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# Introduction

This contribution summaries discussion in email thread [100b-e-NR-eMIMO-MB1-02]

# Background and Summary of Proposals

In RAN1#100e, for the feature of MAC-CE based PL RS update, the UE behavior on tracking PL RS was agreed with regards to following aspects

* which RSs UE should track for pathloss estimation
* from when the updated RS by MAC-CE needs to be applied

When default PL RS is enabled, there are two cases:

* Case1: the QCL type-D RS of the lowest ID CORESET is used as the default PL RS
* Case2: the QCL type-D RS of the lowest ID TCI state among the activated TCI states for PDSCH

In Case1, N TCI states can be configured for the lowest ID CORESET by RRC (N≤64), and the TCI State Indication for UE-specific PDCCH MAC CE can select one of the N TCI states. In Case2, M TCI states can be activated by the TCI States Activation/Deactivation for UE-specific PDSCH MAC CE (M≤8) and TCI field in DCI can select one of the M TCI states. Therefore, the default TCI can be changed by the TCI State Indication for UE-specific PDCCH MAC CE in Case1 and by the TCI States Activation/Deactivation for UE-specific PDSCH MAC CE in Case2. Since both M and N are greater than 4, it needs to be clarified which RSs UE should track for pathloss estimation in the two cases. The application timing of the updated PL RS also needs to be clarified. When default PL RS is enabled for some UL channels and/or signals, there can be RRC configured PL RSs for other uplink channels/signals, e.g. for PUSCH0\_1. Therefore, it needs to be clarified on which RSs UE should track in this case as well, including whether the feature of MAC-CE based PL RS selection can still be enabled for other channels/signals.

9 tdocs submitted for these issues, which are Huawei/HiSilicon(Proposal2), ZTE(Proposal2), vivo(Proposal2), Sony(Proposal1), LGE(Proposal4/5), CMCC(Proposal5), Fraunhofer(Proposal4/5), NTT DOCOMO(Proposal2), Qualcomm(Proposal10).

NTT DOCOMO and vivo proposed that the delayed application timing defined for the newly activated PL RSs by MAC-CE needs to be applied when the default PL RS is changed by the TCI State Indication for UE-specific PDCCH MAC CE or the TCI States Activation/Deactivation for UE-specific PDSCH MAC CE. In ZTE’s tdoc, a problem of long-time mismatch between spatial relation/beam and PL RS was concerned when the delayed application timing is applied to default PL RS. An exemplary illustration is captured below from ZTE’s tdoc:



**Figure 1** Timeline misalignment between beam and path-loss RS update [R1-2001597]

To avoid the problem, ZTE proposed to track the additional PL RS(s) in addition to the RS corresponding to the CORESET with the lowest ID or active PDSCH-TCI state with the lowest ID. Similar technical observation can be found in Huawei/HiSilicon’s and LGE’s tdocs as well.

Qualcomm and Sony proposed to clarify that the feature of default PL RS can be enabled together with the feature of the MAC-CE based PL RS update. In order to reduce UE complexity, Huawei/HiSilicon proposed an additional condition that UE is not required to track RRC configured PL RSs for the UL channel/signal on which the default PL RS is not enabled when default PL RS is enabled. On the other hand, Qualcomm proposed that UE should track the other PL RSs as well as the default PL RS if the total number of configured PL RSs is not greater than 4. It needs to be noted that PL RSs can still be configured for PUSCH0\_1 even if default PL RS is enabled for all of PUSCH0\_0, PUCCH and SRS.

# Discussion

Based on the identified issues/alternatives summarized in section 2, companies are encouraged to provide their views on the following questions.

Q1: When the QCL type-D RS of the lowest ID CORESET is used as the default PL RS, which approach do you prefer?

* Alt1: UE is only required to track the QCL type-D RS of the lowest ID CORESET for pathloss estimation and the delayed application timing defined for the newly activated PL RSs by MAC-CE is applied when the QCL type-D RS is changed by the TCI State Indication for UE-specific PDCCH MAC CE.
* Alt2: The delayed application timing is not applied for the default PL RS and define additional RS(s) that needs to be tracked for pathloss estimation by UE in addition to the QCL type-D RS of the lowest ID CORESET.
  + FFS: which additional RS(s) UE needs to track (e.g. other TCIs for the lowest ID CORESET, the QCL type-D RS for other CORESET)
* Other alternative (please specify)

Q2: When the QCL type-D RS of the lowest ID TCI state among the activated TCI states for PDSCH is used as the default PL RS, which approach do you prefer?

* Alt1: UE is only required to track the lowest ID TCI state among the activated TCI states for PDSCH for pathloss estimation and the delayed application timing defined for the newly activated PL RSs by MAC-CE is applied when the QCL type-D RS is changed by the TCI States Activation/Deactivation for UE-specific PDSCH MAC CE
* Alt2: The delayed application timing is not applied for the default PL RS and UE is required to track the QCL type-D RS(s) in the activated TCI states by the TCI States Activation/Deactivation for UE-specific PDSCH MAC CE for pathloss estimation.
  + FFS: how to handle the case when more than 4 different QCL type-D RSs are activated for PDSCH by the MAC-CE
* Other alternative (please specify)

Q3: When the default PL RS is enabled for some or all of PUSCH0\_0, PUCCH and SRS, do you agree that UE should track RRC configured PL RSs for the UL channel/signal on which the default PL RS is not enabled in addition to the default PL RS if the total number of configured PL RSs is not greater than 4?

* Alt1: YES (please specify whether there is any spec impact)
* Alt2: NO (please specify whether there is any spec impact)

Q4: When the default PL RS is enabled for some or all of PUSCH0\_0, PUCCH and SRS, do you agree that gNB can still configure more than 4 PL RSs for the UL channel/signal on which the default PL RS is not enabled?

* Alt1: YES (please specify whether there is any spec impact)
* Alt2: NO (please specify whether there is any spec impact)

**Companies’ view (to be updated)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company name | View |
| ZTE | Q1: Alt2.  Long-term misalignment between spatial relation/beam and path-loss RS in UL transmission as shown in Figure 1 occurs for each of beam switching through activating TCI state of PDCCH/CORESET with lowest ID, when there is only an active path loss RS to be tracked for the default beam and path loss mode. When the closed loop of UL transmission is accumulated and compensated based on the misaligned path-loss RS, some serious fluctuation of UL transmission/reception power may be experienced frequently. Consequently, The UE shall track additional RS, since the maximum number of PL RS to be tracked by UE is up to 4.  Q2: Alt2  The UE shall track additional RS, e.g., the QCL type-D RS for other TCI states. The same reason as in Q1 should be considered.  Q3: Alt1: Yes (No further spec impact is needed)  If the total number of RRC configured PL RS and default path loss RS is NOT beyond UE capability, the RRC configured PL RS should be tracked as agreed in last meeting.  Q4: Alt1: Yes (with spec impact. The rules of determining PL RS to be tracked in such case should be specified)  These two approaches should be decoupled, and the number of PL RSs can be configured with either more than or no more than 4, regardless of whether the default PL RS is enabled. If the total number of RRC configured PL RS and default path loss RS is beyond UE capability, a priority rule, e.g., default PL RS > RRC configured PL RS, should be considered.  Alternatively, we can consider the improvement of default PL RS determination for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 in order to avoid this combination case between default beam and path-loss approach and MAC-CE based path-loss update approach. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion [to be updated]

From the email discussion [100b-e-NR-eMIMO-MB1-02], xxx
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