# **[100b-e-NR-5G\_V2X\_NRSL-SL\_PHY\_Procedure-04] CSI reporting latency bound and association with CSI trigger**

[100b-e-NR-5G\_V2X\_NRSL-PHY-Procedure-04] Email discussion/approval regarding CSI reporting latency bound and association with CSI trigger

* Introduction and time/frequency location of SL CSI reference resource
* How to determine the latency bound of SL CSI reporting
* Whether/how to associate the reported CSI with the CSI trigger

till 4/24, with potential TPs by 4/29 (Hanbyul, LGE)

Q1: Do you agree the following proposals for the definition of SL CSI reference resource in the time and frequency domain?

* Proposal
  + For a given CSI trigger, CSI reference resource in time domain is the slot where the CSI trigger is received
  + For a given CSI trigger, CSI reference resource in frequency domain is the PRBs scheduled for the PSSCH in the CSI reference resource slot

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Answer |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support, if the following is correct understanding:  If it is allowed that CSI report is triggered multiple times, and when RX-UE receives multiple CSI triggers, the above proposal implies that CSI is calculated based on the CSI-RS in the PSCCH/PSSCH with **the LAST** CSI report. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Q2: How can the UE reporting SL CSI know the latency bound? What is the signaling mechanism of the latency bound for sidelink CSI reporting MAC CE?

- Option 1: (Pre)configuration in a resource pool

- Option 2: PC5-RRC signaling from CSI triggering UE to CSI reporting UE

- Option 3: Explicit SCI indication from CSI triggering UE to CSI reporting UE

- Option 4: Others (please specify it)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred option | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 2 | Required bound is dependent on each PDB. When multiple services are considered, PDB would be different among services and/or UEs. Fixed and/or common value is not desirable solution for the latency bound.  CSI-RS configuration is delivered on PC5-RRC message. The same solution is reasonable. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Q2-1: In case where UE determines the SL CSI latency bound, how is the determination done?

- Option A: By UE implementation

- Option B: Based on UE speed

- Option C: Others (please specify it)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred option | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option A | Bound would be related to PDB, channel busy ratio, etc. We do not understand why only UE speed should be considered. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Q3: Do you think the specification needs to support an overlap of SL CSI reporting window of different CSI trigger, i.e., first CSI trigger is transmitted and second CSI trigger is transmitted additionally before the latency bound of the first CSI reporting?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Answer |
| NTT DOCOMO | Specification should clarify RX UE behavior for re-trigger of CSI report.  CSI triggering could be failed e.g. due to TX collision/half-duplex. In this case, CSI trigger would be transmitted several times. However, let us assume that actually the RX-UE receives both trigger successfully. UE behavior for this case is unclear in the current specification. Which trigger does the UE report CSI based on? When is the correct latency bound? |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Q3-1: If the answer to Q3 is yes, does the CSI triggering UE need to know which CSI trigger is associated with a received CSI report? If so, how?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Answer |
| NTT DOCOMO | Not needed. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |