “N and L ”.  We also share a similar view with vivo, Nokia and Interdigital that N=1 and L>1 is at least to be supported, this simplifies the UE CSI computation, does not require CSI payload reduction, and can solve some companies concern on how to configure N.  As for the progress, we are fine with Huawei’s updated proposal, and whether N=1 is baseline can be discussed as the details FFS. | | |
| ETRI | | We support the proposal. | | |
| CMCC5 | | Support. The L refers to the sub-configuration. If N is smaller than L, it means only parts of the configurations are supported. | | |
| CEWiT | | Support N<=L  Periodic CSI reporting is fully RRC-triggered, which may not comply with dynamic variation of channel and traffic requirements. Hence the gNB may need reports only from a subset of RRC configured adaptations for periodic reporting. Hence a subset (N) of total configuration (L) should be introduced for selection. Where N<=L, so that it can cover reporting for both the subset and all configurations | | |
| FL | | It seems again two companies are not ok with the proposal of this round, particularly the case of N<L.  One clarification question from the objected companies is how N is determined as no L1/L2 signalling (otherwise becomes the same as AP-CSI). The proponent of the proposal clarifies that it could be achieved also by RRC plus predefined rules. UE selection may not be necessary.  One also consider P-CSI may not be efficient enough then in the end if we cannot converge, P-CSI can be dropped.  One or two companies clarify the details of previous simulations and expressed strong willingness to support P-CSI.  Given in the previous round, many companies share the view that UE selection is not preferred. FL consider that incorporating this possibility into N<L may be one of potential reasons that can cause more discussion in future. For the next round, could the supporting companies for N<L for P-CSI clarifies the details and/or down-selection:  **FL4e-p-Q1**  **For Periodic CSI reporting,**  **Alt1: support**   * **FFS details including the possibility of UL reporting in multiple occasions** * **For supporting companies of N<L, please indicate whether/which UE selection/RRC configuration/L1 signalling is required.**   **Alt2: at least support**   * **FFS: limitation of value of L** * **For supporting companies, please indicate whether you consider Lmax=2 is needed**   **Alt 3: periodic CSI reporting is not supported in R18** | | |
| **Company** | **Supported Alt** | | **Objected Alt** | **Comments** |
| Samsung4e | 1 or 2 | | 3 | Isn’t that ‘at least’ support N=L can be interpreted that N<L can be also supported? Probably a bit more clarity to Alt2 will be nicer. For Alt1, we suggest to remove FFS on reporting in multiple occasions as it’s controversial and won’t help to make the progress. For both Alt1 and Alt2, there shall be Lmax but it can be discussed later. |
| Lenovo-4e | Alt2 | |  | Alt2 is the most straightforward approach with reasonable workload in our opinion.  We are also OK with Alt 3 if majority prefers supporting PUSCH reporting only |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Alt1, or Alt2 | | Alt3 | Periodic CSI reporting is important and should not be excluded in NES, we have strong concerns about Alt 3.  For Alt1, we think it is better to move forward without FFS bullets since it should be separated discussed, instead of only applicable to P-CSI. In the case of N<L for Alt1, we prefer an indication from NW side, like a group common DCI to indicate which N CSIs need to be reported.  For Alt 2, if it is supported, we think Lmax=4 can be considered, which is beyond legacy UE capabilities. |
| LG Electronics7 | Alt1 | | Alt3 | As commented before, we think the same handling should be applied to all P/SP/AP-CSI reporting mechanisms.  We are open to address the concerns on UE complexity and CSI payload overhead, by   * Indicating N (that can be 1) out of L via (group-common) L1 signaling * Configuring a criteria to help UE select N out of L * Distributing L CSIs in multiple CSI reporting instances |
| Spreadtrum4 | Alt-1 or Alt-3 | | Alt-2 | Alt-1:  It is very natural Adaptation in NES means the dynamic change of something. We don’t think NES needs UE to pay more energy. Simply increasing the number of CSI reports is not the baseline. The baseline should be dynamic change of the number of CSI reports.  For example, in UE power saving, we cannot say the baseline is to let gNB give the fixed PDCCH transmission occasions. In that way, gNB miss the flexibility. The baseline is also the dynamic change of PDCCH transmission window (C-DRX).  Alt-3:  It needs compromise b/w UE and NW. If we cannot reach consensus, better to go for Alt-3. As mentioned by QC, SP/AP CSI is OK. In realistic, gNB can try SP/AP CSI for NES purpose, e.g. less ports, and if gNB find KPI can be guaranteed, gNB can re-configure P CSI for UEs. We think gNB should perform “try then apply” strategy, instead of “all-in for NES” strategy☺. More UCI decoding at gNB is not efficient for energy also. For high mobility case, P CSI is more efficient, but NES may not be applied for high mobility case in our view. |
| vivo | Alt 1 (with update) | | Alt 2 | We have strong concern on supporting only N>1 and N=L due to the significant increased UE complexity. N<L especially N=1 allows UE to report CSI corresponding to L sub-configurations with lower complexity compared to N=L. We think it is important for UE to support such configuration.  We prefer Alt-1, but it is not clear to us for the first FFS. For P-CSI, UE performs UL reporting in multiple occasions of different periodicities regardless the value of N. We assume the intention here is to FFS the detail for N<L case, e.g., how UE report CSI for N<L. For supporting N<L, we think LGE’s comment could be starting point for further discussion.  Besides, we would like to add another sub-bullet to clarify 1<=N<L will be one of the UE capability.  So, we suggest some update for Alt-1  **For Periodic CSI reporting,**  **Alt1: support**   * **FFS details including ~~the possibility of~~ how to realize UL reporting for N<L ~~in multiple occasions~~** * **For supporting companies of N<L, please indicate whether/which UE selection/RRC configuration/L1 signalling is required.** * **Maximum value of N reported by UE capability can start from 1.** |
| China Telecom | Alt1 | | Alt3 | We think the periodic CSI reporting is important and should not be precluded in NES, so we can’t accept Alt3.  While for alt2, it really seems similar to Alt1 since the “at least” is used here. We prefer the Alt1, and can compromise to Alt2 for making further process. |
| DOCOMO7 | Alt1 | | Alt3 | Similar view as CT.  Periodic CSI is important as we always have P-CSI in each release of LTE/NR and enables the flexibility of gNB operation.  For Alt.1, group common DCI to indicate which N CSIs need to be reported. |
| CEWiT | Alt 1 | |  | Selection for a sub set of configurations i.e. for N<L in Alt1, an indication from NW side is needed. A group common DCI may be used to indicate which N CSIs out of L should be reported. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2, then 1 | | 3 | We object to Alt3. We cannot accept saying that “periodic CSI reporting is not supported in R18”  Periodic CSI reporting has existed since the beginning of NR and LTE, and this is because of its obvious advantages: 1) It does not require dynamic triggering/activation; 2) The reports arrive at the gNB in timely manner (if no channel condition degradation happens) which enables timely link adaptation decisions and better gNB scheduling decisions.  Hence, from our point of view, NES gNB supporting periodic CSI reporting is a **must** and NES UEs supporting periodic reporting does have any additional burden nor require the support of something that the UEs do not support in the first place.  Disabling periodic CSI reporting for NES gNB and relying only on SP-CSIs or AP-CSIs will increase the network energy consumption because the NES network (gNBs) is obliged to use DCIs and/or MAC CEs.  We prefer option 2, However, we do not object to Alt1 as long as L=N is included. We can discuss the details of exact UL reporting (with overhand reduction) later.  Regarding the FL question “- For supporting companies, please indicate whether you consider Lmax=2 is needed” we do not think there is a need for moment. and FFS “- FFS: limitation of value of L” is fine |
| MTK4e | Alt1 with revision | | Alt3 | If provision of more CSI for NES is kind of consensus, how to confine the UE complexity and UCI size (related to UL performance) is essential. For 1<= N < L, it looks a reasonable baseline to support, and UE selection or L1 signaling (efficient adaptation along with L1-based spatial domain adaptation) can be further FFS. For N = L, the support should be conditioned on overhead reduction since L can be large to include all possible spatial adaptation patterns.  In this regard, the following revision is suggested:  **For Periodic CSI reporting,**   * **Support .**    + **FFS: Whether/how UE selection L1 signalling is required** * **Support based on CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression with N CSI report sub-configurations**   **FFS: Details of the reduction/compression design** |
| CMCC6 | Alt 1 | | 3 | Currently we do not support to preclude the periodic CSI reporting in NES, i.e. we do not support Alt 3.  Alt 1 is the most inclusive one. For the periodic CSI reporting N<L, the RRC configuration, MAC CE based updates and L1 signaling can be considered to trigger or active different sub-configs. Currently, we do not have any clue how the selection of N from L can work based on UE’s selection.  Our proposal is to add the *MAC CE based* for the 2nd bullet of the Alt 1   * **For supporting companies of N<L, please indicate whether/which UE selection/RRC configuration/MAC CE based indication or activation/L1 signalling is required.**   For the limitation of Lmax in the Alt 2, our thinking is that this may be too restrictive in current stage, since the combination of power domain and spatial domain adaptation is not discussed. Two may be too restrictive. |
| Apple | Alt 1 with L CSIs or Alt 3 | | Alt 2 | I’m sorry to see that the somewhat goes back to the situation before Friday GTW, even with many company’s support of N<L with a total of L CSI.  Regarding Alt 2, we don’t think N=L should be supported first, which implies that this is the baseline.  For P CSI, If according to some companies preference, Lmax=2 for the N=L case, we do not think the NES gain would be enough for NW perspective and we doubt whether that could be agreed. Actually this would still require overhead reduction study, which needs many spec impact and discussions regarding which quantities can be the same, what is the mapping rule for UE to determine e.g the PMI corresponding to one spatial pattern based on the PMI obtained from another spatial pattern, the impact on UE CSI occupation, etc.  If Lmax >2, we don’t think the PUCCH payload would support such large value for N=L, where in this case supporting N<L is a natural solution where no additional overhead reduction is needed. Regarding “how N is determined as no L1/L2 signalling (otherwise becomes the same as AP-CSI).”, I think this has been explained by us and many other companies that this does not necessarily need signaling, since some pre-defined pattern can be configured. Note that for periodic CSI, we believe that L CSIs is what NW would be needed from UE, which could be a little different from SP/AP.  We think either we support N=L and N<L simultaneously now with details FFS, or we have no consensus on supporting multi-csi feedback on PUCCH.  We propose the following compromised proposal:  **Alt1: support to support feedback of L CSIs**   * **FFS details ~~including the possibility of UL reporting in multiple occasions~~** * **~~For supporting companies of N<L, please indicate whether/which UE selection/RRC configuration/L1 signalling is required.~~** |
| Fujitsu | Alt 1 and Alt 3 | | Alt 2 | Alt-2 is comprised in Alt-1, and we think N<L should be supported to address the overhead and complexity issue. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 1 | | Alt 3 | Share similar view with other companies that the periodic reporting should not be excluded by NES.  In addition, the FFS is not clear to us. More clarification would be preferred. With periodic CSI reporting configuration, the UE will report the CSI on multiple occasions. We understand the ‘multiple occasions’ in the FFS does not aim that. Modification to avoid misunderstanding would be appreciate. |
| Spreadtrum5 | Alt 3 | | Alt 1 and Alt 2 | From Tuesday GTW, I think companies have different views on how to enable/activate/trigger/… N CSI(s) for N<L case. Some companies think UE can autonomously select N CSI(s) from L sub-configuration. But from our side, we think UE autonomously selecting doesn’t reduce UE computation complexity, so we support gNB to trigger N CSI(s) in dynamic way, which can reduce UE complexity. Further, some companies think UE can report L CSI(s) in multiple reporting occasions. We think it may be a little reduce UE complexity since the computation time is prolonged, but the reduction is conservative. There are at least the following alternatives:   * Alt-1: UE autonomously select N CSI(s) to report from L sub-configuration(s) * Alt-2: gNB triggers N CSI(s) from L sub-configuration(s) to report in dynamic way * Alt-3: UE reports L CSI(s) in multiple reporting occasion(s), each reporting occasion has N CSI(s)   Any alternative seems changing periodic CSI to aperiodic or semi-persistent CSI. The benefit for using periodic CSI is just avoid overhead of triggering signaling. From our side, we think keeping periodic CSI as it is may be better for maintenance of spec. The additional overhead of SP/AP CSI triggering is not so critical. |
|  |  | |  |  |

**FL4-p-Q2**

**If supported, assuming the following for SP-CSI and A-CSI also applies here,**

* **Further study how to address/minimize additional UE complexity**

**What may be the necessary enhancements for P-CSI with ? Note, enhancements could be different per cases, e.g. N=1 and N>1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | For N=1, whether enhancements are needed to indicate the active CSI-RS ports for Type 1, e.g., via a port selection parameter  For N>1, multiple sub-configurations are included in the CSI reporting configuration, and multiple CSIs are reported per report. A similar behavior is partially incorporated in Rel-17 multi-TRP CSI, where up to two single-TRP CSI are configured with up to two corresponding CSIs reported |
| LG Electronics6 | We are confused a bit since the proposal is for SP/AP-CSI reporting while the follow-up question is for P-CSI reporting…  From the perspective of CSI reporting, we may not need specific enhancement for N=1 as this is the case for the legacy behavior. On the other hand, N>1 may require enhancements to reduce UE’s computation complexity e.g., by restricting RI (i.e., common RI restriction for all sub-configurations). |
| Apple | As commented in FL4-p-Q2, for P-CSI with N<L, the reporting pattern needs to be determined. |
| Intel | Ok with proposal.  We think we can consider study of supporting common information for CSI (such as rank, PMI, etc) among CSIs to reduce UE complexity. |
| vivo | Ok to further study how to address the additional UE complexity. |
| Nokia/NSB | For N>1, instead of triggering each CSI reporting one by one, a single DCI/MAC-CE signalling may trigger N CSI reporting with triggering overhead saving.  Again, considering of UE complexity reduction, DL overhead reduction, and spec impact (as could also be seen in later Questions and Proposals), N CSIs can be reported in multiple Semi-Persistent reporting occasions, where N=1 or N>=1 in each of the reporting occasions.  For aperiodic reporting, we could still rely on using different DCIs to trigger CSIs in different UL reporting occasions, but this would then increase the DL control overhead. Or we could also enhance the aperiodic reporting triggering to trigger multiple reporting occasions with one DCI, in this way it can be similar to what could be achieved with semi-persistent CSI; as we previously mentioned, semi-persistent CSI reporting could be quite similar to multi-shot aperiodic CSI reporting but without DL control overhead. |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | Support to study how to address/minimize additional UE complexity for periodic CSI.  We think the enhancements for P-CSI with is necessary.  As we commented in FL-p-Q1, when 1<N( ≤L ), the UE complexity can be reduced via high correlation of precoding matrices to avoid unnecessary iteration of some PMIs. And UL signaling overhead can be reduced by common/differential PMI/RI/CQI.  When N<L, activation/de-activation of the CSI reports is one of the potential direction. |
| Xiaomi | No additional enhancement is needed with N=1 for UE complexity reduction.  For N>1, solutions for UE complexity reduction has been discussed in P4. |
| Futurewei | Support but without the note, as it should be applicable to Periodic as well. |
| CATT | The antenna patterns for UE CSI measurements should be specified in order to support the P-CSI enhancement with 1≤N≤L |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, we support.  For UE complexity there are two aspects the first is the number of occupied CPUs and the second is the complexity of operations needed to be executed by each CPU.  N>1 (ideally N=L) enables the possibility of L CSI-Reports overhead reduction which is something that we should strive to achieve in RAN1. It is well known that physical layer should always have as low as possible of measurement overhead to increase the capacity and there is no need to argue against the well-known facts. And, as we discussed before in our contribution, the CPU occupation for multiple CSIs calculation can be reduced by spatial correlation on CSI-RS resources and PMI. For example, there are 2 patterns and each pattern have 4 resources. Due to the CSI-RS resource correlation, after the best CSI-RS resource is determined for one pattern, the UE knows the best CSI-RS resource of another pattern without iteration in all 4 CSI-RS resources. Then, the CPU occupation can be reduced from 8 to 5.    Finally, N=1 does not allow the UEs to make reduced calculations in their CPUs due since the UE will not be able to exploit the correlation properties of different shutdown patterns then free their CPUs quickly for other purposed. The CPUs need to wait the reporting before being freed according to the current specification. |
| Qualcomm4 | We suggest shorting out FL4-p-Q1 first. |
| Samsung4 | For periodic multi-CSI reporting, we propose to introduce an indication from the serving gNB to UEs, e.g., using a UE-group-specific signaling, for skipping the entire multi-CSI reporting for a given occasion when there is no need from network perspective. |
| Fujitsu6 | We are fine with the proposal. As commented in **FL4-p-Q1**, enabling UEs to perform N CSI measurements out of L sub-configurations can reduce UE complexity. The necessary enhancement is to determine which N CSIs need to be reported by UE. To enable this, gNB indication via L1/L2 signaling can be considered. |
| Ericsson 6 | We have the same question as LGE about **FL4-p-Q2.** We assume the question is about further study of UE complexity for p-CSI.  We don’t think a distinction needs to be made on UE complexity between p-CSI and sp/ap-CSI reporting. It seems the complexity is the same. We hold the basic view that the CPU occupation should scale with N, so we don’t think that further study on UE complexity is actually needed. |
| China Telecom | We support to further study how to address/minimize additional UE complexity.  We think the enhancement need is mainly for better choosing the N CSI-RS to measure/report and reducing the complexity brought by reporting multiple CSI reports. |
| ETRI | In our understanding, if N=1 CSI report with no overhead reduction, i.e., reflecting just N=1 sub-configuration, it is the legacy behavior. However, if UE derives N=1 CSI report based on multiple (e.g., L) sub-configurations, then it is not the legacy any more and needs enhancements. So we think both N=1 and N>1 can be considered for potential enhancements, toward CPU occupation and active CSI-RS port counting. |
| CMCC5 | Fine to support. We see no difficulty to apply N<=L and N>=1 to the SP and AP CSI reporting.  If N equals 1, it could be considered as a fallback to the legacy behaviour. Or it can also be the case that only a sub-config or adaptation pattern is applied for the reporting.  If N is larger than 1, then how to report the CSI in one or multiple CSI reporting should be discussed. |
| FL4e | It seems majority consider, if any UE complexity reduction techniques are needed it can be applied as a common solution among different CSI reporting types (e.g. the common CRI/RI/PMI). Then before that, decision is needed on whether/how to support P-CSI reporting and after that, other potential enhancements including the reporting patterns and/or indication content. It seems all aspects have been somehow covered in different proposals in different sections, and no new aspects are identified, therefore, FL suggest we focus on -p-Q1.  This question can be closed. |

**FL4-sp-Q1**

**For Semi-persistent CSI reporting with , can we support**

* **gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc.**

**If supported, do the multiple occasions are determined from one reportConfig (as already agreed), or configured by multiple reportConfig.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Supported or not** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Not | This behavior will lead to further complexity due to variation in payload across different reporting occasions. Moreover, SP CSI reporting is deactivated by a trigger, and hence the CSI reporting behavior, i.e., which Nm CSIs are reported per occasion m, needs to be configured for all occasions until deactivation, which would require significant spec impact. |
| LG Electronics6 |  | We are open to discuss the possibility of distributing CSIs in time domain. If supported, those multiple occasions need to be configured from one CSI report configuration and this feature can be also applied to P and AP-CSI reporting mechanisms. |
| DOCOMO6 | Not support | Agree with Lenovo that the FL4-sp-Q1 will lead a complexity configuration.  Furthermore, many companies assume N and L is a very small value. In this sense, reporting CSIs in different reporting occasion is not necessary.  We prefer that, for P/SP/A-CSIs, all the configured N CSIs can be reported in one reporting instance as payload reduction methods can be explored. |
| Apple |  | We also think the payload in each reporting instance should be the same, thus the number of CSI(s) to be reported in each instance should be the same, however, they could correspond to different sub-configuration to provide gNB more information.  For Semi-persistent CSI reporting with , support   * gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N~~1~~ CSIs in one reporting occasion and N~~2~~ CSIs in next reporting occasion corresponding to different sub-configurations   Regarding the last question, we are not so sure we understand the question correctly. Our understanding is that the whole framework is under single reportConfig. |
| Intel | no | Sending CSI for different patterns in different time instances, delays the information needed at the gNB to make dynamic decisions for spatial adaptation. This seems to be contradicting the general trend for supporting dynamic spatial adaptation. |
| vivo |  | In general, we are fine that the UE behavior for reporting CSIs in different report occasions can be indicated/triggered by gNB for SP-CSI reporting.  Regarding the proposed method, we think it needs more clarifications. Is the indication by gNB used to trigger one SP-CSI report config? Whether CSIs in different reporting occasions are across different periodicities? What is the relationship of (N1, N2) and (N, L)? |
| Nokia/NSB | Support | It can be based on one reportConfig, as this is the main case we have been discussing. Using multiple reportConfig would consume more reporting configurations, something that we should strive to avoid.  And as commented above, it is specifically to address the issue in case PUCCH/PUSCH capacity in each reporting occasion is not large enough to carry N CSI reports within one reportConfig. Then it is beneficial to split of the N CSI reports in multiple occasions to minimize the UE complexity and spec impact.  For example, N1 CSIs (without necessarily needing overhead reduction/compression) can be sent in the first reporting occasion, N2 CSIs (without necessarily needing overhead reduction/compression) can be sent in the second reporting occasion, N3 CSIs (without necessarily needing overhead reduction/compression) can be sent in the third reporting occasion. In other words, there could be multiple reporting occasions catering for CSI reports without being compressed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | N | For semi-persistent CSI reporting, the benefit of triggering two CSIs in different reporting occasion is not clear. gNB can trigger two CSIs separately using legacy spec. If semi-persistent CSI reporting is reported in PUCCH and the multiple occasions are determined from one reportConfig, the mapping between N1+N2 CSIs, L antenna adaptation patterns, and two reporting occasions should be clearly configured. All of these configuration of reportConfig may be complex. If semi-persistent CSI reporting is reported in PUSCH, the triggering DCI needs to schedule 2 PUSCHs at the same time and the overhead will be increased. |
| Xiaomi | No | If FL4-sp-Q1 is supported, additional signalling work may be needed for determine the reporting occasion, as well as related reportConfig. That is too complex. |
| Futurewei | Support | It provides the flexibility in support sub-configurations that correspond to different spatial pattern. |
| CATT | Y | The SP-CSI should be reported in one reportConfig. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | not support | We cannot support before further clarifications on the values of N1 and N2 with respect to N and L. So, we propose to make it as FFS. And propose the proponent(s) to provide more details |
| OPPO | Open | The simplest way is to fix the N value for each activation. But we can understand that the gNB may figure out any inefficiency of the activated CSI reporting and may want to quickly adjust the value of N. It could be discussed together with the dynamic switch function in general. |
| InterDigital |  | Although we are open to consider triggering/indication for CSIs to be reported in different reporting occasions, the intention for ‘one trigger to indicate the UE’ is not very clear. Also, the potential spec impact for indicating in single trigger (e.g. DCI or MAC CE) for the CSIs to be reported in different reporting occasions and with different payloads seems formidable. |
| Qualcomm4 |  | It would not be needed for AP CSI reporting and SP CSI reporting on PUSCH. However, it is debatable for SP CSI reporting on PUCCH.  We suggest discussing this issue next meeting if necessary. |
| Samsung4 | No | If reports are sent in two different occasions, why don’t we simply configure two multi-CSI reports? If multiple reportConfigs are used, there is no further enhancement needed as they are decoupled from each other. Furthermore, this is an optimization issue, which can be deprioritized. |
| Fujitsu6 | Not support | The benefit of reporting multiple CSIs in different occasions is not clear. It increases the scheduling delay and the UCI overhead burden is the same as reporting multiple CSIs in one occasion. |
| Ericsson 6 | N | We think it will be very complicated to specify distributing CSIs in the time domain, and also contradicts the potential of NES to do so.  It is also unclear why this is being discussed when we have already agreed that for sp-CSI reporting, the N CSI reports are in one reporting instance.  **Agreement**  For a CSI report config with *L* sub-configuration(s), support a framework that enables a UE to report *N* CSI(s) in one reporting instance where the *N* CSI(s) are associated with *N* sub-configuration(s) from *L* (where ) and each CSI corresponds to one sub-configuration.   * For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI. * For Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate report of N≤L CSIs where N>=1 * The maximum value of N and L are subject to UE capability * Further study how to address/minimize additional UE complexity |
| China Telecom | At least not now | We are open to discuss it in the further, but now the benefits of this mechanism seems not so clear, since we already support the AP CSI. |
| ETRI | Fine | CSI reporting adaptation is an important feature for flexible NES operation. In our view, the adaptation can be done by either P-CSI report or SP-CSI report, and this proposal is to support the latter one. The adaptation can be done within one reportConfig. |
| CMCC5 |  | Multiple CSIs over multiple occasions should be further clarified about the using scenarios and benefits. We are sure the multiple occasion reporting for the SP CSI reporting is the most priority case. Before we discuss this case, we should first discuss whether it can be supported in periodic and aperiodic reporting. Since it could be easy to reuse the mechanism of periodic CSI reporting in the SP CSI reporting. |
| CEWiT | Yes (partially) | we support the proposal, but are not clear with the intention of sub bullet. If gNB indicated to report CSIs in different reporting occasions. **Can the gNB skip some occations or can it only ask a sub set of occations to be reported in order to reduce the number of CSI reports based on dynamic requirements? Or is it like N1+N2 =N?**  **In either case we suggest following update in the proposal**  **FL4-sp-Q1**  **For Semi-persistent CSI reporting with , can we support**   * **gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc.** * **The trigger also indicates the UE to report for a subset of reporting occasions out of total occations.**   **If supported, do the multiple occasions are determined from one reportConfig (as already agreed), or configured by multiple reportConfig.** |
| FL | @Ericsson  Here exactly we are identifying the need to introduce additional functions to allow multiple instances and/or multiple reportConfig, since today only one reportConfig-to-one report is supported, and FL was unsure what the proponent have in mind. Now with clarifications from Nokia/Apple, it seems we are on the same page that we only focus on one reportConfig.  @all  There is a clear majority not supporting this, at least at this moment. However one or two companies pointing out it may also relates to whether PUCCH or PUSCH is used. Also one or two companies mentioning that this, if supported, may be applicable to P-CSI as well. FL rather consider the only difference between the proposal and the case of P-CSI with multiple occasions is the presence of a trigger, similar to the difference in the framework of configured grant between Type 1 and Type 2.  Given the overall situation, it might be preferable to first have a conclusion on P-CSI since the details of P-CSI may include the report of multiple UL occasions, and if agreed there, it seems natural to extend it to SP-CSI later.  **FL4e-sp-Q1**  **FFS: For Semi-persistent CSI reporting in one reportConfig with , gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc.** | |
| Samsung4e | Okay to postpone the discussion; we sustain our objection to support reporting in multiple occasions. | |
| Lenovo-4e | Agree with Samsung. We do not see mluti-occasion reporting a priority, due to potentially large spec impact, e.g., UCI payload, CPU calculation and association of CSI-RS resources with the N1, N2 CSIs all need to be addressed via specification enhancement | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree that we should have a conclusion on P-CSI first. The details of SP-CSI can be discussed after the method on P-CSI is settled. | |
| LG Electronics7 | We think reporting some CSIs in a reporting occasion and reporting other CSIs in another reporting occasion is one of alternatives to address UE’s complexity and overhead issue. We prefer to put all alternatives (including N indication via L1 signaling or UE’s selection, etc.) together and decide one (or more) of them, desirably which can be applicable to all CSI reporting types. | |
| Spreadtrum4 | Support in principle. It seems UE computation can be relaxed. | |
| China Telecom | We agree with ZTE and the discussion can be postponed. | |
| DOCOMO7 | Similar view with Samsung. | |
| CEWiT | Share similar views with samsumg to postpone the discussion. | |
| Xiaomi | Similar view with Samsung. | |

**FL4-sp-Q2**

**For Semi-persistent CSI reporting with , regarding**

* **Further study how to address/minimize additional UE complexity**

**What may be the necessary enhancements?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Since semi-persistent CSI reporting is further decomposed into two types: SP reporting on PUSCH and SP reporting on PUCCH. We prefer to categorize CSI reporting to two categories: PUSCH-based reporting (aperiodic and SP on PUSCH) and PUCCH-based reporting (periodic and SP on PUCCH). No need to discuss SP CSI reporting separately |
| LG Electronics6 | Same comments as in FL4-p-Q2. We don’t understand why this sort of discussion is separately discussed depending on CSI reporting types. |
| Apple | Agree with Lenovo.  For SP-CSI with N<L, the reporting pattern needs to be determined. |
| Intel | Ok with proposal.  We think we can consider study of supporting common information for CSI (such as rank, pmi, etc) among CSIs to reduce UE complexity. |
| vivo | Ok to further study |
| Nokia/NSB | Please check our comments on FL4-sp-Q1, and FL4-p-Q2.  By enabling different CSIs to be transmitted in different UL occasions, there would not be a need to address UE complexity or to discuss CSI compression as such, meaning that we could leverage existing operations without the need to much optimize those aspects in this case. |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | Similar with our comments on periodic multi-CSIs in one reporting, solutions to compress the CSI overhead/UE complexity, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI can be considered. |
| Xiaomi | Same view with FL4-p-Q2. |
| Futurewei | Not much value whether to agree on this or not |
| CATT | NO UE complexity reduction is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Same comment as for P-CSI. |
| InterDigital | OK |
| Qualcomm4 | It should be noted that at this moment we have not agreed on definition of sub-configuration and some restrictions in resources in a CSI report config. We suggest discussing this question next meeting when the overall framework becomes clearer. |
| Samsung4 | Network to indicate a subset of N sub-configurations from L sub-configurations using DCI (similar to SP-CSI on PUSCH using DCI 0\_1) or MAC-CE (similar to SP-CSI on PUCCH using ‘SP CSI reporting on PUCCH Act./Deact.’ MAC CE), where N does not exceed the number of reports that the UE can handle at a given time, i.e., per UE capability. |
| Fujitsu6 | We are fine with the proposal. gNB activates the N (N≥1) CSIs measurements via L1/L2 signaling can be considered. |
| Ericsson 6 | As commented above, we hold the basic view that the CPU occupation should scale with N, and that there is no distinction between ap/sp/p-CSI reporting. Hence, we don’t think that further study on UE complexity is actually needed. |
| China Telecom | Same view as FL4-p-Q2. |
| ETRI | Same or similar approach in FL4-p-Q2 can be applied. |
| CMCC5 | Similar mechanisms as P and AP CSI reporting. |
| FL4e | Same comments/observations can be made as that for -p-Q2. Therefore we can close the question. |

**FL4-ap-Q1**

For the case N<L, it is pointed out that one of the motivations is for overhead/payload reduction. So ‘no overhead/payload reduction’ may be self-conflict with support of N<L. Perhaps the following simple modifications can be considered

**For Aperiodic CSI reporting on PUSCH with ,**

* **at least the case without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.**
* **This does not preclude that any techniques if agreed for PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Aperiodic reporting is always on PUSCH, the second bullet is not clear to us |
| LG Electronics6 | At least for the case of N=1, we don’t need any enhancements for payload reduction and compression. For the case of N>1, we can consider no CSI compression if CSI is carried on PUSCH (for AP-CSI reporting or SP-CSI reporting on PUSCH cases). |
| DOCOMO6 | As CSIs are comprised of Part1 CSI and Part2 when mapping to PUSCH or PUCCH, even for A-CSI reporting on PUSCH, gNB do not know the size of Part2 CSI. Then the Part2 CSIs may be dropped. In this sense, CSI overhead reduction is necessary even for CSIs transmitted in PUSCH to minimize the CSI dropping probability.  We suggest the following update:  **For Aperiodic CSI reporting on PUSCH with ,**   * **For N=1, ~~at least~~ the case without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.** * **For** **N>1, the case with further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.**   **~~This does not preclude that any techniques if agreed for PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH.~~** |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | Compared to N=L case, N<L does have lower overhead/payload. We think by supporting N<L, it is one of the approaches for CSI overhead/payload reduction. Besides, support CSI reporting without further overhead reduction can provide better performance compared to the reduction case. So, we think the case without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression needs to be supported. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK.  CSI overhead and payload reduction is a secondary aspect, especially that only two meetings are left till the completion of Rel-18, and we should thus strive to reuse existing operations as much as possible in that regard. |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | Agree with DOCOMO’s comment and suggestion. |
| Xiaomi | Generally fine with the proposal. The PUCCH part should be removed. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal since the overhead of A-CSI report is not the main concern |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not agree with the first sub-bullet. Because as we said in our previous comments:  It is well known that physical layer should always have as low as possible of measurement overhead to increase the capacity and there is no need to argue against the well-known facts.  Additionally, there is an agreement to further study CSI feedback with CSI overhead/report payload reduction, and this sub-bullet contradict with that agreement. |
| OPPO | Support |
| InterDigital | Fine with the changes proposed by DOCOMO |
| Qualcomm4 | As commented by companies, 2nd bullet is not needed since AP CSI is only reported on PUSCH.  The 1st bullet is not clear to us: what is “further” in “**further CSI overhead/report payload reduction**”. Furthermore, what CSI overhead/report payload reduction really means?  It is critical to clarify the meaning of text “report N CSI(s) in one reporting instance” in the agreement. From our understanding it may have two interpretations:  Interpretation 1: “report *N* CSI(s) in one reporting instance” in the agreement means N CSIs correspond to N CSI reports which are multiplexed and sent in one reporting instance.  Legacy CSI report structure remains unchanged.  Multiplexing CSI reports and sending the multiplexed report in one reporting instance is already legacy. The key of this text is to support this legacy behavior.  From CSI overhead reduction perspectives, solution such as common CRI, differential CQI/RI is feasible. As commented online, as long as reportQuantity is part of the sub-configuration, gNB can configure whether to report or skip CRI in a report. Differential CQI/RI should be quite straightforward as long as one reference report is identified.  Interpretation 2: “report *N* CSI(s) in one reporting instance” in the agreement means N CSIs are packeted in a single CSI report  Require new CSI report structure, which may not be preferred at this stage of 5G deployment. Furthermore, no clear benefit compared to using legacy CSI report structure.  From CSI overhead reduction perspectives, no clear benefit compared to what is explained under Interpretation 1. One possible disadvantage is that for common CRI reporting, NW does not have flexibility to request CRI for some sub-configurations (e.g., when correlation if any does not hold in real deployment).  We think this clarification should be clear out first before discussing anything related to “CSI overhead/report payload reduction”. |
| Samsung4 | If no overhead reduction scheme is supported, why don’t we simply configure multiple single CSI reports using legacy framework? For multi-CSI report, discussions on the overhead reduction scheme should be prioritized over the vanilla case. |
| Fujitsu6 | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson 6 | Given the time remaining in the WI, we think that at least for ap-CSI and sp-CSI reporting on PUSCH, the baseline case of no-overhead reduction should be supported. Regarding DOCOMO’s comment about potential dropping of Part 2, this does not change the motivation for supporting at least the case of no overhead reduction.  We share the same comments as above that aperiodic reporting is always on PUSCH, so the 2nd sub-bullet of the proposal does not make sense. We understand that periodic CSI reporting can be piggy backed on PUSCH if the PUSCH overlaps PUCCH; however, overhead reduction for CSI reporting on PUCCH (and possibly piggybacked on PUSCH) is a separate discussion.  It is not clear to us why the word “further” is needed in the proposal, since this implies that some overhead reduction is already supported, whereas the baseline is no overhead reduction.  Based on the above, we support the following revision of **FL4-ap-Q1:**  **For Aperiodic and semi-persistent CSI reporting on PUSCH with ,**   * **at least the case without ~~further~~ CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.** * **~~This does not preclude that any techniques if agreed for PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH.~~**   **Side comment to FL**: You mention “For the case N<L, it is pointed out that one of the motivations is for overhead/payload reduction.”  However, we don’t think the motivation for N < L is necessarily overhead/payload reduction. The motivations is that after the gNB has obtained CSI for multiple hypotheses and it has performed adaptation for NES, then the gNB will need to trigger future CSI reports based on the selected hypothesis. In this case only N = 1 report is needed; it is not necessary to obtain reports for the hypotheses. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with DOCOMO’s modification. |
| ETRI | If our understanding is correct, for SP/A-CSI report, N<=L CSI report where N>=1 with no overhead reduction was already agreed. So it seems that this proposal is not needed much. |
| FL | @Lenovo, QC, Ericsson  A couple of companies question the need of the second sub-bullet. As explained in the beginning but maybe not clear enough, if any overhead reduction/payload reduction is agreed for PUCCH (for e.g. SP-CSI), is there any reason we do not use it on PUSCH to reduce the payload as well, even if it may not be a burden for UE. Perhaps the confusion part is due to that the whole second sub-bullet is under A-CSI. But this can be anyway further discussed.  @Ericsson  For the first sub-bullet, thanks for the explanation/side comment. The ‘further’ is indeed added due to that reason – from some other companies’ point of view, N<L has one of the motivations as payload reduction (see vivo comment). Nevertheless, FL consider this is rather a small issue that does not conflict with what we intends to do.  @QC  Thanks for pointing to this. It was FL intention to clarify the meaning of baseline that was discussed in last GTW but that proposal was not selected by majority.  At this stage, to avoid comprehensive texts, the following may be considered:  **FL4e-ap-Q1**  **For CSI reporting on PUSCH with ,**   * **at least the case without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.**   + **Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused**   **This does not preclude that any techniques if agreed for CSI reporting on PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH, which is FFS.** |
| Samsung4e | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo-4e | Not sure what “Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused” means. Does it mean that for, e.g., N=2, 2 CSI reports are reported per CSI reporting config? This is not possible in the current spec, since the specification is limited to a single CSI report per CSI reporting config, and changing this rule would require specification updates that would impact MIMO codebook design |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If the overhead reduction is agreed for CSI reporting on PUCCH, it is easy to apply it to PUSCH. We don’t think CSI reporting on different channels needs different CSI reporting methods. Moreover, it will also make both gNB and UE implementation more complicated if different UE behaviors are assumed depending on whether CSI multiplexes on PUSCH or not. And in the typical TDD deployment, the UL resources including both PUCCH and PUSCH are limited. Therefore, supporting CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression in PUCCH and PUSCH is needed. |
| LG Electronics7 | As we and NTT DOCOMO commented earlier, the case of N=1 should be distinguished from the case of N>1. **Regardless of CSI reporting on PUSCH or PUCCH**, we don’t think CSI reduction/compression is necessary for N=1.  For N>1, could you please clarify what legacy behavior for CSI report is? From our understanding, we need further discussion on how to construct CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 (including CSI omission rule) when N>1. In addition, we think both cases with and without CSI compression should be considered for N>1. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO7 | We do not support the proposal. Similar view as ZTE and LG. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK4e | Support. It looks reasonable for CSI reporting on PUSCH where the data volume is more sufficient for additional CSI for NES. |
| Fujitsu | Support |

**FL4-ap-Q2**

**For Aperiodic CSI reporting with , regarding**

* **Further study how to address/minimize additional UE complexity**

**What may be the necessary enhancements?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | The current CPU occupation definition is very restrictive: it is based on the number of CSI-RS resources used for measurement, and moreover a CSI-RS resource referred to N times is counted N times for CPU occupation purpose. Given that, we believe CPU occupation cannot go below N under current definition  UE complexity can be reduced via reducing/sharing some measurements across the N CSIs, which is further discussed in P4. |
| LG Electronics6 | Same comments as in FL4-p-Q2. We don’t understand why this sort of discussion is separately discussed depending on CSI reporting types. |
| Intel | Ok with proposal.  We think we can consider study of supporting common information for CSI (such as rank, pmi, etc) among CSIs to reduce UE complexity. |
| vivo | Ok to further study |
| Nokia/NSB | As we previously mentioned, for aperiodic reporting, we could still rely on using different DCIs to trigger CSIs in different UL reporting occasions, but this would then increase the DL control overhead. Or we could also enhance the aperiodic reporting triggering to trigger multiple reporting occasions with one DCI, however this becomes in a way similar to semi-persistent CSI; as we previously mentioned, semi-persistent CSI reporting could be seen as multi-shot aperiodic CSI reporting.  Using semi-persistent CSI, considering different CSIs are reported in different reporting occasions, could thus be another option to replace the aperiodic CSI if address UE complexity if that’s seen as a problem.    For N>1, instead of triggering each CSI reporting one by one, a single DCI signalling may trigger N CSI reporting with triggering overhead saving.  Again, considering of UE complexity reduction and spec impact, N CSIs can be reported in multiple reporting occasions. |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | Similar with our comments on periodic multi-CSIs in one reporting, solutions to compress the CSI overhead/UE complexity, e.g. common CRI/PMI, differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI can be considered. |
| Xiaomi | Same view with FL4-p-Q2. |
| CATT | No UE complexity reduction is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Same comment as for P-CSI. |
| InterDigital | Ok with proposal |
| Qualcomm4 | Similar view as being expressed in FL4-sp-Q2 |
| Samsung4 | Network to indicate a subset of N sub-configurations from L sub-configurations using DCI (similar to DCI 0\_1), where N does not exceed the number of reports that the UE can handle at a given time, i.e., per UE capability. |
| Fujitsu6 | We are fine with the proposal. gNB triggers the N (N≥1) CSI measurements via L1 signaling can be considered. |
| Ericsson 6 | As commented above, we hold the basic view that the CPU occupation should scale with N, and that there is no distinction between ap/sp/p-CSI reporting. Hence, we don’t think that further study on UE complexity is actually needed. |
| China Telecom | Same view with FL4-ap-Q2. Maybe FL4-p-Q2/ FL4-sp-Q2/ FL4-ap-Q2 can be merged into one proposal? |
| ETRI | Same or similar approach in FL4-p-Q2 can be applied. |
| CMCC5 | Fine with the proposal. Our view is similar, a unified solution for the complexity and overhead reduction should be studied. |
| FL4e | Same comments/observations can be made as that for -p-Q2. Therefore we can close the question. |

**\*Week 2 end\***

**FL summary part 2**

If multi-CSI feedback is supported, for overhead and UE complexity reduction, CSI content and CSI computation operation needs to be broken down. At least the following are discussed in companies’ contributions:

* CRI: considered enhancement may be possible, by Huawei/HiSi, Google.
* RI: considered enhancement may be possible, by ZTE, Spreadtrum, CMCC, MediaTek, LGe (if unchanged)
* PMI: considered enhancement may be possible, by Huawei/HiSi, Spreadtrum, Intel, ZTE, Samsung, CMCC, MediaTek
* CQI: considered enhancement may be possible, by Huawei/HiSi, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Samsung, CMCC, LGe(target CQI)
* L1-RSRP: considered enhancement may be possible, by Samsung
* General: Docomo (by reporting once for shared content, joint coded field, or difference part only)

As consequence, the potential impact would be on UCI format, CSI computational requirements.

Therefore, a first proposal could be below for guiding further discussion while some following up proposals are also given for possible down-selection. Note, regarding the potential impact on CSI processing requirements, this may be common for power domain adaptation techniques and can be discussed together along with section 3.13 – ‘UE complexity/capability’.

**P4**

**If multi-CSI feedback is supported, for techniques for overhead/report payload/UE complexity reduction, considering the following aspects**

* **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP**
  + - **Impact on UCI format**
    - **Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**
    - **Constraint for e.g. differentiation of different CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial/antenna elements**
* **Signalling aspect including RRC configuration (e.g. wide-band or sub-band, ReportQuantity, power offset) and L1/L2 signalling (e.g. group common signalling, bitmap indication)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. We propose adding an FFS on the possibility of reporting shared report quantities for different CSI corresponding to two spatial adaptation patterns, e.g., common RI/PMI for two spatial patterns but different CQI values for each spatial pattern |
| vivo | Similar comment as P3. Performance benefits on multi-CSI feedback regarding how many throughput and power saving gain, how much UE complexity and overhead reduction can be achieved should be carefully evaluated and clarified first. After there are more evaluation results and analyzes to show clear benefit, whether and how to consider enhancement for overhead reduction/UE complexity reduction can be discussed later. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal with following update.  **~~If multi-CSI feedback is supported, f~~For techniques for overhead/report payload/UE complexity reduction, considering the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP**   + - **Impact on UCI format**     - **Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Constraint for e.g. differentiation of different CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial/antenna elements**   **Signalling aspect including RRC configuration (e.g. wide-band or sub-band, ReportQuantity, power offset) and L1/L2 signalling (e.g. group common signalling, bitmap indication)** |
| Apple | As we have stated in P1, it is unclear which is better, single CSI with complete CSI feedback or multi-CSI with compressed CSI feedback, so it is too early to discuss on this part yet. We could focus on the single CSI or multiple CSI in multiple reporting instances first. |
| Spreadtrum | Analog beam is related to coverage and mobility. They are not adapted so dynamically. |
| ETRI | It seems premature to agree on these details at this stage. “Study” instead of “consider” may be fine for us. |
| Fujitsu | For the first sub-bullet, the feasibility of shared CSI reporting (especially for RI and PMI) corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns needs to be verified first. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support in general.  In our understanding, the multi-CSI has impact on CSI report content, but no impact on UCI format. We think same UCI format determination (like format 1,2,3,) can be applied to this CSI enhancement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the proposal. However, we have the following proposals:   1. Remove L1-RSRP since it not clear how it can help in spatial adaptation or power adaptation 2. Remove the sub-bullet “**Constraint for e.g. differentiation of different CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial/antenna elements**” because the advantage of having such differentiation in the reporting is not clear. 3. L1/L2 signaling is not agreed yet and we do not expect that it will be needed for **configuration** **overhead/report payload/UE complexity reduction**   Hence, we propose the following modifications:  **If multi-CSI feedback is supported, for techniques for configuration overhead/report payload/UE complexity reduction, consider~~ing~~ the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI~~/L1-RSRP~~**   + - **Impact on UCI format**     - **Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **~~Constraint for e.g. differentiation of different CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial/antenna elements~~** * **Signalling aspect including RRC configuration (e.g. wide-band or sub-band, ReportQuantity, power offset) and L1/L2 signalling (e.g. the need of L1/L2 signalling, if L1/L2 is needed whether it is group common signalling, if L1/L2 signalling is needed whether there is a need for bitmap indication)** |
| Nokia/NSB | First, we think it would be better to decouple the ‘UL overhead/report payload’ and ‘UE complexity reduction’ aspects at a first stage.  On the ‘UL overhead/report payload’ aspect, we think that Approaches 1 and 2 that we listed in our input on P3 could be a good starting point, as these approaches would somewhat result in low UL overhead by design (and up to gNB decision).   * Approach 1: UE is configured to select X (such as 1 or 2, etc.) spatial patterns, from a set of indicated candidate spatial patterns, for which the UE reports the corresponding CSI(s) to the gNB. * Approach 2: UE only reports CSI for one spatial adaptation in an UL reporting occasion.   In general, we should aim at reusing the existing CSI framework whenever possible. Also, optimizations on the CSI report content/quantities could be discussed at a later stage once the baseline operation is defined. We should avoid spending time on optimizations if the baseline operation is still not fully clear/defined.  On the second bullet point, although it’s generic, we are generally fine with considering the signalling aspects. |
| MediaTek | Support.  The proposal is inclusive and also provides good directions for companies’ further investigations and discussions. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer to deprioritize this proposal. The detailed techniques can be discussed after multi-CSI feedback is agreed. |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | Support in high-level. The proposal may be formulated in a more directive statement with clear spec impacts. |
| InterDigital | We think it is early to discuss the details of overhead reduction and the related enhancements, before discussing the benefit of multi-CSI feedback (in single report) compared to single CSI feedback. The discussions related to P4 can be considered at later stage. |
| Panasonic | Same Comment with that to P3. |
| Ericsson | Firstly, we agree with Nokia that overhead reduction and UE complexity reduction are separate topics and should be decoupled and discussed separately.  We think the bullet “Constraint for e.g., differentiation …” is unclear and should be removed  We think the examples in the final bullet “Signaling aspect …” should be removed.  As we commented previously, CSI reporting on PUSCH it may not be motivated to reduce overhead as there are not the same overhead restrictions as on PUCCH. So there should be a bullet on “Impact on channel carrying UCI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH  We agree with Huawei that L1-RSRP should be removed. In current specifications, the UE computes L1-RSRP for multiple CSI-RS resources and is configured to report top-N L1-RSRP values, where N is configurable.  Suggested updates below.  **P4**  **If multi-CSI feedback is supported, for study of techniques for overhead/report payload~~/UE complexity~~ reduction, consider~~ing~~ the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI~~/L1-RSRP~~**   + - **Impact on UCI format**     - **Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Impact on channel carrying UCI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **~~Constraint for e.g. differentiation of different CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial/antenna elements~~** * **Signalling aspect including RRC configuration ~~(e.g. wide-band or sub-band, ReportQuantity, power offset)~~ and L1/L2 signalling ~~(e.g. group common signalling, bitmap indication)~~** |
| LG Electronics | We are generally fine with the proposal but it needs to clarify what is the meaning of UCI format. In addition, the priority reporting levels between multiple CSI information and the priority rule for handling collision between the CSI reports in the time-domain can be also considered. |
| FL2 | The following is considered.  **P4-rev1**  **for multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), for techniques for overhead/report payload~~/UE complexity~~ reduction, study the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI~~/L1-RSRP~~**   + - **~~Impact on UCI format~~**     - **Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Impact on channel carrying UCI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **~~Constraint for e.g. differentiation of different CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial/antenna elements~~** * **~~Signalling aspect including RRC configuration (e.g. wide-band or sub-band, ReportQuantity, power offset) and L1/L2 signalling (e.g. group common signalling, bitmap indication)~~** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| China Telecom | Fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO2 | We support the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | We are generally okay with the proposal..  Details in sub-bullet can be added to make it clearer.   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI**   + - **Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Impact on channel carrying UCI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **Solutions to compressing the CSI overhead, e.g.,common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI**       * **Other solutions are not excluded.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is agreed last meeting that "UE complexity needs to be taken into account" and the enhancement with reduced payload, looking into how they are achieved according to multiple companies' input in Q3, also help reduce the UE complexity. ’ Therefore, if this is not added in the P4-rev1, we request a separately bullet to capture this, e.g.  **for multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), for techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect**   * **Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.**   As discussed in our contribution, the multiple CSIs calculation complexity can be reduced by the correlation on CSI-RS resources and PMI. For example, there are 2 patterns and each patterns has 4 resources. Due to the CSI-RS resource correlation, after the best CSI-RS resource is determined for one pattern, the UE knows the best CSI-RS resource of another pattern without iteration in all 4 CSI-RS resources. Then, the CPU occupation can be reduced from 8 to 5. |
| InterDigital | Ok with the updated proposal |
| ITRI | In our perspective, we are fine with P4-rev1 if multi-CSI feedback is agreed. |
| Qualcomm2 | The proposal direction is fine in general. We propose making the following **update**.   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI with following considerations**    + - **Impact at least on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Impact on channel carrying ~~UCI~~ CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **Impact on UE complexity** |
| Lenovo2 | We believe it is necessary to keep the bullet corresponding to “impact on UCI format”. The mapping order of CSI fields when multiple CSI is reported would be necessary to complete the specification, as done for all CSI reporting types. |
| Intel | Generally ok with proposal P4-rev1 |
| Futurewei | Is the understanding correct that these enhancements should only be applicable to the multi-CSI feedback case? Or should we also clarify what the ‘multi-CSI feedback’ options are? |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the updated proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We cannot work on something in details which has not been agreed.  Suggest to clarify and agree on P3 first, then to further discuss the details on P4.  Also, as we commented on P3, it would be better to first define spatial adaptation pattern, CSI-RS resource configuration, CSI report configuration, and the interaction between those, etc.  In other words, ‘enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI’ should not be our priority now. |
| ETRI | Fine with the updated proposal. |
| Fujitsu2 | CSI computation and CPU occupation is related to UE complexity. We suggest to remove this sub-bullet as UE complexity reduction is removed in the main bullet.  **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), for techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI**   + - **~~Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation~~**   **Impact on channel carrying UCI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH** |
| CATT | We are OK with proposal P4-rev1 |
| Apple2 | Focus on the baseline mode first, where UE reports one CSI separately in each reporting instance corresponding to multiple spatial adaptations. When the baseline mode is defined clear enough, we are fine to study necessary enhancement for overhead reduction. |
| Samsung2 | We disagree to remove L1-RSRP. Is the removal because 1) it is considered not relevant to SD adaptation or because 2) an enhancement to current L1-RSRP reporting mechanism is not needed?   1. In the input provided by Huawei, HiSilicon, it was mentioned that ‘Remove L1-RSRP since it not clear how it can help in spatial adaptation or power adaptation’. When Type 2 SD adaptation is performed by gNB and, thereby, gNB’s beam shape and Tx power change, L1-RSRP is necessary to assess the impact of adaptation.   In the input provided by Ericssion, it was mentioned that ‘In current specifications, the UE computes L1-RSRP for multiple CSI-RS resources and is configured to report top-N L1-RSRP values, where N is configurable’. Is the intention of this sentence to note that differential L1-RSRP reporting is already supported? If so, we agree on that specific aspect no additional enhancement is needed. However, there are other aspects that we think an enhancement is needed for L1-RSRP when Type 2 SD adaptation is performed, e.g., UE behavior for calculating L1-RSRP when timeRestrictionForChannelMeasurements is not configured. |
| vivo | We would like to note that for UE to report CSIs associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns, study on techniques for overhead/report payload can be considered.  Besides, we think CSI computation and/or CPU occupation are not related to overhead reduction. So this sub-bullet needs to be removed.  We suggest the following change for the proposal.  **P4-rev1**  **for UE providing N CSIs associated with *N* CSIs associated with *N* spatial adaptation patterns in one or multiple reports where ~~multi-CSI feedback~~** **(if agreed), for techniques for overhead/report payload~~/UE complexity~~ reduction, study the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI~~/L1-RSRP~~**   + - **~~Impact on UCI format~~**     - **~~Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation~~**     - **Impact on channel carrying UCI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **~~Constraint for e.g. differentiation of different CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial/antenna elements~~** |
| LG Electronics2 | We are generally fine with the proposal. But, as we commented, if multi-CSI feedback is supported, the priority reporting levels between multiple CSI information and the priority rule for handling collision between the single-CSI report and the multi-CSI report in the time domain should be also considered. |
| Ericsson 2 | Okay with the FL2 proposal; however, we think that the baseline is no O/H reduction, and this should be captured in the proposal.  We prefer to keep report overhead reduction and UE complexity aspects as separate discussions  Suggestion the following revision  **P4-rev1**  **for multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported. For techniques for overhead/report payload~~/UE complexity~~ reduction, study the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI~~/L1-RSRP~~**   + - **~~Impact on UCI format~~**     - **Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Impact on channel carrying UCI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **~~Constraint for e.g. differentiation of different CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial/antenna elements~~** * **~~Signalling aspect including RRC configuration (e.g. wide-band or sub-band, ReportQuantity, power offset) and L1/L2 signalling (e.g. group common signalling, bitmap indication)~~** |
| CMCC2 | Fine with FL’s update of the proposal and ZTE’s version. And we are open to further discuss the CPU occupation issues. |
| **FL2e** | @Fujitsu, vivo, Ericsson, Huawei  CSI computation may be related to the CSIs to be calculated and how it is counted/reported, thus it is related to overhead/reporting payload. I understand UE complexity can also be separately considered, if others also view CSI computation is more about UE complexity. However, the overhead reduction techniques inevitably would have potential impact on UE complexity anyway, as mentioned by QC. So for now they are kept.  @FW, the multi-CSI is referred to a previous proposal.  @Nokia/NSB, Apple,  If there are any potential issues for a baseline mode that have not been included in the summary, please also indicate and I will add new discussion points. I encourage all companies also have sufficient input for those topics including the topics already in the summary, such as adaptation pattern definition, resource configuration etc..  **P4-rev2**  **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported.**  **For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations**   + - **Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information**     - **Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI**       * **Other solutions are not excluded.**     - **Impact on UE complexity**   **For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect**   * **Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO3 | We support the proposal in principle.  For the solutions to compress the CSI overhead, we think that the method of joint coded quantity, e.g., joint coded RIs which is used in CSIs of R17 NCJT, could be considered as well. So we suggest to **take** **minor update as follow.**    **P4-rev2**  **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported.**  **For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations**   + - **Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information**     - **Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI**        * **Other solutions are not excluded.**     - **Impact on UE complexity**   **For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect**   * **Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.** |
| Spreadtrum2 | Support version of Qualcomm2 |
| LG Electronics3 | We are fine with the proposal.  @DOCOMO: Could you explain how to compress CSI overhead using co-coded RI? |
| OPPO | We re-iterate our comment in P3: we suggest to nail down first the value of L and N in P3 before deciding the necessity of overhead reduction in P4. |
| FL | @OPPO  Narrowing-down the value of L and N is probably to be discussed during UE capability phase, normally. For study purpose, without agreeing on the techniques, is it acceptable? |
| MTK2 | Support **P4-rev2** with **DoCoMo revision**. Although the version looks general enough for potential agreement, the study scope looks quite wide. For assisting progress, we would like to point out most essential overhead and UE complexity reduction is expected from shared CRI/RI/PMI, which can be considered in the study. |
| ZTE, Sanechips3 | Support **P4-rev2** with **DoCoMo** revision.  We think it is not easy to determine the exact value of L, N at this moment. Moreover, similar issues are being discussed in in other proposals, like the impact on CPU/complexity. |
| Fujitsu3 | We agree that CSI computation may be related to overhead/report payload. However, they may also be independent in some cases. For example, CSIs corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns are calculated independently, while differential CSIs are reported. In this case, the overhead/report payload is reduced but the amount of CSI calculation is not reduced. We suggest the following update to make it more clear that we only need to consider the impact on CSI computation and UE complexity if it is identified.  **P4-rev2**  **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported.**  **For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations**   + - **Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information**     - **Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any is identified**     - **Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI**       * **Other solutions are not excluded.**     - **Impact on UE complexity, if any is identified**   **For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect**   * **Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.** |
| Nokia/NSB3 | @FL, Thanks for your reply, please find our text adding below to P4-rev2 with yellow-highlighted  **P4-rev2**  **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed),**  **At least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported.**  Support multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions as baseline.  FFS: Corresponding enhancements on report configuration with Periodic, Semi-Periodic and Aperiodic report  **For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations**   + - **Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information**     - **Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI**       * **Other solutions are not excluded.**     - **Impact on UE complexity**   **For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect**   * **Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.** |
| Futurewei | Support with some additional revision/clarification…. On the complexity reduction, should be clarified what is the possible specs impact. |
| Apple2e | We would like to elaborate more on the multi-CSI feedback mode, where the following two modes are both included, (which is similar to Nokia’s understanding)  Multi-CSI feedback mode A: N CSIs from L sub-configurations are reported in multiple reporting instances.  Multi-CSI feedback mode B: N CSIs from L sub-configurations are reported in one reporting instance.  Based on the understanding, we propose the following changes to P4-rev2:  **For multi-CSI feedback mode A (if agreed), at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported.**  **For multi-CSI feedback mode B (if agreed), at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported, and the CPU occupation and active CSI-RS resource calculation is scaled with N.**  **For ~~techniques~~ ~~for~~ reporting overhead/~~report~~ payload reduction, study the following aspects**   * **~~Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations~~**   + - **Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information**     - **Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**     - **Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI**       * **Other solutions are not excluded.**     - **Impact on UE complexity**   **For ~~techniques for~~ UE complexity reduction, study ~~the following aspect~~ techniques to reduce CPU occupation**   * **~~Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.~~** |
| Lenovo3 | We support P4-rev2 provided by the FL |
| Samsung2e | Support |
| Qualcomm2e | For the case of no overhead reduction, we suggest an **update**:   * Per our understandings, UE is expected to report CSI for each configured spatial adaptation pattern. For NES, it is not preferred to redesign CSI report structure. Hence, whether we have multiple CSIs in one report or having one CSI in one report, the legacy CSI report structure should remain unchanged. * Reporting multiple CSIs in a report works as follows: UE generates CSI for each spatial adaptation pattern in a legacy CSI report structure and multiplexes these CSI reports to send in an PUCCH or PUSCH - This is already supported by current spec when the CSI reporting occasions overlap. For a given CSI report config with multiple spatial adaptation patterns, by itself, the UE is expected to process/report CSIs for spatial adaptation patterns in the same reporting occasion (due to common CSI report config) 🡪 current report structure/multiplexing works for NES.   **P4-rev2**  **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported.**   * **As a baseline, UE reports a separate CSI report for each CSI corresponding to each spatial adaptation pattern.** |
| Ericsson 2e | We support P4-rev2 from the FL.  One side comment: we don’t agree with the view from some companies that the baseline for multi-CSI reporting should be separate CSI reporting instances, since the current CSI framework in NR for aperiodic CSI reporting supports triggering multiple reports in one reporting instance on PUSCH (based on multiple CSI-ReportConfigs). Using a single CSI-ReportConfig with multiple sub-configurations for NES purposes should not fundamentally restrict the ability to have multiple CSI reports in one reporting instance on PUSCH. |
| CATT | We support Proposal P4-rev2. The CSI report on PUSCH has no capacity limit. We agree with Ericsson that using a single CSI-ReportConfig should be the baseline. |

**FL3e**

@Nokia, Apple, Qualcomm

With the discussion following P3-remaining, it should be fine not to change the proposal here considering the case of multi-UL occasions. However, it is desirable to keep the necessary information for study of overhead reduction, e.g. the target is the CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP based on companies’ observation, not other part in CSI.

@All

Rev4 is provided with highlighted changes according to the comments.

**P4-rev3**

For multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported

* FFS: any conditions for the above, e.g. when L, N is smaller than certain value.

For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects

* Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations
  + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information
    - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any
    - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH
    - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI
      * Other solutions are not excluded.
    - Impact on UE complexity, if any

For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect

* Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.

**P4-rev4**

For multi-CSI feedback, at least the baseline case of below is supported

* no overhead/report payload reduction
  + FFS: configurations or any conditions for the above, e.g. when L, N is smaller than certain value.
* CPU occupation is scaled with N

multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions.

For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects

* Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations
  + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information
    - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any
    - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH
    - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI
      * Other solutions are not excluded.
    - Impact on UE complexity, if any

For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect

* Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO4 | It is better that whether the overhead reduction methods applied or not could be configured by gNB according to different adaptation types. E.g., For Type 1 adaptation, we can consider CRI is common, but CQI is different, and for Type 2 adaptation, we can consider CRI is different, but CQI is common. So we suggest the following update.  **For multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported**   * **FFS: configurations or any conditions for the above, e.g. when L/N is smaller than certain value.**   **For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects**   * **Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations**   + - **Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information**     - **Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any**     - **Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**     - **Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI**        * **Other solutions are not excluded.**     - **Impact on UE complexity, if any**   **For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect**   * **Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.** |
| Intel | General ok. Agree with Docomo’s changes. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with Docomo’s version. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK. |
| ZTE, Sanechips3e | We agree with DOCOMO that whether overhead/report payload reduction is used can be configured by gNB. Hence, similar update is suggested.  **P4-rev3**  For multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported   * FFS: any conditions for the above, e.g. when L/N is smaller than certain value, gNB configuration. |
| ETRI | Fine with Docomo’s and ZTE’s versions. |
| Apple3e | As mentioned in our comment to P3-remaining-1, for the supported multi-CSI feedback case, we are fine to support the case of overhead/report payload reduction, with the condition that CPU occupation scaled with N. We think this condition is important, otherwise, there is no room for CPU occupation reduction as mentioned in the last bullet of the proposal. We could either agree it in P3-remaining-1 or here.  **For multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported**   * **CPU occupation is scaled with N** * **FFS: any conditions for the above, e.g. when L/N is smaller than certain value.** |
| Nokia/NSB3 | @FL: we understood the overhead/report payload reduction is important for some companies, but as commented in the previous round, the baseline with multi-CSI feedback with UE reports for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions should also supported.  We propose to split the P4-rev3 into two proposals for better handling of the two cases:  **P4-rev3-1:**  For multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported  Support multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions as baseline.  **P4-rev3-2:**  For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects   * Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity, if any   For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect   * Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction. |
| Fujitsu4 | We are fine with P4-rev3. |
| Qualcomm3e | The proposal is generally fine. We suggest removing FFS under the 1st main bullet. |
| Lenovo3e | Support |
| CATT | We are OK with P4-rev3. |
| Samsung3e | Support the proposal. A minor editorial comment: In the first FFS, L/N 🡪 L, N, as L/N can be misleading to a ratio of the two. |
| LG Electronics4 | We are fine with ZTE’s suggestion.  **@DOCOMO:**  Actually we asked a clarification question on joint-coded RI (that was proposed from NTT DOCOMO) but haven’t received any responses.  Again, could you please explain how to compress CSI overhead using joint-coded RI? |
| China Telecom | We support P4-rev3. |
| Ericsson 4 | OK with P4-rev3 |
| DOCOMO5 | @LGE  Sorry that I missed your questions.  For the joint coded RI, please find an illustration example considering Type 1 adaptation as follow.  If UE is configured to report CSIs for both 8-port and 4-port CSI-RSs and if the RI of 8-port CSI-RSs is rank2, the RI of 4-port CSI-RS could only be rank2 or rank1. There is no possibility of rank3 or rank4 for 4-port CSI-RSs in this case.  In this sense, we can explore the room of CSI payload reduction by joint-coded RI. Actually joint-coded RI is already applied for CSI feedback of multi-TRP in R17 MIMO. I think we can explore more benefits of bit reduction than that for R18 NES.  Also, we can also consider the joint-coding for quantities other than RI. |
| ZTE, Sanechips4 | For the following updated proposal, we think the OH reduction of multi-CSI reporting is clear. It was also agreed in the GTW that multi-CSI in one report is supported. Therefore, we don’t believe the “CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions” is baseline solution. Furthermore, even for the multi-CSI in separate reporting, the OH of CSI reporting can be also reduced by exploit the high correlation of precoding matrices.  Therefore, if we need to consider multi-CSI without no overhead/report payload reduction, we think it should be studied as well.  The following update is suggested.  **P4-rev4**  For multi-CSI feedback, study the following aspects  ~~at least the baseline case of below is supported~~  no overhead/report payload reduction   * + FFS: configurations or any conditions for the above, e.g. when L, N is smaller than certain value.   CPU occupation is scaled with N  multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions.  for techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, ~~study the following aspects~~   * + Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations     - * Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information       * Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any       * Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH       * Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI         + Other solutions are not excluded.       * Impact on UE complexity, if any   for techniques for UE complexity reduction, ~~study the following aspect~~   * + Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction. |
| FL3-fri | Please continue and you may choose one to further modify.  **P4-rev3**  For multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported   * FFS: any conditions for the above, e.g. when L, N is smaller than certain value.   For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects   * Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity, if any   For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect   * Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.   **P4-rev4**  For multi-CSI feedback, at least the baseline case of below is supported   * no overhead/report payload reduction   + FFS: configurations or any conditions for the above, e.g. when L, N is smaller than certain value. * CPU occupation is scaled with N   multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions.  For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects   * Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity, if any   For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect   * Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.   **P4-rev5**  For multi-CSI feedback, at least for study/comparison purpose, a baseline operation refers to one or more of the following operations   * + no overhead/report payload reduction w.r.t. CSI-RS resource configuration with N CSI-RS resources, N sub-configurations and N CSI(s) reports, with/without gNB triggering signalling   + UE reports a separate CSI report for each CSI corresponding to each spatial adaptation pattern   + CPU occupation is scaled with N   + multi-CSI feedback with UE reports in N occasions   For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects   * + Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations     - * Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information       * Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any       * Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH       * Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI         + Other solutions are not excluded.       * Impact on UE complexity, if any   For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect   * + Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction. |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We think N=1 and L>1 case can also take into account potential enhancement for overhead/payload reduction. Not sure why we just mention multi-CSI feedback case.  If there is common understanding that N=1 and L>1 case refers to multi-CSI feedback, we are fine to further study the potential enhancement. However, if not, we don’t think the this study is limited for multi-CSI feedback case. |
| OPPO | We are fine with P4-rev4 |
| CMCC4 | Thanks for FL’s updates.  P4-rev5 is our preference. Without overhead reduction and optimization of CPU occupation, multiple CSI feedback is just a scaling up of the legacy behavior in both CSI calculation and reporting. We cannot think it would be a baseline of the design. But if it is for the study or the comparison, we have no problem. Then the 1st part of P4-rev4 is not acceptable to us. The first part of the P4-rev3 are only supported in some conditions, which is still FFS. But this is kind of more acceptable than P4-rev4.  The 1st part of P4-rev5 only says it is at least for study/comparison. It is acceptable to us.  We have no problem to further study the overhead reduction mechanisms. And we are open for the enhancement of CPU occupation enhancements. |
| LG Electronics5 | We have comments on baseline case/operation.   * + - Regarding the bullet point related to CPU occupation, it doesn’t necessarily scale with N. For example, with A1-1-revised, if there are P resources for sub-configuration#1 and Q resources for sub-configuration#2, CPU occupation results in (P+Q) when N=2. Only if P=Q, CPU occupation is scaled with N. With this understanding, we can replace the bullet with ‘CPU occupation increases as N increases’.     - Regarding the bullet point related to reporting in N occasions, we don’t think reporting in multiple time domain instances is the baseline. Rather, reporting in a single time instance should be the baseline. |
| Spreadtrum3 | Generally fine. |
| MTK3-fri | Support **P4-rev4 with revision.**  We prefer CPU occupation rule is also included for the baseline case, and simple scaling with N looks sufficient. For multi-CSI feedback of the baseline case, multiple occasions may not be necessary for Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, and we can discuss it in **P-Q3-rev1**. Therefore, removal of the following sub-bullet is suggested:  ~~multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions.~~ |
| ZTE, Sanechips5 | **P4-rev3 :**  Firstly, as we comment above, we think overhead/report payload reduction is important for multi-CSI report.  Secondly, it was also agreed in the GTW that multi-CSI in one report is supported. Hence, we don’t think multi-CSI feedback with UE reports in N occasions should be a baseline.  Last, whether overhead/report payload reduction is used can be configured by gNB. And the **following modification for P4-rev3 is preferred.**  **P4-rev3**  For multi-CSI feedback, at least the case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported   * FFS: configuration or any conditions for the above, e.g. when L, N is smaller than certain value.   **P4-rev4:**  For P4-rev4, as we commented in “ZTE, Sanechips4”, what we agreed for multi-CSI is “multi-CSI in one report”, so this should be the baseline (if any), instead of separate CSI report or N reporting occasions. Furthermore, for a solution without any OH/complexity reduction, we cannot accept it as a baseline, either. Therefore, the first paragraph of **rev4 isn’t acceptable.**  **P4-rev5:**  For P4-rev5, for the sake for progress, we are okay to consider the listed bullets as the baseline operation for study/comparison, instead of for design target. **Therefore, P4-rev5 is okay for us.** |
| Fujitsu5 | We prefer P4-rev4 with MediaTek’s update. We think that CPU occupation is scaled with N is conflict with multiple CSIs are reported in multiple occasions. When a CSI is reported, the occupied CPU should be released. If multiple CSIs are reported in multiple occasions, CPU occupation would not scale with N. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer **P4-rev4** with the following updates to still consider the CPU counting as FFS:  **P4-rev4**  For multi-CSI feedback, at least the baseline case of below is supported   * no overhead/report payload reduction   + FFS: configurations or any conditions for the above, e.g. when L, N is smaller than certain value. * FFS: CPU occupation/counting ~~is scaled with N~~   multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions.  For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects   * Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity, if any   For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect   * Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction. |
| Intel | Prefer **P4-rev3** |
| Qualcomm3-fri | We support discussion direction of **P4-rev4**. We share the same views with MTK on CPU occupation and 2nd subbullet of the first part. Furthermore, we would like to clarify “**report N CSI(s) in one reporting instance**” in the agreement means N CSI reports are multiplexed and sent in one reporting instance.  Removing “if any”: why are these impacts singled out? If we keep it, we should add to all other impact bullets. Since this is under study, we suggest to remove it.  Our suggested update for P4-rev4:  **P4-rev4**  For multi-CSI feedback, at least the baseline case of below is supported   * no CSI overhead/report payload reduction   + FFS: configurations or any conditions for the above~~, e.g. when L, N is smaller than certain value~~. * CPU occupation is scaled with N   ~~multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions.~~  Note: “report *N* CSI(s) in one reporting instance” in the agreement means N CSI reports are multiplexed and sent in one reporting instance.  For techniques for CSI overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects   * Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation~~, if any~~     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity~~, if any~~   For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect   * Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not OK with the P4-rev4.  We prefer P4-rev5, however we are OK with P4-rev3. We want to point out that if the proponent support 1<N<L, the possible use case is also to reduce UE report payload. |
| CEWiT | we are ok with **P4-rev5** |
| InterDigital | We support **P4-rev5** |
| Ericsson 5 | For P4-rev4, we suggest below updates (in blue). The CPU occupation and scaling needs to be discussed for all cases. We would be OK to take that bullet independently for discussion. For PUSCH, the baseline should be no overhead reduction, and hence the multiple occasions bullet should be an FFS and for multiple PUCCH occasions.  We do not support P4-rev5 which turns everything into a study.  **P4-rev4**  For ~~multi-~~CSI feedback, at least the baseline case of below is supported   * no overhead/report payload reduction   + FFS: configurations or any conditions for the above, e.g. when L, N is smaller than certain value. * FFS: CPU occupation is scaled with N   FFS : ~~multi~~-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple PUCCH occasions.  For techniques for overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects   * Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation, if any     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity, if any   For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect   * Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction. |

**\*Week 2 start\***

Agreement

* + - For CSI feedback with CSI overhead/report payload reduction, further study whether/how to report a common value and/or a differential and/or joint coded value across same CSI quantity of different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following
    - CRI
    - RI
    - PMI
    - CQI
    - FFS: L1-RSRP
    - Other (new) report quantity, if any
    - further study
    - whether/how it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some sub-configurations/adaptation ~~spatial~~ patterns to reduce the burden at the UE

***Possible Agreement***

*For CSI feedback on PUSCH, at least the case without CSI overhead/report payload reduction is supported*

* *FFS: Details*

*For techniques for CSI overhead/report payload reduction, study the following aspects*

* *Enhancement for report of CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP with the following considerations*
  + - * *Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information*
      * *Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation*
      * *Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH*
      * *Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI* 
        + *Other solutions are not excluded.*
      * *Impact on UE complexity*

*For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect*

* + - *Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.*

The first pullet in the possible agreements has been incorporated in a previous proposal, and the other parts are for study purpose. Furthermore, two major questions debated over GTW is the baseline components of

1. CPU occupation scaled with N

multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions.

As for the 1st point, the framework configures L sub-configurations and can additional use L1 signalling to trigger N<L CSIs. UE complexity reduction is highly expected, and having the highest complexity case (scaled with N or L) as baseline somewhat is counter-productive. On the other hand, FL understands implementation wise linearly scaling could be the case with less changes.

Fancy design is not the target. It would be appreciated the group can focus on enhancements at this stage instead of the worst case (nothing more is agreed). While to ease the concern from UE vendors while keep motivating study of complexity reduction targeting a successful ecosystem, can the following be agreeable?

**FL4-baseline-Q1**

**If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is linearly scaled as [N, L].**

**Note: this does not mean that linearly scaled CPU occupation is not supported if any complexity reduction enhancements are agreed.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **N or L?** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | N | The CPU occupation mainly depends on the number of CSI measurements performed by the UE, whether the measurements correspond to the same or different CSI-RS resources. Since N corresponds to the number of triggered CSIs, the number of CPUs should scale with N |
| LG Electronics6 |  | As commented in LG Electornics5, CPU occupation isn’t necessarily scaled with N. For example, with A1-1-revised, if there are P resources for sub-configuration#1 and Q resources for sub-configuration#2, CPU occupation results in (P+Q) when N=2. Only if P=Q, CPU occupation is scaled with N. With this understanding, we can replace the bullet with ‘CPU occupation increases as N increases’. |
| DOCOMO6 |  | We prefer that complexity reduction techniques should be agreed. |
| Apple | N | If it is determined the N CSI(s) will be indicated by gNB, UE will only calculated N CSI(s). Otherwise, if UE selects N CSI(s) from L, this will be scaled by L, however, this is not our preference. |
| Intel | N | As long as UE does not pick out N CSI from L patterns, the CPU requirement should scale with N. |
| vivo |  | We think how CPU occupation is scaled in case of N>1 needs further discussion. Besides, it should be subject to the UE capability on CSI processing, e.g., when a UE does not support scaling CPU occupation by N or L, what is the UE behavior. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | CPU occupation is mostly relevant for simultaneous CSI computations. Nevertheless, if the CSI reporting is conducted in a sequential manner, CPU occupation would scale only with respect to CSIs being reported in one UL reporting occasion.  We are fine with the overall principle that CPU occupation aspect would need to be considered. However, depending on whether one CSI-RS resource to one or more spatial patterns, in addition to N, we might also need to consider the number of CSI-RS resources. |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 |  | First, we also prefer that complexity reduction should be considered. We can further discuss how the scaling CPU when N>1.  Another thing is that, based on the current spec, the CPU is scaled based on the number of resource to be measurement, instead of number of reports N (there can be multiple resource within a resource set to be measured) or the number of sub-configurations L (Some of the configured resource may not be active yet). |
| Xiaomi | N | The CPU occupation is calculated by the number of CPUs for calculation of CSI reports in **a given OFDM symbol**. In this case, only the number of triggered reporting CSIs, i.e., N, influences the CPU occupation. |
| CATT | N | This is an implementation issue. No agreement is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not clear | We do not agree that **no** further complexity reduction techniques should be the baseline for the reasons we provided in our previous replies.  However, let us assume that the complexity reduction techniques are not agreed, then saying, that CPUs occupations will increase linearly when N and/or with L increase, is not clear and could be possibility not accurate. We cannot make such a claim before knowing for example how N or L will be mapped to the NZP CSI-RS resources that will be used for channel measurements. Hence, we think this should be for further study once the full relation between NES CSI-report-config and its L sub-config with resources used for measurements for different adaptation patterns is clear |
| Qualcomm4 | N | The legacy CPU occupancy counting is specified in TS 38.214 as “, where is the number of CSI-RS resources in the CSI-RS resource set for channel measurement.”  For the framework agreed for NES, if UE does not need to select N CSIs from L sub-configurations, the number of occupied CPUs is linearly scaled by N. In particular, the number of occupied CPUs is where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement referred by the nth sub-configuration for CSI reporting. |
| Samsung4 | N | N is the actual number of CSI calculation and reporting by UE. |
| Fujitsu6 | N | Calculation of CPU occupation should be based on N considering that N is the number of CSI measurements performed by UE. |
| Ericsson 6 | N | As commented previously, we hold the basic view that the CPU occupation should scale with N, and that there is no distinction between ap/sp/p-CSI reporting. |
| China Telecom | N | We support the proposal if it is just a baseline, and we support N. The CPU occupation is according to the CSI-RS resources being measured and reported. Therefore, the since the UE only need to select N CSIs, the N should be used for scaling.  But we prefer taking the overhead and complexity reduction into consideration in the future. |
| ETRI | N | Under no complexity reduction, CPU occupation will linearly scale with N. What we have agreed is N CSIs report derived based on N sub-configurations. It cannot reflect L sub-configurations. |
| CMCC5 |  | We have no problem of FL’s proposal. It means that without any enhancement on the CPU occupation, the legacy calculation mechanisms will be reused. We are open for the enhancements to the CPU occupation enhancements. If needed, this proposal should be a cocnclusion. |
| FL | A number of companies mention that the configured resources/sub-configurations may affect the ‘linearity’. Also a few companies would like to focus on what we can enhance instead of striving for a wording for baseline/no-enhancement case.  Indeed, FL consider this is a proposal to ease UE vendors’ concern in the end if we have nothing to be else agreed – naturally in this case, FL consider the spec will be written in a way that legacy approach applies whatever it is. Please consider this intention of the proposal and indicate whether you can live with it, although the wording may not be perfect enough.  **FL4e-baseline-Q1-as Conclusion:**  **If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is scaled as N increases.**   * + - **legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case** | |
| Samsung4e | Fine. | |
| Lenovo-4e | Support the conclusion | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine with the conclusion. | |
| LG Electronics7 | We have a problem to understand what “**CPU occupation is scaled as N increases**” exactly implies. Rather, we support Qualcomm’s equation for which the number of occupied CPUs is where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement corresponding to the nth sub-configuration for CSI reporting.  We don’t think this proposal is for conclusion, but we think this should be for agreement. | |
| China Telecom | Support the conclusion. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do agree with this conclusion. As we mentioned in our previous comment  Saying, that CPUs occupations will increase linearly when N and/or L increase, is not clear and could be possibility not accurate. We cannot make such a claim before knowing for example how N or L will be mapped to the NZP CSI-RS resources/group of resources that will be used for channel measurements. Hence, we think this should be for further study once the full relation between NES CSI-report-config and its L sub-config with resources used for measurements for different adaptation patterns is clear.  As we discussed before in our contribution, the CPU occupation for multiple CSIs calculation can be reduced by spatial correlation on CSI-RS resources and PMI. For example, there are 2 patterns and each pattern have 4 resources. Due to the CSI-RS resource correlation, after the best CSI-RS resource is determined for one pattern, the UE knows the best CSI-RS resource of another pattern without iteration in all 4 CSI-RS resources. Then, the CPU occupation can be reduced from 8 to 5.    Finally, N=1 does not allow the UEs to make reduced calculations in their CPUs due since the UE will not be able to exploit the correlation properties of different shutdown patterns then free their CPUs quickly for other purposed. The CPUs need to wait the reporting before being freed according to the current specification. | |
| MTK4e | Support with revision.  Given a CSI report sub-configuration can include multiple NZP-CSI-RS resources, the proposal by Qualcomm looks a reasonable revision for more precise conclusion. | |
| CMCC6 | Fine | |
| Apple | Support QC’s equation. | |
| Fujitsu | Support | |
| Xiaomi | Support the conclusion. | |

As for the 2nd point, since for SP-CSI a previous proposal has been provided for discussion, to focus on P-CSI and/or AP-CSI,

**FL4-baseline-Q2**

**Do you consider the case of below is the baseline, or should be supported for P-CSI and/or AP-CSI?**

* + **For a reportConfig, multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | - Under AP-CSI, reporting CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in multiple occasions can be supported via network implementation by triggering the different measurements separately over the multiple occasions  - Also, the benefit of such triggering is not clear. The network may trigger different UE/UE groups with different spatial adaptation patterns, e.g., UE 1 with pattern 1 and UE 2 with pattern 2, without the need for each UE to report CSI for all patterns |
| LG Electronics6 | We don’t think reporting in multiple time domain instances is the baseline. Rather, reporting in a single time instance should be the baseline. |
| DOCOMO5 | Not support.  The benefit of reporting CSIs of one **reportConfig** in multiple occasions is not clear compared with reporting in one occasion with overhead reduction. |
| Apple | For clarification, is this proposalsimilar to the discussion in FL4-sp-Q1?  We think the wording could be modified a little to:  **For a reportConfig, for N<L, N CSI(s) corresponding to different spatial adaptation pattern(s) can be reported in multiple occasions.**  We thinks N=1 should be considered as the baseline, since it does not need any reporting overhead reduction.  For AP-CSI, we don’t see how this can be achieved since only one reporting instance can be triggered. |
| Intel | Not support. We think single occasion multi-CSI feedback should be the baseline. |
| vivo | According to the assessment by FL, for L sub-configurations, UE complexity reduction is highly expected, and having the highest complexity case (scaled with N or L) as baseline somewhat is counter-productive. We think N=1 for L sub-configurations should be the baseline, which does not require CPU occupation be scaled by larger than one and has the lowest complexity for L sub-configurations. It should be also pointed out that CPU occupation for L sub-configurations does depend on the number of CSI to be reported in one report, rather than the number of sub-configurations configured by RRC. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes, if one trigger is used to triggering the multiple occasions (especially for SP-CSI), with reasons/benefits explained above. |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | No, we don’t think it is baseline. Instead, the agreed multi-CSI in one report is the baseline.  Firstly, it has no benefit compared with multi-CSI in one reporting.  Secondly, since the CPU is occupied from the activated CSI-RS to the end of CSI report, the time occupied by the reportConfig may be longer.  Thirdly, how to mapping the multiple CSIs to the multiple occasions is not clear and may require more work compared with multi-CSI in one reporting. |
| Xiaomi | The same view with LG. Reporting N CSIs in one occasion should be the baseline. |
| CATT | We need to have clarification on “multiple occasions”.  We support N=L for P-CSI report in one PUCCH resource and N<=L for A-CSI/SP-CSI in one reportConfig. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No. We agree with LG **multiple** occasions should not be the baseline from our point of view as we discussed in our previous reply for FL4-p-Q1  If multi-CSI feedback with UE reports CSI-feedback for each spatial adaptation pattern in **multiple** occasions, the multiple CSI payload cannot be reduced. |
| OPPO | We think the baseline should refer to the minimum spec impact. In this case, N=1, L>1, can be considered as a baseline. |
| Samsung4 | If reports are sent in two different occasions, why don’t we simply configure two multi-CSI reports? This is an optimization issue, which can be deprioritized at the current stage. Furthermore, despite the benefit, e.g., when PUCCH capacity is limited, the multi-CSI reporting can occur additional issues such as signaling overhead and dependency between the segmented reports in multiple occasions and their self-decodability. |
| Fujitsu6 | Not support. We share the same view as several companies that multi-CSI reporting on one occasion should be the baseline. |
| Ericsson 6 | At least for ap-CSI feedback, we do not agree to feedback on N CSIs in multiple occasions; the baseline is reporting N CSIs in one reporting instance. Actually, we are confused why this is open for discussion given the following agreement that for ap-CSI and sp-CSI, the feedback is in one reporting instance.  **Agreement**  For a CSI report config with *L* sub-configuration(s), support a framework that enables a UE to report *N* CSI(s) in one reporting instance where the *N* CSI(s) are associated with *N* sub-configuration(s) from *L* (where ) and each CSI corresponds to one sub-configuration.   * For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI. * For Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate report of N≤L CSIs where N>=1 * The maximum value of N and L are subject to UE capability * Further study how to address/minimize additional UE complexity |
| China Telecom | No. We share the similar as Xiaomi/ZTE/LG that the N CSI reporting in one occasion should be the baseline. |
| ETRI | Agree with LG. |
| CMCC5 | The mechanism of multiple occasion CSI reporting should be clarified first. |
| FL4e | The intention of the proposal is to discuss the need of reporting in multiple occasions, as a new function, for P/AP-CSI reporting in addition to what we have agreed.  Despite of which is the baseline, it seems whether to support this function is still debatable and this also relates to the question in -sp-Q1. Let’s focus on that proposal and hence, this question is closed. |

For remaining part of the possible agreements, it seems they are mostly what we can do for this meeting, considering the discussion in Q3-Q6. Therefore, simply taking the following as an agreement seems proper.

**FL4-content-Q1**

**The study for CSI overhead/report payload reduction consider at least the following aspects**

* + - * **Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information**
      * **Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**
      * **Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**
      * **Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common CRI/RI/PMI/CQI or differential RI/CQI or joint coded RI** 
        + **Other solutions are not excluded.**
      * **Impact on UE complexity**

**For techniques for UE complexity reduction, study the following aspect**

* + - **Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Support. Prefer to add a note, as follows:  **“Note: Strive to follow legacy design whenever applicable, to reduce specification effort”**  The enhancements under discussion require significant time to discuss/agree upon, and concluding this in the two remaining meetings of Rel-18 normative work is an extremely challenging task |
| LG Electronics | We are ok with the proposal in principle. |
| DOCOMO6 | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Ok with proposal. |
| vivo | Ok for further study.  To figure out the necessity of CSI overhead/report payload reduction, it is encouraged to provide more evaluation/analysis based on some common understanding, e.g., the methodology and assumption used in SI phase, to show the potential performance loss/impact due to overhead/payload reduction. |
| Nokia/NSB | No, but we are open for it with condition  As commented “***the case without CSI overhead/report payload reduction should also be supported***”, which has much less spec impact especially given the limited time until the Rel-18 completion. But we are open for any overhead/report payload reduction to be further discussed, meaning that we should first agree on the “***the case without CSI overhead/report payload reduction***”, then the necessary reduction enhancement on top. |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the Proposal. |
| CATT | We are OK to study but needs the motivation for the overhead reduction |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support this agreement in general. These aspects are important to be studied with the aim at the end to specify efficient and effective CSI NES framework |
| Qualcomm4 | CPU occupation reduction may not necessarily be equivalent to UE complexity. We suggest rewording the following:  **~~For techniques for UE complexity reduction,~~ further study ~~the following aspect~~**   * + - **Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.** |
| Samsung4 | Support the proposal with the following modifications:   * + **Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common (or threshold-based) CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI**      - **Other solutions are not excluded.** |
| Fujitsu6 | We agree with Lenovo that the required specification effort should also be considered. |
| Ericsson 6 | We are okay with **FL4-content-Q1** |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ETRI | Fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC5 | It should be clarified the difference between the 2nd bullet in first part and the sub-bullet of the 2nd part. |
| FL | Majority is fine with the core part. Please see the following modification. FL consider as examples, they are acceptable.  **FL4e-content-Q1**  **The study for CSI overhead/report payload reduction consider at least the following aspects**   * + - * **Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information**       * **Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**       * **Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH**       * **Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common (or threshold-based) CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI**          + **Other solutions are not excluded.**       * **Impact on UE complexity**   **Further study the following aspect**   * + - **Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction.** |
| Samsung4e | Support the revised proposal. |
| Lenovo-4e | Can Samsung please explain the meaning/intent of adding “or threshold-based” next to the report quantities? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Okay. |
| LG Electronics7 | We can accept FL4e-content-Q1 although it is uncertain why differential L1-RSRP is added (current specification already supports differential L1-RSRP reporting from our understanding). |
| Spreadtrum4 | Generally fine. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the proposal. However, we also don’t under the new added words colored in red, which may need further clarified. |
| DOCOMO7 | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine to study all these aspects. |
| MTK4e | Support but prefer no “(or threshold-based)”  The addition of “(or threshold-based)” is not clear since there is no context in the agreement |
| CMCC6 | Fine with the study. And same question as Lenovo to Samsung that what is the threshold-based for the reporting ? |
| Fujitsu | We share the same view as MTK that threshold-based is not clear and should be removed. |
| Xiaomi | Fine for study. |
| FL | **FL5-combined-Q1**   * For CSI reporting on PUSCH with ,   + - at least the case without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.       * Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused in principle     - This does not preclude that any techniques if agreed for CSI reporting on PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH, which is FFS. * The study for CSI overhead/report payload reduction consider at least the following aspects   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common [(or threshold-based)] CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity * If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is scaled as N increases.   + - legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case (i.e., where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement) * Further study the following aspect   + - Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction * FFS: for Semi-persistent CSI reporting in one reportConfig with , gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal in principle. The 3rd bullet might not be true to increase N if each CSI-RS resource is configured for each antenna pattern (e.g., for type 2 configuration). There is no scale of CPU occupation for the increase of the CSI reports. |
| Qualcomm-FL5 | For the 1st bullet, we prefer having it unified for both PUCCH and PUSCH. Furthermore, “without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression” is not clear as we pointed out earlier. We understood the proposal is trying to capture it under “Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused in principle”, but it is just additional clarification on report structure and report multiplexing. We suggest making it clear.  For the 3rd bullet, similar to CATT, the main bullet may not be trued. The formula is more accurate since different sub-configurations may have different number of resources. It should also be noted that whether the legacy/baseline of CPU occupancy can be reduced is already under the next FFS bullet “Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction”.  **FL5-combined-Q1**   * For CSI reporting ~~on PUSCH~~ with ,   + - at least the case ~~without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression~~ where one CSI report carries one CSI is supported.       * Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused in principle     - This does not preclude ~~that~~ any CSI overhead/report payload reduction techniques if agreed for CSI reporting ~~on PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH,~~ which is FFS. * The study for CSI overhead/report payload reduction consider at least the following aspects   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common [(or threshold-based)] CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity * ~~If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is scaled as N increases.~~   + - ~~legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case (i.e., where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement)~~   + As a baseline, the number of occupied CPUs is where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement in the nth sub-configuration for CSI reporting.     - Note: UE does not need to pick N out of L sub-configurations for CSI reporting * Further study the following aspect   + - Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction * FFS: for Semi-persistent CSI reporting in one reportConfig with , gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. |
| Intel | Ok with proposal FL5-combined-Q1.  We are not ok with Qualcomm’s edit to CPU calculation. We think this heavily depends on potential techniques for CSI compression being considered. We think moderator’s original formulation is better at this point in time. |
| Ericsson-FL5 | We support the direction of FL5-combined-Q1, but we have the following comments:   1. We think that in order to have something out of this WI, at least the case of no overhead reduction at least for PUSCH should be supported. Hence, we support the 1st main bullet with removal of the word “further” since it is not clear what further means in this context.    1. Regarding the sub-bullet about legacy CSI report structure, we think this is misleading, since we have already agreed to a new structure for CSI-ReportConfig with multiple sub-configurations. This is not legacy. We understand that multiplexing multiple CSIs on PUSCH may be similar to legacy, but still too early to say that it can be reused completely as is. Suggest removing the sub-bullet. 2. While we agree that CPU occupation scales linearly with N, and Qualcomm’s formula could be viewed as a step forward, it is probably too early to commit to saying that the legacy CPU occupation rule can be used as is, or to agree to a new formula now. We suggest removing the sub-bullet. 3. Regarding the last FFS bullet in the proposal, for the case of sp-CSI reporting on PUSCH we don’t see why the reports should be spread out over multiple occasions. Hence, we think the final bullet with should be limited to studying the case of sp-CSI reporting on PUCCH.   **FL5-combined-Q1**   * For CSI reporting on PUSCH with ,   + - at least the case without ~~further~~ CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.       * ~~Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused in principle~~     - This does not preclude that any techniques if agreed for CSI reporting on PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH, which is FFS. * Further ~~The~~ study ~~for~~ CSI overhead/report payload reduction considering at least the following aspects   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common [(or threshold-based)] CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity * ~~If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed,~~ At least Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is scaled as N increases.   + - ~~legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case (i.e., where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement)~~ * Further study the following aspect   + - Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction * FFS: for Semi-persistent CSI reporting on PUCCH in one reportConfig with , gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. |
| vivo | Ok for further study.  To study CSI overhead/report payload reduction, the impact of performance should also be considered. Therefore, it is encouraged to provide more evaluation/analysis based on the common methodology and assumption used in SI phase, to show the potential performance loss/impact due to overhead/payload reduction.  So we suggest to add a sub-bullet for the following.   * The study for CSI overhead/report payload reduction consider at least the following aspects   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common [(or threshold-based)] CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity     - **Impact on performance including UPT, energy saving gain**   Regarding the 3rd bullet, we share the similar view as CATT. And any potential enhancement for that is covered by the 4th bullet. So we think the 3rd bullet can be removed. |
| CMCC7 | For the 1st bullet, we are fine with either FL’s or E///’s version. We cannot support the updates from QC removing the limitation on PUSCH. Though we share a similar understanding that the overhead reduction should apply to both PUCCH and PUSCH. But the 1st sub-bullet under the 1st bullet, it says at least without overhead reduction is supported. From our understanding, it is more safe if we conclude it without PUCCH.  In the 2nd bullet, the bracketed *threshold-based* should be clarified.  for the 3rd bullet, we generally fine with the E///’s updates. It is not necessary going into the details of the calculation of CPU or the equation. With or without the equation quoted from current spec does not change anything. Then the general description is good enough. Details of the enhancements belongs to the other thread.  For the 5th bullet, we are fine with FL’s version. |
| CEWiT | Ok with proposal FL5-combined-Q1 |
| Samsung5 | We support the proposal in high-level. Overall, the proposal looks stable to us, except the last FFS point, which has not gained much traction so far. For progress and to increase the chance for deriving agreement in short online session tomorrow, we suggest to remove the FFS.   * ~~FFS: for Semi-persistent CSI reporting in one reportConfig with , gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc.~~ |
| LG Electronics8 | The direction could be fine but still we have several comments:   1. For the first bullet, we share the view with Qualcomm in that unified rule for PUSCH and PUCCH is preferred. We also share the view with Ericsson in that CSI reporting with N>1 sub-configurations is different from legacy behavior. 2. For the third bullet, we still think Qualcomm’s equation is technically correct and don’t think it is true that CPU occupation is scaled with N. As we took some examples previously, if the number of CSI-RS resource corresponding to a sub-configuration can be different per sub-configuration, CPU occupation is **NOT** scaled with N. Regarding the NOTE added by Qualcomm, we need a separate discussion on that.   In line with the above comments, we suggest following updates on top of Qualcomm’s.   * For CSI reporting ~~on PUSCH~~ with ,   + - [at least the case ~~without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression~~ where one CSI report carries one CSI (LGE: this is contradictory with the main bullet saying N>1) is supported.]     - at least the case without ~~further~~ CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.       * FFS: further details on CSI payload composition for this case       * FFS: whether this is applied only for CSI reporting on PUSCH       * ~~Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused in principle~~     - This does not preclude ~~that~~ any CSI overhead/report payload reduction techniques if agreed for CSI reporting ~~on PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH,~~ which is FFS. * The study for CSI overhead/report payload reduction consider at least the following aspects   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common [(or threshold-based)] CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity * ~~If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is scaled as N increases.~~   + - ~~legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case (i.e., where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement)~~   + As a baseline, the number of occupied CPUs is where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement ~~in the~~ corresponding to nth sub-configuration for CSI reporting.     - ~~Note: UE does not need to pick N out of L sub-configurations for CSI reporting~~ * Further study the following aspect   + - Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction * FFS: for Semi-persistent CSI reporting in one reportConfig with , gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support QC’ modification of the first bullet. As N>1, and “one CSI report carries one CSI” is not accurate as LG said in their comment.  For the 1st bullet, we do not agree to the base line. And we think it is a straight forward baseline if no CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported at the end of the study. In this agreement     * ~~For CSI reporting on PUSCH with ,~~    + - ~~at least the case without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.~~       * ~~Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused in principle~~     - ~~This does not preclude that any techniques if agreed for CSI reporting on PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH, which is FFS.~~   We are ok with the second bullet as it complements the list of study of the previous agreement  And the third bullet, we do not support QC’s modification on “As a baseline”. We do some modification on QC’s version. As the “Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction” is an independent bullet, “If no further CPU occupation reduction techniques are agreed” should be mentioned in this part.   * + If no further complexity reduction/CPU occupation reduction techniques are agreed,  ~~As a baseline,~~ the number of occupied CPUs is where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement in the nth sub-configuration for CSI reporting.     - Note: UE does not need to pick N out of L sub-configurations for CSI reporting |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the first bullet, since we agree to further study the CSI OH/report payload reduction, we don’t think we need to rush to say “the case without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported” before the outcome is clear.  Furthermore, we don’t think CSI reporting on PUSCH should be discussed separately from the CSI reporting on PUCCH. For both CSI reporting on PUSCH and reporting on PUCCH, a single CSI report framework is enough, otherwise, the gNB and UE implementation complexity will be increased.  We support the second bullet.  For the third bullet, we agree with Ericsson, it is too early to commit to saying that the legacy CPU occupation rule can be used as it is, or to agree to a new formula now. We also suggest to remove the sub-bullet.  For the FFS of multiple reporting occasions, we don’t think reporting multiple CSIs in two separate occasions is necessary. If it is supported, not only the CSI report configuration, but also the CPU occupation will be more complex. As we commented before, the benefit is unclear. However, for the sake of progress, we can live with it as FFS.  So our suggestion is as below.  **FL5-combined-Q1**   * For CSI reporting on PUSCH with ,   + - ~~at least~~ the case without further CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported if no CSI overhead/report payload reduction/compression is supported.       * ~~Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused in principle~~     - This does not preclude that any techniques if agreed for CSI reporting on PUCCH can be used for CSI reporting on PUSCH, which is FFS. * The study for CSI overhead/report payload reduction consider at least the following aspects   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common [(or threshold-based)] CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity * If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is scaled as N increases.   + - ~~legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case (i.e., where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement)~~ * Further study the following aspect   + - Enhancement for CPU occupation reduction * FFS: for Semi-persistent CSI reporting in one reportConfig with , gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc. |
| DOCOMO8 | We generally support the original proposal of **FL5-combined-Q1** from FL. We also shared the same view as Samsung that the FFS point did not have fully discussion so far. We suggest delete the FFS point.   * ~~FFS: for Semi-persistent CSI reporting in one reportConfig with , gNB can use one trigger to indicate the UE to report CSIs in different reporting occasions, e.g., N1 CSIs in one reporting occasion and N2 CSIs in next reporting occasion, etc.~~ |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with Qualcomm’s rewording proposal.  Besides, considering the limited TUs with only two meetings left, we would like to add a note to the 2nd-bullet point below with yellow highlighted:   * The study for CSI overhead/report payload reduction consider at least the following aspects   + - Impact on UCI format, e.g. mapping order or priority among CSI information     - Impact on at least CSI computation and/or CPU occupation     - Impact on channel carrying CSI, i.e., PUSCH, PUCCH     - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common [(or threshold-based)] CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI       * Other solutions are not excluded.     - Impact on UE complexity   Note 1: if to consider anything for CSI overhead reduction, we shall strive to reuse/leverage existing ways/approaches as much as possible (with minimum specs efforts).  At last not least, we may also need to discuss, whether there is the need to require such CSI overhead/report payload reduction by considering if the value of N per reporting occasion is limited to 2 only. |
| Xiaomi | For the first bullet, we share similar view with Ericsson. The legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing are confusing with multiple sub-configurations, we prefer to remove it.  For the CPU occupation rule on the third bullet, we have two concerns on the calculation equation, i.e., .  The first one is about . Referring to current spec, only satisfies under certain condition, e.g., higher layer parameter *reportQuantity* set to 'cri-RI-PMI-CQI', why we only constrain the calculation of CPU occupation for CSI reporting with N>1 into this situation?  [38.214, Sec.5.2.1.6]  A UE is not expected to be configured with an aperiodic CSI trigger state containing more than Reporting Settings.Processing of a CSI report occupies a number of CPUs for a number of symbols as follows:  - for a CSI report with CSI-ReportConfig with higher layer parameter *reportQuantity* set to 'none' and *CSI-RS-ResourceSet* with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* configured  - for a CSI report with *CSI-ReportConfig* with higher layer parameter *reportQuantity* set to 'cri-RSRP', 'ssb-Index-RSRP' or 'none' (and *CSI-RS-ResourceSet* with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* not configured)  - for a CSI report with *CSI-ReportConfig* with higher layer parameter *reportQuantity* set to 'cri-RI-PMI-CQI', 'cri-RI-i1', 'cri-RI-i1-CQI', 'cri-RI-CQI', or 'cri-RI-LI-PMI-CQI',  - if a CSI report is aperiodically triggered without transmitting a PUSCH with either transport block or HARQ-ACK or both when *L* = 0 CPUs are occupied, where the CSI corresponds to a single CSI with wideband frequency-granularity and to at most 4 CSI-RS ports in a single resource without CRI report and where *codebookType* is set to 'typeI-SinglePanel' or where *reportQuantity* is set to 'cri-RI-CQI', ,  - otherwise, , where is the number of CSI-RS resources in the CSI-RS resource set for channel measurement.  The second concern is about N. is sum of (n=1, 2,…,N). If the CPU occupation goes to that way, does it mean that UE **must** calculate N CSIs corresponding to N CSI reports in a given OFDM symbol? That is too restrictive. UE should be flexible enough to choose the number of CSIs for calculation based on its capability.  Based on above analysis, we prefer to remove the third bullet and waiting for further study.  For the last FFS, we also prefer to remove it. It is for trigger signalling, and should be discussed separately. |
| Apple-FL5 | General OK with **FL5-combined-Q1.**  For the 3rd bullte, regarding the description on “using legacy CPU occupation rule”, we think it might be misleading and contrary to the main bullet that the CPU occupation will be scaled, we suggest the following update to be clear, that only for each sub-configuration, the CPU rule is reused.  For the case mentioned by CATT where each CSI-RS resource is configured for each antenna pattern (e.g., for type 2 configuration)., we think if N CSI(s) are to be reported in an instance, the CPU will still scale with N.  **FL5-combined-Q1**   * … * If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is scaled as N increases.   + - For each sub-configuration, legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case (~~i.e.,~~e.g. where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement associated with the nth sub-configuration) * **…**   **For the last FFS, we propose to keep as it is, as this also provides a way to provide a total L CSI(s) and since it is the FFS, it can be studied together with other proposals.** |
| Fujitsu7 | For the first bullet about CSI reporting, we share the same view as Ericsson that the following sub-bullet should be removed. For multi-CSIs reported in one CSI report, there is not legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing that can be reused.   * + - * ~~Legacy CSI report structure and multiplexing is reused in principle~~   For third bullet about the calculation of CPU occupation calculation, we support Qualcomm and LG’s equation. It can accommodate the case where different sub-configurations refer to different numbers of CSI-RS resources.   * ~~If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is scaled as N increases.~~   + - ~~legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case (i.e., where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement)~~   As a baseline, the number of occupied CPUs is where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement ~~in the~~ corresponding to nth sub-configuration for CSI reporting. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support the changes to the first and third bullets (CSI reporting on PUSCH with and CPU occupation) from Ericssion-FL5. The last FFS can be kept as is from the FL proposal. |
| MTK5 | Support with some revisions on 2nd and 3rd bullets  On the subbullet of 2nd bullet:  “[(or threshold-based)]” still looks unclear. Based on FL summary of companies’ contributions, it should come from the following proposal:  “Differential/**threshold-based** reporting of CSI quantities such as CQI, L1-RSRP”  In this regard, the following revision is suggested:   * + - Solutions to compress the CSI overhead, e.g. common ~~[(or threshold-based)]~~ CRI/RI/PMI/CQI/L1-RSRP, or differential/threshold-based reporting of RI/CQI/L1-RSRP or joint coded RI   On 3rd bullet:  “CPU occupation is scaled as N increases” **is not clear**. Scaled can be scaled down instead of scaled up. In the regard, **either of the following can avoid such confusion**:   * If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is ~~scaled as~~ increased with N ~~increases~~. FFS: detailed rule.   + - ~~legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case (i.e., where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement)~~   If no further complexity reduction techniques are agreed, ~~Rel-18 NES supports that CPU occupation is scaled as N increases.~~ legacy CPU occupation rule is reused in principle in this case (i.e., where is the total number of NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement) |
| ETRI | We are generally fine with the proposal. We prefer to remove two subbullets in first and second bullets as suggested by Ericsson-FL5. |

**\*Week 2 end\***

**Q3**

**For multi-CSI feedback (if supported), do you consider whether/which/how of the following can be enhanced for CSI report content reduction?**

* **CRI**
* **RI**
* **PMI**
* **CQI**
* **L1-RSRP**
* **Other (new) CSI content, if any**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company and comments** | | **CRI** | **RI** | **PMI** | **CQI** | **L1-RSRP** | **Other content** | **Other comments** |
| e.g. Company A | Which |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DOCOMO | Which | Common CRI | Common CRI,  Joint coded RI | Common PMI | Differentiate CQI |  |  |  |
| How | Feasibility of reporting common or different CRI according to gNB configuration | For Type 1 adaptation, joint coded RI can be considered.  For Type 2 and power adaptation, common RI can be expected. | For power adaptation, common PMI can be expected. | Wideband Differentiate CQI can be expected. |  |  |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Which | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |
| How | Common  CRI | Differential RI | Common PMI | Differential CQI |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Which | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N |  |
|  | How | Based on the correlation on CSI-RS resources corresponding to different spatial patterns, one CRI can represents multiple best CSI-RS resources. The correlated CSI-RS resources can be pre-configured by gNB or predefined. | For spatial adaptation, the rank may be fall-back, multiple RIs may be needed. Whether multiple RIs can be further compressed, we are open to it. | Based on the correlation on PMIs in the best CSI-RS resource, only one PMI is sufficient in some cases. For example, if the RI remains the same, one PMI can be reported by UE. If the RI is fall-back, the precoding matrix with low rank can be determined/selected from the precoding matrix with highest rank. | Differential CQIs can be reported by UE. | L1-RSRP is used for beam management. it not clears how it can help in spatial adaptation or power adaptation |  |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Please see our input to Q2.  Also, we don’t think discussing such optimizations is essential now, as we should first focus on defining the baseline operation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samsung |  | - | - | Provide separate configurability on whether PMI is reported for each of the multiple reports. Also, consider reusing DFT basis set between reports. | Differential report. | Differential report | Indicator for a subset of multiple reports to share PMI/CQI/RI. UE only report shared PMI/CQI/RI for the subset of reports; for the remaining reports, separate PMI/CQI/RI are reported. | Consider providing indication to UE for whether to perform multi-CSI reporting or not for P/SP reports. |
| Intel | Which | Common CRI | Common RI | Common PMI |  |  |  |  |
| How | While sub-optimal it could be possible to have a common CRI be applied for all spatial patterns. Similarly for rank as well.  Use of common PMI require bit more discussion, since PMI for different number of ports can’t be derived directly from one set of PMI feedback. However, it may be possible to sub portion of the precoding matrix to formulate precoding matrix for smaller number of port case. | | |  |  |  |  |
| Ericsson 2 |  |  | | |  |  |  | At least we think that N CSIs should be reported without overhead reduction, based on occupation of N CPUs. Multi-CSI reporting on PUSCH is a natural candidate, for which overhead is not a significant concern.  Potential overhead reduction/compression can be studied further as a possible “add on” |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |  |
| **FL3** | | Assuming the “case of no overhead/report payload reduction is supported” in P4-rev2 is agreeable, FL considers discussion on details of reduction of overhead and/or UE complexity is necessary.  Also following up along with Nokia’s comments in P4-rev2 and input from Q3, there may be common aspects for example, when a UE can assume some patterns can be skipped for evaluation or CSI computation, then an ‘assumed’ CSI component can be used. For facilitating the study, a proposal is made.  **P-Q3**   * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study the feasibility to report a common value and/or a differential value across different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following**   + - **CRI**     - **RI**     - **PMI**     - **CQI**     - **L1-RSRP**     - **Other (new) CSI content, if any**     - **FFS: configuration/indication details, e.g. bitmap, joint coded indication** * **For multi-CSI feedback, for CSI computation or CPU occupation, further study**   + - **whether it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some spatial patterns to reduce the burden at the UE**     - **(if not agreed separately) whether there is need for CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions**   @All  An update -rev1 is provided below.  **P-Q3-rev1**   * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study whether/how to report a common value and/or a differential /or joint coded value across same CSI quantity of different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following**   + - **CRI**     - **RI**     - **PMI**     - **CQI**     - **FFS: L1-RSRP** * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study**   + - **whether it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some spatial patterns to reduce the burden at the UE**     - **(if not agreed separately) whether there is need for CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions** | | | | | | |
| **Company** | | **Comments** | | | | | | |
| Panasonic | | We think the first bullet can be discussed for both cases of multi-CSI in one or multiple reporting occasions.  Regarding which CSI quantity can be reported with common and differential value, it depends on the concrete hypothetical adaptation patterns from gNB side, e.g. with fixed rank to check differential CQI by different number of ports, or with fixed number of ports to check differential L1-RSRP by different beam directions, or with fixed number of ports to check differential ranks and CQIs. So it can be a bit confusing to mix all the quantities together. Thus our suggestion is to have clearer structure like, which are common values and which are differential values and how to pair them. | | | | | | |
| Lenovo3 | | The list is pretty exhaustive, however we are OK to support since this is only for study | | | | | | |
| Samsung3 | | Support the proposal in high-level. In addition, **thresholding-based reporting** can be also considered. For instance, CQI/L1-RSRP for the second sub-configuration is reported when the difference with respect to the reporting quantity for the first sub-configuration is greater than a certain threshold. Similarly, PMI for the second sub-configuration is reported when a measured distance, e.g., in terms of L-norm, NMSE, etc., between the PMI matrix for the second sub-configuration and that for the first sub-configuration is greater than a certain threshold. | | | | | | |
| DOCOMO4 | | Thank you for the update. It is similar as P4-rev3. But we also provide comments as follow.  1. The overhead reduction is across the same CSI quantity of different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns  2. For overhead reduction method, we think the joint coded value is in the same layer as common value/differentiated value,it should be picked up from sub-bullet into main bullet.  3. Whether separated quantity or common/ differentiated/joint coded value are reported could be configurable by gNB according to different adaptation types. E.g., For Type 1 adaptation, we can consider CRI is common, but CQI is different, and for Type 2 adaptation, we can consider CRI is different, but CQI is common.  Then we suggest the following update.  **P-Q3**   * **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), further study the feasibility to report a common value and/or a differential value/or joint coded value across same CSI quantity of different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following**   + - **CRI**     - **RI**     - **PMI**     - **CQI**     - **L1-RSRP**     - **Other (new) CSI content, if any**     - **FFS: configuration/indication details for different adaptation types~~, e.g. bitmap, joint coded indication~~** * **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), for CSI computation or CPU occupation, further study**   + - **whether it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some spatial patterns to reduce the burden at the UE**     - **whether there is need for CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions** | | | | | | |
| Intel | | Ok with P-Q3 | | | | | | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | | OK. | | | | | | |
| ZTE, Sanechips3e | | Okay with P-Q3 in general.  For the suggestion by DOCOMO, we prefer to keep the original examples to make it clear.   * + - **FFS: configuration/indication details for different adaptation types~~,~~ e.g. bitmap, joint coded indication** | | | | | | |
| ETRI | | Generally fine with the proposal. Maybe this proposal can be merged with P4-rev3. | | | | | | |
| Apple3e | | Generally OK with P-Q3, except for the last sub-bullet. How does reporting in different UL reporting occasions help reduce CSI computation or CPU occupation? | | | | | | |
| Fujitsu4 | | We are generally fine with P-Q3. | | | | | | |
| Qualcomm3 | | L1-RSRP belongs to CSI reporting for beam management. The current spec already allows reporting multiple values of L1-RSRP for a CSI report config. In addition, R15 already supported differential L1-RSRP reporting (see 5.2.1.4.3 in TS 38.214). We are not sure what else should be enhanced for L1-RSRP.  We don’t see the need and motivation of the following bullets. We should also note that in the main bullet we have “**at least for the following”**.   * + - **Other (new) CSI content, if any**     - **FFS: configuration/indication details, e.g. bitmap, joint coded indication**   For 2nd main bullet, we can keep it more general.  We suggest below **update**:  **P-Q3**   * **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), further study ~~the feasibility~~ whether/how to report a common value and/or a differential value across different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following**   + - **CRI**     - **RI**     - **PMI**     - **CQI**     - **~~L1-RSRP~~**     - **~~Other (new) CSI content, if any~~**     - **~~FFS: configuration/indication details, e.g. bitmap, joint coded indication~~** * **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), ~~for CSI computation or CPU occupation,~~ further study**   + - **whether it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some spatial patterns to reduce the burden at the UE**     - **whether there is need for CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions** | | | | | | |
| CATT | | We support Qualcomm’s update. | | | | | | |
| LG Electronics4 | | Qualcomm’s update seems better.  **@FL:** Could you explain what “configuration” is in mind in the FFS in the first sub-bullet? | | | | | | |
| FL | | @LGe  There is proposal from E//(?) to propose e.g. new report quantity. | | | | | | |
| Ericsson 4 | | We suggest below updates (in red) on top of the Qualcomm’s proposed updates   * Suggest adding how it is feasible/possible to skip evaluations. * Suggest removing 2nd subbullet of 2nd bullet as it is not so clear to us – CSI reports would in occasions as per the indication/configuration.   **P-Q3**   * **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), further study ~~the feasibility~~ whether/how to report a common value and/or a differential value across different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following**   + - **CRI**     - **RI**     - **PMI**     - **CQI**     - **~~L1-RSRP~~**     - **~~Other (new) CSI content, if any~~**     - **~~FFS: configuration/indication details, e.g. bitmap, joint coded indication~~** * **For multi-CSI feedback (if agreed), ~~for CSI computation or CPU occupation,~~ further study**   + - **Whether/how it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some spatial patterns to reduce the burden at the UE**     - **~~whether there is need for CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions~~** | | | | | | |
| DOCOMO5 | | Support **P-Q3-rev1**. Just copy as follow for convenience of later discussion.  **P-Q3-rev1**   * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study whether/how to report a common value and/or a differential /or joint coded value across same CSI quantity of different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following**   + - **CRI**     - **RI**     - **PMI**     - **CQI**     - **FFS: L1-RSRP** * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study**   + - **whether it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some spatial patterns to reduce the burden at the UE**     - **(if not agreed separately) whether there is need for CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions** | | | | | | |
| FL3-fri | | @QC  If I understand correctly per Samsung’s explanation, differential L1-RSRP across sub-configurations is more relevant in the context of NES and different from legacy. Thus there could be something for consideration.  **P-Q3-rev1**   * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study whether/how to report a common value and/or a differential /or joint coded value across same CSI quantity of different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following**   + - **CRI**     - **RI**     - **PMI**     - **CQI**     - **L1-RSRP** * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study**   + - **whether it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some spatial patterns to reduce the burden at the UE**     - **(if not agreed separately) whether there is need for CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions** | | | | | | |
| **Company** | | **Comments** | | | | | | |
| OPPO | | OK with P-Q3-rev1 | | | | | | |
| CMCC4 | | Fine with the **P-Q3-rev1.**  For the 1st sub-bullet of the 2nd bullet, if the UE can skip the evaluation of some spatial pattern, is it mean that UE can select which CSI would be feedback to gNB. As commented in other section, this is not a usual behaviour for gNB. This means that gNB may want some feedback of spatial pattern A but receive a feedback of spatial pattern B. gNB cannot get the information which it considers as important. Anyway, it is still for the further study. But from our point, we would like to invite the proponents elaborate more details and benefits. | | | | | | |
| LG Electronics5 | | It seems that companies have different views on the necessity of including L1-RSRP in the list. So, we suggest remove it and some editorials, as follows.  **P-Q3-rev1**   * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study whether/how to report a common value and/or a differential /or joint coded value across same CSI quantity of different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following**   + - **CRI**     - **RI**     - **PMI**     - **CQI**     - **~~L1-RSRP~~**     - **Other (new) report quantity, if any** * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study**   + - **whether it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some sub-configurations/adaptation ~~spatial~~ patterns to reduce the burden at the UE**     - **(if not agreed separately) whether there is need for CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions** | | | | | | |
| MTK3-fri | | We are supportive of **P-Q3-rev1** and think the last sub-bullet is better placed in this proposal instead of **P4-rev4.** | | | | | | |
| Xiaomi | | Generally fine with P-Q3-rev1. Actually, we prefer to discuss the first sub-bullet first. The second sub-bulled needs further discussion. However, considering the second sub-bullet is only for study, we are fine to keep it. | | | | | | |
| ZTE, Sanechips5 | | Okay with P-Q3-rev1. | | | | | | |
| Nokia/NSB | | Since P-Q-rev1 is only for study, we are fine with it. | | | | | | |
| Intel | | Ok with **P-Q3-rev1**  We think **(if not agreed separately) c**an be removed since it is FFS anyways | | | | | | |
| Qualcomm3-fri | | The proposal looks fine. Just one **update** to keep the intention of the proposal in focus:  **P-Q3-rev1**  **For multi-CSI feedback with CSI overhead/report payload reduction, further study** | | | | | | |
| InterDigital | | Fine with **P-Q3-rev1** | | | | | | |
| Ericsson 5 | | We have below comments.  L1-RSRP already includes differential encoding, so it seems complicated to then have differential on top of differential. We think this should be removed.  Furthermore, this proposal is on multi-CSI feedback in one reporting instance. Use of multiple reporting instances is a separate discussion, hence the final bullet should be removed.  Suggested updates in green.  **P-Q3-rev1**   * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study whether/how to report a common value and/or a differential /or joint coded value across same CSI quantity of different sub-configurations/adaptation patterns, at least for the following**   + - **CRI**     - **RI**     - **PMI**     - **CQI**     - **~~L1-RSRP~~** * **For multi-CSI feedback, further study**   + - **whether/how it is feasible/possible for the UE to skip the evaluations of some spatial patterns to reduce the burden at the UE**   **~~(if not agreed separately) whether there is need for CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions~~** | | | | | | |

**Q4**

**For multi-CSI feedback (if supported), for the parameters you indicated possible for enhancement, what could be the potential impact on, including but not limited to**

* **Impact on UCI format**
* **Impact on CSI computation and/or CPU occupation**
* **Constraint for e.g. differentiation of different CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial/antenna elements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | For UCI format, CPU occupation as well as mapping order of CSI fields, we prefer to reuse the Rel-17 CSI framework for multi-TRP (Section 6.3.1.1.2 of TS38.212), which also supported reporting multi-CSI feedback corresponding to up to three transmission hypotheses. We do not believe supporting a new design for UCI mapping is feasible given the limited time available before the end of the Rel-18 discussions |
| DOCOMO | For UCI mapping, we think that R17 multi-TRP CSI mapping cannot be directly used by R18 NES due to the following reasons:  - In R17 multi-TRP, it may contain CSIs of single-point CSI(s) and muti-point CSI. The feedback contents of muti-point CSI is different compared to single-point CSI. As R18 NES only contains single-point CSIs, the UCI mapping of R17 multi-TRP could not be directly reused by R18 NES.  - In R17 multi-TRP, there is no relationship between CSIs, thus payload reduction cannot be performed. But for R18 NES, obvious relations can be observed between CSIs, payload reduction approaches ca be reused. Then the UCI mapping enhancement for R18 NES is needed. |
| Fujitsu | For CSI computation and CPU occupation, it depends on which alternatives for CSI-RS resource configuration and CSI report configuration are adopted. It should be discussed after the agreements w.r.t. configuration is made. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If UE can report some common information for multi-CSI, the CSI computation and/or CPU occupation will be impacted considering that the UE does not need to exhaustively search all the CSI combination (like, CRI, RI, PMI, CQI) for other patterns.  The motivation of the last bullet should be clarified, does it mean “the restriction of codebook”? |
| Nokia/NSB | As we indicated above, impact on UCI format could be considered only after a ‘workable’ baseline operation is defined.  Impact on CSI computation and CPU occupation could be further considered with multi-CSI feedback.   * For CSI computation, we could discuss whether there would be need to consider ways for the UE e.g., to skip the evaluations of some spatial patterns to reduce the burden at the UE. * For CPU occupation, evaluating multiple spatial patterns and providing a corresponding CSI report(s) using one UL reporting occasion would increase the consumption of CSI processing units (CPU) at the UE, given that a CPU is only released after the CSI report is transmitted. And thus, the required number of additional CPUs would potentially need to scale up with the number of spatial patterns to evaluate before the CSI report transmissions. Hence, considering CSI report(s) through different UL reporting occasions would allow to reduce the need to consume many CSI processing units at a time in this case.   CSI report content due to same or different number of spatial elements would need to be discussed as there could be two cases:   * Case 1: When the spatial patterns in the set of candidate patterns have same number of (active) spatial/antenna elements. In this case, there is practically no difference in power/energy saving level (from network Tx perspective) between the different spatial patterns. One way for pattern selection would be to follow similar logic as for CRI (*CSI-RS resource indicator*) down-selection in Rel-15, by basically letting the UE select one preferrable pattern based on UE implementation.   + Other than UE implementation, it’s also possible to let the gNB configure criteria for the selection, such as ones related to rank, RSRP or CQI, etc. * Case 2: When the patterns in the set of patterns have different number of (active) spatial/antenna elements. In this case, different spatial patterns may have different power/energy saving levels. Hence, UE would need to report a pattern(s) with best power/energy saving while fulfilling one or more criteria related with performance constraint, such as minimum rank. |
| Samsung | Impact on UCI format as described in our response to Q3. Agree in high-level that CPU counting needs to be revised for multi-CSI; details FFS. |
| FL2 | To be continued. |

**Q5**

**For multi-CSI feedback (if supported), what need to be RRC configured, in addition to those covered by proposal(s)/discussions in the sections of 3.3 - ‘CSI-RS resource configuration’, 3.5 - ‘CSI report configuration’ and 3.7 - ‘Definition of spatial adaptation pattern’?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Since baseline operation for multi-CSI feedback is still not really defined, we think Q5 could be considered at a later stage. |
| FL2 | To be discussed together with other RRC parameters. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Q6**

**For multi-CSI feedback (if supported), what can be additionally indicated by L1/L2 signaling, in addition to those covered by proposal(s)/discussions in the sections of 3.12 - ‘Need of signalling to UE due to adaptation’?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Since baseline operation for multi-CSI feedback is still not really defined, we think Q5 could be considered at a later stage. |
| FL2 | To be revisited if more progress is available for L1/L2 singalling. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**\*Week 2 start\***

Resume the discussion for L1/L2 signalling details. Please also **indicate what further enhancement details that you think may be needed**, in addition to the below proposal.

**FL4-signaling-Q1**

**For Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting with , reuse the current DCI and MAC-CE mechanism for gNB triggering/indication/activation of CSI report as the starting point. FFS further enhancements.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Support. This appears to be more meaningful for , where DCI/MAC-CE would sub-select N out of L sub-configurations. Hence we propose the following:  **For Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting with , reuse the current DCI and MAC-CE mechanism for gNB triggering/indication/activation of N CSIs out of L RRC configured CSIs ~~CSI report~~ as the starting point. FFS further enhancements.** |
| LG Electronics6 | With this approach, gNB has to transmit DCI or MAC CE individually to every UE (and even per CSI reporting configuration per UE, for SP-CSI reporting case). To reduce signaling overhead from gNB’s perspective, as an alternative, we can consider to use group-common DCI for gNB to trigger/indicate/active N out of L RRC configured CSIs. |
| DOCOMO6 | Not support the proposal.  I think before discussing using DCI/MAC-CE for indication, we should discuss indication using UE-specific/UE-group/Cell-specific signaling firstly.  Using current DCI and MAC-CE mechanism, it means that gNB need to indicate to every UE. The indication overhead is high. UE-group signaling can save such indication payload. |
| Apple | For AP CSI reporting, we are fine. For Semi-persisten, we would suggest discussing this when previous FL4-p-Q and FL4-sp-Q are discussed. |
| Intel | ok |
| vivo | We are fine. |
| Nokia/NSB | For N>1, instead of triggering each CSI reporting one by one, a single DCI/MAC-CE signalling may trigger multiple CSI reportings with triggering overhead saving. |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | We agree that we can reused the current mechanism. However, the CSI report configuration is not clear for semi-persistent/aperiodic CSI reporting configuration till now. And the indication is highly related to the CSI report configurations. Thus, we prefer to discuss the details after the CSI report configuration is clear. |
| Xiaomi | For the Aperiodic CSI reporting, the CSI request field with up to 6 bits is designed for the indication of trigger state, which is associated with specific CSI-ReportConfig(s). If N out of L reports is triggered, at least further enhancement to include this situation should be studied. Nevertheless, the further enhancement is FFS. We are fine to support it to move forward. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the starting point and we agree with the study of further enhancements. |
| OPPO | Support. It is reasonable to consider DCI/MAC-CE as a starting point. |
| InterDigital | Fine with proposal, and share same views with LG and DOCOMO to support group-common DCI |
| Qualcomm4 | We should focus on making progress on definition of sub-configuration this meeting. Without it, it is not clear whether the current AP/SP CSI triggering is sufficient or not.  We prefer to have this discussion later when the overall framework becomes clear. |
| Samsung4 | Support the proposal. In addition, a UE-group-specific signaling can be considered as the network may need to obtain multi-CSI from multiple UEs as assistance information to facilitate its SD/PD adaptation decision. |
| Fujitsu6 | We are fine with the proposal.  In addition, considering the signaling overhead and the cell-wise nature of spatial adaptation performed at the gNB, group-common signaling can be considered. |
| Ericsson 6 | We don’t agree to the current wording of this proposal, since we don’t think the current DCI and MAC-CE mechanisms can be used completely as is. A report configuration with sub-configurations is new, and triggering reports for N sub-configurations out of L is also new, thus some enhancements will be necessary, even if they are reasonably small.  Hence, we propose the following update using the same wording as in the agreement shown below:  **For Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting with , ~~reuse~~ study what enhancements to the current DCI and MAC-CE mechanisms are needed for gNB triggering/indication/activation of N CSI report(s), where the N CSI(s) are associated with N sub-configuration(s) from L in a report config ~~as the starting point. FFS further enhancements~~.**  **Agreement**  For a CSI report config with *L* sub-configuration(s), support a framework that enables a UE to report *N* CSI(s) in one reporting instance where the *N* CSI(s) are associated with *N* sub-configuration(s) from *L* (where ) and each CSI corresponds to one sub-configuration.   * For discussion purpose, N=1 refers to single-CSI while N>1 refers to multi-CSI. * For Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting, support gNB trigger/indicate/activate report of N≤L CSIs where N>=1 * The maximum value of N and L are subject to UE capability * Further study how to address/minimize additional UE complexity |
| China Telecom | We support the proposal and prefer to discuss the details in the future. |
| ETRI | Current DCI and MAC CE may be improved, however, we think group-common signaling needs to be prioritized. |
| CMCC5 | Fine with the starting point and FFS. |
| FL | FL agrees with several companies that we need progress of details as well for e.g. configuration and spatial sub-configurations. For study purpose without going into details, please indicate whether the below general statements are acceptable. You can indicate comments only if you have objection. There is no need to spend too much time on this.  **FL4e-signaling-Q1**  **For Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting with , study what enhancements to the current DCI and MAC-CE mechanisms are needed for gNB triggering/indication/activation of N CSI report(s), where the N CSI(s) are associated with N sub-configuration(s) from L in a report config.** |
| Samsung4e | Support. |
| Lenovo-4e | Support |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support |
| LG Electronics7 | Just to clarify, does this proposal include the possibility of introducing group-common DCI (which is not the one supported by the current specification)? |
| Spreadtrum4 | Fine. For alignment, **in a report config => in a CSI report config** |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We support. And to be accurate on this part “**where the N CSI(s) are associated with N sub-configuration(s) from L in a report config**”  We suggest to copy paste the exact text from the previous agreement highlighted in yellow in the figure below |
| MTK4e | Support |
| CMCC6 | Support |
| Apple | We suggest the following modification to align with the previous agreement.  **For Semi-persistent/Aperiodic CSI reporting with , study what enhancements to the current DCI and MAC-CE mechanisms are needed for gNB triggering/indication/activation of the N CSI(s) in a reporting instance ~~report(s)~~, where the N CSI(s) are associated with N sub-configuration(s) from L in a report config.** |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Xiaomi | Fine with that. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**\*Week 2 end\***

3.3 CSI-RS resource configuration

**Company proposals**

[FW]: Multiple CSI-RS resources, each corresponding to a spatial element configuration, should be specified in one CSI-RS resource setting (Alternative A1-2) with the following supports/enhancements:

* + - The different CSI-RS resources within a resource set, each with different number of antenna port mapping that corresponding a unique ‘spatial pattern’ (as in A1-1), and/or
    - Increasing the number of resource sets that can be configured, each with different number of antenna port, at least for Semi-persistent and periodic resources configuration and CSI reporting.

[Huawei, HiSilicon]:

* Support A1-1) for both type 1 and type 2 shutdown. Each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting implicitly represent one “spatial adaptation pattern”.
* Further study and identify the scenarios and proper CSI-RS transmission patterns that can be beneficial before adopting A1-2).

[Panasonic]: It is important to check both network side regarding realistic flexibilities to support for this feature and the UE side complexity and capability, before concluding on which alternative to adopt.

[Nokia, NSB]:

* If a large number of spatial patterns is considered, an option along the lines of A2-2 could be considered where one CSI report configuration is used to evaluate multiple spatial adaptation patterns.
* To enable CSI assistance information for spatial adaptation, further consider Option 1-2 and Option 2-2:
  + - Option 1-2: one CSI-RS resource is associated to / used to evaluate multiple spatial patterns.
    - Option 2-2: one CSI-RS resource set is associated to / used to evaluate multiple spatial patterns.
    - FFS: whether these options can be used for all cases and scenarios of interest, and if not, which other option(s) should be adopted.
    - FFS: how to indicate the UE with the antenna port subsets which represents different spatial patterns for evaluation/reporting under these options.
      * FFS: whether other information should be indicated/updated to the UE.
* To enable CSI assistance information for spatial adaptation, further consider Option 3-2:
  + - Option 3-2: one resource setting is associated to /used to evaluate multiple spatial patterns.
    - FFS: whether this option can be used for all cases and scenarios of interest.

[vivo]: Support Alt. 1-1 + Alt. 2-2 for spatial element adaptation

* One resource configuration for channel measurement includes multiple CSI-RS resource sets, where each resource set can be associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern
  + - CSI-RS resource in different CSI-RS resource sets may have different resourceMapping (e.g., nrofports) that corresponds to different spatial adaptation pattern
* One CSI report configuration includes multiple sub-configurations, where each sub-configuration corresponds to one of the configured CSI-RS resource sets
  + - Sub-configuration at least includes codebookConfig

[OPPO]: If the spatial adaptation pattern includes one spatial element before adaptation and another spatial element after adaptation, A1-1 may be considered as a subset of A1-2.

[Spreadtrum]:

* Dynamic switching between CSI-RS resources or spatial adaptation patterns for a CSI-RS resource can be considered.
* A1-2) is not supported.

[CATT]: Precoded CSI-RS to emulate different antenna ports could be applied to CSI enhancement for both type-1 and type-2 spatial domain adaptations.

[Fujitsu]: Support CSI-RS configuration

* + - A1-2-1) Each CSI-RS resource (*NZP-CSI-RS-Resource*) is associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns
      * The common parameters are FFS
    - A1-2-2) Each CSI-RS resource set (*NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet*) is associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns

[ZTE]: For spatial element adaptation with multi-CSI report, each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns.

[xiaomi]: support A1-2 that each CSI-RS resource can be associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns.

[InterDigital]: Support association of one CSI-RS resource with more than one spatial adaptation pattern, where each pattern corresponds to a different subset of antenna ports.

[China Telecom]: Support to adopt A1-1) for the association between CSI-RS resource and spatial adaptation pattern, i.e., each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern. Support to associate one CSI-RS resource with one spatial adaptation pattern.

[Google]: Study the rank-specific codebook configuration, where different (N1, N2) can be configured for different ranks.

[CMCC]: Each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns, i.e. A1-2, should be supported.

[CEWiT]: Each CSI-RS resource set associated with one or more spatial element adaptations is supported.

* + - Each CSI-RS within the resource set is associated with individual spatial elements adaptation.

[Transsion]:

* Each CSI-RS resource setting is associated with one spatial adaptation patterns should be excluded.
* Each CSI-RS resource or each CSI-RS resource set setting is associated with one spatial adaptation patterns can be supported.
* Each CSI-RS resource is associated with more spatial adaptation patterns can be supported.

[Apple]: For resource configuration,

* consider the following options to configure the spatial adaptation pattern due to reduction of logical antenna ports (where which value is to be used for CSI report can be further indicated):
  + - Opt 1: one CSI-RS resource associated with multiple *nrofPorts*, same across all CSI-RS resources in a resource set.
    - Opt 2: one CSI-RS resource set with multiple *nrofPort* values, where each CSI-RS resource within the set is associated with a single *nrofPort* value, the additional *nrofPort* values are configured per resource set level.
* consider the following options to configure the spatial adaptation pattern due to change of spatial element mapping or transmission power:
  + - Opt 1: one CSI-RS resource associated with multiple TCI-stats/*powerControlOffsetSS*/ *powerControlOffset* values
    - Opt 2: one CSI-RS resource associated with one TCI-state/*powerControlOffsetSS*/ *powerControlOffset*, and the multiple CSI-RS resources are within one CSI-RS resource set
    - Opt 3: one CSI-RS resource associated with one TCI-state/*powerControlOffsetSS*/ *powerControlOffset*, and the multiple CSI-RS resources are in multiple resource sets

[Lenovo]: Two CSI resource configurations, corresponding to whether the NES mode is activated or deactivated, are supported.

[Qualcomm]:

* A spatial adaptation pattern includes a codebook configuration and reduced NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement with the same number of antenna ports as that in the configured codebook.
  + - An antenna array corresponding to the spatial adaptation pattern is a uniform linear array with a supported configuration provided in Table 5.2.2.2.1-2 and Table 5.2.2.2.2-1 of TS 38.214 for Type-I single panel and Type-I multi-panel, respectively.
    - FFS: how to determine the reduced NZP CSI-RS resource(s).
* If RAN1 adopts A2-2 for CSI report configuration and A1-2 for NZP CSI-RS resource set configuration, the following aspects are included for an CSI report configuration.
  + - NZP CSI-RS resource set configuration for channel measurement includes CSI-RS resources with the same number of antenna ports.
    - Reduced NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement corresponding to a spatial adaptation pattern are determined from the resource(s) in the configured CSI-RS resource set.
    - The CSI processing requirements (e.g., CPU counting, counting of simultaneous active CSI-RS resources, etc.) are scaled linearly by the number of codebook configurations and the number of CSI-RS resources for each configured codebook in the CSI report configuration.
* To determine a reduced NZP CSI-RS resource for a spatial adaptation pattern, one subset of CSI-RS antenna ports associated with a CSI-RS resource in the configured CSI-RS resource set is indicated.
  + - FFS: details on CSI-RS antenna port subset indication.

[AT&T]: Define different CSI reporting hypotheses for different levels of spatial dimensions which rely on the same RRC configuration

* + - For CSI resource configuration, a common CSI-RS resource/resource set is associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns
    - For CSI reporting, support joint reporting of multiple CSIs
      * Further study the need/benefit of overhead reduction

[Docomo]:

* For association between CSI resource and spatial pattern, A1-2) should be supported. Furthermore, to achieve both Type 1 and Type 2 spatial adaptation, Opt.2 or Opt.3 of following can be supported.
  + - Opt.1: Each CSI-RS resource associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns.
    - Opt.2: Each CSI-RS resource set associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns.
    - Opt.3: Each CSI-RS resource setting associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns.
* Codebook configuration should be enhanced by configuring common or separated codebooks for multiple spatial assumptions to achieve Type 1 or Type 2 adaptation.

[Ericsson]:

* For Type-1 spatial element adaptation, each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns (i.e. A1-2 in the RAN1#112 agreement).
* For Type-1 spatial element adaptation, a CSI-RS resource set is configured within a CSI Resource Setting (CSI-ResourceConfig) wherein the set contains a single CSI-RS resource associated with one or more spatial element adaptation patterns.
* For Type-2 spatial element adaptation, each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern (i.e. A1-1 in the RAN1#112 agreement).
* For Type-2 spatial element adaptation, a CSI-RS resource set is configured within a CSI Resource Setting (CSI-ResourceConfig) wherein the set contains multiple CSI-RS resources each one associated with a spatial element adaptation pattern.

[Fraunhofer]:

* Regarding A1-1, for details on the association, multiple spatial adaptation patterns can be associated with individual CSI-RS resource so that UEs can be enabled to provide report(s) with respect to one or more of the CSI-RS resources.
* Regarding A1-2, for details on the association, multiple spatial adaptation patterns can be associated with a single CSI-RS resource while different subsets of the CSI-RS resource can be configured corresponding to each spatial adaptation pattern so that UEs can be enabled to provide report(s) with respect to one or more of the configured subsets of the CSI-RS resource.

[ETRI]:

* For enhancements on CSI-RS resource configuration, further consider the following two options:
  + - Option 1: Each CSI-RS resource can be associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns (A1-2)
    - Option 2: Each CSI-RS resource can be associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern (A1-1)

**FL summary**

Regarding the CSI-RS resource configuration approaches (i.e., A1-1 and A1-2 as agreed in RAN1#112) and association with spatial adaptation pattern, it is observed that solutions could be different between Type 1 and Type 2 and it is possible that a specific gNB may only implement one of the two shutdown types. On the other hand, from UE perspective, a generalized solution applicable to both types (as much as possible) is desirable in order to minimize the implementation work.

A1-1 (supported by 7 companies including Huawei, vivo, CATT, E/// etc.) can be applicable to both types of shutdown cases while A1-2 does not work for Type 2. A slightly larger number of supporters is observed for A1-2 (supported by 13 companies including Nokia, SS, MTK, QC, E///, etc). Also, it seems a few companies (FW, Nokia, Fujitsu, Docomo) mentioning support of A1-2 also support A1-1 as a sub-case of A1-2 by utilizing resource set or resource setting of CSI-RS configurations, in order to allow one CSI-RS resource associated to only on spatial adaptation pattern for type 2.

FL consider specifications can support both approaches for gNB configuration flexibility. How to minimize the specification work for different types of spatial adaptation can be kept in mind in future discussion. Furthermore, in order to not mix the two configuration approaches, at least for ensuring both types of shutdown can be properly considered during the work, a proposal is made below with modified texts for each approach.

Additionally, it seems the discussion so far is to focus on NZP-CSI-RS resource configuration. This makes sense since we are developing enhancement for channel measurement and reporting. Thus it is reflected.

**P5**

**Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) within one resource setting for channel measurement corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns, by the following:**

* **A1-1-revised: multiple resources are configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern**
* **A1-2-revised: a resource setting with one resource is configured, where the resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal, however we believe the answer is different for each spatial adaptation type, for instance, Type-2 cannot be supported with Alt A1-2. |
| vivo | We think the main bullet does not need to limit one resource setting for channel measurement is configured corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns. In fact, multiple resource settings can also be configured for channel measurement corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns. In this case, different resource settings are corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns, and the resources configured within a resource setting are associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern.  We suggest the following modification for P5  **Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) within one or multiple resource setting(s) for channel measurement corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns, by the following:**   * **A1-1-revised: multiple resources are configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern** * **A1-1-revised-2: multiple resource sets are configured within one resource setting, where each resource set is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern.** * **A1-2-revised: a resource setting with one resource is configured, where the resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns**   The difference between A1-1-revised and A1-1-revised-2 is whether the resources within a resource setting can be associated with one or multiple spatial adaptation pattern. In our view, spatial adaptation for NW ES needs to be operated in single or multiple TRPs cases. For m-TRP, multiple resources for channel measurement for different TPRs can be configured as a group. In order to support spatial adaptation for m-TRP, it is simpler to configure different spatial adaptation pattern for different resource settings, where each resource setting including multiple resources corresponding to different TRPs. |
| DOCOMO | A unified indication/configuration approach to support both Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation is expected to minimize the work of specification and improve the configuration flexibility of realistic NES operation.  Although we think that the contents of the proposal do not have much difference compared to A1-1) and A1-2) which we agreed in last meeting but just with re-organized wording, if it can help for the further discussion in the future, we can support the proposals. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the original proposal P5.  Regarding vivo’s modification, it seems to change the principle of P5. We understand the intention of P5 is to configure only one resource setting instead of multiple resource settings. |
| Apple | Are we listing only the resource configuration enhancements here or any configuration that can be considered for spatial adaptation are to be listed? It is noted that A1-1-revised is already supported by current spec, while A1-2-revised needs enhancements.  Another clarification comment is that does this mean that both alternatives will be supported or if only one alternative is enough, we can focus on only one of them? |
| FL to Apple | Any configuration can be considered and the above two are the possible ones that FL see, as different configuration approaches to achieve the purpose of the main bullet. |
| Spreadtrum | A1-1-revised is already supported in current spec. The proposal could be whether A1-2-revised should be introduced in R18 for NES purpose? |
| ETRI | We prefer to have a single solution to reduce the workload. Our preference is A1-2. In our view, A1-2 can support both Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation. |
| Fujitsu | The first sub-bullet only describes the association relationship between resource setting/resource and spatial adaptation patterns, while that for resource set is missing. Depending on the configuration at the resource set level, A1-1-revised can be further divided into the following two sub-alternatives:  Case 1. one resource set is configured within a resource setting, where multiple resources are configured within one resource set and each resource is associated with one spatial adaptation patterns  Case 2. multiple resource sets are configured within a resource setting, where multiple resources are configured within each resource set and each resource is associated with one spatial adaptation patterns  Considering that the case 1 has lower configuration overhead than case 2, case 1 should be supported. Thus, we suggest the following modification:  **P5**  **Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) within one resource setting for channel measurement corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns, by the following:**   * **A1-1-revised: ~~multiple resources are configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern~~**   **one resource set is configured within a resource setting, where multiple resources are configured within one resource set and each resource is associated with one spatial adaptation patterns**   * **A1-2-revised: a resource setting with one resource is configured, where the resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | A1-2-revised.  One CSI measurement resource corresponding to different spatial domain patterns has less overhead of both RRC signaling and CSI-RS transmission, more network energy saving. Moreover, it results in high correlation among multiple CSIs, and the correlation can be used to reduce UL overhead.  However, the restriction of one resource in a resource setting is not needed since different resources can be configured with different QCL information. We prefer the following modification:  **A1-2-revised: a resource setting with one or more resources is configured, where the resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support both options. However, we suggest the following modifications:  **P5**  **Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) within one resource setting for channel measurement corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns, by the following:**   * **A1-1-revised: multiple resources are configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern** * **A1-2-revised: a resource setting with one or more resource(s) is configured, where ~~the~~ each resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns** |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine with the intention of the proposal. However, better to first further discuss and clarify whether to consider CSI-RS resource/ resource set/ resource setting level. It seems the proposal already concludes that resource level is considered.  Also, the discussion should also account for interference measurements as well.  Further, we could discuss whether the existing ZP-CSI-RS framework could be leveraged and improved for the objective here. |
| MediaTek | Support A1-2.  From UE computation point of view, association of a common CSI-RS resource setting implies the possibility of shared CSI computations. In this regard, we are more supportive of A1-2. |
| Futurewei | Support A1-2 and also with the understanding that A1-2 covers the case of A1-1 as well. |
| Xiaomi | The intention of the second sub-bullet. In our understanding, it depends on the gNB configuration for the number of configured resources. In this case, we suggest the following modification:  **P5**  **Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) within one resource setting for channel measurement corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns, by the following:**   * **A1-1-revised: multiple resources are configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern** * **A1-2-revised: a resource setting with one or multiple resources is configured, where the resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns** |
| CMCC | We are not sure a unified design can solve both Type 1 and Type 2 spatial adaptation patterns. For Type 1 spatial adaptation pattern, one CSI-RS resource can be configured with different muting pattens. But for the Type 2 spatial adaptation pattern, due to the change of TxRU or the antenna elements, the antenna pattern would be changed and also the TCI states or the CSI would be changed accordingly. Then it is not suitable to reuse one CSI-RS resource for different spatial adaptation pattern.  For the A1-2 revised, it is a little bit confusing that, multiple resources should be configured within one resource setting. And if multiple beam or the CRI should be indicated, then a multiple resources should be configured within the resource setting. Could the FL or the proponents further clarify this issue. The A1-2 revised would be more understandable if we change the ***one resource*** to ***resources***, and change ***the resource*** to ***each resource***. If my understanding is not correct, please clarify. Thank you. |
| Samsung | Not sure if a revision to previous agreement is needed. In our understanding A1-1 is legacy while A1-2 is an enhancement that can be applicable to both Type 1 and Type 2 SD adaptations. During the RAN1 112 online discussion, the term ‘spatial adaptation pattern’ was more broadly and inclusively understood, not limited to Type 1 SD adaptation. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal, in principle, although we share the same view with Samsung on the need for revision.  At least for Type -1, we are supportive of A1-2. This is because the UE could evaluate CSI for multiple spatial adaptation patterns (e.g. corresponding to different subsets of antenna ports) using the same CSI-RS resource. |
| Panasonic | We think the “one resource setting” in P5 needs clearer explanation. It means a general resource setting for all the configured CSI reports or the CSI-RS resource within a configured CSI report? |
| Ericsson | We agree that different alternatives are needed depending on Type-1 or Type-2 SD adaptation, hence it makes sense to support both. Regarding some companies’ comments on what is supported in current spec, both A1-1 and A1-2 are already supported. What is new is how the spatial domain adaptation is associated with the resources / resources sets.  In current spec, a resource setting (CSI-ResourceConfig) is always configured with CSI-RS resource \*sets\*, and reporting is triggered/configured on sets, not individual resources, even if a set contains only one resource. Hence A1-1 revised and A1-2 revised should be updated to reflect this.  Suggest update below.  **Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement within one resource setting ~~for channel measurement~~ corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns, by the following:**   * **A1-1-revised: a resource set with multiple resources ~~are~~ is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern**   + **Note: this can facilitate network energy savings for Type-2 spatial adaptation** * **A1-2-revised: ~~a resource setting with one~~ a resource set with one resource is configured within a resource setting, where the resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation pattern~~s~~**   + **Note: this can facilitate network energy savings for Type-1 spatial adaptation** |
| Qualcomm | We think the proposal should be further clarified.   * A1-1-revised: unclear on how it works: If we take Type 1 as example, does it mean that the resource set will have resources of different antenna port configurations? Maybe different resources in the set correspond to different spatial adaptation patterns? * A1-2-revised: is there any limitation on “one resource” e.g., Type 1 adaptation does not seem work if the resource has 4 ports only? How does a resource associated with a SAP is determined for the “one resource”?   Hence, we suggest the following **update**:  **On adaptation of spatial elements, for ~~Support~~ configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) within one resource setting for channel measurement ~~corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns,~~ further discuss ~~by~~ the following:**   * **A1-1-revised: multiple resources are configured within a resource setting, where ~~each~~ different resources correspond to different ~~is associated with only one~~ spatial adaptation patterns** * **A1-2-revised: a resource setting with one resource is configured, where the resource is associated with one or more than one spatial adaptation patterns**   **FFS: How to determine a reduced resource for a spatial adaptation pattern from the configured resource.** |
| LG Electronics | In principal, we agree with P5 but suggest some modification as follows.  **Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) within one resource setting (i.e., *CSI-ResourceConfig*)for channel measurement corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns, by the following:**   * **A1-1-revised: multiple resources are configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern and spatial adaptation patterns associated with two different resources can differ** * **A1-2-revised: a resource setting with one or more resource is configured, where each resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns** |
| FL2 | The following is agreed on Monday.  **Agreement**  Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement within one resource setting corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns with at least one of the following   * A1-1-revised: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern * A1-2-revised: For a resource configured in a resource set within a resource setting, the resource can be associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns   + FFS: Whether one or more than one resource can be configured in the resource set   **Q9-moved**   * **~~For overhead reduction for A2-2 (if agreed),~~ do you consider the CSI-RS resource set configuration should only include resources with the same number of antenna ports? Any other restrictions you may consider as needed?** * **Do you consider more than one resource can be configured for A1-2?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Yes. CSI-RS resources within the same set should contain the same number of ports and configured with the same density to avoid violating legacy behavior |
| Fujitsu | As we discussed above, the discussion related to CSI-RS resource set configuration should be moved to section 3.3. |
| Nokia/NSB | This would depend on the exact option(s) that will be considered for A2-2, i.e., resource setting level, resource set level, or resource level etc. |
| LG Electronics | This issue should be addressed together in Section 3.3. |
| China Telecom | We think this should depends on the spatial patterns of CSI-RS resources. For example, if the nested structure is adopted, we think the number of antenna ports in one resource set configuration can be different since there is no extra cost for CSI-RS mapping. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | For the second bullet, we think more than one resource should be supported for A1-2. Even for the current specification, multiple resources within one resource set configured with different QCL information are allowed. We don’t believe a restriction of only one resource within the resource set is needed for A1-2. In this case, if gNB would like to obtain CSI information for different QCL, it has to configure multiple resource settings, and UE has to report all the CSI information for all the resource settings/QCL, the OH and complexity will be increased.  So we don’t think such the motivation of the restriction is valid/clear. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **To answer the first question in Q9-moved:**  We are ok to consider CSI-RS resource set that has resources with different number of antenna ports  **To answer the second question in Q9-moved:**  For A1-2-revised, gNB can configure the UE with more than one resources in CSI-RS resource set and we do not think that we need to limit this implementation flexibility at the gNB**.**  The motivation to limit the number of CSI-RS resource is not clear for us. Especially, for the CSI-RS transmission with port virtualization, one CSI-RS can only cover a limited range of the cell (beam). In this situation, gNB needs to transmit multiple CSI-RS to a UE in order to select a proper CSI-RS beam for a UE. |
| ITRI | In our perspective,   * For the 1st bullet, we think that the number of antenna ports can be different for CSI-RS resource set configuration.   For the 2nd bullet, we think that more than one resource can be configured for A1-2 can be configured. |
| Qualcomm2 | On 1st bullet, for A1-2, the resources in the resource set should have the same number of CSI-RS ports as the number of ports in one codebook configuration in the CSI report config.  On 2nd bullet, we are fine with configuration of more than one CSI-RS resource in the resource set as long as there is restriction on the total number of resources in the set and/or the total number of resources the UE measures CSI in a CSI report config. |
| Intel | Similar comments as Nokia. Changes to existing specification on CSI-RS resources within a CSI-RS resource set has impact to how CRI is determined and how this information is interpreted for multi-CSI feedback.  We also think we need to distinguish number of antenna ports for a CSI-RS resource vs. number of hypothetical antenna ports assumed for a CSI report. Assuming we are discussing the former, we are not sure what is the use case for indicating different number of ports within a resource set. We assume the number of hypothetical antenna ports (that correspond to a spatial pattern) is something separately considered from the actual configured number of ports for a CSI-RS resource. |
| Futrurewei | 1Q: No. Our understanding is that the intention of the revised A1-1 is that within the resource set, the different resources CAN be of different number of antenna ports in order to support different spatial patterns.  2Q: Yes, because current spec support this and we see no reason to restrict the flexibility of current spec. |
| Xiaomi | For the first bullet, prefer to allow one CSI-RS resource set to have different number of antenna ports. That way is efficient to adapt different spatial patterns.  For the second bullet, our answer is yes. Similar view with Futurewei, no motivation to restrict the number of resources to one is observed. |
| ETRI | First bullet: Yes. Since spatial patterns with different number of CSI-RS ports can be configured by A1-2-revised, we don’t see a need to change the specification to allow CSI-RS resources with different number of ports. A1-1-revised may be applicable for FR2.  Second bullet: For NES purpose, there seems no need to another CSI-RS resource in the same CSI-RS resource set. At the same time, if we do not make such restriction, more than one resource is allowed by the current specification. Whether there is need for such restriction can be further discussed. |
| Fujitsu2 | For the 1st sub-bullet, we think CSI-RS resources within a resource set can be associated with different number of antenna ports. In this way, only one resource set configuration is needed for multiple type 1 adaptation patterns, the configuration overhead can be reduced accordingly. In addition, it also requires the least amount of specification work to realize this.  For the 2nd sub-bullet, we are open to multiple resources considering that current specification has already supported this |
| CATT | **Q9**  **1st Bullet –No.** there is no restriction on same number of antenna ports in order to support antenna patterns with different number of antenna ports.  **2nd bullet – Yes**. It is up to gNB implementation to configure one or more CSI-RS resource. |
| Apple2 | For the first bullet, stick to the current spec that the resources within a resource set should have the same number of port. For type 1 spatial adaptation, UE only needs to measure on the same CSI-RS resource using different number of ports assumptions, there is no need to configure multiple resources with different numbef of ports.  For the second bullet, we could be fine to support more as long as the CPU occupation and active CSI-RS and ports are counted accordingly. |
| Samsung2 | For the first bullet point, we think that the restriction on the number of antenna ports to be the same is not needed or may be improper with NES objective. The objective of the current spec having such restriction, i.e., a CSI-RS resource set containing multiple CSI-RS resources to have an identical number of antenna ports, is mainly for beam selection for the same antenna configuration but with different beam directions. Note however that the objective for NES is to probe the impact of adaptation with reduced capability, e.g., subsets of antenna ports from a given CSI-RS resource. Therefore, such restriction is counterintuitive to the objective of NES.  For the second bullet point, yes, we think that more than one resources can be configured, which is up to the network. If we limit a resource set to include only one resource, it is an unnecessary restriction to the current specification. |
| vivo | Q9  For A1-1 where a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, if each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern and different resources are associated with different spatial adaptation pattern, there is no need to limit the CSI-RS resource set configuration should only include resources with the same number of antenna ports.  For A1-2 where a resource configured in a resource set within a resource setting and the resource can be associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns, it is natural CSI-RS resource set configuration can include resources with the different number of antenna ports. |
| LG Electronics2 | To support type-1 spatial domain adaptation for A1-1-revised in the agreement above, we think that two CSI-RS resources within the resource set can have different numbers of antenna ports, which is different from the current specification.  For the second question, we don’t think the restriction of the number of resources within the resource set as one is necessary for A1-2-revised. |
| Ericsson 2 | **First question in Q9-moved:**  The question seems to be about the number of antenna ports for a CSI-RS transmission, which may be different from the port subset on which UE measures and reports CSI.  In that sense, we share a similar view as Intel above.  **Second question in Q9-moved:**  For A1-2 revised, what we prefer is to configure the UE with a single 32-port (non-beamformed) CSI-RS resource in the set, and then the UE would report CSI based on different subsets of the 32 ports corresponding to the different spatial adaptation patterns. Hence we consider that only a single resource in the set is needed. However, based on the GTW session yesterday, we are also OK to consider supporting the (legacy) possibility of configuring multiple beamformed CSI-RS resources in the set and then asking the UE to select the best CSI-RS beam along with RI/PMI/CQI. As Huawei points out, this is referred to as “port virtualization.”  With these two different use cases in mind, we are open to considering a CSI-RS resource set with either a single resource or with multiple resources. Hence, the FFS in the agreement from yesterday’s GTW could be resolved as follows:  **A1-2-further-revised: A resource set with one or multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation pattern**  We think that A1-1 and A1-2 are beneficial for different use cases, and that both should be supported, i.e., no down-selection. For example, A1-1 is useful for Type-2 spatial adaptation, and A1-2 is useful for Type-1 spatial adaptation. This should not be an issue since both A1-1 and A1-2 in terms of CSI-RS resource set configurations are already supported in legacy spec. The only new part is how the spatial adaptation patterns map to the resources which is different for A1-1 and A1-2. |
| CMCC2 | For the 1st question, we are open to further discuss different number of CSI-RS ports could be configured within one resource set.  For the 2nd question, currently there is only one case support one CSI-RS resource within one resource set, which is Type II CSI report. Then the motivation to limit the CSI-RS resource number within one resource set to 1 is not clear. Multiple CSI-RS resources can be configured within one resources set that at least UE can report which CSI-RS or CRI has the best performance under certain spatial pattern. We think more than one resources could be configured for A1-2 |
| **FL2e** | * do you consider the CSI-RS resource set configuration should only include resources with the same number of antenna ports? Any other restrictions you may consider as needed?   Y: Lenovo, QC (for A1-2 in one codebook config), Intel, ETRI (for A1-1?), Apple, E//  N: CTC, HW/HiSi, ITRI, FW, xiaomi, ETRI (for A1-2?), Fujitsu, CATT, Samsung, LGe, CMCC   * Do you consider more than one resource can be configured for A1-2?   Y: all companies.  **P-Q9-moved**  **For A1-2-revised, one or more resources can be configured in the resource set.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO3 | Support the proposal of P-Q9-moved. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Share the similar view as Nokia and Intel |
| LG Electronics3 | Support P-Q9-moved. |
| NEC | The CSI-RS resource set configuration should only include resources with the same number of antenna ports. Multiple CSI-RS resource set configurations in one CSI report configuration should be supported for multiple antenna adaptation patterns with different number of antenna ports. |
| OPPO | Support P-Q9-moved |
| MTK2 | We can support P-Q9-moved as first step while we also prefer the restriction of the same number of antenna ports. For the type-1 adaptation, the intention is to adapt physical antenna setting to a target port number. It is therefore reasonable for UE to measure CSI-RS resources corresponding to the target port number. For the overhead/UE complexity reduction for NES, sharing of RI/PMI is also feasible with a common port number. In this regard, such restriction should be considered to realize efficient CSI measurement and report for NES. |
| ZTE, Sanechips3 | Support P-Q9-moved. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FL3** | * do you consider the CSI-RS resource set configuration should only include resources with the same number of antenna ports? Any other restrictions you may consider as needed?   Y: Lenovo, QC (for A1-2 in one codebook config), Intel (if it is not about the hypothetic ports of multi-patterns), ETRI (for A1-1?), Apple, E//(if it is about CSI-RS), Spreadtrum, NEC, MTK  N: CTC, HW/HiSi, ITRI, FW, xiaomi, ETRI (for A1-2?), Fujitsu, CATT, Samsung, LGe, CMCC  FL original thinking is including the case of hypothetic antenna port corresponding to different patterns, since as vivo pointed out, for A1-1 where **a resource set with multiple resources is configured** within a resource setting, if **each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern** and different resources are associated with different spatial adaptation pattern. This case (different number of APs) is even more natural for A1-2.  Based on the above, it seems no additional restriction is needed for A1-1-revised or A1-2-revised. I may not fully understand the concern.  **Q9-moved-extended**  **Companies are invited to further share your opinion/concern.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We do not think it is necessary to limit the resources within a CSI-RS resource set with same number of antenna ports. This would limit the adaptation hypothesis from gNB side with restricted CSI report.  We are okay and support **P-Q9-moved.** |
| Samsung3 | Agree with the FL summary. |
| CEWiT | We also do not think it is necessary to limit the resources within a CSI-RS resource set with same number of antenna ports. This would limit the adaptation hypothesis from gNB side with restricted  CSI report.  We are fine in general |
| ZTE, Sanechips3e | For A1-1, it is not necessary to limit the resources within a CSI-RS resource set with same number of antenna ports.  While for Al-2, the different spatial adaptation patterns are defined by different hypothetical ports, the number of antenna ports of the resources within a CSI-RS resource set is the same. |
| ETRI | Different spatial adaptation patterns (e.g., different subsets of CSI-RS ports) can be configured by A1-2-revised using one CSI-RS resource. So in our view there is no necessity to allow multiple CSI-RS resources within a resource set (for both A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised). |
| Nokia/NSB3 | We are fine with FL’s observations |
| Fujitsu4 | We agree with FL that the restricting one spatial adaptation pattern within a resource set is not necessary. Different resources within a resource set can be associated with different spatial adaptation patterns. |
| CATT | We are OK with FL’s observations |
| LG Electronics4 | We share the view with the Moderator. For A1-1-revised, a resource within a resource set can be configured with 32 antenna ports while another resource within the resource set can be configured with 16 antenna ports. |
| Ericsson 4 | The question seems to be about the number of antenna ports for a CSI-RS *transmission*, which is a different issue than the port subset on which UE measures and reports CSI.  In that sense, we think it is natural that the number of antenna ports for CSI-RS *transmission* is the same for each resource in the set. On top of this, the UE needs to be told what port subset on which to measure and report CSI as well as codebook related info for the number of ports in the indicated port subset. |
| Apple3e-add | We share similar view as Ericsson 4.  Moreover, for the case that vivo pointed out, “for A1-1 where **a resource set with multiple resources is configured** within a resource setting, if **each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern** and different resources are associated with different spatial adaptation pattern.” We think this observation is only valid for type 2 spatial adaptation pattern where the QCL is changed while the number of ports remains unchanged. In this case, the multiple CSI-RS resoures in the set share the same number of ports.  As for Type 1, we don’t think A1-1 is a good way to handle. If A1-1 is used, multiple CSI-RS resources will be configured for multiple nrofPorts assumptions where actually they can correspond to the same CSI-RS resource just with different number of ports assumptions to compute CSI. I’d like to understand on the group’s understanding on the following case, for Type 1 spatial adaptation, if we use A1-1, we need to configure the CMR as {CRI#1 with 32 ports, CRI#2 with 16 ports}, then does the NW transmits two CSI-RS resources for UE to measure? Our understanding is that from NW perspective, this increases NW RS overhead, and from UE perspective, it increase UE channel measurement and estimation overload, which is not beneficial for either NW or UE.  Therefore, for A1-1, the multiple resources in the CMR set have the same nrofPorts , for A1-2, the multiple resources in the CMR set have at least the same number of antenna ports for transmission, it can be further discussed that whether the subset of ports need to be the same, although our preference is also yes. |
| FL3-fri | Anything needs to be proposed for agreement, to clarify the below?  **For CSI-RS resource configuration of A1-1-revised or A1-2-revised, no additional restriction is needed on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics5 | **@ Apple3e-add:**  We would like to clarify our understanding on A1-1 for Type 1. As Apple took an example, we also think NW needs to configure the CMR as {CRI#1 with 32 ports, CRI#2 with 16 ports}, in which case L=2. If N=2, NW has to transmit two CSI-RS resource and UE also has to report two CSIs corresponding to two CSI-RS resources. We don’t think this increases NW RS overhead in that even in current CSI reporting framework, multiple CSI-RS resources can be configured within a resource set as CMR. The only difference is that the restriction on the same number of antenna ports across resources within a resource set is not needed for this case. Therefore, we don’t need to impose a limitation on the number of antenna ports for A1-1-revised to support Type 1 spatial domain adaptation.  **@ FL:**  For A1-2-revised to support Type-1, the restriction on the number of antenna ports can be vague. For example, NW configures the CMR as {CRI#1 with N1 ports, CRI#2 with N2 ports}, and N3 ports (which is a subset of N1 ports) for CRI#1 and N4 ports (which is a subset of N2 ports) for CRI#2 are also configured. In this case, could the restriction imply that N1 equals to N2? Or, does it mean N1=N2 as well as N3=N4? |
| Xiaomi | We share the similar view with FL. No further restriction is needed on the number of antenna ports. |
| Qualcomm3-fri | No restriction is needed for A1-1-revised.  However, for A1-2-revised, the restriction should be provided that the resources in the set have the same number of ports as the number of ports in its corresponding codebook configuration. For example, the CMR has 16-port CMR1 and 16-port CMR2. Both can have different CSI resource mapping patterns but should follow the same codebook config with (N1, N2) e.g., (8,1).  Furthermore, having restriction on the same # of ports makes A1-2-revised applicable to Type2/Power domain.  If they have different number of ports as 32-port CMR1 and 16-port CMR2, it becomes A1-1-revised. If we still think it can belong to A1-2-revised, the motivation is unclear.  Hence, we think the following proposal is necessary.  **Proposal**  For A1-2-revised, NZP CSI-RS resources have the same number of antenna ports as that provided in a corresponding codebook configuration. |
| CEWiT | We share the similar view with LG Electronics5 |
| Ericsson 5 | We think this discussion can be deferred for now until we make more progress on reporting sub-configurations and resource configuration |
|  |  |

**\*Week 2 start\***

Perhaps now the discussion can be resumed given some progress is available for configurations.

@LGe

For the question you mentioned, if such a restriction is applied, it seems natural that N1=N2 and N3=N4. However, there are a few different view for the need of such restriction for A-1-2, potentially for Type 1 shutdown. The following proposal fallback to A-1-1 first, and companies can continue discussion the case of A-1-2.

**FL4-resourceConfig-Q1**

**No restriction is needed for at least A-1-1-revised on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report.**

**FFS: need of such restriction for A-1-2-revised.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics6 | @ FL, Thanks for the response and we agree with your statements.  We are fine with FL4-resourceConfig-Q1. |
| Apple | Thanks for LGE5’s clarification. Our point is that for type 1 spatial adaptation, NW does not need to configure two CSI-RS resources, only one CSI-RS resource with {32 ports, 16 port} assummptions and two sub-configurations corresponding to two codebook sizes is enough. In this sense, NW only needs to send one 32-port CSI-RS resources, thus saving NW resource. However, if it is NW’s preference and we are the only company that prefer same antenna ports, we are OK to compromise. |
| Intel | ok |
| vivo | Ok |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | Support. |
| CATT | WE are OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In the current spec, CSI-RS resources within one set are configured with same *density* and same *nrofPorts* except for the NZP CSI-RS resources used for interference measurement.  And we think for **A-1-1-revised** that at least this restriction should be removed for the number of ports.  For **A-1-2-revised,** we agree with the FFS. |
| InterDigital | OK |
| Qualcomm4 | The statement of the proposal is too strong. It could be interpreted that the number of ports that are not supported by legacy spec now can be supported, or new port configurations (N1, N2) or (Ng, N1, N2) can be introduced. We suggest softening the language. Furthermore, FFS should be clearer for further study at this stage.  Hence, we suggest the following **proposal**:  **Proposal**   * **For A-1-1-revised, NZP CSI-RS resources in the resource set for channel measurement can have same or different number of antenna ports.** * **FFS: For A-1-2-revised, whether NZP CSI-RS resources in the resource set for channel measurement need to have the same number of antenna ports.** |
| Samsung4 | For A-1-1-revised, no restriction is needed as multiple resources are independently configured.  For A-1-2-revised, multiple SD patterns are derived from a single resource configuration. Therefore, antenna ports for multiple SD patterns shall be a proper subset of the provided single resource configuration as well as the number of ports must comply with one that is supported by current specification, i.e., 1, 2, 4, 8, 12, 16, 24, 32, not an arbitrary number. |
| Fujitsu6 | Support |
| Ericsson 6 | Regarding FL4-resourceConfig-Q1, the proposal needs updates.  A1-2 revised supports the case of single resource and multiple resources. Restriction on number of ports is irrelevant if there is only one resource in the set. This is consistent with Apple’s comment. For the case of multiple resources, we are OK to leave as FFS potential restrictions. Therefore, we suggest the following update.  Hence, we recommend the following update to FL4-resourceConfig-Q1.  **At least for A-1-1-revised and for A-1-2-revised for the case of a single resource in a set, no restriction is needed on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report.**  **FFS: need of such restriction for case of multiple resources in a set for A-1-2-revised.** |
| China Telecom | We support the proposal. |
| ETRI | We still think this proposal is not necessary, however, we are okay with it seeing the majority view. If CSI-RS resources with different number of ports are supported for A-1-1-revised, then the same can be done for A-1-2-revised. Also okay with FFS for now. |
| CMCC5 | Fine |
| FL | It seems the proposal is fine with majority. A bit modification per suggestions.  Please also indicate your view on QC’s suggestion in the next round.  **FL4e-resourceConfig-Q1**  **For A-1-1-revised, no restriction is needed on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report.**  **for A-1-2-revised, at least for the case of a single resource in a set, no restriction is needed on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report.**  **FFS: need of such restriction for the case of multiple resources in a set for A-1-2-revised.** |
| Samsung4e | For A-1-2-revised, the wording ‘no-restriction’ may be too strong. As multiple SD patterns are derived from a single resource configuration, at least the antenna ports for multiple SD patterns shall be a proper subset of the provided single resource configuration. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer the **FL4-resourceConfig-Q1**.  For A-1-2-revised, if a single resource configured in a set, and port subset indication is used. The number of antenna ports configured in the resource includes only one number of antenna ports, the other number of antenna ports corresponding to other patterns are hypothesis value according to the port subset indication. Thus, we prefer the **FL4-resourceConfig-Q1**. |
| LG Electronics7 | We prefer Qualcomm’s version for the first sentence.  The whole point we are talking about here, is for the case where multiple CSI resources are configured within a resource set. We don’t think the second sentence in FL4e-resourceConfig-Q1 is needed. It is obvious that if only a single resource is configured within a resource set, it can be configured with any of values defined for *nrofPorts*. |
| China Telecom | We support the proposal in principle. And we prefer the FL version. Though the Qualcomm’s version has the same intention, but we think the version provided by FL is clearer and more specific, a which can really make progress. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with QC proposal.  In the current spec 38.214, “CSI-RS resources within one set are configured with same *density* and same *nrofPorts* except for the NZP CSI-RS resources used for interference measurement. “  And we think for **A-1-1-revised** that at least this restriction should be removed for the number of ports.  For **A-1-2-revised,** we agree with the FFS.  We do not agree with this “**for A-1-2-revised, at least for the case of a single resource in a set, no restriction is needed on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report.**”  First, we do not understand what single CSI resource case is mentioned here. Second, we think FFS is still needed for A-1-2-revised case. |
| Apple | OK with FL’s version |
| Fujitsu | For A-1-2 revised, we think that no restriction on the configuration of number of antenna ports needs to be clarified. If it means that a resource can be configured with different number of ports, we are fine with it. But our understanding is that it was already agreed in last week’s GTW and we do not need to discuss it anymore. If it means that a resource can be configured with an arbitrary number of ports, e.g., 7 port, we do not support it since it is not practical. |
| FL | There were some discussion over the GTW session. One discussion point was what the restriction means and the other related restriction is how the case of single resource in a set is relevant. For the moment, I put both suggestions for further discussion.  **FL5**  ***-resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification***   * **For A-1-1-revised, NZP CSI-RS resources in the resource set for channel measurement can have same or different number of antenna ports.** * **FFS: For A-1-2-revised, whether NZP CSI-RS resources in the resource set for channel measurement need to have the same number of antenna ports.**   ***-resourceConfig-Q1-Ericsson modification***   * **For A-1-1-revised, no restriction is needed on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report.** * **For A-1-2-revised, at least for the case of a single resource in a set, no restriction is needed on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report.** * **FFS: need of such restriction for the case of multiple resources in a set for A-1-2-revised.** * **Note: legacy port configurations (N1, N2) or (Ng, N1, N2) are supported.** * **Note: no new port configurations (N1, N2) or (Ng, N1, N2) to be introduced.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| Qualcomm-FL5 | For “***-resourceConfig-Q1-Ericsson modification***”, we discussed 2nd bullet during online session. Our point is that if there is a single resource in a set, the number of ports of the configured resource should be above a certain threshold e.g., above 8 or should be high like 32 as Ericsson discussed in Tdoc. Having a small number of ports does not seem useful from efficient adaptation perspective since it does not allow the gNB to adapt to a higher port number (e.g., 8-port resource is configured and then port subset indication to get CSI for 4/2 ports. This does not give gNB flexibility to adapt to > 8 ports). For reduced resource(s) from the configured resource for different spatial patterns, restriction may not be needed as long as the notes in the last 2 bullets are there.  To make further progress, we suggest the following update:   * **For A-1-2-revised, at least for the case of a single resource in a set, the number of antenna ports is higher than P (FFS: value of P) ~~no restriction is needed on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report~~.** |
| Intel | We are ok with both proposals. From our understanding the main proposal to be remove the same number of port limitation for CSI-RS resources within a resource set. |
| vivo | Ok for the first proposal. |
| Ericsson-FL5 | Judging by the discussion in the GTW today, it became clear that there are different views on what “restriction means.” We think it would be good to have resolution on **FL5-resourceConfig-Q2** (see our suggestion for a potential resolution) and more alignment may be needed on what companies have in mind about which SD adaptation type/types apply to A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised before discussion on potential restrictions.  To respond to Qualcomm’s above comment and proposal on A1-2-revised, when there is a single resource in the set, it is not clear to us why there should be a restriction on the number of ports P. The number of ports for both A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised should be left to gNB implementation, since different antenna architectures can have different number of ports.  Based on this, we think some further discussion is needed before making agreements. |
| CEWiT | We are ok with both proposals. Our understanding is that the main proposal is to remove the same number of port limitation for CSI-RS resources within a resource set. |
| Samsung5 | It seems there is some confusion on what is being restricted; our understanding is that the restriction is regarding ‘number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns’ that can be derived from a single resource configuration while it seems E/// thinks that the restriction is regarding the single resource configuration itself. Of course, for the single resource configuration itself, there shall be no restriction. However, for the ‘number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns’ derived from the single resource configuration, there should be certain restriction such as the antenna ports for different spatial adaptation patterns shall be a proper subset of the provided single resource configuration. |
| LG Electronics8 | We prefer ***resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification***. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think we should first discuss on FL5-resourceConfig-Q2 first. And then discuss this Q.  Also, we agree with the FL and Samsung that we should clarify what restrictions we are targeting to relax. For us it is related to the restriction the current spec TS38.214 there is the following restriction   * + - CSI-RS resources within one set are configured with same *density* and same *nrofPorts* except for the NZP CSI-RS resources used for interference measurement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | We think we should first discuss on FL5-resourceConfig-Q2 first. And then discuss this Q.  Also, we agree with the FL and Samsung that we should clarify what restrictions we are targeting to relax. For us it is related to the restriction the current spec TS38.214 there is the following restriction   * + - CSI-RS resources within one set are configured with same *density* and same *nrofPorts* except for the NZP CSI-RS resources used for interference measurement.   Based on this we agree with the original proposal  **No restriction is needed for at least A-1-1-revised on the configuration of number of antenna ports corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns for CSI measurement and report.**  **FFS: need of such restriction for A-1-2-revised.** |
| Spreadtrum5 | We support QC’s version or update from QC’s version. In current spec, we have CSI-RS port number restriction PER resource. From E///’s version, we don’t know whether it means CSI-RS ports number PER resource or resource set or SD pattern… The wording “corresponding to” is not clear for us. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Regarding the restriction here, we think it means whether the number of ports of the resources within the set should be the same or not.  Regarding the exact number of ports (e.g., 32, 16, 8 or 4), we think it depends on gNB implementation. We don’t need extra restriction on that. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with both proposals |
| Xiaomi | Support ***resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification***. Otherwise, the ‘restriction’ may have different understandings. The first proposal is better to clarify what ‘restriction’ means.  Besides, we cannot observation any severe influence if the number of antenna ports of NZP CSI-RS resources in the resource set are different. But for moving forward, we are fine to keep it an FFS. |
| Apple-FL5 | My original understanding according to previous rounds is that the group wants to support A1-1-revised for both Type 1 and Type 2 SD adaptation for NW configuration flexibility, so that the limitation on only the same number of ports within a resource set can be removed.  If A1-1-revised supports both Type 1 and Type 2 SD adaptation, we are fine with the proposal **FL5*-resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification,*** which we compromised for the sake for NW configuration flexibility.  If A1-1-revised is only for Type 2 SD adaption, we think we should stick to the limitation on the same number of ports within a resource set, since Type 2 will not lead to reduction of antenna ports. |
| Fujitsu7 | Firstly, we’d like to clarify the meaning of restriction. As shown in above figures, we think there are three potential restrictions.  Restriction1 is comparable with legacy restriction. For A1-1, with the assumption of type 2 adaptation, restriction 1 is about port number and density and is among different resources. For A1-2, with the assumption of type 1 adaptation, restriction 1 is about port number and density and is among resources without spatial adaptation. In our understanding, the restriction mentioned in the original version provided by FL is restriction 1.  For A1-1, with the assumption of type 2 adaptation, we assume that restriction 2 is the restriction mentioned by Ericsson for A1-2 with a single resource. This is the restriction within a resource associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns. It is not comparable with the legacy restriction. It is not only for single resource. Each resource has a restriction within itself.  For A1-1, with the assumption of type 2 adaptation, a resource can be associated with more than one adaptation patterns. Restriction 3 is about the potential adaptation pattens for resources. It can be that NZP CSI-RS resources in a resource set share the same adaptation patterns  In our understanding, we can discussion restriction 1 and restriction 3 first.  **FL5**  ***-resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification***   * **For A-1-1-revised, NZP CSI-RS resources in a~~the~~ resource set for channel measurement can have same or different number of antenna ports.** * **~~FFS:~~ For A-1-2-revised,**    + **~~whether~~ NZP CSI-RS resources without spatial adaptation in a ~~the~~ resource set for channel measurement need to have the same number of antenna ports.**   + **NZP CSI-RS resources in a resource set for channel measurement are associated with the same spatial adaptation patterns.** * **Note: legacy port configurations (N1, N2) or (Ng, N1, N2) are supported.** * **Note: no new port configurations (N1, N2) or (Ng, N1, N2) to be introduced.**   Besides, regarding other restrictions, such as the lower limit of the number of ports proposed by Qualcomm, we can discuss them later after consensus is reached on this proposal. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Prefer ***resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification***. The restrictions for A1-2-revised can be left FFS and discussed in the next meeting. |
| MTK5 | Support with revision  The use of antenna ports looks not precise under CSI context (and should be the number of CSI-RS ports). Specific use of ‘*nrofPorts*’ looks useful to avoid confusion.  For A-1-2 revised, it looks the FFS can have wider scope to address companies’ different views.  ***-resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification***   * **For A-1-1-revised, NZP CSI-RS resources in the resource set for channel measurement can have same or different ~~number of antenna ports~~** *nrofPorts***.** * **FFS: Whether/what restriction for A-1-2-revised~~, whether NZP CSI-RS resources in the resource set for channel measurement need to have the same number of antenna ports.~~** |
| ETRI | We are OK with ***resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification.***  From our understanding, ***resourceConfig-Q1-Ericsson modification*** is a separate issue and can be discussed in the next meeting. |

**Agreement**

Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement within one resource setting corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns with at least one of the following

* A1-1-revised: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern
* A1-2-revised: For a resource configured in a resource set within a resource setting, the resource can be associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns
  + One or more resources can be configured in the resource set for channel measurement.

**FL5-resourceConfig-Q2**

**For A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised in the above agreement, which alternative do you have concern for support?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | The specification should allow both configurations to allow the selection of configuration in the gNB implementation. |
| Qualcomm-FL5 | From our perspectives, for one SD adaptation type, only one option is supported. Hence, we asked to include “at least one of” during online discussion. If we recalled correctly, Chairman acknowledged during that online discussion that down-selection is possible.  Our view on “for one SD adaptation type, only one option is supported”:   * A1-1-revised is for Type 2 SD:   + The power offset between CSI-RS and SSB is not hypothetical (different from offset between PDSCH and CSI-RS for CSI reporting) – we quoted text from 38.214 earlier. Hence to understand CSI for Type 2 SD, gNB needs to **actually** send CSI-RS corresponding to different CSI-RS/SSB power offset.   + Using A1-2-revised with hypothetical values of CSI-RS/SSB power offsets (or A1-2-power) does not really work in practice. * A1-2-revised is for Type 1 SD |
| Intel | No concern. However, we agree with moderator that we understood the proposal to support configuration of both cases but only enable 1 at a time to be the compromise.  We think that should be the revised agreement. |
| Ericsson-FL5 | We think both A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised should both be supported, but should be configurable for different purposes so we propose the following update to the existing agreement:  **Agreement-Updated**  Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement within one resource setting corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns with ~~at least one of~~ the following   * A1-1-revised: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern * A1-2-revised: For a resource configured in a resource set within a resource setting, the resource can be associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns   + One or more resources can be configured in the resource set for channel measurement.   It is good that Qualcomm provided a refined view “for one SD adaptation type, only one option is supported.” As we stated in the GTW we also think that   * A1-1 revised is more appropriate for Type-2 SD adaptation   + Different from Type-1 SD adaptation, the gNB actually needs to transmit the CSI-RS correspond to each SD pattern, since the antenna muting within each port is transparent to the UE.   + In addition, the multiple CSI-RS resources in the set can each have a different CSI-RS-to-SSB power offset since Type-2 SD adaptation changes the CSI-RS power while the SSB power is fixed due to the scope defined in the WID. Agree with Qualcomm that the gNB needs to actually transmit the CSI-RS resources as stated in the above bullet. * A1-2 revised is more appropriate for Type-1 SD adaptation   + This allows configuration of only a single resource (for the non-precoded CSI-RS case), and enables the UE to still report multiple hypotheses on Type-1 SD adaptation patterns   Given this, we would be okay to clarify something like the following:   * A1-1-revised is supported for Type-2 SD adaptation only   A1-2-revised is supported for Type-1 SD adaptation only |
| vivo | We think A1-1-revised should be supported, since it can be applicable to both Type-1 SD adaptation and Type-2 SD adaptation. Whether it is used for Type-1 or Type-2 SD adaptation is up to gNB implementation.  For A1-2-revised, our understanding is that it cannot be applied for Type-2 SD adaptation. If A1-2-revised needs to be supported, further detail should be discussed about how to apply for Type-1 SD adaptation and whether/how overhead reduction can be adopted first. |
| CMCC7 | We share similar idea that both alternatives have their application scenario, each of which can work in a certain assumption or SD assumptions. |
| Samsung5 | We support the configurability of the two cases, i.e., no concern. |
| LG Electronics8 | We share the similar view with vivo. We don’t think it is desirable to impose a restriction on a gNB’s configuration. Since the framework with A1-1-revised can be applied to both of Type-1 and Type-2 SD adaptation patterns, it is up to gNB’s configuration whether A1-1-revised is used for either of Type-1 or Type-2 (even both Type-1 and Type-2) SD adaptation pattern.  @ Qualcomm, Ericsson,  If Type-1 is not supported for A1-1-revised, why are we discussing ***resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification*** or ***resourceConfig-Q1-Ericsson modification***?  Regarding A1-2-revised, if we support multiple antenna-port hypothesis for a single CSI-RS resource (e.g., 8/16/32 antenna-port hypothesis for a 32-port CSI-RS resource), we will have more issues to be figured out compared to the case of supporting Type-1 with A1-1-revised. For instance, UE needs to be informed of which 8/16 antenna ports (out of 32 antenna ports) are used for CSI measurement, and there could be an issue how to construct MIMO codebook by using informed 8/16 antenna ports.  To sum up, we are open to support both of A1-1 and A1-2. But we are reluctant to conclude now that A1-1-revised is targeted for Type 2 and A1-2-revised is targeted for Type 1, without further analysis. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised.  For type 2 SD, A1-1 should be supported. As we discussed in our contribution as follow:   1. ***For type 2 shutdown, independent CSI-RS resources should be used for CSI measurement of different spatial adaptation patterns, as the precoding/beam forming weight matrix of a logical CSI-RS port must be different.***   In A1-1 approach, IE powercontroloffsetSS in contained in IE NZP-CSI-RS resource. Whether is different or same for resources corresponding to different patterns is no need to be considered, because it is configured by gNB. In addition, as we discussed in our previous reply, powercontrolOffsetSS is used for path-loss calculation and is optional configured in IE NZP-CSI-RS resource. So, we do not think we need to pay more time to discuss this in A1-1.  For type 1 SD, both A1-1 and A1-2 can be support.  If only one of these two is supported for type 1 SD, considering many companies (e.g. QC) prefer A1-2, we can compromise on A1-2. |
| Spreadtrum5 | In our understanding from discussion, it seems that E/// think A1-1-revised is only for Type -2 SD, and A1-2-revised is only for Type-1 SD. So, if we have to down select A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised, it means we only support one of Type-1 and Type-2 SD.  In our view, A1-1-revised only supports Type-2 SD, but A1-2-revised can support both Type-1 and Type-2 SD. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think both A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised should be supported.  For A1-1-revised, it is more appropriate type 2 SD adaptation since the TxRU shutdown at gNB side is transparent to UE, multiple measurement resources have to be configured. For A1-2-revised, it better fits to type 1 SD adaptation. It lead to less configuration signaling, less CSI-RS signaling, more NES chances for gNB due to less CSI-RS transmission occasions.  We also agree with QC, Ericsson’s view “for one SD adaptation type, only one option is supported.” |
| DOCOMO8 | We support both of A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised. |
| Nokia/NSB | To our view, both should be supported by specification, and practically use either A1-1-revised or A1-2 revised in terms of applied types, i.e. Type 2 or Type 1. |
| Xiaomi | We share the similar view with vivo and LG that it should depend on gNB configuration to determine which Alt suits which SD adaptation type. |
| Apple-FL5 | Please also see our comment in response to **FL5*-resourceConfig-Q1-QC modification***  To state our preference, we would support one type for one alternative, which is cleaner and simpler without too many spec redundancy to support two kinds of configuration for one feature.  If it can be agreed that A1-1-revised is only for Type 2 SD adaption, we think we should stick to the limitation on the same number of ports within a resource set, since Type 2 will not lead to reduction of antenna ports, otherwise, we think the previous proposal lifting the limitation on same number of ports already means that A1-1-revised is supported for both Type 1 and Type 2. |
| Fujitsu7 | Regarding the agreement about A1-1-revised and A1-2-reviesed, we would like to ask for clarification on the following points:   1. The intention to support A1-1-revised is for type 2 adaptation, though how to configure and use it fully depends on the gNB implementation.    * If this is the case, when we discuss/design the details of A1-1-revised, type 2 adaptation should be the only case in our mind. 2. The intention to support A1-2-revised is for type 1 adaptation, though how to configure and use it fully depends on the gNB implementation.    * If this is the case, when we discuss/design the details of A1-1-revised, type 2 adaptation should be the only case in our mind. 3. Regarding the sub-bullet in the agreement, “One or more resources can be configured in the resource set for channel measurement”, the only reason we support “more resource” is for the backwards compatibility with the resource configuration for type I codebook. We hope this is a common sense among companies.   We support both alternatives if it can be clarified that the gNB would not configure both at the same time. We don’t see any necessity to support this scenario. Such kind of flexibility cannot provide any benefit compared with configuring either of them. |
| CEWiT | We share similar views with Vivo that A1-1-revised is applicable to both Type-1 SD adaptation and Type-2 SD adaptation. Whether it is used for Type-1 or Type-2 SD adaptation is up to gNB implementation. Hence A1-1-revised should be supported. |
| ETRI | We think we should try to down-select to keep workload manageable. We prefer to understand whether both alternatives are really necessary before agreeing both. Our understanding is as follows:   * A1-1-revised can support both Type 1 and Type 2 SD adaptation.   + Type 1 SD adaptation based on multiple resources with **different** number of ports   + Type 2 SD adaptation based on multiple resources with **the same** number of ports * A1-2-revised can support both Type 1 and Type 2 SD adaptation.   + Type 1 SD adaptation based on a single resource associated with multiple report sub-configurations with **different** number of ports   + Type 2 SD adaptation based on a single resource associated with multiple report sub-configurations with **the same** number of ports   + One limitation is only one QCL assumption is valid during adaptation   From our understanding, the major difference is QCL assumption in the last subbullet, but simple change may resolve this issue. If our understanding is correct, it may be possible to achieve both Type 1/2 SD adaptation using a single alternative. |

**\*Week 2 end\***

3.4 CSI-RS resource mapping pattern

**Company proposals**

Other than CSI-RS resource configuration, the CSI-RS resource mapping (RE mapping) patterns are also mentioned. Views are captured below.

[Nokia, NSB]: Do not introduce additional CSI-RS resource patterns for the purpose of spatial adaptation.

[NEC]: Reduced CSI-RS density for frequency domain network energy saving should be considered.

[xiaomi]: How to enable efficient adaptation of resource mapping for the reception of one CSI-RS resource should be further studied.

[Samsung]: For Type 1 SD adaptation, each NZP CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can include one or more of CSI-RS to RE mapping patterns.

[Qualcomm]: (Observation) It is necessary to enhance CSI-RS patterns so that additional reduced CSI-RS patterns associated with subsets of CSI-RS antenna ports are nested inside the CSI-RS pattern with all CSI-RS antenna ports being active.

* + - Option 1: Introduce additional CSI-RS resource patterns
    - Option 2: Support CSI report based on a subset of CSI-RS resources configured in an CSI report setting

**FL summary**

The need of new CSI-RS resource mapping pattern is not sufficient enough at the moment. However for further digging the potential benefit under the configuration of a common CSI-RS resource for type 1 adaptation/shutdown case, it is suggested to share your views with details for this below question.

**Q7**

**Do you consider there is benefit for introduction of new CSI-RS resource (RE mapping) pattern, and if so, what patterns you think can be introduced?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | The necessity of new CSI-RS resource (RE mapping) pattern should be further studied. |
| ETRI | The necessity of new CSI-RS resource pattern may depend on applied CSI schemes.  When full-port CSI-RS resource is transmitted (e.g., MFTA in Huawei’s tdoc), legacy CSI-RS resource pattern is sufficient. Even if UE uses a subset of CSI-RS antenna ports to derive CSI, the mapping pattern can be maintained.  Meanwhile, when CSI-RS antenna ports of a CSI-RS resource is partially muted, it may be efficient to change the mapping pattern to transmit unmuted CSI-RS antenna ports. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think new CSI-RS resource pattern is not needed. Using signaling to indicates indexes of a subset of ports is easier and has less specification impact. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not think that there is a need to introduce new patterns. It is a lot of specification effort without clear advantages. |
| Nokia/NSB | We still don’t see any strong reason to introduce new CSI-RS resource patterns. Also, for this issue, lots of discussions and efforts are expected. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer not. Multiple additional CSI-RS resource patterns may be needed to configure different situations of spatial adaptations. In this case, the spec influence is huge. |
| CMCC | The need for introducing new CSI-RS resource mapping should be further justified. |
| Samsung | No. |
| **FL2** | Given the discussion so far, is it possible to agree on the following?  **P-Q7**：  **New CSI-RS resource (RE mapping) pattern is not introduced for R18 network energy savings purpose.** |
| China Telecom | We support the P-Q7. |
| DOCOMO2 | Support the proposal considering the potential specification impact and unclear benefits. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support with P-Q7. |
| ITRI | Support |
| Qualcomm2 | The benefits of having new resource pattern: (1) minimal spec change (i.e., adding some new rows in the mapping pattern table) while achieving most potential NES gain; (2) maximally leveraging existing UE implementation.  We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Lenovo2 | Support |
| Intel | Ok with P-Q7 |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB2 | Fine with P-Q7. |
| ETRI | Given that majority supports it, we are also okay with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu2 | We support this proposal. New resource mapping pattern should be precluded to save specification effort. |
| CATT | Agree with P-Q7 |
| Apple | Support |
| LG Electronics2 | We are not against P-Q7, but need clarification on CSI-RS resource pattern or RE mapping pattern in this proposal. According to 211 spec, 18 rows are supported to determine CSI-RS locations within a slot (as in Table 7.4.1.5.3-1). Is it correct understanding that P-Q7 implies no new row will be added in Table 7.4.1.5.3-1? |
| Ericsson 2 | Support P-Q7 |
| CMCC2 | Fine with the conclusion. The new design of the CSI-RS resource mapping pattern would trigger much specification efforts. |
| FL2e | @LGe it is my understanding. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Fine |
| LG Electronics3 | @ Moderator, thanks for the confirmation. In that case, we can make the proposal clearer, as follows.  **P-Q7**：  **New CSI-RS resource (RE mapping) pattern is not introduced for R18 network energy savings purpose.**  **Note: CSI-RS resource (RE mapping) pattern above refers to a row in TS 38.211 Table 7.4.1.5.3-1 determining CSI-RS locations within a slot.** |
| NEC | Support P-Q7 |
| OPPO | Support P-Q7 |
| MTK2 | Support P-Q7 |
| ZTE, Sanechips3 | Support P-Q7 |
| CATT | Support P-Q7 |
| China Telecom | Support P-Q7 |

3.5 CSI reporting configuration

The relevant agreements are excerpted as below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For spatial element adaptation, further study the following   * A2-1) Independent/separate CSI report configurations where each CSI report configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern * A2-2) One CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern   + FFS: Details of sub-configuration |

**Company proposals**

[Huawei, HiSilicon]:

Support A2-2) one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern. Sub-configuration contains:

* For type 1:
* N1 and N2
* FFS：CSI resource setting related parameters
* For type 2:
* FFS: CSI resource setting related parameters

[Nokia, NSB]: Discuss how to configure CSI measurements and reports for different spatial patterns in time, considering different reporting types (semi-persistent, periodic, aperiodic).

[Spreadtrum]: Dynamic switching between CSI report configurations or spatial adaptation patterns for a CSI report configuration can be considered.

[CATT]: One or more sub-CSI reports could be included in CSI report configuration for type-1 spatial domain adaptation with each CSI-RS resource associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns or type-2 spatial domain adaptation with each CSI-RS resource associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern.

[Intel]: (Observation) CSI report setting for multiple CSI feedback corresponding to multiple CSI-RS resource set hypothesis cannot be separated into independent CSI report settings as the multiple CSI feedback may be coupled with each other.

[Fujitsu]: Support CSI report configuration

* + - A2-1) Each *CSI-ReportConfig* corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern
    - A2-2) Each *CSI-ReportConfig* corresponds to multiple spatial adaptation patterns
      * The common parameters are FFS

[xiaomi] support A2-2 with one CSI report configuration containing multiple spatial adaptation patterns.

[InterDigital]: RRC configures a set of antenna ports subsets for each NZP CSI-RS resource. RRC configures a group identity for the purpose of indicating a subset of antenna ports for each NZP CSI-RS resource.

[China Telecom]: Support to adopt A2-2) for CSI report, i.e., one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern, so that the calculation and report complexity of UE can be reduced.

[Samsung]: For Type 1 SD adaptation, each CSI report configuration can include one or more of codebook configurations.

[ETRI]: For enhancements on CSI reporting configuration, adopt A2-2) One CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern.

[CMCC]: One CSI report configuration containing multiple CSI report sub-configuration where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern, i.e. Alt 2-2, should be supported.

[CEWiT]: One CSI report configuration corresponding to one or more spatial element adaptations is supported.

[MediaTek]: One CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern

* + - Note: Legacy CSI report configuration can already be associated to multiple NZP-CSI-RS resource configurations.

[Transsion]: One CSI report configuration that includes multiple CSI report sub-configurations can be supported.

[LGe]:

* the following approaches can be taken into account for CSI framework enhancement.
  + - Approach 1: One CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration is associated with one CSI-RS resource set (for CMR) and corresponds to one spatial or power adaptation pattern. Each CSI-RS resource/resource set can be associated with only one spatial or power adaptation pattern (e.g., for a CSI reporting setting, CSI-RS resource set #1 with 32-APs NZP CSI-RS resource(s) and CSI-RS resource set #2 with 16-APs NZP CSI-RS resource(s), as CMR).
    - Approach 2: One CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration is associated with a subset of CSI-RS resources within a CSI-RS resource set and corresponds to one spatial or power adaptation pattern. CSI-RS resource set can be associated with more than one spatial or power adaptation patterns but each CSI-RS resource within the CSI-RS resource set can be associated with only one spatial or power adaptation pattern (e.g., for a configured CSI-RS resource set in a CSI reporting setting, CSI-RS resources #1/#2 with 32 APs and CSI-RS resources #3/#4 with 16 APs).
    - Approach 3: One CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where multiple sub-configurations are associated with a same CSI-RS resource but correspond to different spatial or power adaptation patterns. Each CSI-RS resource can be associated with one or more spatial or power adaptation patterns (e.g., a CSI-RS resource within a configured CSI-RS resource set for a CSI reporting setting, is configured with multiple power offset values of {-3, 3} dB, or with 32 and 16 APs).
* For a CSI report configuration that contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to a different number of antenna ports, independent/separate *CodebookConfig* higher layer parameters are configured for each sub-configuration.
* For a CSI report configuration that contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where multiple sub-configurations are associated with a same CSI-RS resource but correspond to different number of antenna ports, discuss at least following issues.
  + - How to signal ON/OFF status for each antenna port
    - How to adjust antenna port mapping considering codebook construction based on antenna ports with ON status

[Apple]:

* For reporting configuration, whether using separate CSI configuration or a single report configuration with multiple sub-configurations, depends on the clarification on UE CSI/CSI-RS capability and CPU counting, that is, the number of supported CPUs for CSI measurement and counting remains the same as current UE capability and
  + - If independent/separate CSI report configurations are supported, CPU occupation is based on per configuration as current.
    - If a single report configuration with multiple sub-configurations is supported, the CPU occupation should be based on per sub-configuration.
* If independent/separate CSI report configurations are supported, consider enhancement on multiple report grouping with resource and reporting parameter redundancy reduction.
* If a single report configuration with multiple sub-configurations is supported, consider at least codebookConfig and associated CSI-RS resource/resource set in the sub-config.

[Lenovo]:

* Support a single CSI reporting setting corresponding to multiple higher-layer configured spatial domain adaptation patterns.
* For a CSI reporting setting corresponding to multiple higher-layer configured spatial domain adaptation patterns, support one of the following alternatives
  + - Alt1. Multiple CSI resource settings for channel measurement corresponding to the multiple spatial domain adaptation patterns
    - Alt2. A single CSI resource setting for channel measurement associated with one NZP CSI-RS resource set, where the NZP CSI-RS resource set further comprises multiple NZP CSI-RS resources for channel measurement corresponding to the multiple spatial domain adaptation patterns
* A single CSI report is supported for reporting CSI corresponding to multiple spatial domain adaptation patterns

[Qualcomm]:

* A spatial adaptation pattern includes a codebook configuration and reduced NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement with the same number of antenna ports as that in the configured codebook.
  + - An antenna array corresponding to the spatial adaptation pattern is a uniform linear array with a supported configuration provided in Table 5.2.2.2.1-2 and Table 5.2.2.2.2-1 of TS 38.214 for Type-I single panel and Type-I multi-panel, respectively.
    - FFS: how to determine the reduced NZP CSI-RS resource(s).
* If RAN1 adopts A2-2 for CSI report configuration and A1-2 for NZP CSI-RS resource set configuration, the following aspects are included for an CSI report configuration.
  + - NZP CSI-RS resource set configuration for channel measurement includes CSI-RS resources with the same number of antenna ports.
    - Reduced NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement corresponding to a spatial adaptation pattern are determined from the resource(s) in the configured CSI-RS resource set.
    - The CSI processing requirements (e.g., CPU counting, counting of simultaneous active CSI-RS resources, etc.) are scaled linearly by the number of codebook configurations and the number of CSI-RS resources for each configured codebook in the CSI report configuration.

[AT&T]:

* Define different CSI reporting hypotheses for different levels of spatial dimensions which rely on the same RRC configuration
  + - For CSI resource configuration, a common CSI-RS resource/resource set is associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns
    - For CSI reporting, support joint reporting of multiple CSIs
      * Further study the need/benefit of overhead reduction
* Different CSI reporting hypotheses for different levels of spatial dimensions are defined by reusing the ZP-CSI-RS framework avoiding fundamental changes to the codebook structure and/or CSI-RS patterns
* Consider enhancements to the CSI reporting procedures for efficient reporting of different hypotheses for different levels of spatial dimensions

[Docomo]: For association between CSI report configuration and spatial pattern, A2-2) should be supported. On top of that, A2-2) can be used together with A1-2), e.g., one CSI report configuration with multiple sub-configurations can be configured to measure one CSI resource set/resource setting associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns.

[Ericsson]:

* For Type-1 spatial element adaptation, one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern (i.e. A2-2 in the RAN1#112 agreement).
* For Type-1 spatial domain adaptation, for aperiodic CSI reporting, support configuration of one or more indicators within a trigger state, where an indicator points to a sub-configuration within a CSI-ReportConfig.
* For Type 1 spatial domain adaptation, a CSI-Report sub-configuration includes the following information for CSI measurement and reporting
  + - A number of antenna ports
    - Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook
* For Type-2 spatial element adaptation, support a variant of A2-2 in the RAN1#112 agreement in which one CSI report configuration is associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns, but sub-configurations are not used. The association can be based on current specifications by configuration of a CSI-RS resource set in CSI-ResourceConfig with multiple CSI-RS resources.
* For Type-2 spatial element adaptation, support a new RRC parameter within CSI-ReportConfig that indicates to the UE that it should report multiple CSIs in case a trigger state points to a CSI-RS resource set within CSI-ResourceConfig that contains multiple CSI-RS resources. For example, the new parameter could be named reportConfig2 with new value ‘multi-RI-PMI-CQI.’ The UE uses the legacy parameter reportConfig if the trigger state points to a CSI-RS resource set with only a single CSI-RS resource.

**FL summary**

There is vast support (13 companies) of A2-2 where one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations with each sub-configuration corresponding to one spatial adaptation pattern. Two companies have different opinion, of whom one considers RRC overhead and complexity will not be reduced by A2-2 but could be supportive if the overhead reduction is significant, and another company concerns UE complexity increase. Also UE capability discussion is triggered by two companies, as detailed in another section (section 3.13).

With one of the major motivations to have A2-2 is to enable CSI feedback with reduced reporting payload and/or UE complexity, the potential of that has been demonstrated in many contributions. Note support of a reporting configuration does not mean support of multi-CSI feedback performed by UE. From gNB perspective, it may also reduce the RRC overhead by sharing many IEs in current specification, e.g. *reportConfigType* however may also require additional new parameters. Therefore, it would be desirable to

**P6**

**Support configurability of A2-2 with overhead reduction, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern**

* **FFS: the parameters that need to be separately included for each sub-configurations**
  + - **CodebookConfig, N1 and N2**
    - **nrofPorts**
    - **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**
    - **Other (new) parameters, if any**
* **FFS: whether the resource set configuration only includes CSI-RS resource(s) with the same number of antenna ports.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Support. A common codebook config can be supported for different spatial adaptation patterns, with different groups of sub-configurations including different configurations of N1 and N2, as well as different CBSR.  We also prefer to add codebook subset restriction (CBSR) for parameters to be included separately for each sub-configuration |
| vivo | We are Ok |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal.  We think the motivation of the proposal is minimize the duplicated RRC indication when configuring multiple CSIs for reporting. Firstly, we should carefully consider what kind of parameters are essential for each sub-configuration. Secondly, it also depends on the discussion progress of other issues.  Based on above, we suggest removing sub-bullets as the details may depends on the discussion progress of other issues.  **Support configurability of A2-2 with overhead reduction, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern**   * **~~FFS: the parameters that need to be separately included for each sub-configurations~~**   + - **~~CodebookConfig, N1 and N2~~**     - **~~nrofPorts~~**     - **~~Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook~~**     - **~~Other (new) parameters, if any~~** * **~~FFS: whether the resource set configuration only includes CSI-RS resource(s) with the same number of antenna ports.~~** |
| OPPO | We are fine with P6 |
| Apple | We think it needs to be clarified on what is the overhead reduction here referring to. Configuration overhead, or reporting overhead reduction?  It needs to be discussed together with the CPU occupation. If the CPU occupation is based on per sub-configuration, we could support this enhancement. |
| FL to Apple | It is for RRC configuration overhead reduction. |
| Spreadtrum | Multiple CSI report sub-configurations should be defined at first. |
| ETRI | Support the main sentence. “with overhead reduction” may be deleted, which is being addressed in P3 and Q8 and not much related to this proposal.  For first FFS bullet, some of the parameters may not belong to CSI report configuration but belong to CSI-RS resource configuration. So we prefer to discuss this aspect as a separate proposal. We feel the second FFS bullet is more related to P5, and suggest to also remove it here. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the main bullet. For the 1st sub-bullet, the listed parameters are for type 1 adaptation, which need to be described clearly. For the 2nd sub-bullet, it should be discussed in the CSI-RS resource configuration in section 3.3. As we stated for P5, a resource set containing CSI-RS resource(s) associated with multiple numbers of antenna ports has the benefit of reduced configuration overhead, so it should be considered.  We suggest the following modifications:  **P6**  **Support configurability of A2-2 with overhead reduction, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern**   * **FFS: the parameters that need to be separately included for each sub-configurations if type 1 spatial element adaptation is enabled**   + - **CodebookConfig, N1 and N2**     - **nrofPorts**     - **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**     - **Other (new) parameters, if any**   + **~~FFS: whether the resource set configuration only includes CSI-RS resource(s) with the same number of antenna ports.~~** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the last FFS, it should be discussed in resource configuration, instead of report configuration. Furthermore, whether the resources within the resource set configuration needs to be with the same number of antenna ports is determined by whether/how one resource to be associated with multiple spatial adaptation patterns |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support this proposal and we propose the following modifications:  **P6**  **Support configurability of A2-2 with overhead reduction, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern**   * **FFS: the parameters that need to be separately included for each sub-configurations**   + - **Parameters in CodebookConfig,**     - **N1 and N2**     - **FFS: Codebook subset restriction does not include in sub-configuration.**   **[**Huawei: For type 1 shutdown, multiple N1 and N2 are necessary. **Only one Codebook subset restriction is sufficient for type 1 shutdown case, due to correlation of PMI.]**   * + - **~~nrofPorts~~**   [Huawei: merge with the next sub-bullets below]   * + - **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports, if A1-2-revised is supported ~~within a codebook~~**     - **Other (new) parameters, if any** * **FFS: whether the resource set configuration only includes CSI-RS resource(s) with the same number of antenna ports.** |
| Nokia/NSB | The main bullet is OK in general. We think that sub-band configuration should be also listed to be discussed as part of the sub-configuration (given that different spatial patterns would have different channel characteristics in terms of frequency selectivity).  Further, we could discuss whether the existing ZP-CSI-RS framework could be leveraged and improved, from configuration perspective, for the objective here, or whether this would introduce more overhead / or would be more complicated compared to other approaches. |
| MediaTek | Support the proposal for providing the essential parameters that UE requires to generate CSI outcome for one spatial adaptation pattern. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the main bullet. As for the second FFS, we share the similar view with Fujitsu that it should be discussed separately. |
| CMCC | In general, we are fine with this direction considering the multiple sub-configurations could be used to indicate different assumptions of the spatial/power adaptations. If more details and parameters could be discussed, it could be better. |
| Samsung | Support in high-level.  A few comments on the list: 1) CodebookConfig includes N1-N2 as well as CBSR. Thus, no need to separately list N1-N2, 2) nrofPorts is part of CSI-RS-Resource configuration. Thus, no need to be listed for CSI report configuration. Also, nrofPorts is already known by N1 and N2. 3) subset of antenna ports maybe better to be given as a part of CSI-RS resource configuration. A proper codebook size needs to be set for the indicated subset of antenna ports, not the other way around.  Additionally, it is suggested to include reportQuantity. The report quantities can be separately configured for each sub-configuration to reduce overhead, e.g., PMI may not need to be reported for all the sub-configurations. |
| InterDigital | Generally ok with FL’s proposal. Under the first FFS bullet, we suggest including a group identity as follows:   * **FFS: the parameters that need to be separately included for each sub-configurations**   + - **CodebookConfig, N1 and N2**     - **nrofPorts**     - **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**     - **Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources**     - **Other (new) parameters, if any**   For overhead reduction, we think a group identity associated with a group of NZP CSI-RS resources can be useful to be included for each sub-configuration. For example, such group of NZP CSI-RS resources may be associated with a spatial adaptation pattern. |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |
| Ericsson | We support A2-2, at least for Type-1 spatial domain (SD) adaptation. For Type-2, we don’t think sub-configurations are needed since the adaptation is transparent to the UEs (# of ports does not change) – as mentioned earlier, type 2 SD can be supported with minimal spec updates. In this case multiple resources are needed, where each resource corresponds to a different SD pattern. Hence, we think that the proposal should say “At least for Type-1 SD adaptation”  Also, we are unclear on what “with overhead reduction” means in the main bullet. This can be removed.  We do not think the FFS is relevant since for type 1 SD, there is only one resource needed within a resource set. So the second FFS can be removed.  **At least for Type-1 spatial domain adaptation, Support configurability of A2-2 ~~with overhead reduction~~, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial domain adaptation pattern**   * **FFS: the parameters that need to be separately included for each sub-configurations**   + - **CodebookConfig, N1 and N2**     - **~~nrofPorts~~**     - **number of CSI-RS ports**     - **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna CSI-RS ports on which the UE should measure CSI ~~within a codebook~~**     - **Other (new) parameters, if any** * **~~FFS: whether the resource set configuration only includes CSI-RS resource(s) with the same number of antenna ports.~~** |
| Qualcomm1 | Both FFSs should be discussed in the context of CSI-RS resource configuration and spatial adaptation pattern. Hence, supporting DCM’s suggestion.  While we prefer A2-1, we can live with A2-2 if the CSI processing related parameters are properly scaled. Further, overhead reduction should be discussed later. Hence, we propose the following update:  **On adaptation of spatial elements, Support configurability of A2-2 ~~with overhead reduction~~, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern**   * **CSI processing related parameters are linearly scaled** **with the number of spatial adaptation patterns and the number of resources in each spatial adaptation pattern.** * **FFS: the number of sub-configurations in the CSI report**   **FFS: the number of resources in the CSI report** |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the main bullet, but it seems more discussion is needed for FFS parts especially about which parameters are necessary depending on type of spatial domain adaptation. |
| FL2 | Regarding  **Possible Agreement**  **Support configurability of A2-2 ~~with overhead reduction~~, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern**  There could be certain related issues to be discussed. However as one general configurability, A2-2 seems agreeable to all. **Therefore, comments that concerns this proposal, please elaborate.**  There are several related questions in addition to the original FFSs, which are below and separately questioned.  • Whether it is only for Type-1 spatial domain adaptation?  • Whether CSI processing related parameters are linearly scaled with the number of spatial adaptation patterns and the number of resources in each spatial adaptation pattern.  **P6-rev2**  **At least support ~~configurability of~~ A2-2, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| China Telecom | Support the P6-rev2. |
| DOCOMO2 | Support the updated proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support P6-rev2.  **For the first question: Type 2 can also utilize sub-configuration.**  For type 2, a sub-configuration corresponding to one pattern can contain/associate with CSI-RS resources corresponding to this pattern, such that the CSIs for these resources can be in one report for UCI payload reduction or UE complexity reduction. From gNB configuration perspective, the benefits hold for both cases and this can be a common framework for both type 1 and type 2.  **For the Second question: We do not think the CSI processing related parameters should be linearly scaled with the number of spatial adaptation patterns and the number of resources in each spatial adaptation pattern.**  As we discussed in P4 and in our contribution, the CPU occupation for multiple CSI feedback can be further reduced by the correlation on CSI-RS resources and PMIs. So, we think CPU occupation number can be further reduced. For example, there are 2 patterns and each pattern have 4 resources. Due to the CSI-RS resource correlation, after the best CSI-RS resource is determined for one pattern, the UE knows the best CSI-RS resource of another pattern without iteration in all 4 CSI-RS resources. Then, the CPU occupation can be reduced from 8 to 5. |
| CEWiT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ITRI | Support |
| Qualcomm2 | We suggest adding the following FFS to the proposal since they need be discussed and agreed in RAN1 to make A2-2 feasible.   * **FFS: scaling for CSI processing related parameters** * **FFS: the number of sub-configurations/resources/resource sets in the CSI report configuration** |
| Lenovo2 | * Support. This has been supported in legacy design, e.g., multiple codebook sub-configurations within the same CSI-ReportConfig |
| Intel | Ok with P6-rev2 |
| Xiaomi | Support the updated proposal. |
| Nokia/Nsb2 | The question may relate to how exactly the “sub-configuration” is to be defined. (it can be very much related to Q8)   * Could the defined IEs in sub-configuration cater for both Type-1 and Type-2? * The required CSI processing power also depends on how exactly the “sub-configuration” is to be defined.   We suggest the following updates (in green):  **At least support ~~configurability of~~ A2-2, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern.**   * **FFS whether there is a need to explicitly introduce/configure a ‘sub-configuration’ IE or not.** |
| ETRI | Support the updated proposal. |
| Fujitsu2 | Support |
| CATT | We are OK with P6-rev2 |
| Apple2 | **OK** |
| Samsung2 | Support |
| vivo | Support the proposal |
| LG Electronics2 | Support the updated proposal. |
| Ericsson 2 | Support P6-rev2 |
| FL2e | @QC/Nokia/NSB  FL can sense your flexibility and appreciate your suggestions. However, as many FFSs can be added and modified again and again, FL tends to not add anything new unless they have not shown anywhere – that is to say, the FFSs you proposed are already in other questions/proposals if I have not misunderstood. Even for the sub-configuration definition, you can see that FL to set Q11 without impression that we will have definition of spatial adaptation pattern - this is the same for any new terminology. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Support version from Nokia. Since “sub-configuration” corresponds to one SAP, “sub-configuration” may not be explicitly defined in the Spec. |
| NEC | Multiple CSI-RS resource set configurations should be supported for multiple antenna adaptation patterns with different number of antenna ports in one CSI report configuration. |
| MTK2 | Support. While we support FFS related to clarify UE complexity, a simpler version looks more feasible to achieve consensus. It is, however, noticed that the WID caps total UE complexity as legacy UE and the scaling for UE complexity will be important for practical UE support. |
|  |  |

**Q8**

**For overhead reduction for A2-2 (if agreed), what parameters do you consider need to be separately included for each sub-configuration, including but not limited to**

* + - **CodebookConfig, N1 and N2**
    - **nrofPorts**
    - **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | We prefer to add codebook subset restriction (CBSR) for parameters to be included separately for each sub-configuration |
| DOCOMO | We think that “**a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**” can be predefined as the indication needs much bits and the performance of a predefined pattern is similar as a dynamic indicated pattern if the port number is the same. |
| Nokia/NSB | These parameters could be considered as a starting point. Ng may also be considered for the multi-panel case if seen necessary.  We think that it would be better to mention: CodebookConfig, such as N1-N2 and rank restriction etc.  As we indicated above, we think that sub-band configuration should be also considered to be discussed. |
| Samsung | Not sure how the above listed parameters are related to overhead reduction. If it is related to RRC signaling overhead, it is not a critical problem.  As described in our response to P6, the report quantities can be separately configured for each sub-configuration to reduce overhead. |
| InterDigital | See our response to P6 above |
| FL2 | **P-Q8**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **CodebookConfig, n1-n2**   + **codebook subset restriction**   + **a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**   + **rank restriction**   + **nrofPorts**   + **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**   + **report quantity** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO2 | We have concerns of the updated proposal. Generally speaking, the list is too long and some of them are duplicated, e.g., many of them are related to codebook configurations.  We think one of the motivations of sub-configuration is to reduce the indication payloads, it is better to consider whether each of them is really needed for sub-configurations. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | Following update is suggested.   * + **a subset of antenna ports ~~within a codebook~~**   + **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports ~~within a codebook~~** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think P-Q8 need the following modifications,  **P-Q8**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **Parameters in CodebookConfig~~,~~[Huawei: CodebookConfig contains the following parameters]**   + **n1-n2**   + **~~codebook subset restriction~~**   **[Huawei: As discussed in our contribution, UE can determine a X port codebook subset restriction based on Y port codebook subset restriction. So, codebook subset restriction does not need to be configured in each sub-configuration.]**   * + **rank restriction**   + **~~a subset of antenna ports within a codebook~~**   + **~~rank restriction~~**   + **~~nrofPorts~~**   + **~~Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook~~**   + **Port subset indication [Huawei: The above three bullets (green) can be summarized as this.]**   + **report quantity**   For type 1 shutdown, the number of CSI-RS port is changed, so different N1 and N2 need to be configured for different spatial adaptation patterns. Nevertheless, the configuration of Codebook subset restriction(s) for different spatial adaptation patterns can be further decreased by utilization of PMI correlation. For example, as shown in following, there is always a 32 port PMI that directs to the same/similar direction as a 16 port PMI. If the codebook subset restriction indicates the 32 port DFT vector cannot be used, the corresponding 16 port PMIs will not be used at the same time. |
| InterDigital | The update to proposal P-Q8 suggested by ZTE is reasonable and is ok with us.  For overhead reduction when configuring CSI report configuration, we think it would be useful for configuring a group/set of CSI-RS resources that may be associated with each sub-configuration. As such, we suggest including the following to proposal P-Q8.  **Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources** |
| Qualcomm2 | From the current specification, codebook configuration (*CodebookConfig*) includes (n1, n2) for single panel and (ng, n1, n2) for multi-panel, codebook subset restriction, and rank restriction. Hence, having *CodebookConfig* is sufficient to cover info such as (n1, n2) for single panel and (ng, n1, n2) for multi-panel, codebook subset restriction, and rank restriction.  On the antenna ports, we don’t think *nrofPorts* is needed since the number of ports can be determined from values of ng, n1 and n2 in the *CodebookConfig.* For “a subset of antenna ports within a codebook” and “Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook”, we think they are talking about the same thing. Hence, only one of them should be kept. Furthermore, there is no such subset of ports within a codebook since port is indexed in the CSI-RS resource, not codebook.  Hence, we propose the following **update**:  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **CodebookConfig, ~~n1-n2~~**   + **~~codebook subset restriction~~**   + **~~a subset of antenna ports within a codebook~~**   + **~~rank restriction~~**   + **~~nrofPorts~~**   + **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports ~~within a codebook~~**   + **report quantity** |
| Lenovo2 | We agree with QC’s updates, codebook config already includes most bullets listed. We also believe it is important to identify the supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II |
| Intel | Could someone clarify the distinction between “a subset of antenna ports within a codebook” and “Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook”?  Its not clear to us what we are agreeing to for the following two sub-bullets. |
| Nokia/NSB2 | We don’t see a strong need to include ‘report quantity’ for now. We would be fine with it, but sub-band configuration needs to be added as we previously suggested (given that different spatial patterns would have different channel characteristics in terms of frequency selectivity).  We thus suggest the following updates (in red):  **P-Q8**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be ~~included~~ considered for each sub-configuration**   * + **CodebookConfig, n1-n2**   + **codebook subset restriction**   + **a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**   + **rank restriction**   + **nrofPorts**   + **Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**   + **Sub-band configuration (of frequency related configuration)**   + **report quantity** |
| ETRI | We think Qualcomm’s version is more agreeable at this stage. We prefer to make one more change as:  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **CodebookConfig, ~~n1-n2~~**   + **~~codebook subset restriction~~**   + **~~a subset of antenna ports within a codebook~~**   + **~~rank restriction~~**   + **~~nrofPorts~~**   + **FFS: Information ~~Indicator(s)~~ of a subset of antenna ports ~~within a codebook~~**   + **report quantity**   The reason is that in our understanding, a subset of antenna ports may or may not be explicitly indicated as part of the CSI report sub-configuration. For example, it may be derived by CodebookConfig n1-n2, or may be indicated as part of CSI-RS resource configuration. In the latter case, each sub-configuration may include association information with a spatial element pattern. |
| Fujitsu2 | Most of the above elements are reauired to be separately configured in type 1 adaptation case. More specifically, for type 1 adaptation, different CodebookConfig and nrofPorts are required for different spatial adaptation patterns, while for type 2 adaptation, common CodebookConfig and nrofPorts can be considered. We think that separate lists for type 1 adaptation and type 2 adaptation are needed to facilitate the discussion about which element is required for sub-configuration. |
| CATT | We support Qualcomm’s proposed update |
| Apple | We think only codebookConfig can be seen for current as needed, where codebook subset restriction is configured in the same IE with N1,N2 in codebookConfig.  For nrofPort, we think this should be included in the resource configuration.  For indicators of a subset of antenna ports, we think this may also not be needed if a predetermined rule is defined to determined the ports.  For rank restriction and report quantity, we think this depends on the overhead reduction discussion, and can be FFS for now  **P-Q8**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **CodebookConfig~~, n1-n2~~**   + **~~codebook subset restriction~~**   + **~~a subset of antenna ports within a codebook~~**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **~~nrofPorts~~**   + **~~Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook~~**   + **FFS: report quantity** |
| Samsung2 | Support in high-level along with a few revisions for elaboration. The reasons for revisions is   * n1-n2, CBSR, and RI-restriction are part of CodebookConfig. Thus, listing them in the same level with CodebookConfig is inappropriate. * nrofPorts is part of CSI resource configuration, not CodebookConfig. Also, it is implicitly included in the CodebookConfig via n1-n2 indication. * Do not understand having both ‘a subset of antenna ports within a codebook’ and ‘Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook’. Indicators may be included in the triggering DCI for indication of which sub-configurations.   **P-Q8**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **CodebookConfig**      - **n1-n2, codebook subset restriction, rank restriction**     - **a subset of antenna ports within a codebook**   + **report quantity** |
| vivo | At least consider the following. FFS others   * + **CodebookConfig, n1-n2**   + **nrofPorts**   + **report quantity** |
| LG Electronics2 | There seem to be some sub-bullet that are unclear or duplicated on the list. Regarding codebook config, we share the view with Qualcomm. Regarding indicator of a subset of antenna ports, it might be needed for A1-2-revised but we haven’t decided yet A1-2-revised will be supported. Regarding report quantity, could you please explain why this report quantity can be different for each sub-configuration? |
| Ericsson 2 | We are okay to agree to a list of things that \*may\* be part of a sub-configuration; however, it is too early to agree that they are part of a sub-configuration. We think subset of ports and indicators of subset of ports is redundant, therefor one can be removed. nrofPorts is not needed, if subset of ports is indicated. We assume ‘reportQuantity’ is a common to all sub-configurations.  **P-Q8**  **For CSI report configuration, consider at least the following which may ~~can~~ be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **Parameter(s) within CodebookConfig, e.g., n1-n2**   + **codebook subset restriction**   + **a subset of ~~antenna~~ CSI-RS ports on which the UE shall measure/report CSI ~~within a codebook~~**   + **rank restriction**   + **~~nrofPorts~~**   + **~~Indicator(s) of a subset of antenna ports within a codebook~~**   **~~report quantity~~** |
| Spreadtrum2 | Depends on definition of “Spatial Adaptation Pattern”. Only one of “Spatial Adaptation Pattern” and “sub-configuration” is necessarily to be defined in the Spec. |
|  |  |
| **FL3** | **P-Q8-rev1**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **Parameters in CodebookConfig**     - **n1-n2, and ng for multi-panel**     - **FFS: rank restriction**     - **FFS: codebook subset restriction**     - **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **Port subset indication**     - **FFS whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   **FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.**  **FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Thanks for the updates and we support this. |
| InterDigital | Support P-Q8-rev1 |
| Lenovo3 | Support |
| DOCOMO4 | I am not sure whether Type 2 adaptation can be supported for the proposal. Many companies suggest that a unified framework should be expected for both Type 1 and 2 adaptation.  Assuming one sub-configuration is associated with one CSI of one spatial pattern, for Type 2 adaptation, UE needs to know which CSI resource should be measured for each sub-configuration. In this sense, the CSI-RS resource configuration should be included into the sub-configuration. So  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **Parameters in CodebookConfig**     - **n1-n2, and ng for multi-panel**     - **FFS: rank restriction**     - **FFS: codebook subset restriction**     - **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **Port subset indication**     - **FFS whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   + **FFS: CSI-RS resource/resource set at least for Type 2 adaptation**   **FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.**  **FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources** |
| Samsung3 | Support the proposal in high-level.  A few things:   * Currently n1-n2 and CBSR are jointly coded. If only n1-n2 is indicated for each sub-configuration, it will require a different IE format. Not a big concern but to bring up the issue. * We think separately configuring ‘report quantities’ is necessary as, for instance, PMI may not need to be reported for all the sub-configurations as multi-CSI is to assess the impact of adaptation prior to the actual adaptation and it is not for precise MIMO scheduling. |
| Intel | Ok with P-Q8 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share the same view as DOCOMO4. For type 2 shutdown, different CSI-RS resources should be used for different patterns. And as A1-1-reviesed is agreed. In a resource set, there is a need to let the UE knows which group of CSI resources should be measured for each pattern at least for Type 2 adaptation. So, each sub-configuration needs to contain a group of CSI-RS resources of one resource set.  **P-Q8-rev1**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **Parameters in CodebookConfig**     - **n1-n2, and ng for multi-panel**     - **FFS: rank restriction**     - **FFS: codebook subset restriction**     - **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **Port subset indication**     - **FFS whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   + **A group of CSI-RS resources in a resource set.**   **FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.**  **FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources** |
| ZTE, Sanechips3e | Okay in general.  For A1-2, the port subset indication is needed for the common resource to derive multi-CSI, it is either explicit or implicit. So “whether”is suggested to be removed.   * + **Port subset indication**     - **FFS ~~whether~~ it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration** |
| ETRI | We want to put FFS to the following bullet. If we read the subbullet, a possibility that port subset indication is derived from other parameters is captured. So depending on details, port subset indication may or may not be included in sub-configuration.   * + **FFS: Port subset indication**     - **FFS whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration** |
| Apple3e | Support in general and for the n1-n2 and CBSR, we share the same view as Samsung. We also support ETRI’s proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB3 | Considering the legacy ZP-CSI-RS framework, it’s assumed that PDSCH wouldn’t be mapped to all REs that overlap those of the configured ZP-CSI-RS resource(s). Similar methodology (e.g. CSI-RS wouldn’t be mapped to the REs that overlap of the configured ZP-CSI-RS resources) could be applied to the port subset indication. With that, we have the following proposal below with yellow highlighted.  **P-Q8-rev1**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration**   * + **Parameters in CodebookConfig**     - **n1-n2, and ng for multi-panel**     - **FFS: rank restriction**     - **FFS: codebook subset restriction**     - **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **Port subset indication**     - **FFS whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration or by utilizing legacy ZP-CSI-RS framework.**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   **FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.**  **FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources** |
| Fujitsu4 | We are fine with this proposal in general.  Regarding port subset indication, it may not need to be separately configured since it is possible to derive it from CodebookConfig or nrofPorts. We support ETRI’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm3 | The discussion direction looks reasonable. We suggest some **update** with following reasons:   * The proposal is good for Type 1 SD adaptation only. * For Type 2 SD adaptation, the sub-configuration should only relate to the power offset between CSI-RS and SSB. In the first look it is similar to power domain adaptation. However, there is some subtle difference:   + Power offset between PDSCH and CSI-RS is hypothetical one that UE assumes for CSI measurement.   + However, power offset between CSI-RS and SSB is not hypothetical. The gNB has to transmit CSI-RS with actual signaled offset as specified in TS 38.214:   “The downlink **CSI-RS EPRE can be derived** from the SS/PBCH block downlink transmit power given by the parameter **ss-PBCH-BlockPower** and CSI-RS power offset given by the parameter **powerControlOffsetSS** provided by higher layers, where the CSI-RS is QCLed with the SS/PBCH block, and the SS/PBCH block can be associated with serving cell PCI or additional PCI different from serving cell PCI.”   * nrofPorts is a part of CSI-RS resource configuration. * 1st FFS is unclear. At this stage, we should identify what is needed for Type 1 and Type 2 respectively. * Motivation/benefit of last FFS is unclear   **P-Q8-rev1**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **Parameters in CodebookConfig**     - **n1-n2, and ng for multi-panel**     - **FFS: rank restriction**     - **FFS: codebook subset restriction**     - **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **Port subset indication**     - **FFS whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration ~~or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration~~**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   **~~FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.~~**  **~~FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources~~**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * **NZP CSI-RS resource set for channel measurement where different resources can have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB** |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal. We support Qualcomm’s modification. |
| LG Electronics4 | We have several comments:   * + We agree with Samsung’s comment that n1-n2 (or ng-n1-n2) and CBSR are jointly coded according to current configuration.   + As ETRI commented, Port subset indication needs to be FFS, particularly considering that this might be necessary for A1-2-revised but we haven’t decided yet to support A1-2-revised.   + We think “Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources” is needed for A1-1-revised.   Having said above, our proposal is as follows on top of Qualcomm’s.  **P-Q8-rev1**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **Parameters in CodebookConfig**     - **n1-n2, and ng for multi-panel**     - **FFS: rank restriction**     - **~~FFS:~~ codebook subset restriction**     - **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **FFS: Port subset indication**     - **~~FFS~~ whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration ~~or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration~~**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   + **FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources**   **~~FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.~~**  **~~FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources~~**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**  **NZP CSI-RS resource set for channel measurement where different resources can have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB** |
| Ericsson 4 | We agree with Qualcomm that Type-1 and Type-2 should be separated since it is not yet clear that Type-2 needs much, if anything, in a sub-configuration.  We think we should agree first on the easiest case, i.e., Type-1 single panel codebook. We can include Type-1 multi-panel in the FFS on supported codebook types, hence we suggest to remove ng for now. For port subset indication, we suggest to put details as FFS simply.  We support Qualcomm’s revisions with the following additional **revision** on top:  **P-Q8-rev1**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration used for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **~~Parameters in CodebookConfig~~**   + **n1-n2 (parameter for codebook) ~~and ng for multi-panel~~**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**   + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **Port subset indication**     - **FFS details ~~whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration~~**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   **FFS: sub-configuration content for ~~whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and~~ Type 2 adaptation cases.**  **~~FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources~~**  **~~For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation~~**  **~~NZP CSI-RS resource set for channel measurement where different resources can have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB~~** |
| FL3-fri | The split of type of adaptation seems ok for us to understand the design target. At this stage, FL prefer to keep FFS instead of removing whole bullet or hiding too much information.  For details,  **P-Q8-rev3**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **n1-n2, FFS: ng for multi-panel**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**   + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **FFS: Port subset indication**     - **whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resoruce set for channel measurement [FFS: where different resources can have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB]**   **FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources**  **FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Vivo3 | Ok for the main-bullet and including some details for FFS. |
| OPPO | OK with P-Q8-rev3 |
| CMCC4 | Fine with current version. Since the “at least” is included in the main part, we consider it as other solutions or aspects are not precluded. |
| LG Electronics5 | We are OK with the first part for Type 1 even though we prefer remove FFS prior to ‘codebook subset restriction’.  However, the second part for Type 2 is not clear. From my understanding, power offset between CSI-RS and SSB is configured per CSI-RS resource, so this offset value can be different across difference resources even in current specification. So, I don’t understand why this is captured as FFS. Am I missing something? |
| MTK3-fri | Support P-Q8-rev3 with revision/clarification for Type 2 SD adaptation.  For achieve efficient CSI report with one common PMI (and RI) for Type 2 SD adaptation, it is necessary to require the resources are subject to the same CDM types and the same number of CSI-RS ports. In this regard, the following addition is suggested:  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resoruce set for channel measurement [FFS: where different resources can have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB]**     - ***The NZP CSI-RS resource configurations are subject to the same CDM type and the same number of CSI-RS ports.***   If there is no sufficient consensus on Type 2 SD adaptation part, we can move forward with Type 1 SD adaptation part first. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with P-Q8-rev3. |
| ZTE, Sanechips5 | Both of the agreed A1-1 and A1-2 are important since they are designed for different adaptation types. And port subset indication is useful for A1-2, if FFS is added due to the comment on whether it is supported is unclear, we think same rule applies to A1-1, i.e., type 2 adaptation.  Furthermore, “**For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**” is not needed as the last bullet states that “**FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.**”  For the bullet “**FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources**” it seems duplicated with the bullet “Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resoruce set for channel measurement” so that it can be removed.  The following modification is preferred.  **P-Q8-rev3**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **n1-n2, FFS: ng for multi-panel**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**   + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **FFS: Port subset indication**     - **whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   **~~For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation~~**  **FFS: Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resoruce set for channel measurement [FFS: ~~where different resources can have different~~ power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB]**  **~~FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources~~**  **FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.** |
| Fujitsu5 | We are fine with P-Q8-rev3 as a starting point for further discussion. |
| Nokia/NSB | We would be fine with Ericsson’s suggestion to have the Type 2 part of the proposal as a simple FFS. Another possibility would be to split the proposal into two, one for Type 1 SD adaptation and the other one for Type 2 SD adaptation.  Otherwise, we are fine with **P-Q8-rev3,** but we are not sure whyan FFS was added to Port subset indication, and prefer the previous FL proposal without the FFS. So, we suggest:   * + **~~FFS:~~ Port subset indication** |
| Intel | For proposal P-Q8-rev3, the most essential component for type 1 SD seems to be port subset indication which is left for FFS, which we find it bit odd.  If anything the port subset indication should be one aspect that needs to be part of sub-configuration and the rest can be left FFS. This would be similar to what Nokia commented.  For type 2 SD, from our understanding the current specification already allows for each CSI-RS resource to have potentially different SSB power offset. Similar comment as LG, what is the study component of the FFS for the sub-bullet of type 2 SD? |
| Qualcomm3-fri | Support Nokia’s views on port subset indication   * + **~~FFS:~~ Port subset indication**   Support MTK’s view on Type 2 SD adaptation. When we proposed “**different resources can have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB**”, we were thinking about the main sub-bullet. Hence, there is no need to have FFS anymore since current spec already allows it. 🡪 update  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resoruce set for channel measurement [~~FFS: where different resources can have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB]~~**     - ***The NZP CSI-RS resource configurations are subject to the same CDM type and the same number of CSI-RS ports.***   Support ZTE’s view on the following:  **~~FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources~~**  On this FFS, does it mean multi-panel is FFS? Why should we exclude it? Some suggested **updates**   * + **n1-n2 for single panel or ng-n1-n2 for multi-panel ~~FFS: ng for multi-panel~~**   Alternatively,   * + **n1-n2 for single panel, FFS: ~~ng for~~ multi-panel** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the proposal. But with some modifications.  As mentioned by Samsung that “Currently n1-n2 and CBSR are jointly coded. If only n1-n2 is indicated for each sub-configuration, it will require a different IE format. Not a big concern but to bring up the issue.”. To be clearer, n1-n2 should be modified as N1 and N2, as codebook subset restriction is discussed independently.  We propose also to change, “included for” with “associated with” because it is more accurate.  **P-Q8-rev3**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **~~nN~~1~~-~~,~~n~~N2, FFS: ~~n~~Ng for multi-panel**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**   + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **FFS: Port subset indication**     - **whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be ~~included for~~ associated with each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resour~~u~~ce set for channel measurement [FFS: where different resources can have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB]**   + **Note: The NZP CSI-RS resources in the group corresponds to one Type 2 pattern.**   **[Huawei: Some clarification, the CSI-RS resources in one group corresponds to one type 2 pattern.]**  **FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources**  **FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.** |
| InterDigital | We are ok with **P-Q8-rev3** and agree with FL’s comments to split type of adaptations and keep the FFSs. |
| Ericsson 5 | Regarding the Type-1 part of **P-Q8-rev3**:  We are fine with most parts except that “FFS” needs to be removed from port subset indication - we share the same view as Nokia about why the FFS was added on port subset indication. It seems that there was a concern that if it is implicitly determined, then it does not need to be indicated. It seems there is common understanding that a port subset needs to be determined, so in that sense we suggest following update (in green).   * + **~~FFS:~~ Port subset indication**     - **FFS: details on explicit indication or implicit derivation**     - **~~whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration~~**   Regarding the Type-2 part of **P-Q8-rev3**:  We still have doubts about what exactly needs to be part of a sub-configuration. The bullet that says “Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resource set” is inaccurate, because this is not part of a CSI report configuration; it is contained within a CSI resource configuration, and we have a separate agreement on configuration of resources. While we agree that for Type-2 it makes sense to have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB for the different resources in the resource set, discussion should be separate.  We are also unsure about what is meant by “group” of CSI-RS resources and “group identity.” Does this apply to A1-1 or A1-2? In our view A1-1 makes most sense for Type-2 adaptation, but for A1-1, each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern, so what is the grouping? Furthermore, for Type-2, the adaptation is transparent to the UE – the UE just measures and reports on the different resources since the antenna muting pattern is transparent to the UE for Type-2  Based on this, we think a better way is one of the following:   1. Discuss content of sub-configurations for Type-2 in a separate proposal, or 2. Modify **P-Q8-rev3** as follows**:**   **For CSI report configuration~~, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration~~ for Type 2 SD adaptation**  **FFS: sub-configuration content**   * + **~~Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resoruce set for channel measurement [FFS: where different resources can have different power offsets between CSI-RS and SSB]~~**   **~~FFS: Group identity associated with group of NZP CSI-RS resources~~**  **~~FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases.~~** |
| Apple3-Fri | Fine with the Type 1 part in P-Q8-rev3  For the Type 2 part, we share similar view with Ericsson. |

**\*Week 2 start\***

According to the comments and clarification from companies, the bullet for power offset for Type 2 adaptation has been removed.

The target of the proposal is to identify a minimum set of parameters that at least can be included. Therefore, although the information detail/determination of port subset indication require further discussion, it seems this kind of information is necessary. And as said, FL would like to keep details even if they are ffs for aid of future discussion.

The “group of” for Type 2 adaptation is kept given the response from Huawei to ZTE/Ericsson. To my understanding, it at least applies to Type 2 since it does not seem to be needed for Type 1 with A1-2 to have multiple (instead of one) resources corresponding to multiple patterns. The sub-bullet proposed from MTK is added as one restriction to perform such Type 2 adaptation with enhancement.

Since this is to discuss “at least” and ‘can’ be included for each adaption type, the FFS: whether/how to share some of the parameters regarding Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation cases, could be further discussed, since likely they are in the spec and up to gNB configuration depending on the adaptation cases of Type 1 or Type 2. Unless we will define Type 1 and Type 2 explicitly, there may be no need for sharing parameters across types for a given gNB.

**FL4-RRC-Q1**

**For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**

* + **N1, N2 for single-panel, and N1, N2, Ng for multi-panel**
  + **Port subset indication**
    - **FFS: details on explicit indication or implicit derivation, e.g. whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration, or** **by utilizing legacy ZP-CSI-RS framework**
  + **FFS: rank restriction**
  + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**
  + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**
  + **FFS: report quantity**
  + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**

**For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**

* + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resource set for channel measurement** 
    - **The NZP CSI-RS resource configurations are subject to the same CDM type and the same number of CSI-RS ports.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Support. We are also fine to shorten the proposal by replacing the 1st, 4th and 5th bullets with codebookConfig |
| LG Electronics6 | We have two comments:   * + For the first sub-bullet (N1, N2 for single-panel, and N1, N2, Ng for multi-panel), could you clarify what are the corresponding RRC parameters for those N1, N2, or Ng? From our understanding, N1, N2 for single-panel corresponds to *n1-n2* or *n1-n2-codebookSubsetRestriction* higher layer parameter and N1, N2, Ng for multi-panel corresponds to *ng-n1-n2* higher layer parameter.   + The reason why we requested to put FFS for the second bullet (Port subset indication) was because we haven’t agreed to support A1-2-revised yet. From our understanding, port subset indication is not necessary for A1-1-revised to support Type 1 and for Type 2.   Having said above, we suggest the following modifications.  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **~~N1, N2~~ *n1-n2* or *n1-n2-codebookSubsetRestriction* for single-panel, and ~~N1, N2, Ng~~ *ng-n1-n2*****for multi-panel**   + **FFS: Port subset indication**     - **FFS: details on explicit indication or implicit derivation, e.g. whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration, or** **by utilizing legacy ZP-CSI-RS framework**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**   + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resource set for channel measurement**      - **The NZP CSI-RS resource configurations are subject to the same CDM type and the same number of CSI-RS ports.** |
| DOOCMO | We can support the proposal with following suggested update for Type 2 adaptation.  For Type 2 adaptation, we can not exclude the cases of   * + - One NZP-CSI-RS corresponding to one Type pattern.     - One resource set for one Type 2 pattern and multiple resource sets for multiple Type 2 patterns. Then we suggest the following update.   **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resource in a resource set or resource set ID for channel measurement**      - **The NZP CSI-RS resource configurations are subject to the same CDM type and the same number of CSI-RS ports.**     - **The number of NZP CSI-RS resource in the group can be 1.** |
| Apple | For Type 2 SD adaptation, with the “group”, it seems that one Type 2 spatial pattern will always correspond to multiple CSI-RS resources, is this agreed somewhere?  And for the sub-bullet explaining the CDM and number of ports constraints, we are not against the constraint, but we think it does not need to be listed here, since this a resource configuration constraint and we can have another agreement for this.  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **~~Group of~~ Associated NZP CSI-RS resource(s) in a resource set for channel measurement**      - **~~The NZP CSI-RS resource configurations are subject to the same CDM type and the same number of CSI-RS ports.~~** |
| Intel | ok |
| vivo | Ok  For Type-2 adaptation, the definition of “group” may need further clarification. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| ZTE, Sanechips6 | Regarding the LG’s comments, we need to clarify that the first main bullet is for “Type 1 SD adaptation”, which has been agreed. |
| CATT | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | When A1-1 is used for type 1 SD, there is a need for UE to know which resource corresponds to which pattern in a resource set.  We support with the following modifications in red  **FL4-RRC-Q1**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **N1, N2 for single-panel, and N1, N2, Ng for multi-panel**   + **Port subset indication when A1-2 is used**     - **FFS: details on explicit indication or implicit derivation, e.g. whether it is explicitly provided or can also be derived from e.g. CodebookConfig and/or from CSI-RS resource configuration or from nrofPorts as part of CSI-RS resource configuration, or** **by utilizing legacy ZP-CSI-RS framework**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**   + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resource set for channel measurement when A1-1 is used, FFS use same mechanism as type 2 SD adaptation**   **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resource set for channel measurement**      - **The NZP CSI-RS resource configurations are subject to the same CDM type and the same number of CSI-RS ports.** |
| OPPO | OK |
| InterDigital | Fine with proposal |
| Qualcomm4 | Share same suggestion with Lenovo on “replacing the 1st, 4th and 5th bullets with codebookConfig” and with LGE on “***n1-n2* or *n1-n2-codebookSubsetRestriction* for single-panel, and *ng-n1-n2*****for multi-panel**”. |
| Samsung4 | For Type 1 SD, we support the proposal in high-level. A few comments: It’s hard to understand how the implicit derivation works for ‘Port subset indication’. Probably better to remove the entire FFS to make it simple and easier for agreement. We think ‘report quantity’ is needed to be separately configured for multi-reports, e.g., PMI report may not be needed for all the reports.  For Type 2 SD, it’s a bit difficult to understand the current formulation. What is currently described in the proposal reads to us that it is a legacy behavior. For A1-2-revised, i.e., one resource corresponds to multiple SD patterns, we think that simply ‘powerControlOffsetSS’ can be separately included for each sub-configuration by considering the reduced Tx antenna gain and power.  On the other hand, we think that the network may want to test both Type 1 SD and Type 2 SD adaptations from a single CSI-RS resource by configuring multiple sub-configurations in one CSI report configuration. Therefore, we suggest to add a note in the top level as follows: “Note: The serving gNB can provide a CSI report configuration including sub-configurations for Type 1 SD, Type 2 SD, or both Type 1 and Type 2 SD adaptations” |
| Fujitsu6 | The sub-configuration field of port subset indication is needed if A1-2 is adapted. We support Huawei's modification to add ‘when A1-2 is used’ to make it clear. |
| Ericsson 6 | For Type-2 SD adaptation, we agree with Apple that it is not agreed that one Type-2 pattern always corresponds to multiple CSI-RS resources, so we cannot agree that a group of CSI-RS resources is always configured. We note that with A1-1 revised, each resource corresponds to only a single SD pattern, so it seems that groups of resources are irrelevant. For A1-2 revised, groups might only be relevant if multiple CSI-RS resource are configured. However, A1-2 revised supports also single CSI-RS resource as pointed out by DOCOMO, so groups are irrelevant for that case.  Moreover, we don’t understand why the proposal says that a group of CSI-RS resources is included in a sub-configuration. Sub-configurations are within a CSI report configuration, and resources are configured within a resource configuration, not a sub-configuration.  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resource set for channel measurement**      - **The NZP CSI-RS resource configurations are subject to the same CDM type and the same number of CSI-RS ports.**   Based on this, we can’t agree to the Type-2 part of the proposal as written. To us, it is still not clear that sub-configurations are actually needed for Type-2 shutdown. However, to be flexible, we are okay to FFS whether or not some *indication* of a group of CSI-RS resources is included in a sub-configuration, if sub-configurations are needed. Based on the above, we recommend the following update.  Suggested update to **FL4-RRC-Q1:**  **~~For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration~~ For Type 2 SD adaptation, the content of sub-configuration(s), if needed, is FFS.**   * + **FFS: whether/how a sub-configuration can include indication of Group of NZP CSI-RS resources in a resource set for channel measurement**      - **~~The NZP CSI-RS resource configurations are subject to the same CDM type and the same number of CSI-RS ports.~~**   For Type-1 SD adaptation, we think it is better to work first on the simplest case of Type-1 single panel codebook as a start, and then come back to other codebook types (e.g., multi-panel) later, so the multi-panel can be FFS. Furthermore, regarding port subset indication, we think it is better just to write “FFS: details” and leave out the examples until we have a clearer picture of the overall framework from agreements we make in this meeting. |
| China Telecom | Fine with the proposal. |
| ETRI | We support the proposal in general.  One comment is we still think it is proper to add FFS to port subset indication. If it is determined to derive the port subset from other information (as the subbullet says), how can we say a sub-configuration includes port subset indication? In this case, the meaning of “include” is confusing to us. |
| CEWiT | We share similar views with Ericsson for type 2 SD adaptation. |
| FL | @Lenovo, QC  I guess one of the intention is to identify possibility to enable shared parameters among sub-configurations, and some of the sub-parameters within Codebookconfig may have enhancements. Thus I have not directly use CodebookConfig.  @LGe  Please see Huawei previous response to N1/N2.  For your second comment, I think A-1-2-revised has been agreed.  Can the above clarify your comments?  @vivo, Apple, Ericsson, CEWiT  The agreement for A-1-1-revised, when it was agreed, was clarified that: the pattern can be same or different among the resources. For the case multiple resources corresponding to a same pattern, the proponents consider those resources are only for a same sub-configuration thereby. Please let me know if this clarifies.  **FL4e-RRC-Q1**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **N1, N2 for single-panel, FFS: N1, N2, Ng for multi-panel**   + **[Port subset indication when A1-2 is used]**     - **FFS: details on explicit indication or implicit derivation**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**   + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   + **FFS: NZP CSI-RS resource(s) in a resource set for channel measurement when A1-1 is used, FFS use same mechanism as type 2 SD adaptation**   **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Indication of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) in a resource set or resource set ID for channel measurement**      - **The number of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) can be 1.**   + **powercontrolOffsetSS**   **Note: it is up to gNB to provide a CSI report configuration including sub-configurations for Type 1 SD, Type 2 SD, or both Type 1 and Type 2 SD adaptations.** |
| Samsung4e | Support. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think **Port subset indication when A1-2 is used** should be configured. Port subset indication can indicate a subset of ports in a CSI-RS resource used for CSI calculation. The gNB does not need to configure multiple CSI-RS resources for UE, it can reduce the CSI-RS transmission overhead and configuration overhead , and NW power consumption. Therefore, we think **Port subset indication** is needed. |
| LG Electronics7 | @ FL,  We are OK with “**Port subset indication when A1-2 is used**” as Huawei suggested. However, we haven’t decided yet that A1-2-revised is supported, since according to the yellow part below, we may eventually support A1-1-revised only.  **Agreement**  Support configurability of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement within one resource setting corresponding to more than one spatial adaptation patterns with at least one of the following   * A1-1-revised: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern * A1-2-revised: For a resource configured in a resource set within a resource setting, the resource can be associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns   + One or more resources can be configured in the resource set for channel measurement.   To be fair, we think sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation based on A1-1 should be treated same as that based on A1-2, as follows.  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **N1, N2 for single-panel, FFS: N1, N2, Ng for multi-panel**   + **~~[~~Port subset indication when A1-2 is used~~]~~**     - **FFS: details on explicit indication or implicit derivation**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**   + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   + **~~FFS:~~ Group identity of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) in a resource set for channel measurement when A1-1 is used, FFS use same mechanism as type 2 SD adaptation**   For Type 2 SD adaptation, we haven’t agreed to support more than one resource set for channel measurement in a CSI report config. Therefore, the highlighted part should be removed.  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Indication of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) in a resource set ~~or resource set ID for channel measurement~~**      - **The number of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) can be 1.**   + **powercontrolOffsetSS** |
| DOCOMO7 | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. For the first sub-bullet, it is possible that N1, N2 for single-panel can be implicitly derived from non-shut down case and port subset indications. Hence, we propose to add   **FFS details on implicit derivation**   1. As we discussed in our previous reply, powercontrolOffsetSS is used for path-loss calculation. For CSI calculation, it is not needed. So, we think is should be deleted. 2. There is no need to mention that “**The number of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) can be 1.**” The number of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) is determined by gNB as long as it respect the range of supported values.   We propose the following modifications in red below  **FL4e-RRC-Q1**  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 1 SD adaptation**   * + **N1, N2 for single-panel, FFS: N1, N2, Ng for multi-panel**      - **FFS details on explicit indication or implicit derivation**   + **[Port subset indication when A1-2 is used]**     - **FFS: details on explicit indication or implicit derivation**   + **FFS: rank restriction**   + **FFS: codebook subset restriction**   + **FFS: supported codebook types for PMI, e.g., Type-I or Type-II**   + **FFS: report quantity**   + **FFS: reportFreqConfiguration**   + **FFS: NZP CSI-RS resource(s) in a resource set for channel measurement when A1-1 is used, FFS use same mechanism as type 2 SD adaptation**   **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Indication of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) in a resource set or resource set ID for channel measurement**      - **~~The number of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) can be 1.~~**   + **~~powercontrolOffsetSS~~**   **Note: it is up to gNB to provide a CSI report configuration including sub-configurations for Type 1 SD, Type 2 SD, or both Type 1 and Type 2 SD adaptations.** |
| MTK4e | Support the proposal with “**powercontrolOffsetSS**” kept for Type 2 SD adaptation.  It is understood the power offset will be impacted with adapted number of active antenna elements in Type 2 SD adaptation. Provision of the power offset is necessary for generating correct report. |
| CMCC6 | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Regarding the “powercontrolOffsetSS”, why does it need to be in ther ReportConfig while it is configured in the CSI-RS resource. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson 7 | We are not fine with this part of the proposal for Type-2  **For CSI report configuration, at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation**   * + **Indication of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) in a resource set or resource set ID for channel measurement**      - **The number of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) can be 1.**   + **powercontrolOffsetSS**   Assuming A1-1-revised is used with N resources in a set, and every resource corresponds to a different SD adaptation pattern, there is no need for grouping or indication of groups. In this case no sub-configurations are needed.  Furthermore, powerControlOffsetSS is part of a CSI-RS resource, not a sub-configuration. Each of the N resources can still be configured with a different value of powerControlOffsetSS. There is no need to put this is a sub-configuration.  We object to the Type-2 part of the proposal since it pre-supposes that sub-configurations are needed. They are not needed in all cases.  **For CSI report configuration, further study under which cases sub-configurations may or may not be needed including sub-configuration content ~~at least the following can be included for each sub-configuration for Type 2 SD adaptation~~**   * + **~~Indication of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) in a resource set or resource set ID for channel measurement~~**      - **~~The number of NZP CSI-RS resource(s) can be 1.~~**   + **~~powercontrolOffsetSS~~** |

**\*Week 2 end\***

**~~Q9~~ (FL2: moved to section 3.3)**

**~~For overhead reduction for A2-2 (if agreed), do you consider the CSI-RS resource set configuration should only include resources with the same number of antenna ports? Any other restrictions you may consider as needed?~~**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **~~Company~~** | **~~Comments~~** |
| ~~Lenovo~~ | ~~Yes. CSI-RS resources within the same set should contain the same number of ports and configured with the same density to avoid violating legacy behavior~~ |
| ~~Fujitsu~~ | ~~As we discussed above, the discussion related to CSI-RS resource set configuration should be moved to section 3.3.~~ |
| ~~Nokia/NSB~~ | ~~This would depend on the exact option(s) that will be considered for A2-2, i.e., resource setting level, resource set level, or resource level etc.~~ |
| ~~LG Electronics~~ | ~~This issue should be addressed together in Section 3.3.~~ |

**FL2 QP6**

**For A2-2 approach,**

**• do you consider whether it can be applied to Type-2 spatial domain adaptation?**

**• do you consider whether CSI processing related parameters are linearly scaled with the number of spatial adaptation patterns and the number of resources in each spatial adaptation pattern.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| China Telecom | * Though may not be needed, we think The A2-2 can stilled be used for Type-2 SD adaptations. * Basically , the parameters are linearly scaled with the number of patterns and resources, but it can be influenced by the details for overhead and UE complexity reduction methods. |
| DOCOMO2 | To reply above two questions:  For 1st question: yes, A2-2 can be applied to Type-2 spatial domain adaptation. For example, one sub-configuration is associated with one CSI resource or CSI resource set, each CSI resource or resource set is associated with one Type 2 pattern. Considering multiple sub-configuration associated with multiple Type patterns, Type 2 can be supported.  For 2nd question: it depends on how the measurement is done. If the UE can measure once and obtain multiple CSIs with different spatial/power assumption, e.g., measuring once on 8 port CSI-RS and obtain CSIs with 2/4/8 ports, the linearly scaling could not reflect actual complexity. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | Support.  For the first question, we think we don’t need to limit A2-2 to Type 1 adaptation, it should be considered for both types.  For the second question, we think further discussion is needed. We agree that the CSI processing related parameters will be increased for multi-CSI report. However, the CSI calculation complexity can be reduced considering the high correlation of the precoding matrices of different port numbers. Direct scaling up the CSI processing parameters seems too conservative . |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As discussed in P6-rev2. |
| Qualcomm2 | Yes for 1st question.  For 2nd question, we propose to add “• FFS: scaling for CSI processing related parameters” to P6-rev2. |
| Intel | Q1: yes  Q2: depending on what we agree for the multi-CSI case, and whether reduced complexity CSI feedback mechanisms are supported. |
| Xiaomi | Yes for Q1. |
| Nokia/NSB2 | Depending on its design, A2-2 could still accommodate for Type 2 spatial adaptation: if two spatial patterns are based on Type 2 adaptation, they could still be evaluated using different CSI-RS resource occasions in time. Otherwise, using different CSI-RS resources would also allow to evaluate these spatial patterns.  Overall, the CPU count would need to scale up with either the number of CSI-RS resources and/or the number of spatial patterns being evaluated. How to exactly scale up the CSI processing related parameters could be discussed later once the baseline framework is clearer, e.g., on defining spatial adaptation pattern, CSI-RS resource configuration, CSI report configuration, and the interaction between those. |
| ETRI | Yes for Q1. |
| Fujitsu2 | For the 1st question, we think that A2-2 can be applied to type 2 adaptation. As explained by DOCOMO, each sub-configuration can be associated with one CSI-RS resource, where each CSI-RS resource is associated with one type 2 spatial adaptation pattern.  For the 2nd question, when CSIs corresponding to different spatial adaptation patterns are calculated independently, it is straightforward that CPU occupancy are linearly scaled with the number of spatial adaptation patterns and the number of resources in each spatial adaptation pattern. In the case of utilizing correlation between PMIs, further study is required. In addition, the simplest way is to calculate of CPU occupancy based on the highest case to accommodate different situations. |
| CATT | We don’t think A2-2 would work for Type 2 spatial domain adaptation |
| Samsung2 | 1st point: Yes, it can be applied to Type 2 SD adaptation.  2nd point: We agree the need to revise the current CPU counting method. However, we disagree ‘linearly’ scaling as multi-CSI reports can be derived from a single set of measurements. For instance, it may be just two different power offset values assumed for calculation. Details on how to scale can be further studied. |
| LG Electronics2 | Yes, for the Q1.  For Q2, it can depend on the overhead reduction scheme and how the contents of multi-CSI reports are organized. |
| Ericsson 2 | Q1: Sub-configuration may not be needed for Type-2 SD adaptation, since Type-2 can be done almost with current spec. We think the only thing missing is to be able to configure the UE to report multiple CSIs  Q2: Yes |
| CMCC2 | Yes to Q1  If the CPU occupation rules are not updated. Different configuration of the CSI-RS may lead to linear increase of the CPU occupation. For this aspect, we are open for discussion. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Spatial adaptation patterns is number of logical ant ports for Type-1?  Spatial adaptation patterns is index of analog beam shape for a logical ant port for Type-2?  It is urgent to define spatial adaptation patterns at first… |
| **FL3e** | Please continue the discussion if you have not input or have new comments, about:  **Do you consider whether CSI processing related parameters are linearly scaled with the number of spatial adaptation patterns and the number of resources in each spatial adaptation pattern.**  As the first FFS in the below agreements has been concerned in several places including for spatial domain adaptation and potential UE complexity/payload reduction techniques, it would be needed to further extend this study, along with this question for example.  For the FFS about configuration/indication in the below agreements, it is related to the configuration/definition of spatial adaptation pattern and the discussion of need of DCI for spatial domain adaptation. This can be discussed later. For the FFS about CSI-RS power change, there is already a separate proposal being discussed.  As also clarified online, the A2-2 applies to both types of shutdown. So the first question under FL2 QP6 is addressed.  **Agreement**  For power domain adaptation, for CSI(s) reporting, support configuration of more than one power offset values for PDSCH relative to CSI-RS   * FFS: impact on CSI processing requirement * FFS: details on configuration/indication of the power offset values * FFS: whether/how to additionally consider the case where CSI-RS power is changed   **Agreement**  At least support A2-2, i.e. one CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern.   * FFS: impact on CSI processing requirement |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple3e | Regarding the scaling of CSI processing related parameters, to be precise, this depends on whether the reporting is single-CSI or multi-CSI, on whether the N CSIs are determined by the gNB or selected by the UE and the values of N and L. At least for the case when N=L and no CSI report overhead reduction is supported, the CSI processing related parameters are linearly scaled with N. |
| Lenovo3e | In our understanding, the CSI processing should scale with the how many times a CSI-RS resource is counted in the generation of the CSI report, i.e., equivalent to N |
| Ericsson 4 | Regarding CSI processing requirements, if multiple CSIs are measured and reported by the UE, we think that should be appropriately reflected via scaling in the UE’s CSI CPU budget. If UE measures more CSIs but omits some CSI, it should reflect what the UE actually measured on rather than just on what the UE reported. |
| FL3-fri | It seems this question is lack of interest/input although a dedicated question here is to dig more comments for proceeding. It can be continued here or relevant input can be provided along with previous proposals of e.g. baseline operation. |

3.6 CSI reporting types

**Company proposals**

There are three type of CSI-RS transmission and CSI reporting types. Relevant proposals are given below.

[FW]: At least aperiodic CSI-RS configurations and aperiodic CSI reporting triggered by DCI would support the adaptation of the spatial patterns at the gNB.

[Panasonic]: Further study below L1 signaling enhancement:

- Enhancement based on aperiodic CSI report procedure,

- Enhancement based on semi-persistent CSI report procedure,

- Enhancement based on adaptation of periodic CSI report procedure.

[Nokia, NSB]: Discuss how to configure CSI measurements and reports for different spatial patterns in time, considering different reporting types (semi-persistent, periodic, aperiodic).

[CMCC]: Dynamic adaptation for CSI-RS should be supported for semi-persistent and periodic CSI-RS.

**FL summary**

Most contributions do not seem to specifically differentiate different types of CSI-RS except for two companies as listed above (wherein one company leans more on A-CSI-RS and A-CSI report while one prefers SP/P CSI-RS). FL considers from resource/reporting configuration and UE CSI feedback perspective, the design may be generally common for three CSI-RS types except for the potential need of DCI triggering for A-CSI-RS and A-CSI feedback. Therefore, from specification point of view, it would be desirable that all types of CSI-RS transmission and CSI reporting could be workable based on the enhancements. This does not mandate an exactly common design for all types of reporting procedures.

**P7**

**Specifications support CSI enhancements for network energy savings applicable for periodic CSI report procedure, semi-persistent CSI report procedure and aperiodic CSI report procedure.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | We believe at least aperiodic CSI reporting and semi-persistent reporting on PUSCH should be supported for NES, due to the large CSI feedback overhead corresponding to multiple CSI, which may not be suitable for PUCCH reporting. |
| vivo | Agree |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal to ensure the feasibility of NES configuration and operation. |
| OPPO | We think aperiodic CSI reporting should be treated with high priority. We still hold conservative view on the periodic CSI reporting. We suggest the following revision:  P7-revision  **Specifications support CSI enhancements for network energy savings applicable at least for aperiodic CSI report procedure.**  **FFS: for periodic CSI report procedure, semi-persistent CSI report procedure** |
| Apple | We think current AP CSI report procedures can already provide enough adaptation flexibility, so the enhancement can be applied to periodic and semi-persistent report first. |
| Spreadtrum | Only periodic CSI reporting. AP and SPS CSI reporting is dynamic already. |
| ETRI | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support. We think all of these three types of CSI reporting are important for NES, especially for period CSI report, which is commonly used due to the benefits of less OH. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Although we are fine with the intention of the proposal, we think the current formulation is already concluding that there are enhancements needed. We think that could be one potential direction, but that would need to be discussed first. Also, whether all reporting types would be needed or not. |
| MediaTek | Support at least the use cases of periodic and/or semi-persistent CSI report.  PUSCH for aperiodic CSI report can carry more information so that existing multiple CSI framework without overhead enhancement may still fit in the volume. Also aperiodic nature also implies infrequently triggered. In this regard, CSI enhancement (overhead and UE computation complexity) reduction would be more beneficial for periodic and/or semi-persistent CSI report. In this regard, we support current version or a minimum version (somehow opposite from OPPO proposal):  **Specifications support CSI enhancements for network energy savings applicable at least for periodic CSI report procedure~~,~~ and semi-persistent CSI report procedure; ~~and~~ FFS aperiodic CSI report procedure.** |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. As commented by other companies, the AP CSI-RS has enough flexibility. And the periodic and semi-persistent CSI-RS can provide a relative long period measurement, and consequently more valid CSI measurement and performance. Then both semi-persistent and periodic CSI-RS should be supported. |
| Samsung | Support. We think all types of reporting need to be supported to provide a flexibility to the network. |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |
| Ericsson | While we are open to consider periodic and semi-persistent reporting, we think aperiodic CSI reporting is best suited for requesting of multiple CSIs from the UE in an “on demand fashion” for making decisions at the gNB for energy saving purposes. Hence, we think that aperiodic should be treated with priority. We disagree with comments from some companies that aperiodic reporting already supports spatial/power domain adaptation. Given that there is strong support for A2-2 where a report configuration contains multiple sub-configurations, it still needs to be discussed how to trigger various sub-configurations. This also applies to triggering CSI reports on multiple PDSCH-to-CSI-RS power offsets.  Overall, we support the revised proposal from Oppo.  P7-revision  **Specifications support CSI enhancements for network energy savings applicable at least for aperiodic CSI report procedure.**  **FFS: for periodic CSI report procedure, semi-persistent CSI report procedure** |
| Qualcomm1 | Aperiodic CSI reporting is better fit for the adaptation. We think focusing only on aperiodic CSI reporting makes sense.   * We don’t see the need to support semi-persistent CSI report procedure. It should be noted that this procedure is triggered by MAC-CE and having this triggering often for NES is expected to significantly NES gain.   It may be possible to support the adaptation with periodic CSI reporting. However, such adaptation may be slow due to reporting periodicity. In addition, if L1/2 signalling is introduced to change the CSI reporting, it works just like aperiodic CSI reporting (L1 signalling) or semi-persistent CSI reporting (L2 signalling). |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| FL2 | **P7-rev1**  **Specifications does not preclude that CSI enhancements for network energy savings can be used for any of aperiodic CSI report procedure, periodic CSI report procedure, semi-persistent CSI report procedure.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal. |
| DOCOMO2 | Support the updated proposal to ensure the feasibility CSI reporting configuration. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK. |
| CEWiT | Support the proposal |
| InterDigital | Support |
| ITRI | Support |
| Qualcomm2 | We are fine with the proposal although aperiodic CSI reporting is most efficient way for adaptation. |
| Lenovo2 | Agree with QC. Prefer to limit discussion to CSI reporting over PUSCH, which includes aperiodic reporting and semi-persistent reporting over PUSCH. The CSI feedback overhead and NCPU corresponding to NES spatial adaptation mode is expected to be higher than conventional CSI feedback, it is not preferred to support for reporting on PUCCH or with periodic reporting |
| Intel | ok |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB2 | Fine with the proposal.  Overall, we see benefits to consider semi-persistent CSI reporting, in addition to aperiodic CSI reporting. Actually, semi-persistent reporting could be seen as a multi-shot aperiodic CSI report as the gNB can trigger a semi-persistent report on PUSCH instead of triggering multiple aperiodic CSI reports on PUSCH in order to reduce the PDCCH overhead (only one DCI needs to be transmitted for activation instead of a separate DCI for each CSI report). We are also fine to consider periodic CSI reporting. |
| ETRI | Support the proposal. |
| Fujitsu2 | Support |
| CATT | Ok with the proposal |
| Samsung2 | Support |
| vivo | We support the proposal. But we think we suggest to focus on core features of enhancement for spatial adaptation first. |
| LG Electronics2 | Support the proposal. |
| Ericsson 2 | Agree with Qualcomm2 and Lenovo2 that aperiodic reporting over PUSCH makes the most sense. It is also the most straight forward to specify, and is able to carry more feedback overhead than PUCCH. Hence we think that at least aperiodic should be supported. We can then further discuss the other two:  **Specifications support CSI enhancements for network energy savings applicable at least for aperiodic CSI report procedure.**  **FFS: for periodic CSI report procedure, semi-persistent CSI report procedure** |
| CMCC2 | Support |
| OPPO2 | We support Ericsson’s revision. |
| **FL3 (closed as treated over GTW on Wed)** | There are large support in order to enable the framework applicable to cases as much as possible. There are also 3 companies consider at least/only Aperiodic CSI report needs to be supported.  Given this proposal does not preclude the preference of any company, it is suggested to keep it.  No input is requested unless you have strong preference and additional comments.  **P7-rev1**  **Specifications does not preclude that CSI enhancements for network energy savings can be used for any of aperiodic CSI report procedure, periodic CSI report procedure, semi-persistent CSI report procedure.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo3 | We prefer the proposal version in Ericsson 2 comment |
| Samsung3 | We support with the proposal made by FL3 and do not agree to give a nuance that one reporting type is prioritized over the others as written by Ericsson. |
| **FL** | **No more input is needed as this has been treated and no conclusion at this moment.** |

3.7 Definition of adaptation pattern/information for association

At least for discussion purpose, to identify what is an adaptation pattern would be useful and may also be necessary for configuration purpose. The following are expressed from contributions.

**Company proposals**

[Nokia, NSB]:

* For evaluating a spatial pattern, discuss how to enable the UE to determine the spatial configuration, such as codebook configuration (including codebook subset restriction), corresponding to a spatial pattern.
* Discuss the implications of different spatial patterns potentially having different channel characteristics in terms of frequency selectivity on the design of CSI report configuration, specifically from sub-band configuration perspective.

[OPPO]: RAN1 needs to clarify the definition of ‘spatial adaptation pattern’. Whether a such pattern already includes one spatial element before adaptation and another spatial element after adaptation?

[Spreadtrum]: Spatial adaptation pattern is not defined. (Observation: For Type 1, spatial adaptation pattern means the number of ports in a CSI-RS resource; for Type 2, spatial adaptation pattern means the number of antenna elements in a CSI-RS port.)

[CATT]:

* The dynamic selected number of adaptation of TxRUs should be specified selectively with consideration of the network energy gain and the overhead of the CSI reports in achieving the link adaptation gain.
* For spatial domain adaptation with type-1 antenna element mapping, the pattern of CSI-RS antenna ports should be configured to UE based on the mapping of the row/column of antenna array to the antenna ports.
* For type-2 spatial domain adaptation, each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting is configured and associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern.
* For type-1 spatial domain adaptation, at least the following parameter should be considered in configuration of spatial domain adaptation pattern,
  + - Spatial adaptation indicator used for supporting spatial domain adaptation based CSI report enhancement;
    - Antenna array dimension parameter n1-n2 used for determination of the subset of the MIMO Codebook;
    - Antenna panel number Ng used for assistance in multi-Panel MIMO Codebook determination;
    - Active antenna port indexes corresponding to the spatial adaptation pattern;
    - CSI-RS power offset relative to the SSB based on spatial elements adaptation patterns which will be discussed in section 3.
* For type-2 spatial domain adaptation, at least the following parameter should be considered in configuration of spatial domain adaptation pattern,
  + - Common antenna array dimension parameter;
    - Common antenna panel number Ng;
    - ResourceMapping;
    - PeriodicityAndOffset;
    - PowerControlOffsetSS.
* The codebook subset restriction parameters need to be configured for each antenna pattern for dynamic spatial domain adaptation.

[NEC]: Consider using an associated TRX pool index to address the spatial domain configuration whenever the network enters into the energy saving mode.

[ZTE]: The following can be considered to define “spatial adaptation pattern”

* + - Codebook configuration,
    - Port indication for CSI with different number of ports.

[China Telecom]:

* The spatial patterns of CSI-RS should be defined and configured for UE in advance to achieve the spatial domain adaptation mechanism.
* The number of switched off spatial elements should be specified and restricted to several certain numbers.

[ETRI]:

* For the purpose of discussion, a “spatial adaptation pattern” is defined as a combination of 1) a subset of CSI-RS antenna ports from the total set of CSI-RS antenna ports and 2) virtualization of the subset of CSI-RS antenna ports.
* To improve signalling efficiency, a subset of CSI-RS antenna ports can be represented by (unmuted rows, unmuted columns) based on 2D CSI codebook structure.

[MediaTek]: A 'spatial adaptation pattern' is an augmented configuration based on an NZP-CSI-RS resource configuration that include the associated NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId, a target value of 'nrofPorts' and a list of candidate values of 'powerControlOffset' or 'powerControlOffsetSS'.

* + - Selection of 'powerControlOffsetSS' or 'powerControlOffset' can depend on whether or not the power of CSI-RS is to be adjusted per spatial and power domain adaptation.
    - Note: There can be multiple spatial adaptation patterns associated to an an NZP-CSI-RS resource configuration, each of which contains different target value of 'nrofPorts' and potentially different candidate value(s) of 'powerControlOffset' or 'powerControlOffsetSS'.

[LGe]: Spatial adaptation pattern represents a number of antenna ports for type 1 or a number of enabled antenna elements associated to a logical antenna port for type 2.

[Apple]: A spatial adaptation pattern can be determined by one of the following CSI-RS resource parameters nrofPorts, TCI-State and/or powerControlOffsetSS.

[Qualcomm]:

* A spatial adaptation pattern includes a codebook configuration and reduced NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement with the same number of antenna ports as that in the configured codebook.
  + - An antenna array corresponding to the spatial adaptation pattern is a uniform linear array with a supported configuration provided in Table 5.2.2.2.1-2 and Table 5.2.2.2.2-1 of TS 38.214 for Type-I single panel and Type-I multi-panel, respectively.
    - FFS: how to determine the reduced NZP CSI-RS resource(s).
* If RAN1 adopts A2-2 for CSI report configuration and A1-2 for NZP CSI-RS resource set configuration, the following aspects are included for an CSI report configuration.
  + - NZP CSI-RS resource set configuration for channel measurement includes CSI-RS resources with the same number of antenna ports.
    - Reduced NZP CSI-RS resource(s) for channel measurement corresponding to a spatial adaptation pattern are determined from the resource(s) in the configured CSI-RS resource set.
    - The CSI processing requirements (e.g., CPU counting, counting of simultaneous active CSI-RS resources, etc.) are scaled linearly by the number of codebook configurations and the number of CSI-RS resources for each configured codebook in the CSI report configuration.

[Fraunhofer]: define a spatial adaptation pattern as a configured subset of all available ports in an array of antenna ports at the gNB.

[KT]:

* (Observation) spatial adaptation pattern can be interpreted as CMR partitioning pattern for CSI acquisition from a UE perspective.
* for CSI reporting, we can define spatial adaptation pattern group that comprises the spatial adaptation patterns which achieve identical network energy saving gain.
* best CSI reporting can be configured with the spatial adaptation pattern ID per spatial adaptation pattern group.

**FL summary**

One raised question is that whether such a pattern already includes one spatial element before adaptation and another spatial element after adaptation. Although according to the views provided that CSIs should be available before adaptation, the pattern definition may be different depending on the solutions and signalling, e.g. whether the consideration is for RRC parameters, and for DCI indication if introduced. The pattern here at least should be able to provide certain information related to how spatial elements may be shut down and those information needs to be known by a UE for its measurement and CSI feedback. They can be existing parameters or new parameters, if necessary.

To avoid the impression that an explicit definition of spatial adaptation pattern is needed, suggest to directly discuss the necessary information for RRC (noting that, any need of L1/L2 indication would be firstly based on RRC configuration, so relation to the content of L1/L2 indication can be deferred).

**Q10**

**For spatial domain adaptation,**

* **the following parameters are proposed for RRC configuration**
  + - **indicator used for supporting spatial domain adaptation based CSI report enhancement**
    - **nrofPorts**
    - **Antenna port indexes (FFS active or non-active)**
    - **Codebook configuration n1-n2**
    - **Antenna panel number Ng (for multi-Panel)**
    - **Common antenna array dimension parameter**
    - **Common antenna panel number Ng**
    - **Codebook configuration n1-n2**
    - **Antenna panel number Ng (for multi-Panel)**
    - **ResourceMapping**
    - **powercontroloffset**
    - **PowerControlOffsetSS**
    - **Index to a spatial adaptation pattern**
    - **Index to spatial adaptation pattern group**
* **Which do you consider are needed or shared, considering the following respective configuration approaches**
  + - **A1-1-revised: multiple resources are configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern**
    - **A1-2-revised: a resource setting with one resource is configured, where the resource is associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns**
* **Note: TCI-State can be separately discussed in other sections**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | The priority of the issue is low. It can be discussed later. |
| Spreadtrum | Multiple CSI-RS resource is supported in current spec, so all above parameters can be changed as a whole set. No need to discuss them separately. |
| ETRI | Agree with direction. We can further discuss what is necessary parameters for CSI-RS resource configuration and CSI reporting configuration to express 'spatial adaptation pattern'. |
| Fujitsu | It should be discussed after the agreement w.r.t. CSI-RS resource configuration is reached. |
| Nokia/NSB | The above question is covering several aspects, and this may not be efficient from discussion perspective. Also, some of the aspects are covered in other previous questions.  At least some of the listed aspects could be discussed after the baseline operation is agreed. |
| Samsung | Agree in high-level. The list will naturally become clear as the WI progresses. |
| FL2 | With the agreements on CSI-RS resource configuration, the question is modified as below  **Q10-rev1**  **For spatial domain adaptation,**   * **the following parameters are proposed for RRC configuration**   + - **indicator used for supporting spatial domain adaptation based CSI report enhancement**     - **nrofPorts**     - **Antenna port indexes (for a subset of antenna ports within a codebook, FFS active or non-active)**     - **Codebook configuration n1-n2**     - **codebook subset restriction**     - **Antenna panel number Ng (for multi-Panel)**     - **Common antenna array dimension parameter**     - **Common antenna panel number Ng**     - **ResourceMapping**     - **powercontroloffset**     - **PowerControlOffsetSS**     - **Index to a spatial adaptation pattern**     - **Index to spatial adaptation pattern group** * **Which do you consider are needed or shared, considering the following respective configuration approaches (already agreed)**   + - **A1-1-revised: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern**     - **A1-2-revised: For a resource configured in a resource set within a resource setting, the resource can be associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns** * **Note: TCI-State can be separately discussed in other sections** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO2 | Thank you for the update. But it can be discussed later. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If A1-1-revised is enabled, there is no need to define spatial adaptation. One resource implicitly represents a spatial adaptation pattern.  If A1-2-revised is enabled, due to this approach cannot support for type 2 shutdown, RRC configuration should only consider type 1 shutdown. So,  **Q10-rev1**  **For spatial domain adaptation,**   * **the following parameters are proposed for RRC configuration**   + - **~~indicator used for supporting spatial domain adaptation based CSI report enhancement~~**   [Huawei: Not clear for us. What does it mean?]   * + - **nrofPorts**     - **Antenna port indexes (for a subset of antenna ports within a codebook, FFS active or non-active)**     - **Codebook configuration n1-n2**     - **~~codebook subset restriction~~**   [Huawei: As discussed in our contribution, UE can determine a X port codebook subset restriction based on Y port codebook subset restriction. So, only one codebook subset restriction need to be configure.]   * + - **Antenna panel number Ng (for multi-Panel)**     - **~~Common antenna array dimension parameter~~**     - **~~Common antenna panel number Ng~~**   [Huawei: For type 1 shutdown, they cannot be common.]   * + - **ResourceMapping**     - **~~powercontroloffset~~**   [Huawei: For type 1 shutdown, the EPRE of the CSI-RS remains the same. There is no need to configured this parameter in type 1 shutdown case]   * + - **~~PowerControlOffsetSS~~**   [Huawei: For type 1 shutdown, the EPRE of the CSI-RS remains the same. There is no need to configured this parameter in type 1 shutdown case. In addition, PowerControlOffsetSS is used for pathloss calculation, it is no need for CSI calculation.]   * + - **~~Index to a spatial adaptation pattern~~**     - **~~Index to spatial adaptation pattern group~~** * **Which do you consider are needed or shared, considering the following respective configuration approaches (already agreed)**   + - **A1-1-revised: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern**     - **A1-2-revised: For a resource configured in a resource set within a resource setting, the resource can be associated with more than one spatial adaptation patterns**   **Note: TCI-State can be separately discussed in other sections** |
| Qualcomm2 | We should focus on P-Q8 where we define sub-configuration/spatial adaptation pattern. This question can be discussed after we have good understanding on P-Q8. |
| Lenovo2 | Prefer to defer the discussion until the framework is agreed |
| Intel | In general, these details can be discussed after high level solutions/configuration are more concrete. |
| Nokia/NSB2 | As we also indicated on Q8, we think that sub-band configuration (or frequency relate configuration) needs to be added as we previously suggested (given that different spatial patterns would have different channel characteristics in terms of frequency selectivity). |
| ETRI | We prefer to discuss necessary parameters together with relevant functionality/usage as was done in P6. |
| CATT | We are OK with Q10-rev1 but should be aligned after the agreements in P-Q8 |
| Apple | Thanks for the list, however we think this list mixes resource configurations and reporting configuration parameters together. We think this could be separately discussed with Q8, while Q8 focuses on the reporting parameters and Q10 focuses on resource configuration parameters. |
| Samsung2 | We think it would better to be discussed later once features are stable. |
| vivo | Can be discussed later |
| LG Electronics2 | Depending on which one or both between A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised will be supported, or depending on type-1 or type-2 spatial domain adaptation, we may need different set of necessary RRC configurations. |
| Ericsson 2 | We agree with some other companies’ view that we can come back to this later. Focus first on P-Q8 as suggested by Qualcomm. |

**Q11**

**How many patterns/CSI-RS resources/resource sets/resource setting/sub-configurations in reportConfig/report config(s) do you consider are needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | This depends on UE capability. Prefer to discuss 2,4 corresponding to different capability levels |
| DOCOMO | The priority of the issue is low. It can be discussed later. |
| ETRI | This issue can be discussed later. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If gNB has more information about channel state of different number of ports, it has more choices to adapt the antenna patterns to fit into traffic arrival and channel condition without sacrificing system performance. However, UE complexity will be increased if the number of antenna patterns increases. The CSI enhancement should not exceed the legacy UE capability. Hence, we think at least 2,3,4 patterns should be supported. |
| Nokia/NSB | In our view, defining an exact (max) number of spatial patterns to consider in a report configuration is not essential. We could discuss this at a later stage, also considering UE capability etc. |
| CMCC | This can be discussed later. |
| Samsung | Same view as Lenovo and it can be discussed later. |
| FL2 | Majority seems to prefer to discuss this later. For reminder, the below is considered  **PQ11**  **FFS: the number of patterns/CSI-RS resources/resource sets/resource setting/sub-configurations in reportConfig/report config(s).** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Seems OK. This also relates to the discussion of *L* in **P3-rev1**. |
| ITRI | OK |
| Qualcomm2 | This FFS should be added to P6-rev2 for further discussion later e.g., next meeting. |
| Lenovo2 | Agree with Huawei, should be part of P3-rev1 |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| ETRI | OK |
| CATT | OK |
| Apple | OK. The exact number can not be discussed before the whole framework is defined clear enough. |
| Samsung2 | Agree to postpone the discussion. |
| vivo | Can be discussed later |
| Ericsson 2 | We don’t think this proposal is needed, especially since it is trying to cover too many things. We can come back to this later once some of the other details on reporting configuration and resource configuration are settled. |
| CMCC2 | Fine with the FFS |
| **FL2e** | @Ericsson  This is only to set a discussion point to facilitate the discussion since some of the questions are proposed in other proposals already. My feeling is that it may be rather better to gather them together for future study.  **PQ11-rev1**  **FFS: the number of patterns/CSI-RS resources/resource sets/resource setting/sub-configurations in reportConfig/report config(s).**   * **Note this does not imply explicit definition in the spec for a pattern and/or a sub-configuration.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO3 | Support the proposal. |
| LG Electronics3 | We don’t have a strong objection, but the whole bullet is FFS and we will eventually discuss the number of those RRC parameters. So it might be better not to make any agreement on that proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with PQ11-rev11 |
| MTK2 | Can we put this FFS under P6-rev2 so as to provide better context? |
| ZTE, Sanechips3 | Support the proposal. |
| CATT | We are OK with PQ11-rev1 |

3.8 Need of adaptation of spatial/transmission power of CSI-RS

There are many discussion regarding the adaptation of CSI-RS, in addition to PDSCH.

**Company proposals**

[FW]: It should be left to network implementations to ensure that the coverage of SSB and/or the CSI-RS are not negatively impacted due to spatial patterns adaptation.

[Huawei, HiSilicon]: reducing the transmission power of CSI-RS is unnecessary.

[Nokia, NSB]: (Observation) If spatial adaptation is not allowed to impact at least some of the CSI-RSs (other than the ones used for spatial patterns evaluation), less network energy savings will be achieved and the gNB wouldn’t be able to e.g., multiplex CSI-RS and PDSCH in the frequency domain (at least in some cases).

[vivo]: Spatial element adaptation and power offset adaptation are not applicable to the CSI-RS Resources for L1-RSRP/L3-RSRP measurement/ beam management.

[CATT]: Coverage of common control channels/signals with spatial domain adaptation should remain the same.

[ZTE]:

* (Observation) The spatial element adaptation with type 1 mapping method does not impact the antenna port configuration of CSI-RS resources for beam management.
* (Observation) The impact on beam management with type 2 mapping method can be avoided by NW implementation.

[Samsung]:

* RAN1 should specify necessary enhancements to support the case when CSI-RS transmission power changes per Type 2 SD adaptation.
* For Type 2 SD adaptation, each NZP CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can include one or more of CSI-RS transmission powers.
* Introduce a signaling mechanism for indicating CSI-RS transmission power change for CSI calculation.

[CMCC]:

* Dynamic adaptation for CSI-RS should be supported for semi-persistent and periodic CSI-RS.
* Uplink power control enhancement is needed for separate uplink and downlink spatial adaption case.

[Transsion]: It is suggested that spatial element adaptation of CSI-RS may be not supported.

[AT&T]: Further study whether adaptation of the number of antenna ports is limited to UE-specific PDSCH transmissions or also extends to cell-wide CSI-RS transmissions

* + - In the latter case, group re-configuration should be specified for efficient signaling of the spatial network energy savings state to all UEs.

[Ericsson]: Type-2 spatial element adaptation enhancement is not supported in symbols configured with periodic CSI-RS. I.e., updates to *powerControlOffsetSS* are not supported for periodic CSI-RS.

**FL summary**

Views for support of adaptation on CSI-RS are split. 6 companies (Nokia/NSB, Samsung, CMCC, and InterDigital, Fujitsu, LGe as they mentioned in the section of ‘Beam management and/or measurement related CSI enh.’) consider it is necessary to support enhancements for compensation of the potential power change for type 2 shut down. 7 (FW, Huawei/HiSi, vivo, CATT, ZTE, Transsion, E//) consider such enhancement is not needed, either because the WID said adaptation is only applied to PDSCH, or consider such power change to PDSCH can be handled by gNB implementation. 3 companies (NEC, Lenovo, AT&T) propose to continue study. For the moment, the following is made.

**Q12**

**Do you consider Type-2 spatial element adaptation enhancement is not supported in symbols configured with CSI-RS?**

**If it is supported, do you consider the impact on CSI-RS transmission power/coverage needs further enhancement or can be up to gNB handling?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | Same behavior is expected for Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation. Then enhancement of Type 2 spatial adaptation enhancement can be supported in symbols configured with CSI-RS. The coverage issue can be up to gNB handling. |
| Fujitsu | Both type 1 adaptation and type 2 adaptation can be supported in symbols configured with CSI-RS. If adaptation is also performed for 1-port or 2-port CSI-RS, enhancements on BFD and RLM are necessary to avoid false alarm of beam failure and radio link failure. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If the number of antennas for CSI-RS transmission is reduced, the transmission power and coverage will be degraded. In this case, the cell-edged UEs cannot detect CSI-RS and will seriously affect the user experience. Hence, we prefer that Type-2 spatial element adaptation enhancement is not supported in symbols configured with CSI-RS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For type 2 shutdown, no need to do some enhancement for CSI-RS, e.g. boost the transmission power of CSI-RS.   1. In type 2 shutdown case, if a weak transmission CSI-RS is received by a UE, it is used for the UE to measure the corresponding RS and report the CSI, thus with multiple measurement and report corresponding to different patterns with potentially weak CSI-RS transmission, gNB can essentially take use of that for better adaptation decision. 2. Even if the gNB decides to boost the CSI-RS transmission power to get a better CSI measurement, independent IE *nzp-CSI-RSresource* can be used to configure the CSI-RS resource in type 2 shutdown case as supported in current mechanism already. gNB can configure IE *nzp-CSI-RSresource* by considering the increased transmission power of CSI-RS, potentially for multiple patterns, and choose better CSI. So, static RRC informing CSI-RS transmission power for type 2 shutdown is sufficient. |
| Nokia/NSB | In general, we support considering the impact of spatial adaptation on at least some of the CSI-RS (we could discuss if this includes CSI-RS for beam failure detection or not, …). This would be beneficial e.g., to allow multiplexing PDSCH and CSI-RS in the frequency domain, and more generally to achieve more NES gains/opportunities.  If the above is agreed, we could further discuss whether there is need to indicate the UE a change of power or, equivalently, change of number of antenna elements; and this could be even considered from an antenna port perspective. |
| CMCC | We do not see any difficulties in supporting type 2 adaptation for the symbols configured with CSI-RS. If the transmit power is reduced due to the type 2 adaptation, power boosting could be used to maintain the coverage. |
| Samsung | Not supporting Type-2 SD in symbols configured with CSI-RS does not make sense. This implies that the network needs to adapt its spatial elements back and forth multiple times even within one slot, if it includes CSI-RS. Therefore, it needs to be supported and the CSI-RS transmission power also needs further enhancement as it is not just assumed by gNB but the UE also needs to know the CSI-RS power for correct calculation of CSI. |
| Panasonic | After some of the TxRUs are shut down, it naturally applies and impact all the slots/symbols no matter configured with CSI-RS or not. In deployments configured with precoded CSI-RS by multiple TxRUs, to adapt the CSI-RS power is necessary. |
| FL2 | Three companies consider overall no enhancement is needed even if type 2 adaptation is supported in symbols configured with CSI-RS. Five companies consider it needs enhancements. Please continue the discussion. |
| Qualcomm2 | CSI-RS is used for various use cases. What is CSI-RS for in the proposal? Is it for CSI reporting only? We think this should be clarified first before detail discussion. |
| Intel | Not entirely sure what it means to be left to gNB implementation. Some form of power offset information should be conveyed to the UE, otherwise how would the UE be able to compute CSI feedback?  Here we assume question is asking whether some additional enhancements need to be made on top of the existing power offset signaling supported for CSI feedback for type 2 adaptation. For this question, we think not likely needed. However, this requires some further discussion on how the CSI report configuration is set for not only type 2 but also for type 1, as we would prefer to have some unified CSI report signaling framework for this approach. Therefore, we think this question may need to be revisited once, RAN1 has more conclusion on the CSI report framework for multi-CSI feedback cases. |
| CATT | It should be transparent to UEs when the CSI-RS has different characteristic due to network energy saving. Thus, no specification impact. |
| Apple | Slighly prefer not to support Type 2 for CSI-RS, since this complicates UE measurement procedure due to the potential change of CSI-RS transmission power. |
| Samsung2 | Not supporting Type-2 SD in symbols configured with CSI-RS does not make sense. To avoid frequent adaptations by gNB, the applicability of Type-2 SD adaptation needs to be assumed in the specification work regardless of symbols configured with CSI-RS or not. |
| vivo | We think Type-2 spatial element adaptation enhancement can be supported in symbols configured with CSI-RS. The impact can be up to gNB handling. |
| LG Electronics2 | We think both type-1 and type-2 spatial domain adaptations should be supported in symbols configured with CSI-RS, and necessary enhancements to support it can be discussed. |
| Ericsson 2 | We think Type-2 SD adaption should not be supported on periodic CSI-RS since periodic CSI-RS is used for power control and beam failure detection, and changing the power of CSI-RS would complicate both of those procedures. Furthermore, the power savings benefits are small. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Share the similar view as Ericsson 2. Type-2 should be limited for usage. The analog beam shape is changed in our view. |
|  |  |

3.9 Need of adaptation of Panel

Also, panel-wise adaptation and relevant issues/procedures are analysed by below.

[Lenovo]:

* Dynamic switching between single-panel operation and multi-panel operation supported in legacy design can be used for NES purposes
* Dynamic switching between single-panel operation and Rel-17 SFN operation supported in legacy design as an optional feature can be used for NES purposes
* If the NES mode is activated for DL CJT with NPanel panels, only a subset of the panels are activated. FFS: the value of N’
* Support enhanced beam reporting, which allows a UE to report the best N beams for each antenna panel independently in one CSI report for NES purposes

**FL summary**

It reads a bit too broad in order to propose anything for potential agreements, e.g. what needs to be switched between single-panel operation and multi-panel operation/R17 SFN operation, and what parameters represent for N beam (e.g. CRI). It is suggested that the proponent to specifically indicate what RRC parameters/L1 indication are needed as well as other necessary specification enhancement for the panel adaptation for NES, in respective sections e.g. CSI-RS resource configuration, definition of adaptation pattern (although note that multi-TRP is out of the scope).

**Q13**

**Companies are also invited to share your views about the proposals from the proponent.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | In Rel-18, CSI reporting enhancements for CJT are supported with two modes, where in Mode 2 the different nodes correspond to co-located panels with the same average delay. We understand that multi-TRP scenarios, e.g., NCJT are out of scope of NES enhancements, however for CJT, where some modes support co-located panels, the answer is not clear to us. We are OK to defer discussion on this question if the moderator (and other delegates) believes this is out of scope as well |
| DOCOMO | The priority of the issue is low. It can be discussed later. |
| Nokia/NSB | Multi-panel case could be explicitly considered in the discussion, but we prefer to first focus on defining the baseline operation for the single panel case.  Also, the use of multi-panel may be transparent to the UE where the gNB could represent a panel by a subset of antenna ports. |
| Samsung | Issues related to single panel should be the priority. Issues and solutions related to the treatment of multi-panel as co-located TRPs would fall under m-TRP operation and therefore should be kept out of the scope. |
| FL2 | This discussion can be revisited later. |

3.10 Beam management and/or measurement related CSI enh.

For bean management, and also other L1/L3 measurement, there are following proposals.

**Company proposals**

[Nokia, NSB]:

* Discuss whether the existing TCI state indication procedures should be enhanced when considering spatial pattern adaptation.
* Discuss how/whether spatial adaption impacts beam failure detection and beam recovery procedures.

[vivo]: Spatial element adaptation and power offset adaptation are not applicable to the CSI-RS Resources for L1-RSRP/L3-RSRP measurement/ beam management.

[CATT]: Multiple beam management functions could be performed with each BM function associated with one TxRU set.

[NEC]:

* Study the impact of spatial elements adaption if the CSI-RS resource is configured as reference RS in TCI state, QCL info, spatial relation, and pathloss reference signal.
* Support scaling the threshold of beam failure detection and threshold of candidate beam identification for power domain network energy saving.

[ZTE]: The enhancement on beam management should be deprioritized.

[InterDigital] RAN1 to consider solutions reducing signaling overhead from changes of TCI states when Type 2 adaptation is used.

[Google]: The enhancement on beam measurement and report for NES should only focus on CSI-RS based beam measurement and report.

[Fujitsu]: Enhancements on RLM and RRM measurement on CSI-RS are necessary considering the potential transmission power fluctuation of 1-port CSI-RS due to adaptation of spatial element.

[Samsung]:

* Specify a solution for preventing beam failure and/or RLF due to potential SD/PD adaptation, e.g., hypothetical beam failure and/or RLF reports for the indicated hypothetical power offset values.
* Specify a solution to enhance beam failure recovery procedure, e.g., switch/update of RS set for beam failure detection and that for candidate beam identification according to the network adaptation.

[CMCC]:

* Enhancements can be studied to enable UE to jointly measure CSI-RS or PL RS transmitted before and after spatial elements on/off.
* Threshold for beam failure recovery or radio link monitoring may be needed to update together with spatial elements on/off.
* TCI states may be needed to update simultaneously with the adaptation of spatial elements.

[LGe]:

* Consider at least the following issues for beam management enhancement.
  + - How to inform UE to adjust the RX beam when receiving a specific CSI-RS for beam management
    - How to handle the case where CSI-RS configured for beam management, radio link monitoring or link recovery procedures is affected by gNB’s adaptation of spatial elements
    - How to adjust the number of repetitions for a CSI-RS resource with the higher layer parameter repetition set to 'on' or 'off'
* Consider the following methods for TCI configuration enhancement.
  + - Method 1: Configure multiple candidate CSI-RS resources as reference signal for QCL information or for spatial relation information, and switch one of them based on L1/L2 signaling
    - Method 2: Configure multiple candidate sets of TCI state(s) associated with DL/UL signal/channel and switch one of them based on L1/L2 signaling
    - Method 3: Invalidate DL/UL signal/channel related to a CSI-RS resource that is deactivated or affected due to gNB’s adaptation of spatial elements

[Lenovo]: For Type2 spatial domain adaptation, evaluate whether the antenna element per port adaptation impacts the accuracy of the QCL relationships between DL/UL RSs.

[AT&T]: If RAN1 agrees to support type 2 spatial adaptation, study the need for beam management and beam failure enhancements.

[Docomo]: Configured TCI may be invalid due to dynamic spatial and power adaptation. An enhanced TCI switch mechanism corresponding to dynamic adaptation should be supported.

[Fraunhofer]: RAN1 to discuss mechanisms to enable UEs to perform beam measurement and efficient reporting to meet NES requirements while maintaining sufficient link gains.

**FL summary**

A number of companies mentioned the need of enhancement for beam management and TCI framework. A first question is whether such enhancement is only motivated due to support of type 2 spatial adaptation.

**Q14**

**If Type-2 spatial element adaptation is not applied in symbols configured with CSI-RS, do you consider what enhancement is needed for beam management and/or TCI framework?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | We already agree that both types of spatial adaptation should be supported. If Type-2 adaptation is not applied to symbols with CSI-RS, can we consider that Type-2 adaptation is not supported? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No enhancement is needed. |
| Nokia/NSB | We don’t think this is only motivated by Type 2 adaptation, but generally by any spatial adaptation type. |
| CMCC | From our understanding, both types of spatial adaptation should be supported. Both spatial adaptation types should be considered for the beam management and or TCI frameworks should be considered, if any. |
| Samsung | In our view, type-1 and type-2 both adaptations should be supported for TCI framework. |
| CATT | BM enhancement for different number of antenna ports (Type 1) and beam width (Type 2) should be supported for spatial adaptation |
| Ericsson 2 | See our comments on P8 below |

**P8**

**At least if Type-2 spatial element adaptation can be applied in symbols configured with CSI-RS, further study the enhancement of beam management and/or TCI framework.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Support |
| vivo | We don’t see the need to adopt spatial element adaptation for the CSI-RS Resources for L1-RSRP/L3-RSRP measurement/ beam management. So there is no need to consider enhancement of beam management and TCI framework. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO | More discussion is needed. |
| Apple | Fine for study. |
| ETRI | Fine to study further. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Even if the Type-2 spatial element adaptation can be applied in symbols configured with CSI-RS, the impact on beam management brought by the spatial element adaptation can be avoided by NW implementation. The gNB does not need to perform spatial element adaptation for the CSI-RS resources configured for beam management, and a small amount of energy saving gain is sacrificed to avoid the impact. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine to consider this proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support and think indication of the corresponding power level changing will be useful to minimize impact to potential channel averaging utilized in beam measurements. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| CMCC | Fine to study. |
| Samsung | Support |
| Panasonic | Agree. |
| Ericsson | We do not support the proposal  We agree with the comments from ZTE and vivo.  Furthermore, even if Type-2 adaptation results in wider CSI-RS beams, it is not expected that L1-RSRP measurements at the UE will result in a different UE Rx beam selection that would require a different TCI state to be indicated to the UE for PDSCH/PDCCH reception. Furthermore, Type-2 adaptation of SSB is not in scope, hence if SSB is the QCL reference for PDCCH/PDSCH reception, no enhancements are needed. |
| LG Electronics | Support in general. However, we think enhancement of beam management and TCI framework can be needed also for type-1 spatial domain adaptation. For instance, as in **A1-2-revised** of P5, if 16 antenna ports out of 32 antenna ports within the same NZP CSI-RS resource are turned off, QCL property can be affected even for type-1 spatial domain adaptation. |
| FL2 | Clarification is that support of Type 2 adaptation naturally applies to PDSCH, however whether it also applies to CSI-RS is the question here. For the timing being, the following seems agreeable to majority. Please show your concern if any; otherwise no need for input.  **P8**  **At least if Type-2 spatial element adaptation can be applied in symbols configured with CSI-RS, further study the enhancement of beam management and/or TCI framework.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | We don’t think the spatial domain adaptation has to impact the RS for beam management and/or TCI framework. So we don’t think the proposal is needed. |
| Qualcomm2 | Similar comment to Q12 C&P below:  CSI-RS is used for various use cases. What is CSI-RS for in the proposal? Is it for CSI reporting only? We think this should be clarified first before detail discussion. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal |
| Samsung2 | Support the proposal.  In our view, both Type 1 and Type 2 adaptation of spatial elements will have associated impact on TCI framework. In Type 1, switching off CSI-RS ports configured within a CSI-RS resource will impact QCL property and thus, change TCI state. In Type 2 adaptation of spatial elements, muting of antenna elements associated with a CSI-RS port will also impact QCL and TCI state.  In summary, we support proposal of enhancing TCI framework, at least for Type 2. However, Type 1 is not precluded. |
| vivo | As commented before, adaptation for the CSI-RS Resources for beam management would have impact on the L1-RSRP/L3-RSRP measurement, thus may affecting the legacy behavior based on the RSRP measurement. |
| Ericsson 2 | We do not support P8 (see comments above) |
| CMCC2 | Fine to further study. |
| FL3 | @QC  My understanding is the CSI-RS is for CSI reporting and beam management. |
| InterDigital | Ok with proposal |
| FL3e | **P8**  **At least if Type-2 spatial element adaptation can be applied in symbols configured with CSI-RS, further study the enhancement of beam management and/or TCI framework.**  @All  There seems to be sustained objection. However, considering this is only for study purpose, FL suggest one more time for companies to be flexible.  **P8-rev1**  **At least if Type-2 spatial element adaptation can be applied in symbols configured with CSI-RS for CSI reporting or beam management, further study the potential enhancement of beam management and/or TCI framework.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO4 | Support the proposal. |
| Intel | While we do not object to further study, we would like to get some clarification on what it means to apply type 2 adaptation in symbols configured with CSI-RS.  Type 2 adaptation is simply using a different/alternative antenna elements for transmitting signals. Its not clear to us what applying type-2 in symbols are referring to. In general, what antenna elements are being used by gNB is not known to the UE, and gNB generally has the degree of freedom to choose any antenna elements for a signal/channel. gNB will need to consider continuity of the channel and potential QCL relation issue, but selection of specific antenna elements are up to implementation.  So its not clear to us what the first part of the sentence is referring to.  If the proposal is to study BM/TCI enhancements due to type-2 adaptation, that is ok. If so, it might be cleaner to simply state as such . |
| Xiaomi | Fine for further study. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| ZTE,Sanechips3e | P8 is not preferred. |
| Apple3e | Fine to study |
| Fujitsu4 | Fine for further study |
| Qualcomm3 | Thanks FL for clarification. With that understanding, we should have the following **update**.  **P8**  **At least if Type-2 spatial element adaptation can be applied in symbols configured with CSI-RS for CSI reporting or beam management, further study the enhancement of beam management and/or TCI framework.** |
| Samsung3e | We support the proposal in high-level but we disagree to frame the proposal for the case when the Type-2 SD can be applied to symbols configured with CSI-RS or not. If, hypothetically speaking, the adaptation is restricted to non-CSI-RS symbols, this implies that the network needs to dodge every single symbol with CSI-RS by keep adapting back and forth, which effectively makes the Type2-SD feature unusable. As a baseline, it should be applicable regardless of whether symbols are configured with CSI-RS or not and, therefore, we suggest to revise the proposal as follows.  **Proposal**  **For Type-2 spatial element adaptation, further study the enhancement of beam management and/or TCI framework.** |
| LG Electronics4 | Support P8 (also fine with Qualcomm’s revision) although we think those enhancements are necessary even for type-1 spatial element adaptation. |
| Ericsson 4 | As we explained in earlier rounds, we do not support P8. |
| FL3-fri | Please indicate only if you have strong concern on the below.  **P8-rev1**  **At least if Type-2 spatial element adaptation can be applied in symbols configured with CSI-RS for CSI reporting or beam management, further study the potential enhancement of beam management and/or TCI framework.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CMCC4 | no concern for further study. |
| ZTE,Sanechips5 | P8 is not preferred. |
| Qualcomm3-fri | Update “potential” to “necessary” |
| Ericsson 5 | We do not support Proposal **P8-rev1**.  We strongly believe that even if Type-2 spatial element adaptation is applied to CSI-RS for CSI reporting and/or CSI-RS for beam management, any impact to CSI reporting and or beam management can be avoided/handled by gNB implementation – the UE is not aware of which antennas are muted within a port, so the adaptation is transparent to the UE.  Regarding Type-2 adaptation of CSI-RS for beam management, we understand that Type-2 shutdown would result in wider CSI-RS beams due to muting of antenna elements. However, it is not expected that L1-RSRP measurements at the UE would result in the UE selecting a fundamentally different gNB Tx beam direction – a wider beam covers a narrow beam. Hence previous UE feedback of preferred gNB *narrow* transmit beam is sufficient information for the gNB to decide which *wider* gNB Tx team to use. Furthermore, the UE Rx beam to use for reception of a CSI-RS transmitted in a wider gNB Tx beam will not change compared to a narrower gNB Tx beam since a wide beam covers a narrow beam. Hence it is not needed to indicate a new TCI state (QCL source) for reception of a CSI-RS for beam management.  Regarding Type-2 adaptation of CSI-RS for CSI reporting, after Type-2 adaptation, the gNB will trigger CSI reporting again, where the CSI-RS will be now transmitted with a wider beam. However, for reception of this CSI-RS, the TCI state does not need to change since the QCL source is most often an SSB, and Type-2 adaptation on SSB will not occur (out of scope in WID).  Another important issue is that opening up study for enhancements on beam management and TCI framework will lead to very long discussions that will not complete in the remaining 2 meetings. Generally our view is that beam management/TCI framework discussions are better handled within the MIMO WI. |

3.11 Need of transition time due to adaptation

There is study point related to transition time.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  Discuss the signalling aspects for spatial/power domain adaptation for Rel-18 NES-capable UEs considering that   * Whether there is a need for transition time per adaptation (for UE) * Whether/How to inform UE on spatial adaptation pattern update and/or PDSCH/CSI-RS transmission power change due to adaptation. |

Views from companies are given below.

**Company proposals**

[Huawei, HiSilicon]: Transition time per adaptation (for UE) is unnecessary.

[Nokia, NSB]:

* The impact of transition time for spatial adaptation should be accounted for when deciding on the option(s) (regarding resource configuration discussed above) to adopt to enable the evaluation of multiple spatial patterns.
* Discuss the need to specify transition time for spatial adaptation taking into account the different (sleep) states the gNB could be transitioning from/into.

[CATT]: From the UE perspective, there is no transition time for the antenna pattern change in the spatial domain adaptation.

[MediaTek]: RAN1 to further discuss and decision which of the following restrictions is adopted for spatial and power domain NES adaptation:

* + - Alt 1: A data interruption time is introduced
      * FFS: Interruption time duration(s), which may depend on UE capability report
    - Alt 2: Restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s), w.r.t. the setting before NES adaptation.

**FL summary**

2 companies consider that transition time is not needed and can be handled by gNB scheduling. One company consider this transition time also relates to gNB sleep states. Further one company consider such impact may lead to data interruption and/or require restriction to adaptation in terms of range of ports/power change.

The possible causality of such an impact on UE and whether it requires restrictions to gNB is not sufficiently elaborated yet. At least from gNB perspective, it may be up to gNB control how to utilize the different sleep states for scheduling. For UE, some companies mention AGC while some companies also consider AGC is not an issue. This needs more discussion.

**P9**

**Further study the impact of spatial and power domain adaptation, considering:**

* **whether data interruption time/transition time is introduced**
* **whether restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and/or PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s) is needed**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We don’t think transition time or time restriction for UE is needed. It can be handled by gNB scheduling. However, we are open to discuss. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Apple | Support. We think the transition time per adaptation is important for UE to accommodate for the CSI computation or CSI-RS measurement. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We don’t think the transition time for UE is needed. It is adaptation at gNB side. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support further study. |
| Nokia/NSB | We understand the views saying that accommodating ‘transition time’ could be left up to gNB implementation. However, we think we should discuss this aspect so that a common understanding between companies is reached in that regard. To this end, we suggest considering our following observations (copied from our Tdoc R1-2302393) as a starting point for the discussions:  **Observation 28:** **There would be no transmissions of (DL) signal/channels possible during a NW transition time for spatial adaptation, at least considering the spatial elements being impacted by the adaptation.**  **Observation 29: The transition time range for spatial adaptation would depend on the sleep state the gNB is transitioning from/into, and it might also depend on whether analog or hybrid beamforming is considered.**  **Observation 30: Even for the cases where a somewhat large transition time is required for spatial adaptation, the gNB should be able to reduce the impact of such transition time as much as possible still based on implementation. Also, introducing and specifying a transition time would potentially require noticeable specifications efforts.**  On the second bullet-point, we think that the power related aspect for PDSCH could be more discussed under the power domain adaptation. Overall, we see need to indicate the UE a ‘change’ of power adaptation and/or number spatial elements (where this latter one could be considered from antenna port perspective, e.g., for Type 2 adaptation). The need for a restriction in the range reading ‘change’ indication should also be considered in the discussions. |
| MediaTek | While restriction is useful for UE to accommodate the impact due to spatial and power domains adaptation, explicit indication for PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power change timing and value(s) can potentially help UE to deal with the power change more smartly. In this regard, one additional bullet is suggested for the proposal:  **Further study the impact of spatial and power domain adaptation, considering:**   * **whether data interruption time/transition time is introduced** * **whether restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and/or PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s) is needed** * **Explicit indication for PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power change timing and value(s)** |
| CMCC | Fine for further study. |
| Samsung | Support in high-level to further study those aspects. |
| Panasonic | Agree. |
| Ericsson | We think that these can be handled by gNB implementation and scheduling. |
| LG Electronics | Basically we think transition time or application delay can be introduced in case gNB indicates/triggers spatial/power domain adaptation pattern via DCI or MAC-CE. However, we can discuss P9 further once such kind of indicator is agreed. |
| FL2 | Considering the majority preference, the following is made. Note that the indication for notifying the adaptation to UE is not the same indication for gNB indicating/triggering e.g. multi-CSI.  **P9-rev1**  **Further study the potential impact of spatial and power domain adaptation, considering:**   * **whether data interruption time/transition time needs to be introduced** * **whether restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and/or PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s) is needed** * **whether explicit indication for PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power change timing and value(s)** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| China Telecom | Support for further study. |
| DOCOMO2 | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE,Sanechips2 | We don’t think the proposal is needed. The timing issue can be handled by gNB. Moreover, even with the current spec, the PDSCH transmission power can be dynamically adjusted without any indication. |
| CEWiT | we are fine with the proposal |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Qualcomm2 | Support the proposal |
| Lenovo2 | Support |
| Intel | Ok with study. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB2 | **First, we think that ‘transition time’ and ‘power or spatial change’ should be under separate proposals.**  In addition, we don’t understand what “power change timing’ exactly mean in P9-rev1. Overall, we see need to indicate the UE a ‘change’ of power adaptation and/or number spatial elements (where this latter one could be considered from antenna port perspective, e.g., for Type 2 adaptation). The need for a restriction in the range ‘change’ indication could also be considered in the discussions. |
| Fujitsu2 | Support for further study |
| CATT | We are OK to further study but don’t see this is an essential issue |
| LG Electronics2 | OK for the further study, but we have an editorial comment as below.  **P9-rev1**  **Further study the potential impact of spatial and power domain adaptation, considering:**   * **whether data interruption time/transition time needs to be introduced** * **whether restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and/or PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s) is needed** * **whether explicit indication for PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power change timing and value(s) is needed** |
| Ericsson 2 | Below agreement already considers aspects such as transition time/pattern update/power change, etc. Can it be clarified what is the intention for the new proposal?  **Agreement**  Discuss the signalling aspects for spatial/power domain adaptation for Rel-18 NES-capable UEs considering that   * + Whether there is a need for transition time per adaptation (for UE)   + Whether/How to inform UE on spatial adaptation pattern update and/or PDSCH/CSI-RS transmission power change due to adaptation. |
| CMCC2 | Fine to further study. Our understanding is, if the relative transmit power of PDSCH and CSI-RS is changed due to the NES enhancements, UE should have the knowledge and can differentiate it from the normal use cases without the updates of the power offset. Since the UE may use different demodulation scheme or assumptions for the demodulation for PDSCH. |
| FL2e | @Ericsson  The intention is to provide small amount of new considerations from previous agreement, including possible data interruption, and thus a range as a restriction may be needed for the change of antenna ports and/or PDSCH transmission power.  @Nokia  The timing means the time that an adaptation is to be performed. |
| MTK2 | Thanks for FL clarification. We support the proposal (and LGE revision looks good). |
|  |  |

**FL3e**

With FL clarification to Ericsson, whether the below can be agreeable or not as a small step forward. If not, the previous agreements about transition time still hold for future study.

**P9-rev1**

Further study the potential impact of spatial and power domain adaptation, considering:

* whether data interruption time/transition time needs to be introduced
* whether restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and/or PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s) is needed
* whether explicit indication for PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power change timing and value(s) is needed

**P9-rev1-part1**

**Further study the potential impact of spatial and power domain adaptation, considering:**

* **whether data interruption time/transition time needs to be introduced**
* **whether restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and/or PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s) is needed**

**P9-rev1-part2**

**Further study the potential impact of spatial and power domain adaptation, considering:**

* **whether explicit indication for PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power change is needed**
* **FFS: details of what is exactly indicated.**
* **FFS: time when the adaptation is assumed based on the indication.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO4 | Support the proposal. |
| Intel | Ok with proposal. |
| CEWiT | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with proposal |
| ZTE,Sanechips3e | As we commented before, the proposal is not preferred.  Moreover, the transmission power of PDSCH can be already dynamic changed by the current spec. Additionally indication of PDSCH power value is too restrictive for gNB implementation. |
| Apple3e | OK |
| Nokia/NSB3 | Thanks FL for the clarification.  We still think that ‘transition time/ interruption time’ and ‘power or spatial change indication’ aspects could be made under separate proposals to facilitate the discussions. Also, the ‘change timing’ is not fully clear still.  We thus suggest the following to have the following separate proposals as one example (updates are in blue).  **P9-rev1-1**  **Further study the potential impact of spatial and power domain adaptation, considering:**   * **whether data interruption time/transition time needs to be introduced** * **whether restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and/or PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s) is needed** * **~~whether explicit indication for PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power change timing and value(s) is needed~~**   **P9-rev1-2**  **Further study the potential impact of spatial and power domain adaptation, considering:**   * **~~whether data interruption time/transition time needs to be introduced~~** * **~~whether restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and/or PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s) is needed~~** * **whether explicit indication for PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power change ~~timing and value(s)~~ is needed** * **FFS: details of what is exactly indicated.** * **FFS: time when the adaptation is assumed based on the indication.** |
| Fujitsu4 | Fine for further study |
| Qualcomm3e | We are fine with the proposal |
| Lenovo | OK to study |
| Samsung3e | At high level, we support to study those listed aspects, if the following comments are taken into account.  1st bullet: We are fine to study the needs of introducing data interruption time/transition time aspects. Note however that our understanding is that gNB transition time is an implementation issue and has no spec impact. Introducing data interruption time can be considered if majority of UE vendors think that UE AGC settling time needs to be provisioned with SD/PD adaptation.  2nd bullet: We do not think any restriction is needed for the range of change of CSI-RS ports, as we haven’t seen any good reasons why such restriction is needed to be introduced. Regarding restricting the range of change of power offset values, in the original proposal in the MTEK’s contribution, it was either to restrict the range of power offset values or to introduce data interruption time, if UE AGC needs settling time. Thus, it’s better to jointly handle both aspects.  3rd bullet: We support the study as is.  Consequently, we suggest the following revised proposal:  **Proposal:**  **Further study the potential impact of spatial and power domain adaptation:**   * **whether gNB transition time due to SD/PD adaptation needs to be explicitly accounted by UE** * **whether either DL data transmission interruption time needs to be introduced or restricting the range of change of PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power offset(s) is needed, e.g., due to UE AGC settling time** * **whether explicit indication for PDSCH (and CSI-RS) power change timing and value(s) is needed** |
| LG Electronics4 | We are fine to further study. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson 4 | We do not support this since the existing agreement is sufficient and holds for further study. |
| DOCOMO5 | I think the FL update the proposal into **P9-rev1-part1 and P9-rev1-part2** if I understand them correctly.  We can support **P9-rev1-part1 and P9-rev1-part2.** |
| ZTE,Sanechips5 | Similar views with Ericsson 4 |
| FL4 | As a proposal for study, it receives multiple very negative comments with one main reason of being lack of new value compared with previous agreements/FFS.  Given this, FL considers proponent can take the comments (here as well as in Q15) into account and can still propose anything corresponding to the bullets shown in P9.  Another proposal based on this, will not be pursued here within this meeting. |

**Q15**

**For further discussion, please elaborate the aspects/reasons that may lead to**

* **data interruption time/transition time, and/or**
* **restriction in the range of change of number of CSI-RS ports and/or PDSCH (and CSI-RS, if agreed) power offset(s)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | If different spatial adaptation patterns correspond to different CSI-RS resources of the same CSI-RS resource set, the number of CSI-RS ports corresponding to the different spatial adaptation patterns should remain the same, otherwise further spec enhancement is needed |
| Nokia/NSB | To further discuss the transition time aspect, we copy the following from our Tdoc (R1-2302393):  Regarding the transition time for spatial pattern change, there are two main cases to consider:   * Case 1 – CSI-RS transmissions to enable spatial adaptation: depending on which option(s) among the various options discussed earlier in this contribution, there may be a need for a transition time between two (consecutive) CSI-RS resources transmitted using different spatial patterns. * Case 2 – spatial adaptation for PDSCH: when the gNB decides to adapt the spatial pattern for PDSCH transmissions, there would be a need for a transition time to switch from one spatial pattern to another.   One aspect to discuss is the assumption to make regarding the impact on gNB transmissions during the transition time. In our view, there would be no transmissions possible during this time, at least considering the spatial elements being impacted by the adaptation.  Another important aspect, be it for Case 1 or Case 2 above, is whether the gNB could accommodate the transition time for spatial adaptation based on gNB implementation. This could be feasible potentially depending on the range/values to assume for the required transition time. The transition time range would depend on the sleep state the gNB is transitioning from/into, and it might also depend on whether analog or hybrid beamforming is considered etc. |
| FL2 | Please continue to elaborate the details. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with further study.  However, from our perspective,   1. gNB can schedule PDSCH transmission by considering the transition time per spatial/power adaptation. In addition, the TxRUs/spatial elements shut-down/turn-on and DL transmission power increase/decrease can be implemented in extreme short duration, e.g. in one OFDM symbol. So, we think that, transition time is unnecessary. 2. Current specification does not restrict that transmission power of PDSCH and DMRS. However, the UE needs to handle the PDSCH and DMRS reception power changes which is not a problem and can be overcome by the AGC tracking. Actually, we can further check this issue. |

3.12 Need of signalling to UE due to adaptation

The relevant agreements are excerpted as below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  Discuss the signalling aspects for spatial/power domain adaptation for Rel-18 NES-capable UEs considering that   * Whether there is a need for transition time per adaptation (for UE) * Whether/How to inform UE on spatial adaptation pattern update and/or PDSCH/CSI-RS transmission power change due to adaptation. |

**Company proposals**

[FW]: The association based on layer 1 signaling should be introduced to dynamically signal the following to the UE the CSI-RS resources to use for its CSI reporting:

* + - The CSI-RS resource or subset of CSI-RS resources that corresponds to different number of antenna ports, and/or
    - The CSI-RS resource set that corresponds to different number of antenna ports.

[Huawei, HiSilicon]:

* Informing the UE on spatial adaptation pattern update and/or PDSCH transmission power change is unnecessary.
* There seems no need for gNB to indicate which exact CSI-RS resources for UE to measure and report, unless there are a large amount of CSI-RS resources configured.

[Panasonic]:

* Further study below L1 signaling enhancement:
  + - Enhancement based on aperiodic CSI report procedure,
    - Enhancement based on semi-persistent CSI report procedure,
    - Enhancement based on adaptation of periodic CSI report procedure.
* Enhancement of L1/L2 signal can be designed with unified structure to support dynamic spatial element and power domain adaptation.

[Nokia, NSB]:

* Support signalling of spatial pattern change to the UE. Discuss signalling content of spatial adaptation, considering that different spatial patterns may differ in at least one of the following spatial elements:
  + - Set of antenna ports,
    - Set/number of active (or muted) antenna elements or TxRUs for one or more antenna ports.
* Discuss signalling ways for spatial adaptation, considering the following options as a baseline:
  + - Option 1: Use DCI, including group common DCI if seen beneficial, to indicate the UE(s) a spatial pattern change/adaptation.
      * This option could include leveraging signaling for existing operation(s) if feasible/possible.
    - Option 2: Use MAC CE to indicate the UE(s) a spatial pattern change/adaptation.
    - Option 3: Use semi-static or even semi-dynamic configuration and operation, i.e., via RRC or MAC CE, for switching between various spatial patterns over different period of times, i.e., spatial partitions in time. And use dynamic signaling, via DCI or MAC CE, to update such configuration.

[vivo]: Support group common DCI to indicate the active sub-configuration corresponding to a spatial adaptation pattern that UE shall report. For each CSI reporting occasion corresponding to one report configuration, only one sub-configuration can be indicated as active.

[CATT]: The L1-signaling indication of antenna pattern is essential to be included in the DCI format when spatial domain adaptation is performed with the number of Tx antenna changes with different antenna pattern.

[NEC]:

* Consider the activation of different network energy saving techniques (e.g., time, frequency, spatial, power) via semi-static network energy saving configuration.
* Support both accumulative value indication and absolute value indication for efficient adaption of power and spatial elements for network energy saving.

[Intel]: Consider supporting L1 based signaling, such as DCI based signaling, that enables re-configuration of CSI-RS resources and CSI report for a group of UEs.

[Fujitsu]:

* For single CSI feedback, group-common L1 signaling should be considered to efficiently indicate the UEs of the CSI-RS resource/report update.
* For multiple CSIs feedback, UCI overhead and CSI processing complexity reduction is required. To achieve this, gNB selects the CSIs to be reported and indicates them to UE.
  + - Dynamic signaling is used for indicating UE of the CSIs need to be measured and reported

[ZTE]: To better adapt to CSI reporting requirements, dynamic indication of one or more CSIs can be considered, where the dynamic indication should convey information for one or multiple spatial adaptation patterns to support multi-CSIs.

[InterDigital]:

* A DCI can indicate subset of antenna ports applicable to a group of NZP CSI-RS resources for CSI reporting.
* The DCI indicating subset of antenna ports is received in a UE-group common search space.

[China Telecom]: The indication should be transmitted to UE to trigger the corresponding CSI measurement and reporting when the spatial adaptation happens. The new measurement is not for gNB to make the decision of adaptation but just to secure the network performance.

[Google]: Support dynamic activation/deactivation for a CSI report configuration.

[Samsung]:

* Introduce L1/L2 signaling for updating a given NZP CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting by indicating an index from the set of configured CSI-RS mapping patterns, CSI-RS transmission powers, and PDSCH transmission powers per Type 1 SD, Type 2 SD, and PD adaptations, respectively.
* Consider UE-group-specific L1 signaling for updating a given NZP CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting per SD/PD adaptation.
* If a L1/L2 signaling for updating a given NZP CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting is introduced, the number of active CSI-RS ports in a given active BWP should be derived based on the L1/L2 signaling indication.
* Extend the current TCI state indication DCI to additionally indicate a CSI-RS resource sub-configuration ID per SD/PD adaptation.
* Introduce L1/L2 signaling for updating a given CSI report configuration by indicating an index to a CSI report sub-configuration from the set of configurations per Type 1 SD adaptations.
* For multi-CSI reporting, a UE is indicated by the serving gNB a set of CSI-RS resource sub-configurations for which the UE reports CSI.
* Introduce a signaling mechanism for indicating CSI-RS transmission power change for CSI calculation.

[ETRI]:

* For use case 2, a spatial adaptation pattern that UE receives for CSI measurement can be dynamically indicated (switched) by a DCI.
* When the CSI-RS antenna port virtualization (or, beam pattern) is expected to change due to TX chain activation or deactivation, UE can be indicated to reset its CSI measurement or reporting behaviour.

[CEWiT]: gNB dynamically signalling information about the adaptation of spatial elements to the UE is supported. gNB adapting the spatial elements and indicating UE to report CSI corresponding to the adapted configuration is supported.

[MediaTek]:

* Specify cell-wise indication of spatial and power domain adaptation for NES, including
  + - Indication of change in maximum number of ports utilized for CSI (Type-1 disabling/enabling)
    - Indication of change in PDSCH and/or CSI-RS power offsets (Type-2 disabling/enabling)
    - Indication of (partial) reset to CSI and beam management procedures
* For cell-wise indication, utilize SIB for broadcasting the candidate settings of spatial and power domain adaptation for NES and some bit(s) in paging indications for activating one candidate setting for the NES adaptation.

[Lenovo]:

* Evaluate whether dynamic switching between two P/SP CSI reporting configurations corresponding to activated and deactivated NES modes is needed
* For Type1 spatial domain adaptation, evaluate the following sub-types for determining the selected antenna ports when the NES mode is activated
  + - Type1-A. Antenna port group indication via port-selection parameter in Type-II PS codebook type
    - Type1-B. Antenna port group indication via CRI field, where different CRI codepoints correspond to different antenna port groups of the same CMR

[AT&T]: Further study whether the actual number of spatial dimensions for which the UE shall report CSI uses L1 or MAC procedures

[Ericsson]:

* When a UE receives DCI indicating a trigger state with multiple sub-configuration indicators, the UE transmits one CSI report including CSI results corresponding to each of indicated sub-configurations.
* When a UE receives DCI indicating a trigger state including only one sub-config indicator, the UE measures and reports CSI according to the indicated sub-configuration only.

[ITRI]: For NES spatial domain adaptations, at least the following signal mechanisms for spatial element adaption should be discussed:

* + - UE specific DCI
    - Group common DCI
    - Cell-wise indication

**FL summary**

Apart from the purpose to mitigate/address the issue due to adaptation as discussed in the section of ‘Need of transition time due to adaptation’, there are other purposes for dynamic signalling, including switching/reconfiguration of CSI-RS resource(s), activation or deactivation of adaptation operation. A large number of companies support introduction of L1/L2 signalling to UE. For single-CSI feedback, it can be used for indication of the exact CSI-RS resource for UE to measure and report CSI as supported by [vivo, Apple], while for multi-CSI feedback, a subset of CSI-RS resources is indicated to reduce the UE burden while achieve fast adaptation, as proposed by 8 companies [FW, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Intel, Samsung, ZTE, ETRI, E//].

The signalling may be carried via DCI or MAC-CE. It may be carried in a UE specific, UE-group-common or cell-wise manner.

Considering the proposal in section of ‘CSI feedback’ where the gNB is assumed to be able to further indicate/trigger a subset of CSI(s),

**P10**

**If single-CSI feedback is supported, support L1/L2 signaling to indicate/trigger a CSI-RS resource corresponding to a spatial adaptation pattern.**

**If multi-CSI feedback is supported, support L1/L2 signaling to indicate/trigger a subset of CSI-RS resources corresponding to one or multiple spatial adaptation patterns.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Support |
| DOCOMO | For indication of CSI-RS resource, we could discuss issues of section 3.3 and 3.4 firstly. After that we can come back here. |
| Apple | **We are supportive of L1/L2 signalling to activate/trigger the CSI-RS resource/report. For certain scenarios, e.g. Type 1 spatial adaption and power domain adaptation, no new resources are needed to be activated/triggered, only the report corresponding to a different spatial adaptation patter or power assumption needs to be triggered. Therefore, we propose the following modification:**  **If single-CSI feedback is supported, support L1/L2 signaling to indicate/trigger a CSI-RS resource/report corresponding to a spatial adaptation pattern.** |
| Spreadtrum | Both single and multi-CSI feedback is supported in current spec. We don’t know why to discuss them separately? |
| ETRI | We support the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, sanechips | Okay.  As we commented in P1, the indication/triggering of a single CSI feedback/one spatial adaptation pattern is a special case of multi-CSI feedback/multiple adaptation pattern, it can be considered together with multi-CSI feedback/multiple adaptation patterns. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support L1/L2 dynamic signaling.  The motivation of gNB indicating subset of CSI(s) or one to report is not very clear for us. Why gNB needs some CSIs/one at some point and needs some other CSIs/ another one CSI at another point? From our perspective, gNB needs all CSIs to do the shutdown decision and scheduling decision. If only a subset of CSI(s) is reported by UE, gNB cannot do proper shutdown (due to the lack of all CSIs) which resulting in performance loss and less energy saving gain. |
| Nokia/NSB | It is a bit early to discuss this aspect. We should first discuss and agree on other (baseline) aspect. |
| MediaTek | Support and fine with Apple revision suggested. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Samsung | Support |
| InterDigital | While we support L1/L2 dynamic signaling, we think the contents of the dynamic signaling is to be further discussed. In principle, dynamic signaling should effectively convey the update to the spatial adaptation pattern while incurring low overhead. For example, if multiple CSI-RS resources are associated with a spatial adaptation pattern, indicating each of the CSI-RS resource in L1/L2 signaling may not be effective. In such scenarios, indicating the sub-configuration corresponding to a group of CSI-RS resources can be more effective than indicating each CSI-RS resources. |
| Panasonic | We are okay. Also we support revision from Apple, which we think that should additionally apply to multi-CSI feedback.  **If single-CSI feedback is supported, support L1/L2 signaling to indicate/trigger a CSI-RS resource/report corresponding to a spatial adaptation pattern.**  **If multi-CSI feedback is supported, support L1/L2 signaling to indicate/trigger a subset of CSI-RS resources/report corresponding to one or multiple spatial adaptation patterns.** |
| Ericsson | We don’t support the proposal in its current form.  While we agree that that for the purposes of CSI reporting, it is necessary to inform the UE what PDSCH-to-CSI-RS offset(s) to assume (for power domain adaptation) and what codebook info(s) to assume (for Type-1 spatial domain adaptation), we don’t think the proposal about triggering resource(s) is meaningful. The proposal should be written in terms of triggering CSI reports, not resources.  Furthermore, for the 2nd bullet, it is not clear why a “subset” of CSI-RS resources needs to be triggered/indicated. |
| LG Electronics | In general we are fine with the intention of P10, but suggest some modifications as follows.  **Support L1/L2 signaling to indicate/trigger a subset of CSI report sub-configurations corresponding to one or multiple spatial or power adaptation patterns out of those configured in a CSI report configuration.**  **FFS: Signaling details** |
| FL2 | This is already in a previous proposal. |

**Q16**

**Do you consider such signaling should be via DCI or MAC-CE?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | It can be discussed later. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Spatial/power domain adaptation will impact all UEs in a cell, MAC-CE is UE-specific signaling and may cost more signaling overhead. Hence, we prefer the signaling to be DCI, if dynamic indication is supported. |
| Nokia/NSB | This could be considered at a later stage, after some other important aspects are clarified. |
| Xiaomi | Also prefer to discuss it later. |
| Samsung | It can be DCI and/or MAC-CE depending on the reporting types. |
| InterDigital | We prefer DCI for dynamic signaling |
| CEWiT | We also prefer DCI for dynamic signaling |
| Intel | If signaling are to be supported, it should be DCI.  MAC-CE does not allow configuration to multiple UEs, and MAC CE must be sent to each UE individually, which defeats the purpose of introducing signaling to reduce latency and overhead. |
| CATT | DCI |
| LG Electronics3 | We prefer DCI but can discuss this later. |
| OPPO | DCI is prefered |
| China Telecom | We are open to both options, while we prefer DCI. |

**Q17**

**Do you consider such signaling should be via UE-specific, UE group-common or cell-wise?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | It can be discussed later. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Similar with Q16, UE group-common DCI is preferred, if dynamic indication is supported.  For cell wise indication, it can be implemented via group common DCI by configuring the same RNTI for all the NES-capable UEs in the cell. |
| Nokia/NSB | This could be considered at a later stage, after some other important aspects are clarified. |
| Samsung | UE-specific signaling can be baseline. Additionally, UE group-common signaling can be considered. |
| InterDigital | We prefer cell or group common signaling for lower overhead |
| Intel | Group-common is preferred for the obvious reasons. |
| CATT | UE-specific |
| LG Electronics3 | We prefer UE group-common DCI but can discuss this later. |
| OPPO | Group-common DCI is prefered |
| China Telecom | Group-common is preferred. |

3.13 UE complexity/capability

UE complexity and relevant capabilities are one aspect that needs to be clarified/discussed as mentioned in WID.

|  |
| --- |
| * Note: Legacy UE CSI/CSI-RS capabilities applies when considering total number of CSI reports and requirements |

**Company proposals**

[Nokia, NSB]: Clarify the exact UE CSI/CSI-RS capabilities covered in the following Note (captured in the WI description):

* + - “Note: Legacy UE CSI/CSI-RS capabilities applies when considering total number of CSI reports and requirements.”
    - Without further clarifications on this Note, all the legacy capabilities related to total number of CSI reports and requirements would need to be assumed.

[Intel]:

* Discuss further whether legacy UE CSI capability related to total number of CSI reports and requirements can be utilized to only indicate to network energy saving enhancement of multi-CSI feedback for multiple CSI-RS resource set hypothesis (if agreed to be introduced) but not for general legacy UE CSI capabilities when UE is indicating more than 1 concurrent CSI report processing in a CC.
* From UE capability perspective, treat a CSI report setting for multiple CSI feedback corresponding to multiple CSI-RS resource set hypothesis as one CSI report setting per BWP.
* (Observation) The UE complexity for handling multi-CSI feedback in a CSI report for multiple CSI-RS resource set hypothesis may not be equivalent to multiple legacy CSI report for multiple legacy CSI-RS resource sets.
* (Observation) For type 2 port selection codebook, legacy capability for maximum number of port can be applied to infer support for any hypothetical CSI-RS port subset configuration that is strictly smaller than the maximum number of ports for NES enhanced multi-CSI feedback.

[Qualcomm]: UE reports a set of supported candidate values for the total number of CSI-RS resources per set for an CSI-RS resource set configured with repetition set to ‘on’.

**FL summary**

Although UE capability might be also discussed in a later stage, two companies noted that it is important to understand how the enhanced/developed UE capabilities are related to the legacy UE capabilities, and which.

Literally, total number of CSI reports and requirements is concerned and thus the directly relevant capabilities at least include the *csi-ReportFramework*. On the other hand, if all legacy capabilities and their general use also include the count for NES purpose, there can be other interpretation such that one joint report of CSI(s) can be treated as one report as proposed by Intel.

The total ‘requirement’ in the text could be vague about where it applies to (measured ports, report, CSI calculation or resource etc.). At least there is preference from one or two companies (Spreadtrum, Qualcomm) to consider CSI processing requirement as linearly scaled with e.g. number of CSI-RS resources as baseline, without compression. However this consequently leads to linearly scaled up UE complexity, thus FL consider whether it is really beneficial or not needs some more discussion. Nevertheless, the intention of such text in WID should be kept in mind such that UE vendors can afford the enhancements to be developed from this feature.

**Q18**

**Which legacy UE capability(ies) do you consider should apply, regarding the note in WID?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | From our understanding, supporting R18 NES is one kind of new UE capability, so with the new capability, the extension of the UE capability defined in *csi-ReportFramework* can be considered if necessary. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think it’s important to reach common understanding between companies on the Note. As we indicated in our Tdoc, without further clarifications on the Note, all the legacy capabilities related to total number of CSI reports and requirements would need to be assumed. |
| Samsung | Our understanding is that at least the following Rel-15 UE capabilities (TR38.822) are related with the note in WID:  - FG 2-33, CSI-RS and CSI-IM reception for CSI feedback  - FG 2-35, CSI report framework |
|  |  |
| FL2 | In any case, it seems potential impact can be studied on at least some of the existing UE capabilities. Note due to NBC, new capabilities will be developed.  **PQ18**  **Study the potential enhancements/extension to at least**  **- FG 2-33, CSI-RS [and CSI-IM reception] for CSI feedback**  **- FG 2-35, CSI report framework** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | okay |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t think discussion of relationship with UE capability is necessary at this stage. It is too early to define and actually anything new is an extension/enhancement – the discussion for any exact impact can be carried out during the discussion. |
| Qualcomm2 | We share the same view as Samsung on the interpretation of UE capability Note in WID.  We do not support PQ18. Since the Note already says “Note: Legacy UE CSI/CSI-RS capabilities applies when considering total number of CSI reports and requirements”, the PQ18 goes against the Note.  BTW, the intention of the question is just to understand what capabilities are related to the Note in WID. |
| Intel | Ok with study. |
| Nokia/NSB | On PQ18, our understanding is that the Note restrict us from introducing new capabilities, but we are open to further discuss this. |
| Fujitsu2 | In our understanding, the enhancement/extension of UE capabilities is conflict with the statement of the note in the WID. But we are open for further study. |
| CATT | OK to study |
| Apple | The “Note” in the TR restricts the increase of UE total number of CSI reports and requirement. How to count the number of CSI reports and requirement should be based on the enhancements to be made for NES. |
| CMCC2 | UE capability issues could be discussed later. |

# DL transmission power adaptation

The objective for transmission power adaptation is as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify necessary enhancements on CSI related procedures including measurement and report, and signaling to enable efficient adaptation of power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS [RAN1, RAN2] |

The relevant agreements are excerpted as below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For adaptation of power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS, further study the following   * Where/how to configure multiple power offset values   + Whether/how one or more power offset values are dynamically indicated to UE for CSI measurement/reporting, and PDSCH reception   + Overhead reduction for CSI reports associated with multiple power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS   + Whether other UE report content can be included |

By dividing companies’ proposals into different subsections, they can be summarized as below.

4.1 Adaptation of transmission power of PDSCH

**Company proposals**

[Nokia, NSB]: Configuration of multiple powerControlOffset values within a single NZP-CSI-RS resource is supported.

[OPPO]: RAN1 does not support CSI reporting based on multiple power offset configuration.

[Spreadtrum]: Dynamic switching among multiple power offsets between PDSCH and CSI-RS can be considered.

[Fujitsu]: Support each CSI-RS resource/resource set to be associated with multiple power offsets between CSI-RS and PDSCH.

[ZTE]: Each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with one or more power offset values.

[Samsung]: each NZP CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can include one or more of PDSCH transmission powers.

[CMCC]: Multiple power offset values can be configured and dynamically indicated and/or activated.

[Transsion]: RRC signaling plus L1/L2 signaling can be used to configure the multiple power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS.

[LGe]: Power adaptation pattern represents a power offset value between PDSCH and CSI-RS.

[Qualcomm]: If RAN1 adopts a framework where UE performs CSI for more than one power offset value for a CSI report config, the following aspects are included.

* + - The CSI processing requirements (e.g., CPU counting, counting of simultaneous active CSI-RS resources, etc.) are scaled linearly by the number of power offset values and the number of CSI-RS resources in the CSI report configuration that gNB requests CSI report.

[Ericsson]:

* For power domain adaptation, for aperiodic CSI reporting, support configuration of one or more *powerControlOffsets* within a trigger state.
* When a UE receives DCI with a trigger state indicating multiple *powerControlOffsets*, the UE transmits one CSI report including CSI results corresponding to each of the *powerControlOffsets*.
* When a UE receives DCI indicating a trigger state including only one *powerControlOffset*, the UE measures and reports CSI according to that *powerControlOffset*.

**FL summary**

Many support of configuring multiple poweroffset between CSI-RS and PDSCH is observed. 4 companies also support the introduction of L1/L2 signalling for further indication/triggering a subset of power offset value(s). One company consider it shout not be supported while one company can be conditional supportive. Since there is still uncertainty on whether RRC configured multiple power offsets can be agreeable or not, the introduction of L1/L2 signalling on top of that is separately discussed. Note there is an FFS on the impact on CSI processing requirements set for power domain adaptation, while this can actually be discussed together with that for spatial domain adaptation techniques.

**P11**

**For power domain adaptation, support configuration of more than one power offset values for PDSCH relative to CSI-RS**

* **FFS: impact on CSI processing requirement**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Support. Different power offset values may impact RI, PMI and CQI, e.g., lower PDSCH power implies lower rank would be supported and vice versa, leading to impacting PMI and CQI in turn. |
| vivo | Ok in principle.  We prefer to use the same framework for multiple power offset configuration as for spatial adaptation pattern. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO | Based on our simulation results, we don’t see the benefits. Thus, we don’t support this proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal, and we think a common configuration framework should be strived for both spatial and power adaptation. |
| ETRI | Support the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree.  UE performs CSI measurement with more than one power offset values and report multi-CSI can guarantee the network obtain the proper/accurate CSI measurement results and assist the network for the dynamic transmission power adjustment. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support  Similar to spatial domain, gNB can do proper shutdown and scheduling decision based on the multiple CSIs. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the proposal |
| MediaTek | Support and think the power offset(s) can also be used for UE to estimate the CQI with reduced/increased beam power level due to Type-2 adaptation. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. Besides, a unified framework for spatial and power adaption is preferred. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |
| Ericsson | We suggest below updates.  **For power domain adaptation, for CSI reporting, support configuration of more than one power offset values for PDSCH relative to CSI-RS**   * **FFS: impact on CSI processing requirement** * **FFS : Triggering/indication of power offset value(s)** |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal but it would be better what FFS bullet (i.e., impact on CSI processing requirement) implies can be clarified. |
| FL2 | **P11-rev1**  **For power domain adaptation, for CSI reporting, support configuration of more than one power offset values for PDSCH relative to CSI-RS**   * **FFS: impact on CSI processing requirement** * **FFS : Triggering/indication of power offset value(s)** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **P11-rev1**  **For power domain adaptation, for CSI(s) reporting, support configuration of more than one power offset values for PDSCH relative to CSI-RS**   * **FFS: impact on CSI processing requirement** * **FFS : Triggering/indication of power offset value(s)** |
| CEWiT | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| ITRI | Support |
| Qualcomm2 | We suggest to add an FFS:  FFS: details on configuration of the power offset values. |
| Lenovo2 | Support |
| Intel | Ok with P11-rev1 (also Huawei’s update). |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB2 | We support the proposal but prefer to remove the 2nd FFS or use the wording from the previous meeting: “Whether/how one or more power offset values are dynamically indicated to UE” |
| ETRI | Support |
| Fujitsu2 | Support |
| CATT | We do not support the proposal since the power adaptation would be transparent to the UE reception of PDSCH/DMRS after radio channel |
| Samsung2 | Support  In our view, difference in power offset between CSI-RS and PDSCH would impact CSI measurements to be used for PDSCH link adaptation. |
| vivo | Ok in principle  For next step, we think more details on how to configure more than one power offset should be discussed. The similar framework for power domain adaptation as spatial domain adaptation can be used. E.g.,   * A1-1: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one power offset values * A1-2: For a resource configured in a resource set within a resource setting, the resource can be associated with more than power offset values |
| LG Electronics2 | Support |
| Ericsson 2 | Support P11-rev1. Okay with the FFS added by Qualcomm2 |
| CMCC2 | Support. |
| **FL2e** | @Nokia  the second FFS is removed considering that the previous agreement already has an better FFS as you pointed out.  @vivo  will set another discussion point for your suggested following up.  **P11-rev2**  **For power domain adaptation, for CSI(s) reporting, support configuration of more than one power offset values for PDSCH relative to CSI-RS**   * **FFS: impact on CSI processing requirement** * **FFS: details on configuration of the power offset values.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO3 | Support the proposal. |
| LG Electronics3 | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO2 | We don’t see the necessity of configuring more than one power offset. It does not lead to performance gain with increased UE measurement. But if we are the only one company has the concern, we can be flexible and follow the majority view. |
| FL | @OPPO Like:) |
| MTK2 | Support with revision. For CSI calculation, PDSCH power is the critical factor, while a constant PDSCH to CSI-RS power offset can correspond to a different PDSCH if a different CSI-RS to SSS power offset is assumed. In this regard, for CSI reporting, at least the following FFS needs to be included:  **P11-rev2**  **For power domain adaptation, for CSI(s) reporting, support configuration of more than one power offset values for PDSCH relative to CSI-RS**   * **FFS: impact on CSI processing requirement** * **FFS: details on configuration of the power offset values.** * **FFS: Support of more than one power offset candidate values for CSI-RS relative to SSS** |
| ZTE, Sanechips3 | Support the proposal by FL. |
| InterDigital | We support **P11-rev2** |

**Q19**

**For power domain adaptation, do you consider there is need to introduce L1/L2 signalling, for e.g. indicating/switching the adaptation(s) corresponding to a (subset of) power offset values?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We prefer to use the same framework for multiple power offset configuration as for spatial adaptation pattern. To be specific, we prefer to indicate only one power offset value as that for spatial domain adaptation |
| DOCOMO | RAN1 should provide the gNB the feasibility to configurate power offsets. We consider above is necessary. |
| ETRI | If a unified design for spatial and power domain adaptations is taken, Q19 may correspond to P10. |
| Fujitsu | Similar as spatial element adaptation, L1/L2 signaling can be considered for indicating the hypothesis power offset or a subset of hypothesis power offset. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If the dynamic indication is considered for spatial domain adaptation, similar framework can be applied to power domain. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Seems not necessary. The same reason as we discuss in spatial domain. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think that there is no need for L1/L2 signalling to indicate which power offset value is used for CSI reporting. However, indication of actual PDSCH power change using L1/L2 signalling should be considered. |
| Xiaomi | Signaling to indicate the power offset adaptation is beneficial for improving the CSI accuracy. Thus, it should be supported. |
| CMCC | At least the L1/L2 signaling can be introduce for the power domain adaptation. A unified mechanism could be strived for both power and spatial domain adaptation. |
| Samsung | Yes. Likewise, CSI-RS transmission power. powerControlOffset/powerConrolOffsetSS values are needed to be known by UE for correct calculation of CSI. |
| InterDigital | We share similar views with Fujitsu in that L1/L2 dynamic signalling can be considered for indicating the adjustment to the power offset value between PDSCH and CSI-RS. |
| LG Electronics | Similar to the spatial domain adaptation, L1/L2 signaling can be used to request the report of CSI information corresponding to specific power offset values or to indicate adaptation. |
| FL2 | To be revisited. |

**FL3 P11-e**

**For power domain adaptation, support a same framework as spatial domain adaptation for CSI-RS resource configuration, i.e.**

* **A1-1-power: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one power offset value**
* **A1-2-power: one or more resources can be configured in a resource set within a resource setting and each resource can be associated with more than one power offset values**

**FL3 P11-e-rev1**

**For power domain adaptation, support at least one of the following**

* **A1-1-power: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where resources can have different power offset values**
* **A1-2-power: one or more resources can be configured in a resource set within a resource setting and each resource can be associated with one or more power offset values**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Lenovo3 | In our understanding, the power offset is needed so that the UE can compute the CSI based on the hypothetical power of the DL PDSCH (associated with DMRS). So the same resource can be used to compute multiple power offset values (A1-2). Can proponents of A1-1 give an example on a case in which A1-1 is needed/relevant? |
| Samsung3 | Support |
| DOCOMO4 | Generally support the proposal with following update.  **For power domain adaptation, support a same framework as spatial domain adaptation for CSI-RS resource configuration, i.e.**   * **A1-1-power: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where each resource is associated with only one power offset value** * **A1-2-power: one or more resources can be configured in a resource set within a resource setting and each resource can be associated with more than one power offset values** |
| Intel | Ok with proposal. |
| CEWiT | We support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with proposal. |
| ZTE,Sanechips3e | Okay. |
| ETRI | Support the proposal. |
| Apple3e | Support |
| Fujitsu4 | Support |
| Qualcomm3 | We suggest **some update**:  **FL3 P11-e**  **For power domain adaptation, support at least one of the following ~~a same framework as spatial domain adaptation for CSI-RS resource configuration, i.e.~~**   * **A1-1-power: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where resources can have different power offset values ~~each resource is associated with only one power offset value~~** * **A1-2-power: one or more resources can be configured in a resource set within a resource setting and each resource can be associated with one or more ~~than~~ power offset values** |
| LG Electronics4 | We support the proposal and we are fine with Qualcomm’s modification. |
| FL | @QC could you explain a bit the difference? Seems both cases are multiple-to-multiple mapping |
| China Telecom | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson 4 | For power domain adaptation, since the PDSCH-to-CSI-RS offset is a value used only for CSI reporting, multiple power offsets can be associated with a single CSI-RS resource, which is A1-2-power. There is no need to limit to only a single power offset value as in A1-1.  We are OK with by Qualcomm’s suggested revision to A1-2-power. By changing to “one or more power offset values” then A1-2 becomes a superset of A1-1 and hence we do not need A1-1 separately.  Then, where the different power offset values(s) are configured/indicated also needs some discussion.  Suggested updates in red below on top of Qualcomm updates.  **FL3 P11-e**  **For power domain adaptation, support ~~at least one of~~ the following ~~a same framework as spatial domain adaptation for CSI-RS resource configuration, i.e.~~**   * **~~A1-1-power: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where resources can have different power offset values each resource is associated with only one power offset value~~** * **A1-2-power: one or more resources can be configured in a resource set within a resource setting and each resource can be associated with one or more ~~than~~ power offset values** * **FFS: Details of where the different power offset values(s) are configured/indicated** |
| DOCOMO5 | We can support the updated **FL3 P11-e-rev1** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3-fri | Please comment only if you have concern**.**  **P11-e-rev2**  **For power domain adaptation, support one or more resources can be configured in a resource set within a resource setting and each resource can be associated with one or more power offset values**   * **FFS: Details of where the different power offset values(s) are configured/indicated** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics5 | We think two alternatives are still valid also for power domain adaptation. So, we prefer to keep two alternatives for power adaptation, similar to spatial adaptation. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are OK |
| Qualcomm3-fri | We think there can be two possible options following lines of A1-1-revised and A1-2-revised. Hence, previous suggestions. The latest proposal is on Option 2. Since we should target the same framework for both spatial and power domain, we should keep both in discussion for now. From our perspectives, A1-2-revised makes sense for Type 2 SD while A1-1-revised/Option 1 is for Type 2 SD and power domain.  **Option 1 (in the line of A1-1-revised)**  One CSI report config with three sub-configurations:  P-port NZP CSI-RS resource set (for channel measurement) containing   * + Sub-configuration 1: 1st group of P-port NZP CSI-RS resources   + Sub-configuration 2: 2nd group of P-port NZP CSI-RS resources   **Option 2 (in the line of A1-2-revised)**  One CSI report config with three sub-configurations:   * P-port NZP CSI-RS resource set (for channel measurement) * Sub-configuration 1: 1st power offset between PDSCH and CSI-RS * Sub-configuration 2: 2nd power offset between PDSCH and CSI-RS   Hence, we still think our updated proposal in Qualcomm3 should be pursued. |
| CEWiT | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson 5 | We support Proposal **P11-rev2**, as it allows both alternatives from previous version of the proposals. |

**\*Week 2 start\***

As a few companies prefer to go back to the two approaches framework and several changes are made by companies based on one response from QC, FL would like to take that one as baseline for further discussion, with modifications of supporting both for more flexibility and adding a bit more for future study.

**FL4-power-Q1**

**For power domain adaptation, support the following configurations for CSI-RS resource configuration,**

* **A1-1-power: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where resources can have different power offset values**
* **A1-2-power: one or more resources can be configured in a resource set within a resource setting and each resource can be associated with one or more power offset values**
* **FFS: Details of where the different power offset values(s) are configured/indicated.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Unlike spatial domain adaptation, power domain adaptation is hypothetical, i.e., the UE would adjust its measurements corresponding to one resource based on different power scaling corresponding to different offsets, therefore A1-2-power suffices. Can proponents of A1-1-power elaborate on why it is needed? |
| LG Electronics6 | We are generally fine with the proposal, having the similar approaches to spatial domain adaptation.  One clarification question: Does this proposal intend to support both approaches or support at least one of them (similar to the previous agreement for spatial domain adaptation)?  @ Lenovo, I think Qualcomm3-fri above provides an exemplary explanation on A1-1-power. |
| DOCOMO6 | Similar concern as Lenovo. |
| Intel | While the proposal is wide enough to cover various cases, it might be too generic.  We think there should be some alignment between power settings and spatial patterns. It not clear to us whether the two cases A1-1-power and A1-2-power will be paired with the spatial pattern configurations. We would prefer if this is deferred until the spatial pattern configuration becomes more clear. |
| Lenovo – Re | Thanks to LG for pointing out A1-1 power proposal in QC’ comment. In our understanding, A1-1-power is useful for joint spatial/power adaptation, which has not agreed yet to be supported. We prefer to focus on A1-2-power for now before considering scenarios with joint spatial/power adaptation |
| vivo | We wonder whether we need to support both A1-1 and A1-2 for power domain adaptation. Different from spatial domain adaptation, there is no different type for power offset adaptation. We think supporting one of the alternatives should be sufficient. Given that A1-1-power framework can also be used for Type-1 or Type-2 spatial domain adaptation, we prefer A1-1-power for power domain adaptation. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support option A1-2. We are not sure if A1-1 needs to be supported. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer A1-2 for unified framework. |
| CATT | We are OK with the support of A1-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal with the following tiny modifications in red  **For power domain adaptation, support the following configurations for CSI-RS resource configuration,**   * **A1-1-power: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where resources can have different power offset values** * **A1-2-power: one or more resources can be configured in a resource set within a resource setting and each resource can be associated with ~~one or~~ more than one power offset values** * **FFS: Details of where the different power offset values(s) are configured/indicated.** |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support **FL4-power-Q1**. A suggestion to update the FFS bullet as follows, as it is unclear what ‘where’ denotes:  • FFS: Details of ~~where~~how the different power offset values(s) are configured/indicated. |
| Qualcomm4 | We were thinking about A1-1-power to facilitate joint SD and PD adaptation if such joint adaptation is supported later on. If majority does not want to go this route, we are fine to only go with A1-2-power where the sub-configuration now is just the hypotheses on the power offset.  If both are in the agreement, we suggest to have “at least of the following” in the main bullet. |
| Samsung4 | As commented during the online session, for PD adaptation, we think two cases are possible: 1) adapting power level for both CSI-RS and PDSCH, 2) adapting power level for PDSCH only while keeping CSI-RS power level. Clearly, as Case 1) is much simpler network operation by reducing the overall transmission power level for both CSI-RS and PDSCH, it will help the solution to be widely adopted and commercially successful. Therefore, we first suggest to clarify whether RAN1 supports Case 1), Case 2) or both.  Note that, for Case 1), the CSI-RS and PDSCH transmission power can change together which results in a change in powerControlOffsetSS while the offset between CSI-RS and PDSCH, i.e., powerControlOffset, may remain the same. On the other hand, for Case 2), the change is only on the ‘assumption’ on the PDSCH transmission power with respect to CSI-RS, i.e., powerControlOffset. |
| Fujitsu6 | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson 6 | We support A1-2 plus the FFS.  Regarding A1-1, we still think that it is a subset of A1-2. A1-2 allows multiple resources, each associated with a power offset. Isn’t this exactly A1-1? The only potential difference is that A1-1 says “different power offset values;” however, our reading of A1-2 is that it does not preclude different power offsets. With this reasoning, can someone explain how A1-2 does not already cover A1-1? |
| China Telecom | We support the proposal. |
| CMCC5 | Fine with the spirit of the proposal. Our preference is Alt 2. We do not want to send multiple CSI-RS resources with different powercontroloffset, which means that the overhead of the CSI-RS resources increase. Based on different assumptions of the transmit power, the UE can derive the impacts and feedback to the gNB. |
| FL | It seems the first A-1-1-power somewhat relates to the joint operation of spatial adaptation and power adaptation. However, the only difference from A1-2 seems to FL is that the possibility of multiple resources corresponding to a same power offset value.  As the joint operations has not been fully considered, FL suggestion is:  **FL4e-power-Q1**  **For power domain adaptation, support the following configuration(s) for CSI-RS resource configuration,**   * **FFS: A1-1-power: a resource set with multiple resources is configured within a resource setting, where resources can have different power offset values** * **A1-2-power: one or more resources can be configured in a resource set within a resource setting and each resource can be associated with one or more power offset values** * **FFS: Details of how the different power offset values(s) are configured/indicated.** |
| Samsung4e | We are fine with the proposal but prior to that we suggest RAN1 to first discuss and agree on the supported cases from   * Case 1) adapting power level for both CSI-RS and PDSCH * Case 2) adapting power level for PDSCH only while keeping CSI-RS power level. * Both Case 1) and Case 2).   We think Case 1) is much simpler network operation by reducing the overall transmission power level for both CSI-RS and PDSCH, and it will help the solution to be widely adopted and commercially successful. |
| Lenovo-4e | We are fine with this proposal  @Ericsson: Yes, A1-2-power covers A1-1-power, however A1-1-power implies the need of multiple resources to measure multiple power offset values, which is unnecessary from our perspective (for the case of power domain adaptation only) |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Okay with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics7 | We can accept FL4e-power-Q1, although we think A1-1-power is useful especially to support joint configuration of spatial and power adaptations, as FL pointed out. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CEWiT | Fine with the proposal |
| CMCC6 | Fine with the updates from FL. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the updated proposal. |

**\*Week 2 end\***

4.2 Need of adaptation of transmission power of CSI-RS

**Company proposals**

[Huawei, HiSilicon]: reducing the transmission power of CSI-RS is unnecessary.

[CATT]:

* Each CSI-RS resource should be configured with one or more power offset relative to the SSB based on spatial elements adaptation patterns.
* With configuration of multiple *powerControlOffsetSS* values associated with different spatial element adaptation patterns, additional enhancement on *powerControlOffset* value is not needed for feedback overhead reduction purpose.

[Transsion]: It is recommended to change only the power of PDSCH.

[Ericsson]: For power domain adaptation techniques, dynamic updates for *powerControlOffsetSS* are not supported.

**FL summary**

Only small number of companies contribute on this with split views.

**Q20**

**Do you consider there is need to support dynamic update of *PowerControlOffsetSS*, at least for power domain adaptation?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | No. Dynamic update of PowerControlOffsetSS is not needed, so far the proponents have not provided evidence on whether energy savings corresponding to power adaptation of CSI-RS has considerable gains compared to PDSCH power adaptation |
| vivo | No need to consider. |
| DOCOMO | From our understanding, the adaptation of the power offset between CSI-RS and SSB is out of the scope of R18 NES WI. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | There is no need to dynamic update of *PowerControlOffsetSS*. |
| Nokia/NSB | This question seems to be related to Q12 above. RAN1 should wait for Q12 to progress before discussing this. |
| CMCC | Whether an update of the ***PowerControlOffsetSS*** is needed depends on the mechanism related to the CSI-RS enhancements. If the transmit power of the CSI-RS is changed, e.g. due to type 2 spatial adaptation, the ***PowerControlOffsetSS*** will be changed. We are open for the discussion of this issue until the enhancements related to the CSI-RS is more clear. |
| Samsung | For PD adaptation, no.  For Type 2 SD adaptation, yes. |
| InterDigital | Given the adverse impact to legacy UEs, we do not think updating PowerControlOffsetSS is needed |
| Panasonic | Yes, as this would be a consequence of Type 2 adaptation. |
| LG Electronics | If Type 2 spatial element adaptation is adopted, the CSI-RS power may be changed because the number of TxRUs per port is changed while the number of ports is maintained. |
| FL2 | The view is a bit split and may also be related to a previous discussion for spatial adaptation. It can be revisited later. |
| CATT | Yes |

4.3 CSI report configuration and reporting

**Company proposals**

[Nokia, NSB]:

* CSI report based on NZP-CSI-RS resource containing multiple power offset values is specified
  + FFS how the size of the report is reduced
* CSI reporting is enhanced by adding information about how much PDSCH power can be reduced and still maintain the same rank and/or MCS that is achievable with the powerControlOffset value included in the NZP-CSI-RS configuration.

[CATT]: With configuration of periodic CSI report setting, multiple sub-CSI associated with different powerControlOffset values should be reported to gNB.

[NEC]: Support UE to report its tolerance of potential PDSCH power reduction.

[Fujitsu]: Both single CSI feedback and multiple CSIs feedback can be considered for CSI tracking when dynamic adaptation of PDSCH transmission power is adopted.

* + - For single CSI feedback, group common L1 signaling to update of power offset between CSI-RS and PDSCH should be considered
    - For multiple CSIs feedback, gNB could indicate to UE the hypothesis power offsets for CSI measurement and report to reduce UCI overhead.

[ZTE]: Multi-CSI report with multiple power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS should be supported. Differential CQI should be can be adopted for multi-CSI in one reporting with multiple power offset values.

[xiaomi]: Enhancement to enable CSI reporting with multiple power offsets should be introduced.

[InterDigital]:

* A CSI report contains CSI information associated with at most one power offset value.
* CSI report contains indication of assumed power offset adjustment.

[China Telecom]: Support one CSI report contains multiple CSIs corresponding to different power control offsets. FFS: mechanism to reduce the reporting complexity.

[Google]:

* Support the UE to report a power backoff indicator (PBI) in a CSI report indicating the potential transmission power backoff for PDSCH.
* Support to introduce a CQI subset restriction to reduce the CQI feedback overhead and identify a better transmission power backoff.

[CMCC]: Multiple CSI reports within one CSI reporting should be supported at least for the power domain enhancements.

[Lenovo]:

* Evaluate the following UE-assisted power control offset selection techniques for possible down selection for Rel-18 NES-capable UEs:
  + - Alt1. Reporting a power control offset value based on a target WB CQI configured by the network
    - Alt2. Reporting two CQI values associated with two power control offset values corresponding to whether NES mode is deactivated or activated, respectively
      * FFS: Whether the second CQI value is a differential CQI value with respect to the first CQI value
* If the UE is configured to report two CQI values associated with two power control offset values corresponding to whether NES mode is deactivated or activated, respectively, the subband differential CQI values corresponding to the second power control offset are reported via one bit each

[Qualcomm]: RAN1 only specifies joint CSI report for multiple CSIs in power adaptation if its CSI report overhead reduction is high compared to separate CSI reports.

* + - A separate CSI report for each CSI corresponding to a power offset value that gNB requests as baseline.

**FL summary**

There are many aspects similar to the discussion for spatial domain adaptation that. Apart from those, the UE reported content may include something new as proposed by [Nokia/NSB, NEC, Google]. As the views are not yet sufficient, further study is proposed.

**P12**

**Further study the need of UE report of power back off of PDSCH, e.g. a maximum value of PDSCH power back off.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | OK to study, however the maximum PDSCH power back off should be constrained by another QoS, e.g., a minimum CQI value that needs to be achieved under the maximum PDSCH power back-off value |
| vivo | For different power offset, legacy CSI report is sufficient. |
| DOCOMO | If UE can report CSIs related to different PDSCH power assumptions, above report may be not necessary. |
| OPPO | Based on our simulation results, we don’t see the benefits. Thus, we don’t support this proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We don’t think UE report of power back off of PDSCH is necessary since UE may not have clear information about traffic arrival and scheduling strategies at NW side. Meanwhile, it is more beneficial for UE to report CSI with multiple power offset between CSI-RS and PDSCH, and gNB can performs the dynamic transmission power adjustment according to the report. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK to study, but seems no need for this.  Multiple CSIs corresponding to multiple powercontroloffset(s) (configured or indicated by gNB) has been reported from UE. gNB can derive the proper power back off value based on the multiple CSIs. Hence, there is no need to additionally report power back off of PDSCH. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | No support. We prefer specification directly capture the largest PDSCH power increment/reduction (i.e., no need of additional UE report) |
| Samsung | No. The current proposal is ambiguous; Calculating PDSCH power backoff is not that straightforward. It depends on numerous factors such as MCS, rank, HARQ retransmission, and more. |
| Ericsson | While we agree that PDSCH-to-CSI-RS offset needs to be indicated to the UE for the purposes of CSI reporting, we don’t think that indication of PDSCH power is needed. Also it is not clear what “backoff” means in this context. Backoff from what? Moreover, there is no signaling of DL power (or power backoff) in today’s spec. DL power control for PDSCH is up to gNB implementation. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FL2 | A slight majority seems not prefer to support this direction. Can be revisited later. |
| CMCC2 | Fine to further study. |

4.4 Need of signalling to UE due to adaptation

The relevant agreements are excerpted as below, same one as that for spatial adaptation while a need for that for different domains could be different.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  Discuss the signalling aspects for spatial/power domain adaptation for Rel-18 NES-capable UEs considering that   * Whether there is a need for transition time per adaptation (for UE) * Whether/How to inform UE on spatial adaptation pattern update and/or PDSCH/CSI-RS transmission power change due to adaptation. |

**Company proposals**

[FW] support adaptive power adaptation dynamic signaling to the UE of the multiple *powerControlOffse*t values to be used in CSI can be introduced.

[Huawei, HiSilicon]: Informing the UE on spatial adaptation pattern update and/or PDSCH transmission power change is unnecessary.

[Panasonic]: For efficient and effective power domain adaptation, the power offset between CSI-RS and PDSCH and the power offset between CSI-RS and SSS should be adapted with enhanced L1/L2 signaling for CSI report.

[Nokia, NSB]: Define PDSCH transmission change indication limited to cases where it is beneficial for the UE.

* FFS Discuss in which cases the indication is beneficial to the UE (e.g., if power change rate is high and/or power change is large)
* FFS Discuss whether the UE should provide information related to when it benefits from the indication (e.g., by indicating its need, or by indicating a power change rate or range which the UE can/cannot cope with).

[CATT]: Dynamic signalling could be used to activate/deactivate semi-persistent CSI report for subset of powerControlOffset values but could not be used for dynamic change of powerControlOffset value/subset associated with periodic CSI report configuration.

[Fujitsu]: Both single CSI feedback and multiple CSIs feedback can be considered for CSI tracking when dynamic adaptation of PDSCH transmission power is adopted.

* + - For single CSI feedback, group common L1 signaling to update of power offset between CSI-RS and PDSCH should be considered
    - For multiple CSIs feedback, gNB could indicate to UE the hypothesis power offsets for CSI measurement and report to reduce UCI overhead.

[ZTE]: Dynamic indication can be considered for power domain enhancement.

[xiaomi]: Signaling to enable efficient adaptation of power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS needs further study.

[InterDigital]:

* Support reporting of CSI based on dynamically indicated power offset.
* Power offset assumed for a NZP CSI-RS resource is determined by its RRC-configured power offset value and a dynamically signaled power offset adjustment.
* RRC configures a group identity for the purpose of power offset adjustment for each NZP CSI-RS resource.
* A DCI can indicate an adjustment of power offset between PDSCH and CSI-RS applicable to a group of NZP CSI-RS resources for CSI reporting.
* The DCI indicating adjustment of power offset is received in a UE-group common search space.

[China Telecom]: Not support to indicate the power offset values to UE for CSI measurement/reporting.

[Google]: With regard to the AGC, support to indicate the transmission power backoff ratio for the scheduled PDSCH by DCI.

[Samsung]:

* Introduce L1/L2 signaling for updating a given NZP CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting by indicating an index from the set of configured CSI-RS mapping patterns, CSI-RS transmission powers, and PDSCH transmission powers per Type 1 SD, Type 2 SD, and PD adaptations, respectively.
* Consider UE-group-specific L1 signaling for updating a given NZP CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting per SD/PD adaptation.
* If a L1/L2 signaling for updating a given NZP CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting is introduced, the number of active CSI-RS ports in a given active BWP should be derived based on the L1/L2 signaling indication.
* Extend the current TCI state indication DCI to additionally indicate a CSI-RS resource sub-configuration ID per SD/PD adaptation.

[CMCC]: Multiple power offset values can be configured and dynamically indicated and/or activated.

[CEWiT]: Dynamically adapting the DL transmit power of signals/channels at gNB in specific set of frequency and time resources is supported. Dynamically indicating about the adaptation of DL transmit power to the UE is supported.

[Transsion]: RRC signaling plus L1/L2 signaling can be used to configure the multiple power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS.

[Lenovo]: For power control offset indication for Rel-18 NES-capable UEs, evaluate the following alternatives for down selection:

* + - Alt1. Configuring two power control offset values per CSI-RS resource, along with dynamic indication of whether the NES mode is activated or deactivated
    - Alt2. Dynamic indication of the power control offset, e.g., via DCI indication
    - Alt3. MAC-CE based power control offset indication

[Qualcomm]: The UE is provided with an indication on the PDSCH transmission power change.

* + - FFS: Details on PDSCH transmission change indication

**FL summary**

The discussion on the need of dynamic signalling for power adaptation is very similar to that discussed for spatial adaptation. It is suggested to discuss this after more progress available for spatial domain adaptation.

**Q21**

**Discussion can be requested if you have different view. Otherwise there is no need for input.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Others

5.1 LS discussion

The following LS is received, and relevant tdoc as well as guidance from Chair is copied as below.

[R1-2302288](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302288.zip) LS on 3GPP work on Energy Efficiency SA5, Huawei

To be taken into account in agenda item 9.7. If response to SA5 is needed, handle it under [112bis-e-R18-NES-01].

Relevant tdoc:

[R1-2303799](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2303799.zip) Draft Reply LS on 3GPP work on energy efficiency Huawei, HiSilicon

Main content in the draft is copied here for reference.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Overall Description:**  RAN1 thanks SA5 for providing their view of the ongoing work on Energy Efficiency (EE) and the questions.  RAN1 would like to note that the Rel-18 WID for network energy savings for NR has been updated to RP‑230566. Also, although this is a RAN1-led work item, as also quoted in Note 13 in S5-231149, the work for this item includes objectives led by RAN2, RAN3 and RAN4 respectively.  Furthermore, in addition to energy savings that the WID RP-230566 is to directly address, the candidate solutions discussed therein can also address digital sobriety by requiring a smaller volume of data to be processed, stored, and transported, e.g. joint report of multiple CSIs with overhead reduction, for spatial and power domain techniques. This can be noted in your future work.  To be accurate and comprehensive, the following revised texts are provided for the table of 3GPP Release 18 work on EE.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | RAN WG1 |  | * Rel-18 SID in RP-221443 [8]. Expected completion date: RAN#98 (Dec. 2022). Completed. See objectives in NOTE 11. * TR 38.864 [9]. See evaluated techniques for energy saving in NOTE 12. * Rel-18 WID in RP-230566 [x]. Expected completion date: RAN#104 (June 2024). See objectives in NOTE 13. |  | | RAN WG2 |  | Objectives led by RAN2 in RP-230566. See objectives in NOTE 13. |  | | RAN WG3 |  | Objectives led by RAN3 in RP-230566. See objectives in NOTE 13. |  | | RAN WG4 |  | Objectives led by RAN4 in RP-230566. See objectives in NOTE 13. |  |     **2. Actions:**  **To 3GPP SA5:**  **ACTION:** RAN1 respectfully ask SA5 to take the above into account in their future work on Energy Efficiency. |

**FL2** **Q22**

**Do you consider a reply LS is needed? And if so, any modification to the draft reply LS in** [**R1-2303799**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2303799.zip)**?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is needed since SA5 asked RAN/RAN1 and relevant WGs to correct the table if needed and inform them. RAN1 as the leading WG for this WI can take the responsibility for a response LS, since the latest RAN plenary did not take care of it and left it up to WGs. |
| Apple | Although we concur with necessity for LS relply, with the current detailed wording including schemes that are not RAN1 agreement yet is not acceptable, “e.g. joint report of multiple CSIs with overhead reduction, for spatial and power domain techniques..”  We suggest either sending the LS providing only current WI scopes or wait until the last RAN1 meeting for a detailed reply. |
| Ericsson 3 | Regarding the proposed changes to SA5 table of 3GPP Release 18 work, they are NOT necessary. The table reflects all objectives (RAN1/2/3/4) from the WID in NOTE13. Since RAN1 is leading WG, capturing in one place as SA5 has done is enough. Likewise, SA5 has also captured all objectives (RAN1/2/3) from the SID in a single place (NOTE11). Thus, there is no need to update the SA5 table from RAN1 point of view.  The update of WID reference (from RP223540 to RP-230566) is non-essential - the only changes seem to be a) update of “Unique identifier of WI” and b) an additional “supporting company” – these do not justify triggering of an LS reply to SA5.  Regarding Digital Sobriety and which aspects of Rel-18/RAN1 work could be considered digitally sober, our preference is leave this to RAN discussion (if needed). As the WID is titled “Network energy savings for NR”, we think SA5 has well-reflected the Rel-18 work under "Energy Saving" perspective.  Overall, at this point, we do not see that a reply is needed from RAN1 perspective. |
| LG Electronics3 | We can follow the majority view on the necessity of this LS. However, as Apple pointed out, the paragraph including “joint report of multiple CSIs with overhead reduction” can be removed at least. |
| **FL3** | As a bit discussed in the reflector between RAN1 Chair and other companies, the updated WID is agreed in the recent RAN plenary and this plenary considers this is up to WG to decide how to handle the LS. Considering this is the only WI ongoing from RAN level and SA5 is asking correction and keeping them informed about the progress, it would be good to have some following up to keep them updated.  With another comment from Apple/LGe, the following is considered  **PQ22**  **Agree on a reply LS to SA5 with the removal of the following from the draft LS in** [**R1-2303799**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2303799.zip)  *Furthermore, in addition to energy savings that the WID RP-230566 is to directly address, the candidate solutions discussed therein can also address digital sobriety by requiring a smaller volume of data to be processed, stored, and transported, e.g. joint report of multiple CSIs with overhead reduction, for spatial and power domain techniques. This can be noted in your future work.* |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung3 | We agree with Ericsson’s point above. The content of RAN1 WI scope is already well captured in S5-231149. We don’t see the value of the reply at this point. |
| Apple3e | Our intention is not to mention any ongoing work that is not agreed yet in the LS. If it is preferred by the group to provide more details, we think the LS can be sent at the end of R18. |
| Nokia/NSB3 | To our view, we don’t see the need to handle it in RAN1. It involves information of other WGs, where RAN is much better place to handle it. We prefer to have it handle it in the coming RAN meeting, there is nothing in a hurry need to be replied to SA5, so let’s wait and have it handled in the coming RAN meeting. |
| Ericsson 4 | Our earlier comments still hold - at this point, we do not see that a reply is needed from RAN1 perspective. |
| FL4-LS | Given the discussion, it seems a reply LS, when needed, can be considered in future. Therefore, there is no action needed for the LS from SA5 this time. A conclusion recording the consideration of RAN1 can be below:  **Possible Conclusion:**  **A reply LS to** [R1-2302288](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302288.zip) **can be considered in future. There is no action needed for the LS from SA5 this time.** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics6 | We are fine with Possible Conclusion. |
| Nokia/NSB | @FL:  Just for our understanding, will it be future handled by RAN? Or still be future handled in RAN1? |
| Samsung4 | Support the conclusion. |
| Ericsson 6 | We think the second sentence is sufficient for now with below update.  **From RAN1 perspective, there is no action needed for the LS from SA5 this time.** |
| FL4e | @Nokia, not clear yet. If RAN takes care of it in future, RAN can indicates what needs to be done in WGs.  @all  Please also check the comment from Ericsson 6. |
| Samsung4e | Support E/ revision. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Okay with Ericsson’s version. |
| LG Electronics7 | We are OK with Ericsson’s suggestion. |
| CMCC6 | Fine with the conclusion, if no RAN1 action needed. |
| FL5 | **(indicate comment over email, only if you have other view) From RAN1 perspective, there is no action needed for the LS** [R1-2302288](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302288.zip) **from SA5 this time.** |
| CATT | No action for RAN1 |

# Conclusion

Tbd.

# Reference

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**R1-2302333**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302333.zip) | Spatial and Power Adaptations for Network Energy Savings | FUTUREWEI |
| [**R1-2302337**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302337.zip)**=>**  [**(/R1-2303955)**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Inbox/R1-2303955.zip) | CSI enhancements for network energy saving | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [**R1-2302389**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302389.zip) | Spatial and power domain adaptation for network energy saving | Panasonic |
| [**R1-2302393**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302393.zip) | Techniques in spatial and power domains | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [**R1-2302498**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302498.zip)**=>**  **(/**[**R1-2303910**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2303910.zip)**)** | Discussions on NES techniques in spatial and power domain | vivo |
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# Appendix

## A. Objectives

|  |
| --- |
| The objectives of the work item are the following:   1. Specify SSB-less SCell operation for inter-band CA for FR1 and co-located cells, if found feasible by RAN4 study, where a UE measures SSB transmitted on PCell or another SCell for an SCell’s time/frequency synchronization (including downlink AGC), and L1/L3 measurements, including potential enhancement on SCell activation procedures if necessary [RAN4, RAN2] 2. Specify enhancement on cell DTX/DRX mechanism including the alignment of cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX in RRC\_CONNECTED mode, and inter-node information exchange on cell DTX/DRX [RAN2, RAN1, RAN3]  * Note: No change for SSB transmission due to cell DTX/DRX. * Note: The impact to IDLE/INACTIVE UEs due to the above enhancement should be avoided.  1. Specify the following techniques in spatial and power domains  * Specify necessary enhancements on CSI and beam management related procedures including measurement and report, and signaling to enable efficient adaptation of spatial elements (e.g. antenna ports, active transceiver chains) [RAN1, RAN2] * Specify necessary enhancements on CSI related procedures including measurement and report, and signaling to enable efficient adaptation of power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS [RAN1, RAN2] * Note: Above objectives are only for UE specific channels/signals * Note: Legacy UE CSI/CSI-RS capabilities applies when considering total number of CSI reports and requirements  1. Specify mechanism(s) to prevent legacy UEs camping on cells adopting the Rel-18 NES techniques, if necessary [RAN2] 2. Specify CHO procedure enhancement(s) in case source/target cell is in NES mode [RAN2] 3. Specify inter-node beam activation and enhancements on restricting paging in a limited area [RAN3]. 4. Specify the corresponding RRM/RF core requirements, if necessary, for the above features [RAN4] |

## B. RAN1#112 agreements for 9.7.1

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2301964** FL summary#1 for spatial and power domain techniques for R18 NES Moderator (Huawei)  **Agreement**  For the purpose of further discussions in RAN1 on NES spatial domain adaptations, consider the following cases   * Type 1: all antenna elements associated to a logical antenna port is disabled/enabled * Type 2: part/subset of antenna elements associated to a logical antenna port is disabled/enabled     **R1-2301965** FL summary#2 for spatial and power domain techniques for R18 NES Moderator (Huawei)  **Agreement**  For spatial element adaptation, further study the following   * A1-1) Each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with only one spatial adaptation pattern   + FFS: Details on how the association is done * A1-2) Each CSI-RS resource/resource set/resource setting can be associated with one or more spatial adaptation patterns   + FFS: Details on how the association is done * FFS: Details on the definition of “spatial adaptation patterns”   **Agreement**  For spatial element adaptation, further study the following   * A2-1) Independent/separate CSI report configurations where each CSI report configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern * A2-2) One CSI report configuration contains multiple CSI report sub-configurations where each sub-configuration corresponds to one spatial adaptation pattern   + FFS: Details of sub-configuration   **R1-2301966** FL summary#3 for spatial and power domain techniques for R18 NES Moderator (Huawei)  **Agreement**  For spatial domain adaptation, further study necessary enhancements for multiple CSI(s) where each CSI corresponds to a spatial adaptation pattern, e.g.   * FFS: gNB indicates to UE which CSI(s) the UE shall report * FFS: the UE selects which CSI(s) are reported * FFS: multiple CSI(s) are reported in a joint CSI report * FFS: Overhead reduction for multiple CSI(s)   Note: UE complexity needs to be taken into account.  **Agreement**  For adaptation of power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS, further study the following   * Where/how to configure multiple power offset values   + Whether/how one or more power offset values are dynamically indicated to UE for CSI measurement/reporting, and PDSCH reception   + Overhead reduction for CSI reports associated with multiple power offset values between PDSCH and CSI-RS   + Whether other UE report content can be included   **Agreement**  For spatial and power domain adaptation, solution(s) based on adaptation within an active BWP is considered as baseline  **Agreement**  Discuss the signalling aspects for spatial/power domain adaptation for Rel-18 NES-capable UEs considering that   * Whether there is a need for transition time per adaptation (for UE) * Whether/How to inform UE on spatial adaptation pattern update and/or PDSCH/CSI-RS transmission power change due to adaptation. |