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## Introduction

The scope given in the Rel-19 NR Evolved MIMO WID [1] pertaining to CSI enhancement is as follows:

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

## Summary of companies’ views

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

Table 1A Summary: issue 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 1.1 | Work scope: Type-II codebook structures to be extended for CJT support, assuming a common design framework   * Opt1. Rel-16 regular eType-II * Opt2. Rel-16 port selection (PS) eType-II * Opt3. Rel-17 port selection (PS) FeType-II   **FL Note**: All the 3 options can of course be extended for CJT. But perhaps the scope can be reduced if there is consensus not to refine 1 or 2. | **Opt1 (R16 R-T2):** Huawei/HiSi, Samsung, Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, MTK, ZTE, Lenovo, LG, Apple, DOCOMO, NEC, vivo (high priority), CMCC, OPPO, IDC, Futurewei, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Intel, CATT, CEWiT, Spreadtrum, IITK, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, AT&T, Sony  **Opt2 (R16 PS-T2):**  **Opt3 (R17 PS-T2):** Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, ZTE, Lenovo, DOCOMO, vivo, CMCC, Xiaomi, Sony |
| 1.2 | Work scope: The number of cooperating TRPs (=N) supported in Type-II codebook refinement (note: WID specifies 4 as the max)   * N=1, 2, 3, 4   **FL Note**: This is from spec perspective, not for evaluation (evaluation can prioritize a subset) | **N=2**   * **Support:** Huawei/HiSi, Samsung, OPPO, Lenovo, LG (by default), DOCOMO, NEC, vivo, Nokia/NSB, IDC, Futurewei, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Intel, MTK, CATT, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, AT&T, Sony * **Not support:**   **N=3**   * **Support:** Huawei/HiSi, Samsung, vivo, Nokia/NSB, IDC, Futurewei, MTK, CATT, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Xiaomi, AT&T * **Not support:**   **N=4**   * **Support:** Huawei/HiSi, Samsung, Apple, DOCOMO (open to N=4 for intra-site), NEC, vivo, Nokia/NSB, IDC, Futurewei, Intel, MTK, CATT, ZTE, CEWiT, Spreadtrum, IITK, Ericsson, Xiaomi, AT&T * **Not support:** |
| 1.3 | Work scope: Rel-16/17 Type-II codebook/PMI components to be refined or reused for CJT extension   1. SD and FD basis vector designs (not precluding adding new values of N1, N2, N3) 2. SD and FD basis selection schemes (not precluding per-TRP or joint-across-TRPs selection, this refers to, e.g. the combinatorial indication and two-step FD basis selection) 3. W2 coefficient quantization scheme 4. Non-zero coefficient selection and indication schemes 5. Strongest coefficient indication scheme 6. Supported parameter combinations (keeping same set of parameters, whether the legacy values are fully reused or possibly refined for, e.g. further overhead reduction) and parameter values (including, e.g. R, K0) 7. Per layer feedback   **FL Note**: Considering work scope and continuity with legacy design (some already being deployed), we should strive for maximum reuse of legacy designs. Although one may claim that evaluation is needed to ensure whether reusing as such results in desirable performance, the above parameters are primarily “format” issue. | **1 (SD/FD basis design):**   * **Fully reuse legacy:** Huawei/HiSi (for R17), Lenovo, Samsung, Apple, DOCOMO, NEC, vivo, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, IDC, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Intel, MTK, CATT, ZTE, CEWiT, IITK, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, AT&T, Sony * **Refinement:** Huawei/HiSi (Joint SD-FD eigen-vector basis for R16)   **2 (SD/FD basis selection scheme):**   * **Fully reuse legacy:** Samsung, Nokia/NSB, Apple, NEC, vivo, CMCC, IDC, ZTE, CEWiT, IITK, Ericsson, Xiaomi, AT&T, Sony * **Refinement:** vivo (per TRP SD basis selection)   **3 (W2 quantization):**   * **Fully reuse legacy:** Samsung, Apple, vivo, CMCC, Nokia/NSB (re. co-scaling, both reference amplitudes may need reporting for TRPs other than the strongest), Intel (same as Nokia), CATT, ZTE, CEWiT, IITK, Ericsson, AT&T * **Refinement:** Xiaomi (TRP specific phase and amplitude)   **4 (NZC):**   * **Fully reuse legacy:** * **Refinement:** Huawei/HiSi (joint across TRPs), Lenovo, vivo (joint across selected TRPs), CMCC, CATT, ZTE (further study the bitmap is for each TRP or N TRPs, the maximal number of non-zero coefficients may be per TRP per layer), Spreadtrum, AT&T   **5 (SCI):**   * **Fully reuse legacy:** * **Refinement:** Huawei/HiSi (joint across TRPs), Samsung (strongest TRP), Nokia/NSB (FD basis ref), ZTE (FD basis ref), NEC (we also support strongest TRP indication), vivo (joint across TRPs), CMCC, IDC, CEWiT, Spreadtrum, IITK, Ericsson, Xiaomi (reference TRP), AT&T, Sony   **6 (Parameter combination):**   * **Fully reuse legacy:** * **Refinement:** Samsung, ZTE, Huawei/HiSi (R values), Lenovo,NEC (we also support R values), vivo (need evaluation), CMCC, Nokia/NSB, IDC, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, MTK, CATT, Ericsson, AT&T   **7 (Per layer feedback):**   * **Fully reuse legacy:** Samsung, DOCOMO, vivo, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, CEWiT, IITK, Ericsson, Xiaomi, AT&T * **Refinement:** Huawei/HiSi (receiver side information by per-RX feedback), ZTE |
| 1.4 | Work scope: Supported NZP CSI-RS (CMR) setups in Resource Setting associated with Rel-18 Type-II codebook for CJT   * Opt1: 1 NZP CSI-RS resource, max # ports = 32 * Opt2: *K*>1 NZP CSI-RS resources with the same number of ports (representing *K* TRPs), max # ports per resource = 32   **FL Note**: Both are valid options for CJT operation.  Note that in the current Rel-15/16/17 spec and UE capability, the max # ports per resource is 32, and the highest UE capability allows a total of 256 ports across all resources. | **Opt1 (1 resource)**   * **Support:** ZTE, Samsung, Lenovo, NTT Docomo, Nokia/NSB, Qualcomm, LG, Apple, NEC, IDC, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Intel * **Not support:**   **Opt2 (>1 resources)**   * **Support:** Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, ZTE, Samsung, Spreadtrum, CATT, vivo, Xiaomi, Lenovo, CMCC, NTT Docomo, Nokia/NSB, MTK, CEWiT, Qualcomm, LG, OPPO (max total 32), IDC, Futurewei, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, IITK, AT&T * **Not support:**   **Additional restriction on the max total # ports across all resources beyond Rel-15/16/17 spec and UE capability:**   * **No:** Huawei/HiSi, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, IDC, CATT, ZTE, CEWiT, IITK, Ericsson * **Yes (specify):** vivo (max=32) OPPO (32), MTK (32), Qualcomm (32) * **Only when CSI-RS resources assigned to different TRPs are in the same slot (specify)**: Ericsson |
| 1.5 | Candidates for Rel-16/17 Type-II codebook extension for *N*-TRP CJT   * Opt1. Per-TRP (port-group or resource) SD/FD basis selection + relative co-phasing/amplitude (including WB and/or SB). Example formulation:   + = co-amplitude and   + = co-phase * Opt2. Per-TRP (port-group or resource) SD basis selection and joint (across *N* TRPs) FD basis selection. Example formulation: * Opt3. Per-TRP (port-group or resource) joint SD-FD basis selection + relative co-phasing/amplitude (including WB and/or SB). Example formulation:   + = co-amplitude and   + = co-phase   **FL Note**: The above are valid options for CJT operation, with potentially different use cases.  Example formulations are for discussion purposes (spec formulation is up to the 38.214 editor).  For Opt1/2, for per-TRP SD/FD basis selection, whether to have per-TRP RRC parameter(s) for L and/or M or not is a **separate issue** | **Opt1 (per-TRP SD/FD)**   * **Support:** Xiaomi, OPPO (not both), LG, Lenovo, MTK. Samsung, ZTE (per TRP group should be possible), CATT, Apple, NTT Docomo (for inter-site), Fraunhofer/HHI, Intel, AT&T, Huawei/HiSi (no co-scaling), NEC, CMCC, IDC, CEWiT(co-amplitude including value 0) , Spreadtrum, IITK, Sony * **Not support:**   **Opt2 (per-TRP SD, joint-FD)**   * **Support:** Ericsson, Samsung, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, OPPO (not both), Lenovo, NTT Docomo (for intra-site. The case of the same SD basis across TRPs can be also considered.), Nokia/NSB, Fraunhofer/HHI, MTK, Intel, Qualcomm, NEC (co-amplitude and co-phase should also be considered in Opt2), vivo, CMCC, IDC, AT&T, Sony * **Not support:**   **Opt3 (per-TRP joint SD-FD basis)**   * **Support:** Huawei/HiSi (no co-scaling) * **Not support:** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Metric** | **Key observation** |
| Huawei/HiSi | SLS: Mean UPT, 5% UPT | * Observation 4: The CJT codebook design with joint space-frequency domain statistical eigenvectors achieves 10~15% gain for mean UPT and 12~43% gain for 5%-tile UE UPT, compared with DFT basis. * Observation 5: The full channel feedback for CJT codebook can provide about 10~20% gain for mean UPT and 30~90% gain for mean UPT and 5% UPT respectively. * Observation 6: Compared to TRP independent selection of coefficients for W2,   + Joint selection among TRPs can provide about 7~10% and 16~28% performance gains for mean UPT and edge UPT, respectively, when each TRP has 32 CSI-RS ports.   + Joint selection among TRPs can provide up to about 2~6% and 12~22% performance gains for mean UPT and edge UPT, respectively, when each TRP has 8 CSI-RS ports. * Observation 7: There is a significant performance loss at both mean UPT and 5% UPT when the frequency domain granularity changes from 2RB to 4RB, especially at 5% UPT (a loss more than 26%). |
| Ericsson | SLS: Mean UPT, 5%/50%-/95%-UPT | For mean/5%/50%/95% UPT, the gains of mTRP over sTRP are:   * RU20: 1%/5%/0%/0% * RU50: 11%/42%/13%/1% * RU70: 28%/80%/35%/2% * Full buffer: 27%/57%/-/- |
| MTK | SLS: Mean UPT | * Ideal CSI: up to 30% gain, compared to sTRP * mTRP codebook: up to 15% gain, compared to sTRP * Ideal CSI > mTRP codebook > Rel-16 eType-II for mTRP > Rel-16 eType-II for sTRP > Rel-15 Type-I MP for mTRP |
| Samsung | SLS: Mean UPT vs overhead | * Observation 1: CB2 and CB1 yield gain in throughout vs. overhead trade-off over Rel-16 T2 CB, with CB2 outperforming CB1. * Observation 2: The throughputs of CB2 and CB1 do not change significantly as overhead increases. The overhead for both codebooks is high. This implies that the set of parameter combinations can be refined for CB1/CB2 to further reduce the overhead. * Observation 3: for varying number of TRPs (),   + CB2 outperforms CB1 for any value   + The performance of CB2/CB1 remain similar as overhead is increased for the existing Rel-16 paraComb=1,2..,6. * Observation 4: Significant performance gain (e.g.35-45% in avg. UPT with CB2 and 25-35% in avg. UPT with CB1) can be achieved with mTRP C-JT CSI (N=2,3,4) over sTRP CSI (N=1). * Observation 5: the throughput-overhead trade-offs for 4 ports are similar to that for 8 ports. * Observation 6: Further significant performance gain (e.g.70-110% in avg. UPT with CB2 and 50-90% in avg. UPT with CB1) can be achieved with mTRP C-JT CSI (N=2,3,4) over sTRP CSI (N=1). * Observation 7: A similar trend is observed that CB2 (55%) > CB1 (44%) sTRP with Rel-16 eType-II CB (0%) as the case of intra-cell scenarios. |
| Nokia | SLS: Mean UPT, cell-edge (5%) UPT | * In our preliminary simulation results, we observe very significant throughput gains in intra-site (rural macro + RRH) deployment at 700 MHz, in the order of 40% for mean UE throughput and 116% for cell-edge throughput. Gains are also significant, although smaller, for inter-site (urban macro only) deployment, with increase in throughput of about 8% and 34% for mean UE and cell-edge throughput, respectively. |
| ZTE | SLS: Mean UPT, 5%/50%-/95%-UPT | * Observation 4: From evaluation results, it can be observed that, compared with sTRP and NC-JT, C-JT can bring performance gains in terms of both cell-edge and mean UPT. |
| Vivo | SLS: Mean UPT, 5%/50%-/95%- UPT | * Observation 1: Ideally, more significant gain can be obtained by JT in the Indoor Hotspot and intra-site CoMP scenarios. * Observation 2: TRP recommendation causes marginal performance loss, but it reduces feedback overhead and UE complexity significantly because more than 50% of Ues do not need to report CSI for all TRPs in the measurement set. * Observation 3:   + Compared to Scheme 2, Scheme 1 has performance gain. |
| CATT | SLS: Mean UPT, 5% UPT | * Comparing with S-TRP scheme, intra-site C-JT scheme can provide significant gain, both for the cell edge and cell average. Specifically, nearly 200% SE gains for the cell edge Ues, and 21% SE gains for the cell average are achieved. |
| CEWiT | LLS : SE vs SNR | * Observation 1: Dynamic selection of TRPs shows considerable spectral efficiency improvement. * Observation 2: Spectral efficiency gain is considerable across all SNR range. |
| **Summary**:   * Performance gain of Type-II CJT over sTRP   + SLS (UPT, UPT vs overhead): Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, MTK, Samsung, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, CATT   + Other: CEWiT (SE) | | |

**General observation**:

* Table 1.A:
  + [1.1] No company supports codebook refinement based on Rel-16 Type-II PS codebook. The majority supports Rel-16 Type-II regular although Rel-17 Type-II PS still receives ample support.
  + [1.2] Codebook refinement for NTRP=2, 3, 4 receives majority support.
    - Based on the Tdocs, this value can be assumed as RRC/higher-layer configured.
    - Some companies propose to support dynamic TRP selection (including multiple hypotheses) on top of this, which can be discussed later as a part of design details.
  + [1.3] In general, most companies prefer to reuse legacy (Rel-16/17) design components as much as possible with some refinement to accommodate CJT use cases.
  + [1.4] Both using 1 and >1 NZP CSI-RS resources receive ample support. Some companies propose additional restrictions in terms of the maximum number of ports across resources.
  + [1.5] In terms of codebook structure, both Opt1 (Opt3 can be considered as a variation of Opt1) and Opt2 receive strong support.
* Table 1.B: At least eight Tdocs include simulation results demonstrating significant gain of extending Type-II codebook for CJT mTRP

Based on the above inputs, the following **moderator proposals** are made:

**Proposal 1.A**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP includes refinement of the following codebooks:

* + Rel-16 eType-II regular codebook
  + Rel-17 FeType-II port selection (PS) codebook

FFS: Whether to prioritize/down-select from the two

**Proposal 1.B**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP includes the support of NTRP=1, 2, 3, and 4 cooperating TRPs

* + FFS: Signaling of NTRP, e.g. higher-layer (RRC) vs. dynamic
  + FFS: Determination of NTRP, e.g. NW-configured vs UE-selected

**Proposal 1.C**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP includes the following NZP CSI-RS (CMR) setups in Resource Setting associated with Rel-18 Type-II codebook for CJT

* Opt1: 1 NZP CSI-RS resource, max # ports = 32
* Opt2: *K*>1 NZP CSI-RS resources with the same number of ports (representing *K* TRPs)
  + FFS: The maximum number of ports per resource, and the total number of ports across all resources

**Proposal 1.D**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP includes down-selecting at least one or merging from the following codebook structures:

* Alt1A. Per-TRP (port-group or resource) SD/FD basis selection + relative co-phasing/amplitude (including WB and/or SB). Example formulation:
  + = co-amplitude and
  + = co-phase
  + Including special case of (no co-scaling)
* Alt1B. Per-TRP (port-group or resource) joint SD-FD basis selection + relative co-phasing/amplitude (including WB and/or SB). Example formulation:
  + = co-amplitude and
  + = co-phase
  + Including special case of (no co-scaling)
* Alt2. Per-TRP (port-group or resource) SD basis selection and joint (across *N* TRPs) FD basis selection. Example formulation:

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| From ROUND 1 | |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and, if needed, update your view in Table 1A/1B** 2. **Share additional inputs here, if needed** 3. **Moderator proposals will be added in the next revision** |
| Lenovo | We prefer to prioritize Issues 1,1, 1,2, and 1,4 before discussing further codebook design details in Issue 1.3. Also, our preference for Issue 1.5 would depend on outcome of Issues 1.2, 1.4. |
| LG | - Issue 1.4 and 1.5 can be discussed with priority in this meeting and discussed together since they have dependency each other.  - For issue 1.2, further evaluation is needed and it is premature to make a decision/progress in this meeting.  - Issue 1.3 is codebook details so we can discuss it in future meetings and higher level discussion should be prioritized in this meeting. |
| Samsung | Re 1.3, component 4 and 7, we prefer reusing legacy design principle as much as possible. Re component 4 (NZC), we would like clarify that that exact details will depend on the CB structure. For ex, for decoupled CB, the bitmap requires bits, and for joint CB, it requires bits where . So, in our view, both bitmaps follow legacy design in principle.  Re 1.3 and 1.5 (Opt3) on joint SD-FD basis, other than the new SVD/eigen-vector basis vectors, does this also include DFT-based design? |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think it is important to discuss the target scenario first, including intra-site/inter-site deployment, and issue#1.1. And we think intra-site deployment has higher priority.  Then our preferred options for issue#1.4, #1.5 as well as #1.2 are related to the target scenario.  - For different scenarios, the preferred option could be different.  And then issue#1.3 is based on the outcome of #1.5.  - For different scenarios, the codebook formulation may be different, then the detailed design for each issue in #1.3 could be also different. |
| NEC | We provided our position in the table. In addition, we propose to consider switching between single-TRP and multi-TRP hypotheses for CJT codebook. |
| Vivo | Regarding 1.4, the max number of ports per resource set is up to 64 for resource selection rather than codebook search in current spec and UE feature, and 256 ports is the total number of ports across all CCs in a band. We have concern to increase the number of ports for one codebook search larger than 32 due to UE implementation complexity.  Re 1.5, for Opt 2, W1 arranged as the 1st polarization across all TRPs and the 2nd polarization across all TRPs can also be considered as an alternative. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | @Samsung, the joint SD-FD basis can use eigen-vector basis or DFT basis, and the eigen-vector basis can also be used for joint SD-FD basis or separate SD-FD basis.  For the components in issue#1.3, they would depend on the decision of other issues and further evaluations, the detailed discussion can be the next step.  For issue#1.4, we don’t think there’s necessity to limit the max number of CSI-RS ports. With such limitation, the TRPs equipped with massive MIMO will not be able to use CJT. In addition, since rel-15, there’s UE capability to measure CSI-RS resources with up to 256 ports, which has been larger than that required for CJT already. |
| CMCC | We think issue #1.1, #1.2 and #1.4 should be discussed firstly, since the outcomes of these issues are much related to the detailed design of codebook, i.e. issue #1.3 and issue #1.5.  For issue # 1.3, it is more or less related to the structure of codebook in issue #1.5, so we think issue #1.3 and #1.5 should be discussed jointly. |
| OPPO | For issue#1.2, we think CSI feedback for up to 4 TRPs can be supported. However, simultaneous transmission from more than two TRPs cannot be supported without enhancement on transmission schemes (e,g. TCI state), which is out of scope.  [Mod: For CJT where precoding/beamforming is done jointly and coherently across all TRPs, there is no need for TCI enhancement. Note that this is primarily FR1 and TCI state indication is not needed (coherent combining is done at the UE side). Also, all the DMRS ports involved in CJT are assumed QCL-ed] |
| Nokia/NSB | - Issue 1.3  Component 3 (W2 quantisation). Reusing legacy quantisation, in our view, does not preclude, e.g., reporting a reference amplitude for the stronger polarisation of each TRP other than the strongest TRP. In legacy single-TRP quantisation this reference amplitude is assumed 1 and not reported, but for CJT this scaling factor may be needed.  [Mod: I agree. Reusing quantization scheme refers to the differential approach. What you mentioned above is basically SCI issue, which IMO needs some refinement]  Component 4. We support reuse of legacy design as much as possible also for joint selection across TRPs, but some details may depend on the codebook structure in 1.5. |
| Futurewei | We updated our views in the above tables. |
| Intel | **We updated views in the tables above and items where it is not updated is FFS from our view** |
| MediaTek | In our thinking, issue 1.1, 1.3 and 1.5 are related to the codebook design, and the design details in 1.3 would highly depend on the outcome of 1.1 and 1.5. Therefore it would help to prioritize issues 1.1 and 1.5. As an example, if option 1 (per TRP eType II CB + co-phasing/amplitude) in issue 1.5 is agreed, then most of the details in 1.3 are agreed by default. However, if option 2 is agreed, then some of the details would need to be evaluated, while retaining legacy design as baseline. |
| CATT | * Issue 1.1 for a common design framework, issue 1.4 for CSI measurement framework and issue 1.5 for the basic codebook structure can be discussed with priority in this meeting. * Issue 1.2 would depend on the scenarios and layout for CJT. For intra-cell layout discussed in EVM, both 2,3,4 TRPs can be selected by UE; For inter-cell layout discussed in EVM, typical 3 co-located TRPs for might be enough for inter-cell CJT transmission. Hence all numbers of TRPs should be studied in Rel-18. * Issue 1.3 can be discussed based on the outcome of Issues 1.5. |
| Mod V20 | Re the inter-dependence on issues among one another and which should be decided first, this depends on how convergent companies’ views are. Almost all issues are related but the group cannot decide all pertinent issues at once. Some issues are clearly more fundamental than other (e.g. 1.1, 1.4, 1.5) while issue 1.3 is clearly a next-level issue. This assumes that the group doesn’t get stuck on some fundamental issues.  Therefore, I’d suggest that the group focus on working together to converge on all issues rather than debating which issue(s) should be decided first  Then I’ll see how we can progress maximally. |
| ZTE | First, we tend to agree with NTT DOCOMO that the target scenario should be discussed first. Intra-site, inter-site and intra-site &inter-site should be supported.  [Mod: Yes, this is already reflected in the EVM (i.e. no need for additional discussion and agreement). Given that CJT can have wide range of applicability and different NW vendors may prioritize certain layouts, it makes sense to accommodate such layouts]  Secondly, in order to reduce the complexity at UE side and allow flexible MU scheduling at gNB side, we recommend to reports other information of H besides V, such as U and eigenvalue. In other words, receiver side information by per-RX feedback should be considered with high priority, if maximizing the benefits of C-JT. |
| CEWiT | We also propose to consider TRP selection while designing the CJT Codebook, as mentioned in EVM. |
| Spreadtrum | We have updated our preference in the Table.  For issue 1.3, it is not clear on the definition of legacy design and refinement. For example, some companies prefer fully reusing legacy SD/FD basis selection scheme but also support Opt1/2 in issue 1.5. In order to better understanding the issue, we have some clarification questions:  [Mod: When it is time to agree on this issue, I will use equations or reference to specs to avoid ambiguity]   * For SD and FD basis vector designs, does legacy design means SD and FD basis vectors are DFT based?   [Mod: It means the exact DFT-based design for SD and FD, e.g. O3=1, (O1,O2) combos, SD and FD are disjoint, are unchanged.]   * For SD and FD basis selection schemes, does legacy design means SD and FD basis selection are per TRP selection?   [Mod: No, this depends on the codebook structure. This refers to the selection and indication mechanism, e.g. combinatorial for SD, two-stage scheme for FD, etc.]   * For W2 coefficient quantization scheme, does legacy design means polarization-specific differential quantization with legacy alphabet?   [Mod: Yes]   * For per layer feedback, which parameters does it refer to?   [Mod: Type-II PMI is defined per layer since Rel-15. Some companies propose additional refinement.] |
| Ericsson | Some comments below:   * Regarding Issue 1.2, N=2 or 3 may be typical for macro scenarios. N=4 may be considered for indoor scenarios. * Regarding Issue 1.4, one aspect we may need to further discuss is if CSI-RS resources from different TRPs need to be sent in the same slot or different slots. If in the same slot, the total number of CSI-RS ports may be constrained by the available resources in a slot.   [Mod: This is a good point. Included]   * Regarding Issue 1.5, Option 1 seems to assume wideband co-phasing is performed among TRPs, which may be a limitation. Anyway, we are open to study Options 1 and 2 and compare the performance-overhead tradeoffs.   [Mod: Based on companies’ Tdocs, I don’t think co-phasing/scaling is limited to WB. Added this to avoid ambiguity] |
| Qualcomm | We share similar view that Issue 1.1 and 1.2 should be discussed prior to details on codebook details (issue 1.3);  Currently for Issue 1.3, we have a general view to reuse existing mechanisms as much as possible;  Regarding max number of ports from UE complexity perspective, 32 is the max value for a Rel-16 eType-II report. By maintaining this value 32, UE complexity can be comparable with existing implementation, especially for codebook Opt2 as summarized in Issue 1.5 – It is also noted that this total number can be generally enough for 4 TRPs in some low FDD band .e.g 700MHz  [Mod: Your concern is valid. Of course this is usually an issue of UE capability – considering that we now have super-UEs (e.g. objective 5 for UL 8Tx in the WID. There may be some room for expanding the highest UE capability in terms of PMI calculation. This can be discussed later] |
| Xiaomi | For 1.1, we prefer Opt1.  For 1.2, N=2, 3, 4 are all OK for us.  For 1.3, we prefer to fully reuse legacy for 1, 2 and 7 and prefer refinement for 3 and 5. |
| AT&T | We updated our views in the Table 1A |
| Lenovo 2 | - We agree with NTT DOCOMO, and ZTE on the importance of discussing the target scenario, e.g., intra-site vs. inter-site CJT, as well as confirm the discussion is limited to intra-cell CJT  - Another aspect that needs further discussion for CSI reporting is whether CSI would correspond to multiple transmission hypotheses, e.g., for N=3, up to 4 CJT hypotheses can be supported: {(TRP1,TRP2), (TRP1,TRP3), (TRP2,TRP3), (TRP1,TRP2,TRP3). It should be discussed whether CSI corresponding to all hypotheses would be reported (similar to Rel-17 NCJT CSI reporting), or otherwise |
| ROUND 2 | |
| Mod V00 | 1. **Check and, if needed, update your view in Table 1A** 2. **Share additional inputs here, if needed, on FL proposals** |
| vivo | **Proposal 1.A**:  Support FL's proposal. Considering the workload, Rel-16 eType-II regular codebook can be with a higher prioritization in our view.  [Mod: Added FFS to address your input ]  **Proposal 1.B**:  For the work of codebook refinement, we are OK for the support of NTRP=2, 3, and 4 with configuration. We think enabling reporting PMI with number of TRPs smaller than the configured NTRP can be further studied to reduce feedback overhead. Therefore, we propose to modify the proposal as follows.  **Proposed update of Proposal 1.B**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP includes the support of NTRP=2, 3, and 4 cooperating TRPs   * + The value of NTRP is assumed to be configured via higher-layer signaling   + FFS: Type-II codebook refinement with different number of TRPs with the configuration of NTRP   [Mod: Added FFS (about signaling) to address your input ]  **Proposal 1.C**:  Regarding CMR setting, we have concern to increase the number of ports for one codebook search larger than 32 ports due to UE implementation complexity. In current spec, the max number of ports per resource set is up to 64 for resource selection rather than codebook search and the max number of measured ports does not exceed 32 ports for Type II codebook. Besides, the two options should have a fair comparison in terms of number of CSI-RS ports across NTRP TRPs. On the last sub-bullet, we think the maximum number of ports across all resources for CJT should not change the legacy UE capability. Therefore, we propose to modify the proposal as follows.  **Proposed update of Proposal 1.C**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP includes the following NZP CSI-RS (CMR) setups in Resource Setting associated with Rel-18 Type-II codebook for CJT   * Opt1: 1 NZP CSI-RS resource, max # ports = 32 * Opt2: *K*>1 NZP CSI-RS resources with the same number of ports (representing *K* TRPs), ~~max # ports per resource = 32,~~ the maximum total number of ports of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT in a CSI report across TRPs = 32.   + ~~Additional restriction on the maximum total number of ports across all resources beyond Rel-15/16/17 spec and UE capability, e.g. when multiple CSI-RS resources are received in the same slot~~   [Mod: Since the majority prefers no restriction, I cannot add your request for now. Removed the max # ports per resource and keep this aspect FFS for further discussion. This is the best I can do considering the majority.]  **Proposal 1.D**:  Fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Regarding **proposal 1.D** (codebook structure), Alt 1A can be just a special case of Alt 2  Accommodating the co-phase/-amplitude coefficients (either WB or SB) into (i.e. implicit co-phase/-amplitude), Alt 1A can be re-written as (an example with 2 TRPs {A,B})  While for Alt 2 codebook  Alt 1A is just restricting Alt 2 by setting some off-diagonal coefficients of as 0  Therefore in our view, from **standard** **perspective**, we can have Alt 1A and 2 discussed in a more unified way – at least try not diverging into two kinds of codebooks, which can potentially increase the efforts for UE implementation  [Mod: Added “merging from” to address your input – I agree it’s possible to merge depending on the final designs] |
| CATT | Thanks for the FL’s general observation on C-JT. For proposal 1.B, we agree with the scope of 2,3,4 TRPs. But as concluded in general observation, there are multiple alternatives for the determination on value of NTRP, mainly including higher-layer signaling or dynamic selection by UE. Hence, we think all alternatives can be further studied and it is premature to make a decision in this meeting. The following proposal can be considered:  **Proposal 1.B**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP includes the support of NTRP=2, 3, and 4 cooperating TRPs   * + FFS: The determination of the value of NTRP ~~is assumed to be configured via higher-layer signaling~~   [Mod: Added FFS to address your input ] |
| Lenovo | ***Proposal 1.A***  It appears that the proposal implies the support of both codebook sub-types (beam-based codebook and PS codebook). We prefer to keep the door open for supporting only one of them based on evaluation results and use cases, as follows:  **Proposal 1.A’**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP includes refinement based on at least one of the following codebooks~~, based on a common design framework~~:   * + Rel-16 eType-II regular codebook   + Rel-17 FeType-II port selection (PS) codebook   [Mod: Added similar FFS to address your input (merging with vivo input re prioritization)]  ***Proposal 1.B***  Regarding Proposal 1.B, in our opinion the supported values of NTRP should be further studied, e.g., whether a subset of the values {2,3,4} are supported, based on performance and/or corresponding UCI overhead. From another aspect, it seems the value NTRP is explicitly configured via high-layer signaling based on current description. We think the detailed RRC signaling design (e.g., implicit or explicit signaling) for deriving value NTRP can be further discussed in later meetings. Based on the above discussion, we propose the following modification:  **Proposal 1.B’**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP includes the support of NTRP=2, 3, and 4 cooperating TRPs   * + The value of NTRP is assumed to be ~~configured~~ derived via higher-layer signaling   + FFS: Supported values of NTRP   Regarding the determination og value of NTRP, we are also fine with CATT’s updated wording  [Mod: Added FFS (about signaling) to address your input with CATT and vivo]  ***Proposal 1.C***  Does the proposal support both Opt.1 and Opt.2 based on configuration or aims at down-selecting one of them? In our opinion it would be more reasonable to select only one option. Prefer to add “down select” for the options  [Mod: Both options have enough supporters and have different use cases. The additional spec impact of supporting both is small. Please consider other companies’ views.]  ***Proposal 1.D***  We are fine with the alternatives under Proposal 1.D in principle. We agree with Ericsson’s comments that there are performance-overhead tradeoff differences between the alternatives. For relative co-phasing/amplitude, it is possible to be applied in wideband, subband as in the proposal. Also, it is possible to be applied in the selected beams in W1 or non-zero coefficients in W2. For example, for one TRP. We prefer to keep it open on how to apply co-phasing/amplitude in the first meeting since different performance-overhead tradeoff can be achieved for different schemes.  [Mod: Added possibility of no co-scaling to address your input] |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.A:** our preference is Rel.16 eT2 regular codebook, but we can be open to study R17 PS T2 CB also,  Proposal 1.B: support  Proposal 1.C: we support both Opt1 and Opt2 since they can be beneficial for different use cases and scenarios. For instance, Opt1 can be beneficial for intra-cell, and Opt2 for inter-cell.  Proposal 1D:   * We prefer to study these alts, and decide whether down-select to one or more than 1 in future meetings. So, suggest to add the text “down-selecting one or more than one…”   [Mod: Added similar FFS to address your input]   * @QCM: in our view, Alt1A and Alt2 are different. Alt1A when Wf is independent per TRP and Alt2 when Wf is common across TRPs. The UE implementation can be different for the two. |
| Apple | The proposals from the FL look good to us |
| LG | Proposal 1.A: if this is agreed then does it mean the refinement of the both codebooks is supported? If yes, we cannot support. We need further study and evaluation for R17 FeType II PS.  [Mod: No, I added FFS for this]  Proposal 1.B: regarding more than 2 TRPs, further study and evaluation is needed.  [Mod: Looking at the Tdocs, there are ample results demonstrating the benefit for 3 and 4. And this is supported by a number of companies]  Proposal 1.C: In Option 1, different port groups are transmitted from different TRP so the CSIRS needs to be associated with multiple TCI states for distributed TRPs. We suggest to add FFS for Option 1 as follow. FFS: whether/how to associated TCI states and CSI-RS ports. We are fine with Samsung’s suggestion to down select one or more.  [Mod: Looking at the Tdocs and input, each option is supported by a number of companies, arguing different use cases. I hope you can understand ☺]  Proposal 1.D: Support and prefer to keep 1A and 2 separately. The intention of 1A is to reuse legacy Type II codebook for each TRP but multiply cophase/coamplitude on the legacy codebook. On the other hand, Alt2 is to make unified codebook for aggregated channel of multiple TRPs. |
| Mod V10 | **Revised FL proposals to address inputs** |
| NTT DOCOMO | For Proposal 1.C, is the intention to support both options, or to further down select one option? From our understanding, the selection of CMR configuration could be related the deployment scenario. Does the Proposal 1.C imply to support both intra-site and inter-site MTRP CJT?  [Mod: Since both options have strong support from many companies, yes it is intended to include both. In general yes, K=1 can be more natural for intra-site, while K>1 for inter-site, but the opposite can also work since the spec will not include such restriction ☺]  For Proposal 1.D, we also have a question for clarification. Considering a CJT scenario from multiple panels from an gNB, the SD/FD basis selection could be the same for multiple TRPs (not per-TRP). Is this scenario precluded or can be regarded as included in Alt 1B?  [Mod: Any of the alternatives can be used for MP scenario although Alt2 is perhaps more efficient. When used for MP, the UE will naturally/automatically select, by the property of the composite channel, common SD and FD basis across “TRPs”. Remember that Rel-15 Type-I MP codebook has the structure of Alt1A] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For proposal 1.A, we are wondering what’s the meaning of a common design framework. We prefer to remove it as this can be a part of the discussion on the details.  [Mod: Removed ☺ It’s initially meant to have a unified structure, but agree it is too early]  For proposal 1.B, we support to include NTRP=1 also as naturally gNB should have the flexibility to configure with 1 TRP. And if it’s UE selected, then UE should also be able to select one best TRP also.  [Mod: Correct, thanks, we still need to discuss signaling and values anyway. This proposal means the design will accommodate 1, 2, 3, and 4 TRPs in CJT NW implementation]  For proposal 1.C, the maximum total number of ports can be 128 ports. This is still within the Rel-15 UE capability FG 2-41, where UE SRS resources of 1-64 and total number of ports 2-256. Anyway, this is related to UE capability which can be addressed in UE feature discussion.  [Mod: I agree. But due to some concern from several companies, e.g. vivo, MediaTek, Qualcomm, ... (due to Type-II computational complexity) the best compromise at this point is to leave this topic for future discussion. Hence the FFS for progress] |
| Mod V13 | Slight revision to address inputs |
| LG | Proposal 1.B: Based on tdoc review, two companies compare performance gain for different number of MTRPs and many companies provide initial evaluation results based on 2 TRPs, with diverging EVM assumption. We are open to study but prefer to put FFS on more than 2 in this meeting.  Proposal 1.C: I don’t mean to put FFS on Opt1 but add a new bullet for FFS under Opt1. There may be some misunderstanding. |
| ZTE | Re proposal 1.D, we have similar comments as DCM that TRP-**group** specific SD/FD basis selection +per-TRP relative co-phasing/amplitude (including WB and/or SB), considering that up to 4 TRPs are considered in this WID. So we have the following suggestion for Alt1A.   * Alt1A. Per-TRP/Per-TRP-group (port-group or resource) SD/FD basis selection + Per-TRP relative co-phasing/amplitude (including WB and/or SB).   + Example-1 formulation:     - = co-amplitude and     - = co-phase     - Including special case of (no co-scaling)   + Example-2 formulation:     - = co-amplitude and     - = co-phase     - Including special case of (no co-scaling)   Then, in our views, regarding of which alternative in 1.D is selected, the RX side information, such as U matrix, can be also reported to gNB for assisting MU-MIMO scheduling/post-SINR determination. How about adding the following under the end of proposal 1.D:   * In addition, Rx-side information besides Tx-side precoding matrix can be considered to be reported to gNB. |

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

Table 3A Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2.1 | Work scope: Type-II codebook structures to be extended for time/Doppler-domain compression, assuming a common design framework   * Opt1. Rel-16 regular eType-II * Opt2. Rel-16 port selection (PS) eType-II * Opt3. Rel-17 port selection (PS) FeType-II   **FL Note**: All the 3 options can of course be extended for Doppler-domain compression. But perhaps the scope can be reduced if there is consensus not to refine 1 or 2.  Note that WID dictates no change in spatial- and frequency-domain designs, hence the time/Doppler-domain component is “modular” | **Opt1 (R16 R-T2):** Samsung, Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, ZTE, Xiaomi, OPPO, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Lenovo, LG, Apple, DOCOMO, NEC, vivo, CMCC, IDC, Futurewei, Intel, MTK, CATT, CEWiT, Qualcomm, Sony  **Opt2 (R16 PS-T2):**  **Opt3 (R17 PS-T2):** Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, Xiaomi, Lenovo, DOCOMO, vivo, CMCC, MTK, Sony |
| 2.2 | Candidates for time/Doppler-domain basis design:   * Alt1A. Orthogonal (critically-sampled) DFT * Alt1B: rotation factor + orthogonal DFT * Alt2. Non-orthogonal (over-sampled) DFT * Alt3. Other waveforms (e.g. SVD-type, DPSS/Slepian, DCT, polynomial)   **FL Note**: Orthogonal DFT (Alt1) can be used as a baseline. Whether other waveforms can offer significant benefit can be assessed. | **Alt1A (orthogonal DFT):** Huawei/HiSi, Samsung, ZTE, IDC, OPPO, Apple, Nokia/NSB, Fraunhofer IIS /Fraunhofer HHI, MTK, Intel, Lenovo, LG, NEC, vivo(study), CMCC, IDC, CATT, CEWiT, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Sony  **Alt1B (rotation factor + orthogonal DFT):** Samsung (study), Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Apple (study), Sony (study)    **Alt2 (Oversampled DFT):** Samsung (study), Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, vivo(study), IDC, Qualcomm, Xiaomi (study), Sony (study)  **Alt3 (Other – specify):** Samsung (study DPSS/Slepian, DCT), Nokia/NSB (study DCT)  **Alt4 (None):** Lenovo (Identity transformation) for case of a small number of time samples, vivo (no compression in time/Doppler-domain, i.e., reporting multiple W2), MTK (Same as Lenovo’s comment) |
| 2.3 | Fundamental time/Doppler-domain compression parameters:   1. TD/DD basis vector length N4 (analogous to 2N1N2 and N3) 2. TD compression unit relative to slot length (analogous to the relation between FD compression unit and CQI sub-band, i.e. for FD compression) 3. The number of selected TD/DD basis vectors (analogous to L and M) 4. …   **FL Note**: While the exact details depend on the waveform (basis design) selection, some fundamental parameters are applicable for any waveform selection | **1 (TD/DD basis length):** Samsung, Nokia/NSB, IDC, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Intel, CEWiT, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Sony  **2 (TD compression unit):** Samsung, MTK, Qualcomm  **3 (# selected basis vectors):** Samsung, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Apple, Nokia/NSB, IDC, Intel, ZTE, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Sony |
| 2.4 | Work scope: Rel-16/17 Type-II codebook/PMI components to be refined or reused for TD/DD compression extension   1. SD/FD basis selection 2. W2 coefficient quantization scheme   Note: Rel-16/17 SD/FD basis design is **fully reused** per WID  **FL Note**: Considering work scope and continuity with legacy design (some already being deployed), we should strive for maximum reuse of legacy designs. Although one may claim that evaluation is needed to ensure whether reusing as such results in desirable performance, the above parameters are primarily “format” issue. | **1 (SD/FD basis selection):**   * **Fully reuse legacy:** Samsung, Nokia/NSB, Intel, LG, DOCOMO, vivo (study details), CMCC, IDC, MTK, CATT, ZTE, Ericsson, Sony * **Refinement:** Apple **(if the 3D W2 is sparse)**   **2 (W2 quantization):**   * **Fully reuse legacy:** Samsung, Nokia/NSB, CEWiT * **Refinement:** Apple **(if the 3D W2 is sparse), IDC, ZTE(per TD/DD basis per layer)** |
| 2.5 | TD vs DD basis in codebook structure   * Alt1. TD basis, e.g. * Alt2. DD basis, e.g.   + Note that may be the identity as a special case   **FL Note**: The above example formulations are for discussion purposes (spec formulation is up to the 38.214 editor) | **Alt1 (TD basis):** CATT, Xiaomi, LG, vivo (study), Ericsson  **Alt2 (DD basis)**: Samsung, Xiaomi, OPPO, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Intel, vivo (study), Huawei/HiSilicon, IDC, MTK, CATT, ZTE (In technical, Alt-1&2 are the same), Qualcomm, Sony |
| 2.6 | The use of legacy NZP CSI-RS to facilitate necessary measurements   1. P CSI-RS, e.g. periodicity and offset setting 2. SP CSI-RS, e.g. burst setting 3. AP CSI-RS, e.g. group triggering 4. TRS   **FL Note**: **Companies are encouraged to comment on how to use P/SP/AP CSI-RS for the purpose of CSI calculation involving Type-II with TD/DD compression.**  CSI-RS enhancement is out of scope. However, how to use/refine the legacy/current CSI-RS resource setting to facilitate necessary measurements should be discussed as it can affect evaluation and detailed designs. | **P CSI-RS**: LG, MTK, Qualcomm  **SP CSI-RS**: Samsung, LG, Lenovo, IDC, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, MTK, Qualcomm, Sony  **AP CSI-RS**: Samsung  **CSI-RS burst for AP and SP (multiple CSI-RS resources/samples):** Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, CATT, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, DOCOMO (study), CMCC, Futurewei, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Intel, MTK, ZTE, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Sony  **TRS**: CATT, Nokia/NSB (CSI-RS+TRS), vivo (CSI-RS+TRS), IDC, ZTE(CSI-RS+TRS) , CEWiT, Xiaomi, Sony (study) |
| 2.7 | CQI definition and calculation (including prediction) associated with the PMI from Type-II with TD/DD compression, e.g. whether UE-side CQI prediction: including “future” CQI(s) with TD/DD PMI  **FL Note**: **Companies are encouraged to comment on CQI definition and calculation associated with the PMI from Type-II with TD/DD compression.**  While PMI associated with the extended Type-II CB is by nature predictive (i.e. allowing the gNB to predict future PMI), how to define/extend CQI to match the PMI needs to be discussed to ensure maximum benefit. | **Reducing CQI mismatch:** Lenovo  **CQI based on multiple reported PMIs**: Nokia/NSB, IDC  **UE-side prediction:** Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, ZTE, vivo, Nokia/NSB, MTK, Intel, Qualcomm (no CQI prediction), Apple, IDC, CATT  **gNB-side prediction**: Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Qualcomm (no CQI prediction), IDC  **No** **prediction**: Futurewei, Samsung (R18 enhancement doesn’t require prediction) |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Metric** | **Key observation** |
| Huawei/HiSi | SLS: Mean UPT | Observation 8: The performances of R16 Type II at 30km/h and 60km/h UE speed have 25.8% and 35.3% loss compared with UE speed of 3km/h. The performances of R17 Type II at 30km/h and 60km/h UE speed have 30.7% and 40.8% loss compared with UE speed of 3km/h.  Observation 9: For UE-based CSI prediction at speed 60km/h with 10ms periodicity of CSI feedback,   * 14% average gain compared with R17 type II * 13% average gain compared with R16 type II. |
| ZTE | SLS: Mean UPT, 50%/5% UPT | Observation 2: Regarding CSI prediction scheme-2 (-based prediction), based on SLS simulation results in UMa, we can observe:   * In LOS, some performance gain and potential CSI overhead reduction can be obtained via exploring Doppler-domain information. * However, for NLOS, it is difficult to identify dominant Doppler components for CSI prediction/extrapolation, and consequently advanced algorithm (like artificial intelligence (AI) for CSI prediction) may be further studied |
| CATT | SLS: Mean UPT, 5% UPT | Observation-1:   * When the CSI feedback periodicity is 5ms, the average throughput of 60km/h has 22% loss and the 5% edge throughput of 60km/h has 45% loss compared with 3km/h. |
| Vivo | SLS: Mean UPT, 95%/50%/5% UPT | Current codebook types only cultivate spatial domain and frequency-delay domain characteristics and feedback the most important components in both domains without considering any Doppler-time domain information. However, performance degrades considerably when the UE is moving in medium/high speed where Doppler effect becomes a crucial factor, as shown by the preliminary simulation results in Figure 1. |
| OPPO | SLS: Mean UPT vs overhead | Multiple types of codebook have been introduced in Rel-15/16/17. However, most codebook design only considers low mobility. In medium/high mobility, the channel response estimated by UE and the channel of practical PDSCH transmission may be mismatched due to UE’s movement. The performance of Rel-16 eTypeII CSI reporting may be worse than that of type I codebook in medium/high mobility as show in figure 1.  Observation 1:   * The enhanced Doppler domain reporting has better performance for speed of 30km/h (Doppler frequency fd<220Hz, about 15% gain over type I) * The CSI overhead would not be increased by Doppler basis reporting. Meanwhile, time domain DFT can be considered as starting point for study. * Burst CSI-RS can further improve the performance for 60-120km/h (220Hz<fd<880Hz, 5%~10% gain) * The performance gain for velocity>=60km/h is small (fd>220Hz, about 5% gain). |
| Nokia/NSB | Autocorrelation | 1. We observe that at medium/high velocity, the coefficients of are significantly less correlated in time than the CSI-RS channel measurements, which suggests that effective compression of PMI in time/Doppler domain is hard to achieve. 2. The low time correlation of seems related to the fact that eigenvectors are calculated with a phase uncertainty, and they are calculated independently for each CSI-RS measurement occasion, hence a random phase factor tend to decorrelate the time sequence of . |
| Fraunhofer/HHI | SLS: Mean UPT vs overhead | Observation 7: Enhanced Type II CB with Doppler domain information outperforms Rel. 16 Type II CB in terms of performance and feedback overhead. |
| MediaTek | CDF of performance | Observation 3: When the channel is LOS, the rank, , and can be the same for 40 ms with acceptable performance, for both the RMa scenario with UE speed 60 km/hr and the UMa scenario with UE speed 30 km/hr.  Observation 4: For the case of RMa 60 km/hr and NLOS, the rank, , and can be the same for 40 ms with acceptable performance.  Observation 5: For the case of UMa 30 km/hr and NLOS, at least the rank and can be the same for 40 ms with acceptable performance. |
| CeWiT | Overhead, MSE | From the above table, it can be seen that with partial CSI feedback, overhead is considerably reduced, while the nMSE are quite low (order of 10-4). |
| Qualcomm | Correlation, CDF of performance | Observation 1: Two issues exist for CSI reporting under fast fading channel environment: (1) Larger overhead with frequent report; (2) CSI outdating due to report latency  Observation 2: Certain performance gain of eType-II-Doppler can be observed over delayed Rel-16 eType-II: 1.7dB @10% CDF, 0.4dB @50% CDF, under ideal environment w/o noise or interference. |
| **Summary**:   * Performance gain of Type-II Doppler (SLS) over Rel-16/17 Type-II: Huawei/HiSi, ZTE (in LoS), OPPO, Fraunhofer/HHI, CeWiT, Qualcomm * Performance loss of Rel-16/17 with medium/high speed: CATT, vivo, OPPO, Nokia/NSB, MTK | | |

**General observation**:

* Table 3.A:
  + [2.1] No company supports codebook refinement based on Rel-16 Type-II PS codebook. The majority supports Rel-16 Type-II regular although Rel-17 Type-II PS still receives ample support.
  + [2.2] The super-majority favors orthogonal DFT basis waveform while several companies propose to study other waveforms
  + [2.3, 2.4] A number of companies support the analogous extension of FD compression in terms of Doppler/time-domain compression parameters as well as reusing legacy components as much as possible. This can be discussed later once fundamental components such as codebook structure and basis waveform are decided.
  + [2.5] At this point, the majority supports Doppler-domain-based codebook structure. Some companies argued that the two structures can be equivalent. While this could be true per linear transformation, choosing one of the two alternatives seems important for discussion purposes (noting that the spec representation will be left to the editor)
  + [2.6, 2.7] From companies’ inputs, some discussion is needed on whether or how to utilize P/SP/AP CSI-RS and TRS as “CSI-RS burst”. This is also related to whether CQI enhancement is needed and tied with codebook enhancement.
* Table 3.B: At least six Tdocs provided results demonstrating significant gain from using Type-II codebook refinement with Doppler-domain compression

Based on the above inputs, the following **moderator proposals** are made:

**Proposal 2.A**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities includes refinement of the following codebooks, based on a common design framework:

* + Rel-16 eType-II regular codebook
  + Rel-17 FeType-II port selection (PS) codebook

FFS: Whether to prioritize/down-select from the two

**Proposal 2.B**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities includes down selection from the following codebook structures (for discussion purposes):

* Alt1. Time-domain basis,
  + Alt1A: Time-domain basis commonly selected for all SD/FD bases, e.g.
  + Alt1B: Time-domain basis independently selected for different SD/FD bases
* Alt2. Doppler-domain basis
  + Alt2A: Doppler-domain basis commonly selected for all SD/FD bases, e.g.
  + Alt2B: Doppler-domain basis independently selected for different SD/FD bases
  + Note that may be the identity as a special case
* Alt3. Reuse Rel-16/17 (F)eType-II codebook with multiple and a single and report.

**Proposal 2.C**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities includes down selection from the following Doppler-/time-domain basis waveforms for codebook design:

* Alt1. Orthogonal DFT (with or without rotation factor)
* Alt2. Oversampled DFT
* Alt3. Other waveforms, e.g. DCT, Slepian
* Alt4. Identity (i.e. no Doppler-/time-domain compression)

**Proposal 2.D**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities includes the following CSI measurement and calculation aspects:

* Potential refinement on Resource setting configuration on CSI-RS (for CSI and/or tracking) for measuring a burst of CSI-RS, including the applicable time-domain behaviors
* Whether/how UE-side or gNB-side prediction is assumed for CQI/PMI/RI calculation
* Potential enhancements on CQI definition and calculation procedure in relation to the PMI of Rel-18 Type-II codebook for high/medium velocities

Table 4 Additional inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| From ROUND 1 | |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and, if neededm update your view in Table 3A/B** 2. **Share additional inputs here, if needed** 3. **Moderator proposals will be added in the next revision** |
| Lenovo | - Prefer to prioritize discussion on Issues 2.1, 2.2 and 2.6. Suggest deferring discussion of other issues after these issues are more stable  - For Issue 2.2, we prefer adding a new alternative Alt4) corresponding to trivial/identity transformation, which could suffice if PMI corresponding to a small number of time instants, e.g., 2, are reported  - For issue 2.6, since some alternatives are correlated, suggest to shorten the options to (i) P CSI-RS, (ii) SP CSI-RS, (iii) burst AP CSI-RS, and (iv) TRS. |
| LG | - Issue 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 are codebook details so we can discuss it in future meetings and higher level discussion should be prioritized in this meeting.  - We prefer to prioritize issue 2.5 and 2.6, which are about overall codebook structure and measurement resource configuration.  - Another high level issue we need to discuss in this meeting is whether PMIs are calculated based on predicted channel for slots/symbols maybe after current CSI reference resource or measured channel for slots/symbols maybe no later than current CSI reference resource. The former case assumes UE side prediction and the latter case assumes gNB side prediction. |
| Apple | On discussion in 2.4, our understanding is while the bases vector construction is fixed by the WID already, whether at all the Doppler offsets, the same SD bases and FD components are selected really depend on the sparseness of W2. Logically it is possible at some Doppler offsets, the relevant rays’ number is small, hence forcing the same SD and FD selection as for the rest of Doppler offsets is a waste. Since overhead is always a big issue in CSI feedback, it is not desirable to take decision now without evaluation. We prefer to keep the discussion open. |
| Samsung | 2.6: re TRS for CSI reporting, we are not sure it can be used since TRS is configured primarily for other purposes and is restricted to only 1 port.  2.7: re Prediction, for codebook description and PMI reporting, we don’t prefer any dependence on UE or gNB-side prediction, i.e., the CB enhancement should work for the case of no prediction. For CB evaluations, companies can consider predictions if they want to. Whether prediction for CQI enhancement is needed can be discussed separately. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For issue 2.1, we agree that it would be good to have focused target. We think either R16 PS or R17 PS can be dropped.  For issue 2.2, we are open to any direction right now, although we agree orthogonal DFT could be a baseline. Issue 2.3 can be discussed further after issue 2.2.  For issue 2.4, our understanding is that reuse of SD/FD basis is described in WID. We are open to discuss W2 refinement.  For issue 2.5 to 2.7, we are generally open to discuss. Regarding CSI-RS resource, whether to introduce new configuration to support CSI-RS burst seems one of the important points. |
| vivo | It is feasible to reach general principles in this meeting, detailed designs such as issue 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 can be discussed after we have better picture of the framework. Options for issue 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 can be listed for further study.  We think another solution to allow UE to report the PMI based on the predicted channel should be also considered. In UE can predict the CSI in slot n based on multiple previous received CSI-RS estimates |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can prioritize issues 2.1, 2.5 and 2.6, the other issues may depend on the decision of these issues.  For issue#2.6, we have similar view with Samsung on the use of TRS. |
| CMCC | We think issue #2.1 and #2.5 should be discussed firstly so that the basic codebook structure can be determined.  For issue #2.3 and #2.4, they are more about codebook details and we can discuss it in future meetings.  For issue #2.7, although we think PMI or CQI prediction is more related to the implementation on UE or gNB side, we are open to discuss the spec impact of prediction. |
| OPPO | The WID only includes refinement of type II codebook. Enhancement on CQI is out of scope. we prefer to prioritize the study of codebook enhancement based on legacy CQI mechanism. |
| Nokia/NSB | - Issue 2.2. In our understanding Alt4 proposed by Lenovo is already included as a special case in Alt 2 of 2.5  - Issue 2.6. We propose to study the use of CSI-RS+TRS in case of UE reporting future PMIs. In this case it may be possible for a UE to extrapolate/predict future channels from measurements of the two RS, because the time correlation functions of all CSI-RS ports is similar to that of the TRS port.  - Issue 2.7.  We agree CSI extrapolation/prediction and time-domain compression can be discussed separately, and that compression is applicable to past PMIs, future PMIs or a combination of both. We also think that prediction/extrapolation is either a UE or gNB implementation. However, there has to be a common understanding between UE and gNB on the timeline of the reported PMIs (past, future or both) and associated CQI(s).  We propose to study reporting of a single CQI because we think MCS selection does not change as rapidly as the fast-fading coefficients of W2 and there can be significant feedback overhead saving, especially for subband CQI reporting. |
| Futurewei | Added our views in the above table |
| Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI | In our view, it is important to first discuss the codebook structure. After deciding on Item 2.5, codebook details in items 2.2 -2.4 can be discussed.  Re the codebook structure, the current alternatives listed as Alt 1 and Alt 2 assumes identical Doppler components for all spatial beams. Based on our observations, each beamformed channel experiences a different Doppler shift/spread. Therefore, assuming identical Doppler components for all spatial beams may not be a good step to start with.  In our opinion, the codebook structure at this stage shall be kept as general as possible assuming different Doppler components for different spatial beams and FD components. Therefore, we would like to add the following as a third alternative Alt 3  where, and are the -th time-domain basis vector and -th frequency domain basis vector associated with spatial beam . Note that the above formulation **does not preclude** using identical Doppler components for all spatial beams as in Alt 2. RAN 1 can arrive to such a conclusion based on evaluations in the future meetings. |
| Intel | thanks very much Eko, added our views |
| MediaTek | @Samsung: We have concern on that PMI reporting can be independent of UE or gNB-side prediction. For PMI reporting, UE and gNB should have a common understanding whether the estimated past PMI or the predicted future PMI is reported.  It is unclear to us how gNB uses the reported PMI without knowing it is for the past or for the future. Although codebook description mainly focuses on CSI compression, we want to keep it open until we decide whether UE or gNB-side prediction or both are supported. |
| CATT | On 2.2: We do not see much difference between Alt1B and Alt2. They are equivalent if the selected DFT vectors are orthogonal as we did for the SD and FD basis selection of Rel-15/16 Type II codebook.  On 2.4: W2 quantization scheme can be decided later and we are open for further discussion.  On 2.5: We are fine with either option.  On 2.6: TRS shall be fully considered in the measurement. Using CSI-RS burst for channel measurements incurs large CSI-RS overhead, especially when, e.g., 32-port CSI-RS is configured. |
| Mod V20 | Re the inter-dependence on issues among one another and which should be decided first, this depends on how convergent companies’ views are. Almost all issues are related but the group cannot decide all pertinent issues at once. Some issues are clearly more fundamental than other (e.g. 2.1, 2.5, perhaps 2.6) while issue 2.2 and 2.3 are clearly next-level issues. This assumes that the group doesn’t get stuck on some fundamental issues.  Therefore, I’d suggest that the group focus on working together to converge on all issues rather than debating which issue(s) should be decided first  Then I’ll see how we can progress maximally. |
| ZTE | For issue 2.5 , from our perspective, the two Alts are same.  [Mod: They can be equivalent after one is transformed to another domain, but in terms of basis design and other parameter details, they are not (in general) identical]  Please give more clarification of the difference between the two Alts. In addition, as shown by our simulation result, the frequency component of one element of W2 across multiple time occasions are not sparse, but the frequency component of H between gNB and UE across multiple time occasions are sparse. Therefore, we propose to feedback TD/DD basis corresponding to H instead corresponding to W2/V. |
| CEWiT | We wish to prioritize Issue 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.6.  Regarding 2.2, priority to be provided to Alt A: Orthogonal DFT vectors and this will be a good starting point.  W2 quantization defined in 2.4 will lead to a low complexity mechanism at UE with reduced overhead and reporting latency.  Regarding 2.6, we support the use of TRS. Though TRS is confined to 1 port, it is very useful for Doppler measurements. |
| Ericsson | on 2.5, we suggest to evaluate both Alts and discuss further details later.  On 2.6, regarding the above comment related to (CSI-RS+TRS) ‘the time correlation functions of all CSI-RS ports is similar to that of the TRS port’, we do not think this is always true. For beamformed and possibly delay pre-compensated CSI-RS, the autocorrelation of different ports could probably be quite different since they correspond to different channel clusters in angle/delay domain. |
| Qualcomm | Regarding Issue 2.6 on TRS alternative, it may not achieve CSI-RS performance due to single-port. Besides, enhancement of TRS (especially a major enhancement to e.g. multi-port) is out of scope  Regarding Issue 2.5, as long as the TD basis selection and NZC selection/quantization are decoupled from the matrix formations, the two alternatives are equivalent. Alt2 is slightly preferred for discussion for its similarity to existing T2 |
| Xiaomi | Issues 2.1, 2.5 and 2.6 should be discussed with high priority. Other issues can be discussed in the future meeting. For issue 2.5, in our view, in Alt1 is same to in Alt2. Since and respectively denote SD basis and FD basis, can be named TD basis considering TD compression. For Alt2, the codebook structure should be .  [Mod: Either expression is fine since W2 can be arranged to match which comes first in the Kronecker product] |
| Lenovo 2 | @Nokia: I see your point that new Alt4 in 2.2 is correlated to a special case of Alt2 in 2.5. We prefer listing this alternative under 2.2 for better clarity, but can be flexible about how this alternative is captured  [Mod: OK] |
| ROUND 2 | |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and, if needed, update your view in Table 3A** 2. **Share additional inputs here, if needed, on FL proposals** |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.A**:  Support.  **Proposal 2.B**:  It is hard to verify the optimal solution in limited alternatives given by Alt1 andAlt2 without concrete evaluation results. Alt3 is added for consideration to avoid compression loss in TD/DD.   * Alt3. Reuse Rel-16/ 17 (F)eType-II codebook with multiple and a single and report.   [Mod: OK]  **Proposal 2.C**:  OK.  **Proposal 2.D**:  OK. |
| CATT | For proposal 2.D, it is better not to list the last topic “UE-side or gNB-side prediction” under the topic “CQI enhancement”. Because the topic “UE-side or gNB-side prediction” may be required even if CQI is not enhanced. We propose to promote this bullet one level up.  In addition, the CSI-RS does not have to be a burst of CSI-RS if TRS and CSI-RS are used jointly.  **Proposal 2.D**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities includes the following CSI measurement and calculation aspects:   * Potential refinement on Resource setting configuration on CSI-RS (for CSI and tracking) for measuring ~~a burst of~~ CSI-RS, including the applicable time-domain behaviors * Whether/how UE-side or gNB-side prediction is assumed for CQI/PMI/RI calculation * Potential enhancements on CQI definition and calculation procedure in relation to the PMI of Rel-18 Type-II codebook for high/medium velocities   [Mod: OK] |
| Lenovo | ***Proposal 2.A***  It appears that the proposal implies the support of both codebook sub-types (beam-based codebook and PS codebook). We prefer to keep the door open for supporting only one of them based on evaluation results and use cases, as follows:  **Proposal 2.A’**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities includes refinement based on at least one of the following codebooks~~, based on a common design framework~~:   * + Rel-16 eType-II regular codebook   Rel-17 FeType-II port selection (PS) codebook  [Mod: Added FFS to address this]  ***Proposal 2.B***  We prefer VIVO’s update on Proposal 2.B  ***Proposal 2.C***  Support  ***Proposal 2.D***  Support |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.A:** our preference is Rel.16 eT2 regular codebook, but we can be open to study R17 PS T2 CB also,  Proposal 2.B   * Support * @vivo, Lenovo: Alt3 is included in Alt2 since we have the note, which implies Alt3   [Mod: I don’t think so since the note in Alt2 says nothing about multiple W2 and single W1]  Proposal 2.C: support  Proposal 2.D   * 1st bullet: we don’t think TRS can be used to T2 CB refinement. We are open to study TRS based TDCP reporting (item 3) thought. So, we prefer to remove TRS, or at least add FFS. * 2nd bullet: as mentioned earlier, we don’t think the T2 CB refinement and CSI reporting should be based on UE-/gNB-side prediction. The refinement should work w/ and w/o it. So, we prefer to delete the sub-bullet.   **Proposal 2.D**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities includes the following CSI measurement and calculation aspects:   * Potential refinement on Resource setting configuration on CSI-RS (for CSI ~~and tracking~~) for measuring a burst of CSI-RS, including the applicable time-domain behaviors * Potential enhancements on CQI definition and calculation procedure in relation to the PMI of Rel-18 Type-II codebook for high/medium velocities   + ~~Including whether/how UE-side or gNB-side prediction is assumed for CQI/PMI/RI calculation~~   [Mod: Since the majority view considers prediction for CSI calculation, I cannot take your suggested changes. Anyway the wording is “whether/how”. Re TRS, as the wording says “potential”, it is too early to rule this out since there are a few companies proposing this.] |
| Apple | ***We support 2.A, 2.C and 2.D.***  ***For Proposal 2.B,***   1. It can be clarified whether Alt. 1/Alt. 2 are for the code structure discussion only, other choices e.g. bitmap design/coefficient selection are not constrained by that (e.g., the codebook structure does not prescribe the bitmap design (assuming we will do bitmap), potential selection from common spatial beam bases, FD component bases w.r.t. Doppler offset should not be excluded at this time). Fraunhofer raises a good point above, as in end it is a tradeoff between feedback overhead and performance, Alt. 3 as suggested Fraunhofer can be considered.   [Mod: Overall I agree except Alt3 from Fraunhofer isn’t aligned with WID. Please check my comment for Fraunhofer. I also added sub-alternatives for independent TD/DD selection per SD/FD]   1. On the notations in 2.B: our understanding is W2 in Alt.1/Alt. 2 are different from W2 in Rel-16. We note the W2 notations are different for Alt. 1 (without tilde) and Alt. 2 (with tilde). is any special meaning attached to different notations of W2 in Alt. 1 and alt. 2?   [Mod: Not really, just to emphasize that those two W2s are different since they combine the multi-dimensional bases differently ☺]   * Alt1. Time-domain basis, e.g. * Alt2. Doppler-domain basis, e.g.   + Note that may be the identity as a special case |
| Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI | We support **Proposal 2.A** and **2.C**.  Re **Proposal 2.B**, in our understanding the current codebook structure formulations assume selection of identical Doppler components for all spatial beams and FD components. We think that such an assumption can be made only after studying the impact on performance and feedback overhead. So, we would like to clarify whether the current formulations allow independent selection of Doppler components per spatial beam and FD component or not? If yes, we would like to add a note that selection and indication of Doppler components per spatial beam and FD component is not precluded. If not, we would like to add a new alternative (Alt3) to proposal 2.B  **Proposal 2.B**: The work scope of Type-II codebook refinement for high/medium velocities includes down selection from the following codebook structures:   * Alt1. Time-domain basis, e.g. * Alt2. Doppler-domain basis, e.g.   + Note that may be the identity as a special case * Alt3. Time-domain basis, e.g.,   where, and are the -th time-domain basis vector and -th frequency domain basis vector associated with spatial beam .  [Mod: Sorry I missed this comment before. Looking at the precoder structure, unfortunately this is not aligned with the WID which says “without modification to the spatial and frequency domain basis”. The above precoder implies independent FD/TD basis selection across SD bases which deviates from Rel-16/17. Perhaps your intention is independent TD basis selection across SD/FD bases, which looks like this (I changed the subscripts to associate with domains)?  If yes, I can add the equation as a sub-alternative (I already added this variation for both TD and DD approaches)]  Re **Proposal 2.D**, we share the same view as Samsung. we don’t envision any meaningful enhancements on T2 CB using TRS as it is confined to a single port.  [Mod: Noted, but please check my response to Samsung] |
| LG | Proposal 2A: We need further study and evaluation for R17 FeType II PS.  [Mod: FFS added]  Proposal 2B: if this proposal is agreed, does it mean Type II codebook refinement is supported? If yes, we suggest to remove “down selection from”. Or we suggest to make note that this proposal does not mean to support codebook refinement and separate discussion is needed to decide whether it is supported or not. The intention of the note is to consider potential down selection between codebook refinement and reporting TDCP. We also have the same comment on other proposal 2X and proposal 3X including “down selection”.  [Mod: The two features are separate. I don’t handle them together for down selection]  In addition, we are fine with add a note Fraunhofer suggested. Regarding vivo’s comment on multiple W2 without compression, we are OK with adding it as another alternative. The Intention of Alt 2 is to introduce Doppler domain basis but if Wd is identity it means nothing, which is the same as legacy codebook from our understanding. We prefer to remove Note in Alt 2.  [Mod: The note was proposed by companies such as Nokia and vivo as a possibility to change Wd when coherence time is large. It is too early to rule this out at this stage]  Proposal 2C: Support  Proposal 2D: In our view, CQI enhancement is out of scope according to WID.  [Mod: From Tdocs, almost all companies don’t see it that way ☺] |
| Mod V10 | **Revised FL proposals to address inputs** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Ok with the updated Proposal 2.A/2.B/2.C/2.D. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For proposal 2.B, we prefer Doppler-domain basis, the equation perhaps can be discussed later together with detailed discussions. We are fine to keep them as examples though. |
| Mod V13 | No revision |
| LG | @FL: Proposal 2B: Could you clarify the meaning of the proposal, first? Regarding your comment on two separate feature, the purpose of codebook enhancement is to make better precoder determination in high speed scenario. This use case is overlapped with TDCP as it is captured in Proposal 3A. |
| ZTE | Re Proposal 2.B/2.C, one general question: in our views, even for Al1 and Alt2, we have different matrix W\_t and W\_d, but from basic perspective, it may be the same right? In other words, W\_t and W\_d does not imply that they should be designed with different basic vectors/waveforms. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI | @FL: We are fine with your modifications on Alt 3 in our comment section. For more clarity, we suggest adding it to **Proposal 2.B** as Alt 3.  Re and , we have the same understanding as ZTE. For clarity, perhaps may we suggest using same notation in all alternatives? |

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

Table 5 Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 3.1 | Work scope: Targeted use case(s) of TRS-based TDCP reporting  DL reception   * Opt1.1. Aid CSI prediction at gNB, in general * Opt1.2. Aid CSI prediction at gNB, targeting DL reception configured with 1- or 2-port NZP CSI-RS   Range of UE speed   * Opt2.1. Medium-speed only (e.g. 10-30kmph) * Opt2.2. High-speed only (e.g. 30-120kmph) * Opt2.3. Both medium and high-speed (e.g. 30-120kmph)   **FL Note**: The WID dictates this as a CSI reporting and to “assist DL precoding”. The targeted use case(s), as usual, won’t be a part of the specs. But they need to be considered at least for **evaluation** and design.  Note that CSI-RS for tracking comprises only 1 port. | DL reception:   * **Opt1.1.** (General): Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, vivo, IDC, MTK, CATT, CEWiT, Xiaomi * **Opt1.2.** (1- or 2-port): Samsung   Range of UE speed   * **Opt2.1**. Medium v: * **Opt2.2**. High v: Samsung, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, ZTE * **Opt2.3**. Medium+high v: Ericsson, ZTE, vivo (need evaluation), Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, Lenovo, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, IDC, MTK, CATT, Sony |
| 3.2 | Work scope: CSI reporting format for TDCP   * Alt1. Stand-alone CSI report (not tied or inter-dependent with other CSI parameters)   + Note: Not precluding multiplexing with other UCI parameters (e.g. CSI, ACK, SR, …) on PUCCH/PUSCH, if applicable * Alt2. Tied/inter-dependent with other CSI parameter(s)   **FL Note**: This affects how TDCP is determined and reported. | **Alt1 (stand-alone):** Ericsson, ZTE, Samsung, Apple, DOCOMO, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, MTK, CATT, Xiaomi  **Alt2 (not stand-alone, be specific):** vivo, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, LG, IDC, CATT, Xiaomi |
| 3.3 | Candidates for TDCP   * Opt1. Doppler shift * Opt2. Doppler spread * Opt3. Cross-correlation in time * Opt4. Number of peaks in CIR * Opt5: CSI-RS resource and/or CSI reporting setting configuration assistance   **FL Note**: A few candidates have been proposed and will be down-selected. | **Opt1 (Doppler shift):** ZTE, Xiaomi, Samsung, CEWiT, vivo (reporting multiple Doppler shifts), IDC, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, CATT  **Opt2 (Doppler spread):** Ericsson, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, CEWiT, IDC, CATT, Xiaomi  **Opt3 (XCorr):** Ericsson, Samsung, CEWiT, Nokia/NSB (study), CATT  **Opt4 (# CIR peaks):** Ericsson (Relative Doppler shift of a number of peaks in channel impulse response) , Xiaomi  **Opt5 (Resource/reporting config assistance):** Apple, MTK, Lenovo |

**General observation from Table 5**:

* [3.1] The super-majority favors more general use cases in terms of UE speed and # CSI-RS ports. Some companies also pointed out more general use cases beyond CSI prediction, such as MIMO/precoding mode determination at the gNB. It is important to have a limited number of use cases.
* [3.2] The majority prefers TDCP as a stand-alone report while some companies propose to report TDCP along with (dependent on) CSI parameters
* [3.3] The majority view supports Doppler-related parameters while some other time-domain correlation parameters are also proposed.

Based on the above inputs, the following **moderator proposals** are made:

**Proposal 3.A**: The work scope of TRS-based TDCP reporting focuses on the following use cases for evaluation purposes:

* Targeting medium and high UE speed, e.g. 10-120km/h as well as HST speed
* Aiding gNB to determine
  + CSI reporting configuration and CSI-RS resource configuration parameters,
  + Precoding scheme, using one of the CSI feedback based precoding schemes or an UL-SRS reciprocity based precoding scheme
* Aiding gNB-side CSI prediction

**Proposal 3.B**: The work scope of TRS-based TDCP reporting includes down selection from the following TDCP reporting formats:

* Alt1. Stand-alone reporting (no inter-dependence with other CSI/UCI parameters)
  + Note: This doesn’t preclude multiplexing with other UCI parameters (e.g. CSI, ACK, SR, …) on PUCCH/PUSCH, if applicable
* Alt2. Inter-dependent and reported with other CSI parameter(s)

**Proposal 3.C**: The work scope of TRS-based TDCP reporting includes down selection from the following TDCP parameters:

* Alt1. Doppler shift
* Alt2. Doppler spread
* Alt3. Cross-correlation in time
* Alt4. Relative Doppler shift of a number of peaks in CIR
* Alt5: CSI-RS resource and/or CSI reporting setting configuration assistance

Table 6 Additional inputs: issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| From ROUND 1 | |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and update your view in Table 5** 2. **Share additional inputs here if needed** 3. **Moderator proposals will be added in the next revision** |
| Lenovo | In our opinion, supporting codebook enhancements for both CSI-RS based reporting and TRS based reporting would impose a huge burden on the group in terms of discussion, simulation work and spec impact. Prefer to down select between both approaches: (Alt-1). CSI-RS based codebook design and (Alt-2) TRS based codebook design, where for Alt-2 reusing Rel. 16/17 legacy codebooks for CSI refinement can be achieved (without the need to design a new Type-II codebook) |
| LG | Issue 3.1 should be prioritized. In our view, the use case and purpose of Type II codebook refinement and reporting time domain information via TRS are overlapped, i.e., PMI prediction for time varying channel, but they have a quite different specification impact. So, we prefer to down select one. |
| Apple | For 3.1, actually the report from TRS may be used for gNB to configure relevant CSI reports, e.g. the one as discussed in Section 2.2, supporting gNB side CSI prediction is not the only use case. |
| Samsung | @Lenovo: In our understanding, TDCP feedback doesn’t involve TRS-based codebook design. Therefore issue 2 (Type-2 codebook) and issue 3 (a new UCI, possibly standalone) are separate and not competing with each other |
| NTT DOCOMO | For issue 3.3 and 3.4, we are open to discuss at this stage. |
| Vivo | Prefer to agree on general framework of TRS-based reporting like issue 3.1 in this meeting. However, we are not sure what is the difference between Opt1.1 and Opt1.2.  Regarding Opt2 in issue 3.3, multiple Doppler shifts measured from multiple TRS ports, each precoded with a specific SD-FD basis, may be beneficial to achieve better prediction.  Regrading Opt3 in issue 3.3, cross-correlation in time needs to be clarified. Whether AR (Autoregression) is included? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Issue 3.1 can be prioritized so that we can be clear to evaluate what benefits can be achieved for what metrics, and the baseline, and scenarios for evaluation can also be determined. |
| OPPO | The difference between option 1.1 and option 1.2 is unclear to us. We prefer to prioritize Issue 2 over issue 3. In our understanding, the scope of issue 2 can include that of issue 3 depended on the detail solutions for issue 2. |
| Nokia/NSB | - Issue 3.1. Agree with Apple, in our understanding Opt.1.1 includes for example, aiding gNB to configure/trigger RS resources and CSI reports with different granularity in time depending on UE speed, etc. Also agree with Samsung that TDPC reporting is a very different approach from Type-II enhancement in time domain and it does not involve codebook design  - Issue 3.3  Opt 3. In our understanding this is the auto-correlation in time of the TRS signal (sometimes the term cross-correlation is used to indicate the correlation between two different signals)  Opt 4. In our understanding, this is a about reporting parameters of the Doppler spectrum (Fourier-transformation of the time auto-correlation) |
| Ericsson | 3.1  We don’t see CSI prediction as the main use case. There are other use-cases that are also “assisting DL precoding”. Important use-cases are   * Aid gNB to decide on CSI feedback periodicity and CSI RS configuration parameters, * Aid gNB to decide on precoding scheme, using a CSI feedback based precoding scheme or an UL-SRS reciprocity based precoding scheme. * Aid gNB to control RS overhead. How often to trigger/configure the SRS, CSI-RS based on doppler report. How many additional DMRS configuration is needed. * Aid gNB to decide what information to use from the UE, E.g. When to switch between TypeI and TypeII CSI report, or between Type II and TypeII Doppler CSI report. Type II Doppler is more robust at high speed, but potentially overhead heavy.   We also think that when we are evaluating TRS based Doppler reporting it would be a shame not to also study the DMRS density usecase, even though it’s not directly connected to CSI-based precoding.  [Mod] As the most prominent proponent of TDCP, the FL (and perhaps the other companies) would appreciate it if the suggested use case(s): 1) are aligned with the WID as much as possible (e.g. DMRS density selection doesn’t seem aligned with the scope), 2) are limited (perhaps select 1-2 from the above). This is important so that other companies to form their views on, e.g. which TDCP(s) should be supported in Rel-18 given the use case(s). I am unsure if other companies can evaluate all the above use cases   Since performance degradation due to Doppler is seen already at 10km/h we think 10km/h should be included in the study. In fact we think that also 3km/h should be included as a reference without Doppler degradation. Thus we think the range 3km/h to 120km/h should be studied. We think the lower part of the range is of highest importance.  3.3  We would prefer to re-formulate Opt 4 as “Relative Doppler shift of a number of peaks in CIR” to make it more clear what is meant here.  Our understanding is that Xiaomi also propose this in section 2.2.2 in their contribution R1-2203795 where they write “The Doppler shifts of multiple propagation paths can be obtained through power delay profile estimation.”. It’s obviously up to Xiaomi to say if this is correctly interpreted.  [Mod: OK]  3.4  We think an important part of the study is to investigate the accuracy of the measurements. The accuracy will to a large extent decide how useful the measurements will be. This is most efficiently evaluated in LLS. We therefore think that LLS should definitely be used for this study. We also think that some of the use-cases can be studied through LLS.  General  We agree with Samsung that TDCP feedback doesn’t involve TRS-based codebook design. In our view TRS based Doppler should be used to aid the gNB in taking decisions on CSI feedback periodicity, CSI configuration parameters, precoding scheme, etc, rather than to predict the precoder. Therefore issue 2 and 3 are separate and not competing with each other. |
| Futurewei | We think Issue 3.1 should be prioritize. |
| Intel | Issue 3.1 should be discussed – its not clear to us what is the objective and KPI for this issue |
| CATT | We are open to discuss issue 3.1 and 3.2. In addition, we think the target duplex mode (the FDD or TDD) can be discussed with priority. In our opinion, Type-II codebook refinement discussed in issue#2 can already solve well the channel aging problem for FDD system. Hence, the TRS-based TDCP reporting for TDD system can be discussed with priority. |
| Mod V20 | The FL agrees that 3.1 and 3.2 are the most fundamental issues at this point |
| ZTE | Firstly, we share the same views with E///, and it is unclear for us why this enhancement is relevant to prediction. Then, as clarifying our position for 3.3., we suggest to report the delta of Doppler shift from different TRS, rather than just a single TRS.  [Mod: Some companies propose that having a TDCP report can aid gNB side CSI prediction, assuming that TDCP parameters such as Doppler spread or shift cannot be reliably estimated from UL signals – which seems to be the case in general due to DL/UL inter-cell interference asymmetry, IMO ☺] |
| CEWiT | We prefer to prioritize 3.1 and 3.3. Regarding 3.4, we support LLS rather than SLS, since LLS is sufficient for study on improvements related to reference signals and CSI reporting mechanisms. |
| Ericsson 2 | For evaluations, we can accept the following two use cases for evaluation purposes:  · Aid gNB to decide on CSI feedback periodicity and CSI RS configuration parameters,  · Aid gNB to decide on precoding scheme, using one of the CSI feedback based precoding schemes or an UL-SRS reciprocity based precoding scheme.  [Mod: Thanks for your understanding. Included]  In the end, we can aim to have a TRS based Doppler spread report with a certain accuracy requirement. In practice, the gNB can use the report for whatever it wants. |
| Xiaomi | In our view, we should align our understanding what is aim of TRS-based reporting of TDCP. According to contribution of all companies, there are potential three aims of TRS-based reporting of TDCP   * It is used to enhance Type II codebook * In FDD system, it is used to aid the gNB in taking decisions on CSI feedback periodicity, CSI configuration parameters, and so on, * In TDD system, it is used to aid the gNB predicting the evolution in time of the channel measured from SRS.   [Mod: Included, the first bullet can be considered as gNB-side prediction in general, not only for Type-II codebook]  Issue 3.3. depends on the above aims. Thus, it is necessary to decide which aims of TRS-based reporting of TDCP should be studied.  For Opt4 of issue 3.3, we agree with the proposal of Ericsson, i.e., multiple Doppler shifts of a number of peaks in channel impulse response corresponding to different propagation paths should be reported to aid the gNB predicting the evolution in time of the channel measured from SRS in TDD system. |
| Lenovo 2 | @Samsung: Maybe the “TRS based codebook design” expression I have used was misleading, so let me re-interpret. If TRS is to be used to measure and report TDCP, one question would be whether to include the TDCP feedback within the same CSI report carrying the PMI measured via CSI-RS, or reported separately in a standalone CSI report. Obviously both alternatives have pros and cons in terms of complexity, flexibility, overhead, and reporting timeline. I agree that Issue-2 and Issue-3 are somewhat separate, however the specification effort to support both can be a burden to the group given the limited TU, and the fact that the entirety of high-speed CSI enhancement represents one half of this agenda. The workload burden should be taken into account when making decisions on whether/what would be specified  [Mod: The FL fully sympathizes with your view on workload ☺  But given that the WID is not formulated in such a way that it points to down selection of the two, while companies can propose to choose only one of the two, there is also enough justification if the use cases are different.] |
| ROUND 2 | |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and, if needed, update your view in Table 5** 2. **Share additional inputs here, if needed, on FL proposals** |
| vivo | **Proposal 3.A**:  Add “for evaluation purpose” because the relationship of the above different use cases and spec impact is not clear. The intention to list all these use cases is to identify benefit through evaluation.  **Proposed update of Proposal 3.A**: The work scope of TRS-based TDCP reporting focuses on the following use cases for evaluation purpose:   * Targeting medium and high UE speed, e.g. 10-120km/h as well as HST speed * Aiding gNB to determine   + CSI feedback periodicity and CSI RS configuration parameters,   + Precoding scheme, using one of the CSI feedback based precoding schemes or an UL-SRS reciprocity based precoding scheme * Aiding gNB-side CSI prediction   [Mod: OK]  **Proposal 3.B**:  OK.  **Proposal 3.C**:  In Alt1, in our view reporting a single Doppler shift may not workable because a single Doppler shift doesn’t impact the precoder.  For Alt5, firstly, we don’t think Alt5 is a kind of time-domain channel parameter, so it is out of scope. Secondly, with reporting of other alternatives, the eNB implementation can determine these configurations. So we suggest remove Alt5.  **Proposed update of Proposal 3.C**: The work scope of TRS-based TDCP reporting includes down selection from the following TDCP parameters:   * Alt1. Doppler shifts * Alt2. Doppler spread * Alt3. Cross-correlation in time * Alt4. Relative Doppler shift of a number of peaks in CIR * ~~Alt5: CSI-RS resource and/or CSI reporting setting configuration assistance~~   [Mod: Since several companies propose this, at this point it is too early to remove this. Whether this is out of scope or not depends on the detailed designs. This can be further discussed in later meetings] |
| CATT | Regarding Proposal 3.A, on the use cases, we don’t think determining CSI feedback or CSI-RS configuration parameters or determining precoding scheme are useful use case for this feature. These use cases does not require very accurate Doppler information at gNB side. SRS, PUCCH/PUSCH DMRS can provide Doppler estimation sufficient for determining CSI feedback/CSI report configurations or precoding schemes. CSI prediction is the useful use case from our perspective.  [Mod: With vivo’s addition of “evaluation purposes” I think this should be fine ☺ especially since one of the main proponents of TDCP envisions this as a strong use case – selected from their 5-6 initial use cases]  For targeting speed in Proposal 3.A, whether HST speed is in the work scope needs further discussion and research. Because if HST scenarios is included in this work, it would impose a huge burden on the group in terms of discussion and spec impact. Hence the HST speed could be agreed to ‘FFS’ and discussed with lower priority.  [Mod: While I tend to agree it is good to narrow things down even more, since this is for evaluation purposes, the amount of submitted results in future meetings will naturally de/prioritize certain scenarios. Another proponent of TDCP feels strongly about HST use cases ☺]  For Proposal 3.B, we are open to discuss both alternatives. But on Alt2, it is possible that TDCP parameters are reported together with CSI in some reporting instance and reported independently in some other reporting instances. Our suggestion is to delete ‘always’.  **Proposal 3.B**: The work scope of TRS-based TDCP reporting includes down selection from the following TDCP reporting formats:   * Alt1. Stand-alone reporting (no inter-dependence with other CSI/UCI parameters)   + Note: This doesn’t preclude multiplexing with other UCI parameters (e.g. CSI, ACK, SR, …) on PUCCH/PUSCH, if applicable * Alt2. Inter-dependent and ~~always~~ reported with other CSI parameter(s)   [Mod: OK] |
| Lenovo | ***Proposal 3.A***  Regarding Proposal 3.A, we prefer replacing “CSI feedback periodicity” with “CSI Reporting Configuration”, as follows  **Proposal 3.A**: The work scope of TRS-based TDCP reporting focuses on the following use cases:   * Targeting medium and high UE speed, e.g. 10-120km/h as well as HST speed * Aiding gNB to determine   + CSI ~~feedback periodicity~~reporting configuration and CSI RS configuration parameters,   + Precoding scheme, using one of the CSI feedback based precoding schemes or an UL-SRS reciprocity based precoding scheme * Aiding gNB-side CSI prediction   [Mod: Make sense, OK]  ***Proposal 3.B***  Support, prefer CATT’s updated version  ***Proposal 3.C***  Support moderator’s version. Not clear why VIVO would like to omit alternatives prior to evaluation/study |
| Samsung | Proposal 3.A: support, with minor wording changes   * Assuming other use cases are not excluded, we suggest to add “…at least the following use cases:”   [Mod: Since some companies above already wanted to narrow down use cases, adding “at least” doesn’t help ☺ I prefer not to add that]   * To be more specific, we suggest to add e.g. for the HST speed, i.e., (e.g. 500km/h).   [Mod: HST speed may not only include 500kph, but also 180mph (US, outdoor), 350kph (some areas in Japan), and perhaps other, depending on the areas. We can leave this to the proponents for HST scenarios for TDCP to decide]  Proposal 3.B: just to clarify   * Alt1: implies only one report quantity (i.e. TDCP) * Alt2: at least two report quantities (i.e. TDCP + at least one CSI parameter)   [Mod: Correct]  Proposal 3.C: OK |
| Apple | While the list of alternatives is quite long, it may be still of value to collect companies’ views from the very first meeting, down selection will take its course in future meetings. From that, we are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| LG | Proposal 3.B and 3.C: we have the same question as Proposal 2B, regarding whether it implies supporting TDCP reporting. |
| Mod V10 | **Revised FL proposals to address inputs** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We generally support all updated FL proposals.  For 3.A, adding “evaluation purpose” is ok, while we do not see it very essential change.  For 3.C, we also think alt5 should be kept. |
| Mod V13 | No revision |
| ZTE | Re 3.A, we think that the following should be added as for usage. BTW, we do not think that it can be used for CSI prediction to be honest, but anyway, we are open to other candidate.  **Proposal 3.A**: The work scope of TRS-based TDCP reporting focuses on the following use cases for evaluation purposes:   * Targeting medium and high UE speed, e.g. 10-120km/h as well as HST speed * Aiding gNB to determine   + Frequency-offset pre-compensation in mTRP, e.g., for SFN   + CSI reporting configuration and CSI-RS resource configuration parameters, e.g., periodicity,   + Precoding scheme, using one of the CSI feedback based precoding schemes or an UL-SRS reciprocity based precoding scheme * Aiding gNB-side CSI prediction   Re 3.C, we think that relative Doppler shift between two or more TRSs should be considered.  **Proposal 3.C**: The work scope of TRS-based TDCP reporting includes down selection from the following TDCP parameters:   * Alt1. Doppler shift * Alt2. Doppler spread * Alt3. Cross-correlation in time * Alt4. Relative Doppler shift of a number of peaks in CIR or relative Doppler shift of different TRS(s) * Alt5: CSI-RS resource and/or CSI reporting setting configuration assistance |
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