# **[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. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Basically agree.In the time domain, we think better to restrict the reference resource to the slot which carries the “latest” CSI trigger. This is because multiple CSI triggers might be received over a time. This simplification allows a one-to-one correspondence between CSI trigger and CSI report. |
| Apple | Agree |
| ZTE,Sanechips | agree |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 + Option 3 | We think one latency bound or a list of latency bounds can be configured. When only one bound is configured, option 2 is utilized. When a list of latency bounds is used, it provides better flexibility at the TX UE side. It may decide the latency bound dynamically based on the service type or whether the last CSI report is successfully received or not. The list will be configured by PC5-RRC, and SCI (option 3) is used to explicitly indicate the used latency bound. |
| Apple | Option 2 | The resource pool (pre)configuration does not fit for channel condition of every pair of UEs and does not fit for every data QoS. The explicit SCI indication increases the L1 signaling overhead.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 1 | FFS whether it is a per resource pool configuration |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

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. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option A | The latency bound depends more strongly on service priority, link-level factors such as MCS table, and so on, than only on speed. UE may take into account whatever it needs to when setting the latency bound. |
| Apple | Option A | The channel status depends on relative speed of peer UEs, instead of absolute speed. The relative UE speed is hard to obtain. Hence, we do not think it is based on UE speed.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option A |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

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? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No. We think the TX UE should not trigger another CSI procedure before CSI report is received or the corresponding latency bound is exceeded. Otherwise, the relationship between the CSI triggers and the CSI reports will be rather complicated. |
| Apple | In general, we do not support the overlap of SL CSI reporting window of different CSI triggers. This simplifies the operations at both Tx UE and Rx UE, as well as reducing potential L1 signaling overhead. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No needs to support this. Non-overlap of reporting window could be assumed for unicast. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |