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1. Introduction

In this contribution, the contributions submitted in AI 8.1.2.2 are summarized.

1. 1. RRC related

Although RAN1 has sent LS to RAN2 on RRC leaving detailed design to RAN2, based on contributions following points are proposed, please indicate if you agree or disagree any of them.

Proposal 2.1: please indicate whether one or more of the followings are acceptable

#1: [The value maxNrofAddionalPCI-r17 is 7.](#_Toc95761913)

#2: [Change the field name ssb-ToMeasure to ssb-PositionInBurst in SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17.](#_Toc95761914)

#3: Additional information for the cell with SSB associated with different PCI should include rate matching pattern, LTE-CRS rate matching pattern, and RNTI.

#4: The information related to “SSB time domain position” for SSB with PCI different from the serving cell consists of halfFrameIndex.

#5: [Add the SSB transmission offset and SSB transmission power to SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17.](#_Toc95761912)

#6: SSB from a serving cell associated with additional PCI can be directly configured in QCL-info and SSB-InfoNcell-r16/SSB-Configuration-r16 are used for providing the correct SSB information.

#7: A new RRC IE can be introduced to configure the information for SSB associated with PCI different from the serving cell if the related information is not configured in MeasObject.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company |  | Comments (if any) |
| Apple | #1/2/3/4 Agree  #5 : Agree transmission power  #6/7 : Suggest more discussion | #6 : The proposal does not look clear to us. Does it mean to introduce a new QCL rule ?  #7 : We think the condition that ‘if the related information is not configured in MeasObject’ can be removed. |
| Spreadtrum | #1 : Agree  #2 : Agree  #3 : Partially agree  #4 : Agree  #5 : Agree  #6/#7 : up to RAN2 | #3 : We are fine to include the rate matching pattern. But we are not clear why RNTI is included. More clarification is needed. |
| QC | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Disagree  #4: Agree  #5: Agree  #6-7: Not clear. | #3: It has been discussed in the previous meeting. The motivation for this work is not DSS. Hence, there is no need to go beyond the two lists that are already possible based on CORESETPoolIndex.  #5: There is a clear agreement already, and RAN2 needs to implement it. If needed, we can send LS. |
| OPPO | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Disagree  #4: Agree  #5: Agree  #6: Disagree  #7: Disagree | #3: In Rel-16, the CRS rate-matching pattern is associated with *CORESETPoolindex.* It is unclear to us how this proposal can work togehter with Rel-16 mechanism.  #6/7: It was agreed that the detailed RRC signaling is up to RAN2 design. |
| DOCOMO | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Partially agree  #4: Agree  #5: Agree  #6: Disagree  #7: Partially agree | #3: RNTI is not needed.  #6/7: RAN2 issues. And we think we have agreed to introduce a new RRC IE to include the SSB configuration with additional PCIs. |
| ZTE | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Agree  #4: Agree  #5: Partially agree  #6: Disagree  #7: Agree | #5 Agree with SSB transmission power. The meaning of “SSB transmission offset” is unclear. Is it the agreed ssb-PositionInBurst? Further clarification is needed herein.  #6 Disagree.  First of all, RAN1 has agreed that the newly added indicator in TCI-State cannot be the exact PCI value. In addition, given that SSB-InfoNcell-r16/SSB-Configuration-r16 is dedicated to DL PRS, which is very different from the intention of inter-cell MTRP related beam indication and cannot be used. BTW, it is worth noting that the configuration of DL PRS is directly from LMF, instead of the gNB. |
| Samsung | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Agree to rate matching patterns  #4: Agree  #5: Need some clarification  #6: Disagree  #7: Disagree | #3: rate matching patterns are needed. Not sure why RNTI is here – more clarifications are needed.  #5: similar view to ZTE. Some clarifications on SSB transmission offset are needed.  #6, 7: RAN1 has already agreed to introduce a new RRC parameter to configure additional PCI’s SSB information. Furthermore, in the RAN2 running RRC CR R2-2202000, the new RRC parameter SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17 is introduced. In MTCAdditionalPCI-r17 and QCL-Info, AdditionalPCIIndex is being considered as the new indicator. From R2-2202000:  SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  additionalPCIIndex-r17 AdditionalPCIIndex,  additionalPCI-r17 PhysCellId,  ssb-periodicity ENUMERATED { ms5, ms10, ms20, ms40, ms80, ms160, spare2, spare1 } OPTIONAL, -- Need S  ssb-ToMeasure-r16 SetupRelease { SSB-ToMeasure } OPTIONAL -- Need M  }  -- Editor’s note: guidance in excel says SSB periodicity but does not mention offset. Also transmission power is mentioned, this is not added here for now.  AdditionalPCIIndex ::= INTEGER{FFS}  -- TAG-SSB-MTC-STOP  -- ASN1STOP  QCL-Info ::= SEQUENCE {  cell ServCellIndex OPTIONAL, -- Need R  bwp-Id BWP-Id OPTIONAL, -- Cond CSI-RS-Indicated  referenceSignal CHOICE {  csi-rs NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId,  ssb SSB-Index  },  qcl-Type ENUMERATED {typeA, typeB, typeC, typeD},  ...,  [[  additionalPCI-r17 AdditionalPCIIndex OPTIONAL -- Need R  --Editor’s note: Can be discussed if ASN1 overhead reasons should have another way to implement than using this extension.  --Editor’s note: Needed in Rel-15/16 TCI state for mTRP intercell and in Rel-17 TCI state for BM intercell  ]]  } |
| Ericsson | #1, #2, #5, #6 Agree.  #3 ? RNTI  #4 Disagree  #7 Up to RAN2 | On issue #4 we don’t have agreement on it. The halfFrameIndex is used to indicate to UE about the PRACH slot when SSB periodicity is 5ms. For providing SSB time domain position, the periodicity and SSB position in burst are sufficient.  On issue #5, to clarify the question from ZTE, it is the ssb-PositionsInBurst we meant as SSB transmission offset. |
| LG | #1: (Agree)  #2: (Agree)  #3: (Disagree)  #4: (Disagree)  #5: (Partially agree)  #6: (Disagree)  #7: (Agree) | #1 : We are fine with 7 unless there is a critical issue.  #2 : OK  #3 : Not necessary  #4 : Motivation is not clear and further discussion is needed. Does UE know this paramenter without explicit signaling after SSB measurment associated with additional PCI?  #5 : We are fine if majority supports.  #6 : Disagree. It was agreed to introduce new RRC signal to provide SSB information associated with additiaonal PCI. There is no relation with SSB-InfoNcell-r16  #7 : Agree. |
| Futurewei | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Partially agree  #4: Disagree  #5: Partially agree  #6: Ok but it’s for RAN2  #7: Disagree | #3 : For RNTI, does it assume the other cell may assign a different C-RNTI for the UE ? This seems to be a reasonable option but we want to understand the proposal better.  #4 : This requires further discussion and a new agreement.  #5 : Unclear about the offset part.  #7 : Seems not needed. |
| CMCC | #1, #2, #4, #5,#7 : Agree  #3 : Disagree  #6 : Disagree | #3：RNTI is not needed.  #6 : Support to use AdditionalPCIIndex configured in SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17. |
| ZTE2 | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Agree  #4: Agree  #5: Partially agree  #6: Disagree  #7: Agree | #3:  To answer the question from QC and OPPO: note that the number of CORESET pool indexes is 2 and the number of candidate PCIs can be more than 2, if the LTE-CRS rate matching pattern isn’t configured per PCI, it will cause large scheduling latency due to RRC reconfiguration of LTE-CRS rate matching pattern is needed when considering the PCI of one CORESET pool index is updated by MAC-CE. In addition, different PCIs may be associated with different ZP-CSI-RS pattern and PRB level pattern, so such rate matching pattern configured per PCI is also needed.  To answer the question from spreadtrum, DOCOMO, Samsung, Ericsson and Futurewei: the RNTI which at least includes C-RNTI is used to generate scrambling sequence for channels and it is allocated per cell. The UE is allocated with a new C-RNTI when PCI is switched in Rel-15/16. Now if the C-RNTI is shared by all candidate PCIs, the C-RNTI should be reserved in all cells of the all candidate PCIs, otherwise it can’t guarantee two UEs in one cell are allocated with different C-RNTIs. The C-RNTIs are allocated per PCI groups including all the candidate PCIs instead of per PCI. It needs more C-RNTIs to cover more UEs in all cells of all candidate PCIs. So the C-RNTI should be configured per PCI to avoid the above issue as what we have done in cell switching case in Rel-15/16. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Disagree  #4: Disagree  #5: Disagree  #6: Unclear  #7: Unclear | #3 : Not needed  #4/5 : No need to explicitly indicate these as the UE can obtain it from the configured Measurement Object  #6/7: Proposal unclear |
| vivo | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Disagree  #4: Agree  #5:  #6: Disagree  #7: Disagree | #5 : can be discussed  #6, #7 : up to RAN2 |
| Nokia/NSB | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Disagree  #4: Agree  #5: Ok to discuss.  #6: Unclear  #7: Disagree | #3: Rel-16 mDCI mTRP framework can be reused to indicate the additional rate matching patterns. Nothing else needed.  #6: need further information.  #7: not needed. |
| Xiaomi | #1: Agree  #2: Disagree  #3: Aagree  #4: Agree  #5: Agree  #6: Disagree  #7: Disagree | #1 : Accoding to the CR R2-2203032 in RAN2 117e meeting, the value of maxNrofAddionalPCI-r17 is FFS. And from RNA1 perspective, 7 is an acceptable vale of maxNrofAddionalPCI-r17 based on the discussion of the maximum number of additional RRC -configured PCIs.  # 2 and #7 : It is RAN2’s decision.  #3, # 4, and # 5 : It seems these three proposals are about other non-serving cell information. We are not sure whether all these information are needed or not, we can discuss them one by one. RNTI and halfFrameIndex  #6 : There is a conclusion that Rel-15/16 QCL rule between the source and target RS/channel for non-serving cell RS/channel is reused in mTRP inter-cell operation. And in Rel-15/16, SSB can not be used as an direct QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDSCH. Therefore, SSB from a serving cell associated with additional PCI can not be directly configured in QCL-info at least for PDSCH. |
| InterDigital | #1: Agree  #2: Agree  #3: Agree  #4: Agree  #5: Agree  #6: Not clear  #7: Disagree | For #7, there is no need to a new parameter, gNB should configure the UE properly. |
| Moderator | #1: Unanimous agreement  #2: Everyone except Xiaomi agrees with this item. Motivation of this proposal is to let RAN2 know the necessary correction. With this understanding I would like to check with Xiaomi whether it is acceptable.  #3: 5 companies agree, 4 companies partially agree (question on RNTI), 7 companies disagree  #4: 13 companies agree, 4 companies disagree  #5: 7 companies agree, 7 companies partially agree (question on SSB transmission offset), 2 companies disagree. I would like to check with Huawei/HiSilicon whether it is acceptable if “SSB transmission offset” is removed.  #6: Majority views are either “disagree” or “not clear”  #7: Majority views are "disagree"  Proposal 2.1:   * [The value maxNrofAddionalPCI-r17 is 7.](#_Toc95761913) * [Change the field name ssb-ToMeasure to ssb-PositionInBurst in SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17.](#_Toc95761914) * Add the SSB transmission power to SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17 | |
| QC | Support, but do we need to send LS to RAN2 (as they need to be captured in RAN2 spec)? | |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. And we think LS to RAN2 is needed. | |
| LG | Support | |
| Samsung | Fine with the FL’s proposal. As suggested by QC and DOCOMO, a LS to RAN2 could facilitate their design. | |
| Apple | Support and we think an LS is necessary. | |
| ZTE | Support | |
| Lenovo | Support. | |
| Xiaomi | #2: Thank Moderator’s explanation. It is acceptable for us now. | |
| Spreadtrum | Support | |
| CATT | Support. | |
| Ericsson | Support | |
| Futurewei | Support Proposal 2.1  Also we think the C-RNTI described in ZTE2 seems useful and suggest to further discuss it. | |
| Moderator | According to the comment above following offline agreement is proposed. @Futurewei, ZTE as the deadline to conclude RRC related issues is approaching, I would suggest to defer discussion to include C-RNTI. Thanks for understanding  Offline agreement  Proposal 2.1: following revisions on RRC are agreed. Send LS to RAN2   * [The value maxNrofAddionalPCI-r17 is 7.](#_Toc95761913) * [Change the field name ssb-ToMeasure to ssb-PositionInBurst in SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17.](#_Toc95761914) * Add the SSB transmission power to SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17 | |

* 1. Value ranges for X1, X2

Value ranges for X1 and X2 have been agreed in RAN1#106b-e with other values as FFS. One company proposed to extend the value ranges, hence following is proposed.

Proposal 2.2:

* + The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X1 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are the same as time domain positions and periodicity of the serving cell SSBs, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};
  + The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X2 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are different with time domain positions and periodicity of the serving cell SSBs, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | comments |
| Apple | OK |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| QC | Ok |
| OPPO | The condition should be consistent with the agreement for X2. |
| DOCOMO | OK for RRC configured values. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Samsung | It seems OK to extend the values |
| Ericsson | Support |
| LG | We are open to extend value ranges. |
| Futurewei | OK |
| CMCC | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| vivo | support |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok |
| Xiaomi | Fine with proposal 2.2. But, should this be discussed in Agenda 8.16.1, namely MIMO UE feature part? |
| InterDigital | OK  Since this is an extension of a previous agreements, it may be better to also re-iterate that   * Note: The two modes cannot be enabled simultaneously. |
| Moderator | Updated Proposal 2.2:   * + Case 1: The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X1 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are the same as time domain positions and periodicity of the serving cell SSBs, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};   + Case 2: The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X2 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs is not according to case 1, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};   @xiaomi, it is ok to make decision here and reflect in UE feature later  @InterDigital, the note is agreed in previous meeting, still valid here. |
| LG | We have a question for clarification. If value 0 is reported for Case 1, how can UE support inter-cell MTRP? From my understanding, if value 0 is reported for Case 1, UE has no choice but to report value 0 for Case 2 as well because Case 2 is more complicated than Case 1. Then, UE cannot support inter-cell MTRP because additional PCI cannot be configured at all. |
| Apple | Support |
| ZTE | Note that this proposal is relevant to UE capability reporting, we think one note is needed to clarify at least a non-zero value of case 1 or case 2 should be reported by the UE. Hence we suggest:  Updated Proposal 2.2:   * + Case 1: The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X1 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are the same as time domain positions and periodicity of the serving cell SSBs, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};   + Case 2: The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X2 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs is not according to case 1, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};   + Note: At least a non-zero candidate value of case 1 or case 2 should be reported by the UE. |
| NTT DOCOMO2 | @Xiaomi, LG, ZTE, I think here we’re discussing RRC configured values instead of UE feature reporting values.  We agree with LG that value of 0 should not be reported for case1 by UE, and case1 should be default cwe ase to be supported for inter-cell MTRP. But it does not mean the value of 0 for case1 cannot be configured by NW.  Assuming UE reports 1 for case1 and 1 for case2, it is still possible that the NW configures the 0 for case1 and 1 for case2 assuming this NW has case2 deployment.  Our understanding of the RRC configured candidate value is that, if UE reports X for a case, NW can configure {0, 1, …, X} for the case.  Hence, we think Mod’s version is okay. We do not support the note added by ZTE, which is not related to RRC configuration signaling, and should be discussed in UE feature. |
| OPPO | According to previous agreements, we think X1 and X2 are candidate values for UE capability reporting instead of RRC configurable values. In this case, this discussion may collide with the UE feature discussion in 8.16.1, e.g. whether 0 should be included in X1 and whether the note is needed is also being discussed in the UE feature. We think it is better not to discuss the same issue in two AI in parallel. |
| Lenovo | We share similar view with OPPO that this proposal only related with RRC configuration, X1 and X2 should be the candidate values for the UE capability report. Therefore, it should be discussed together with UE feature. |
| Xiaomi | @Moderator: Thanks. We are fine with the Updated Proposal 2.2. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| CATT | We share the similar view as DOCOMO. Support the Mod’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support Mod’s proposal. |
| Futurewei | Agree with DOCOMO and fine with the Mod’s proposal. It should be “~~is~~ are not according to case 1”. |
| Moderator | Thanks Futurewei for grammatical correction,  @Xiaomi, LG, ZTE, OPPO, as companies expressed this proposal is for gNB RRC configuration, hence I think it is fine to include 0 for both X1 and X2. This is also related to RRC value range, hence need to conclude within this week.  Updated Proposal 2.2:   * + Case 1: The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X1 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are the same as time domain positions and periodicity of the serving cell SSBs, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};   + Case 2: The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X2 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are not according to case 1, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7}; |
| OPPO | Before we agree on the proposal, we need to confirm that companies are in the same page first. In our understanding, the X1 and X2 are for UE capability reporting. 0 should not be here for X1 in this case, and it would be better to discuss it in UE feature. For RRC signaling, gNB can configure any value not exceeding the reported capability, which is up to RAN2 and not needed to be discussed here. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Mod’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | This is discussion for RRC parameter sent from network. So if network doesn’t configure this X1/X2 parameter, the default value is 0. The intension of the proposal is to agree on possible configuration values, and we can leave the signaling optimization work to RAN2. |
| Nokia, NSB | The UE should at least report either X1 > 0 or X2 > 0 to operate with inter-cell m-TRP operation. Not sure that is captured in the proposal 2.2. We shall delete candidate value 0 and discuss with the fully picture in the UE capability discussion. we are fine to agree with other values. |
| LG | We can support the proposal with following revision in order to avoid confusion with UE reporting value:  Updated Proposal 2.2: *For RRC configured value of X1 and X2,*   * + Case 1: The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X1 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are the same as time domain positions and periodicity of the serving cell SSBs, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};   + Case 2: The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X2 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are not according to case 1, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7}; |
| Moderator | Continue discuss over email |

* 1. Rate matching

Rate matching issues have been discussed for several meetings in past with one agreement in RAN1#104-e with 2 FFSs. Multiple companies discussed those FFSs and proposals are diverse. Based on proposals in contributions, following options are listed below, and proposed to down select in RAN1#108-e.

Proposal 2.3: down select one of the options in RAN1#108-e

Option1: Do not support additional rate matching behaviour for inter-cell multi-TRP operation.

Option2: PDSCH/PDCCH from serving cell is rate matched around SSB from serving cell associated with additional PCI. PDSCH/PDCCH from serving cell associated with additional PCI is rate matched around serving cell SSB.

Option3: PDSCH/PDCCH from the serving cell is not rate matched around SSB from serving cell associated with additional PCI. PDSCH/PDCCH from serving cell associated with additional PCI is not rate matched around serving cell SSB.

Option4: For each cell with additional PCI, LTE CRS pattern for rate matching can be configured.

Option5: PDSCH is rate matched around the SSB for L1-RSRP measurement in addition to those SSBs with same PCI.

Please provide your views/comments on the 5 options in table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| xxx |  |
| Apple | Support option 2 and option 4 |
| Spreadtrum | Support Option 4.  For option 4, in our understanding, it is one straightforward extension since we already has supported LTE CRS ratematching pattern per CORESETPOOLINDEX in Rel-16 M-DCI based M-TRP. |
| QC | Support Option 3. Isn’t Option 3 the agreed behavior already (given that the 2 previous FFS’s are not agreed). In other words, what is the difference between Option 1 and Option 3?  Also, in description of Option 3, “SSB from serving cell associated with additional PCI” is not clear. |
| OPPO | Support Option 1/3. |
| DOCOMO | Support Option 1/3/4.  For Option 4, the intension was to support RRC configuration of LTE CRS pattern per additional PCI, like #3 in Proposal 2.1. |
| ZTE | Support option 3 and option 4.  Regarding option 4, note that up to 7 non-serving cells has been supported and LTE-CRS is configured as cell-specific, LTE-CRS pattern should be taken into account. For the same reason, we think ZP-CSI-RS pattern and PRB level pattern should be configured additionally for each PCI. |
| LG | Support option 2 considering inter-cell nterference between SSB and PDSCH/PDCCH. |
| Futurewei | Support Option 3, and Option 1 seems also aligned with Option 3. |
| CMCC | Support 1,3,4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Option 1.  Option 3 can be considered if <<PDSCH/PDCCH from serving cell associated with additional PCI>> is revised as <<PDSCH/PDCCH from the serving cell but is associated (indirectly QCLed) with SSB with PCI different from the serving cell>>. |
| Vivo | Support option 2, however if there is no consensus then option 1 is default |
| Nokia, NSB | Support Option 1 and 3. Agree with QC. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer option 1, 3 |
| InterDigital | We are OK with option 4.  For Options 1/3, we have a similar view as Qualcomm. |
| Moderator | Option 1 and 3 are equivalent, if there is no consensus on option 2, 4, 5, then by default is option1.  6 companies expressed support of option 4. Let’s check whether option 4 is acceptable  Updated proposal 2.3: support following rate matching behaviour   * For each cell with additional PCI, LTE CRS pattern for rate matching can be configured. |
| QC | Do not support the Updated Proposal 2.3. Isn’t it the same as #3 in Section 2.1, which is not supported by at least 7 companies? |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support updated proposal 2.3.  @QC, the updated proposal 2.3 is not the same as #3 in Section 2.1. And some companies do not support #3 in Section 2.1 because of RNTI part, not because of rate matching part. |
| LG | We have similar question with QC. Does the updated proposal mean to introduce new RRC signaling for multiple LTE CRS patterns as additional non-serving cell information? Rel-16 already supports to configure two LTE CRS patterns based on CORESETPoolIndex, so we can use it for inter-cell LTE CRS rate matching without enhancement. |
| Apple | Support the updated proposal 2.3. |
| ZTE | Support  @QC, LG, note that the number of CORESET pool indexes is 2 and the number of candidate PCIs can be more than 2, if the LTE-CRS rate matching pattern isn’t configured per PCI, it will cause large scheduling latency due to RRC reconfiguration of LTE-CRS rate matching pattern is needed when considering the PCI of one CORESET pool index is updated by MAC-CE.  In addition, we think PRB symbol level and RE level rate matching pattern including rateMatchPatternToAddModList, rateMatchPatternGroup1, rateMatchPatternGroup2, zp-CSI-RS-ResourceToAddModList, aperiodic-ZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetsToAddModList and sp-ZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetsToAddModList should be configured per PCI. So we suggest  *Proposal 2.3-1*  *For each cell with additional PCI, PRB symbol level and RE level rate matching pattern can be configured.*   * *The PRB symbol level rate matching pattern includes rateMatchPatternToAddModList, rateMatchPatternGroup1, rateMatchPatternGroup2* * *The RE level rate matching pattern includes zp-CSI-RS-ResourceToAddModList, aperiodic-ZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetsToAddModList and sp-ZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetsToAddModList* |
| OPPO | We share similar view as QC. If one PCI is associated with one LTE CRS pattern in Rel-17, and one value of CORESETPoolindex is also associated with one LTE CRS pattern as in Rel-16, which pattern should UE use for mDCI based mTRP? Will both patterns be applied simultaneously? |
| Lenovo | Rel-16 has support to configure LTE CRS pattern for different CORESETPoolIndex. When per-PCI LTE CRS pattern is configured, if the LTE CRS pattern associated with CORESETPoolIndex value associated with the indicated TCI state is different from the LTE CRS pattern addociated with the PCI associated with the indicated TCI state, which one should be used or both are used for UE to perform rate matching? |
| Spreadtrum | Support the updated proposal.  Our understanding is that the updated proposal not intend to support LTE CRS pattern per PCI. It just say to support LTE CRS pattern configured for one cell with additional PCI.  We also support option3. |
| Ericsson | OK to support. We can also accept option 1. |
| Futurewei | We accept Option 1 but we are open to further discuss the proposal. Do the proponents of the proposal mean that the LTE CRS pattern per PCI can/may be configured but not necessarily always configured? Whether it is configured / not configured is decided by gNB or specified in the standards? Please clarify. |
| ZTE2 | Support the update proposal 2.3  @OPPO,Lenovo, if a first LTE-CRS pattern is configured for an CORESET pool index and a second LTE-CRS pattern is configured for an PCI of the same CORESET pool index, the LTE-CRS pattern used for rate matching for the CORESET pool index should be replaced with the second LTE-CRS pattern because the first LTE-CRS pattern just is associated with a TRP of serving cell PCI or only one additional PCI. It supports LTE-CRS pattern is updated after PCI is updated for the CORESET pool index.  @Futurewei, Yes. |
| Moderator | As LG explained “Rel-16 already supports to configure two LTE CRS patterns based on CORESETPoolIndex, so we can use it for inter-cell LTE CRS rate matching without enhancement.” Hence updated proposal 2.3 seems not needed. In this case the my proposal is to agree on option1.  Updated proposal2.3  Option1: Do not support additional rate matching behaviour for inter-cell multi-TRP operation. |
| Apple | In our view, R16’s two LTE CRS patterns are not enough, since now we support 7 additional PCI. Without any enhancement, it means the 7 additional PCIs should share the same LTE CRS pattern. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with Apple.  In NW deployment, it is highly possible that the additional PCIs cells are not co-located so that different LTE CRS patterns should be considered when PDSCH is transmitted from different PCI cells. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Mod’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | This should be a conclusion. |
| ZTE | Agree with the comment from Apple. It leads the PCI associated a CORESETPoolIndex can be updated by MAC-CE, but the LTE-CRS pattern doesn’t match the PCI. The PDSCH is rate matched around wrong LTE-CRS pattern unless using RRC reconfiguration. It leads MAC-CE updating PCI doesn’t work well.  In addition, the 7 additional PCIs are associated with 7 neighboring cells, and these CRS pattern should be different to avoid interference from each other. |
| QC | We do not think optimizations specific to DSS is needed at this point for this agenda item. DSS has its own agenda item in both Rel-17 and Rel-18. |
| Futurewei | Support the updated proposal 2.3 with Option 1.  It seems to us that the current mechanism can already work; it just does not support dynamic switching of additional cells with different LTE CRS patterns (but slower switching for different patterns or dynamic switching with the same pattern is still well supported). Given the additional work needed and it’s already the end of the release, we prefer Option 1. |
| Moderator | Conclusion:   * Do not support additional rate matching behaviour for inter-cell multi-TRP operation. |
| ZTE | Support Option 4.  Option 4 doesn’t need too much specification effort and it is very beneficial to guarantee the Rel-17 inter-cell function suitable more scenarios and to guarantee resource efficiency. |

* 1. QCL related

Two contributions discussed QCL related issues, #1 is more of clarification where as #2 has been discussed in previous meetings. Please indicate whether you agree/disagree with the issues and provide comments in the table, if any.

#1: If SSB collides with DL signals associated with the same PCI, gNB should ensure the DL signals and SSB are QCLed with QCL-TypeD.

#2: TP for 38.214:

If the UE is configured with [TCI-State]s with [tci-StateId\_r17], the reference RS may additionally be an SS/PBCH block associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell, or a CSI-RS QCLed with an SS/PBCH block associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell.

#3: for TS 38.214

-- unchanged part omitted—

*If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block associated with the same PCI in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with ‘typeD’, if ‘typeD’ is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.*

--unchanged part omitted—

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company |  | Comments (if any) |
| Apple | #1 : Agree  #2 : Disagree  #3 : Agree | #1 and #3 seem to be the same proposal  #2 : We think current spec only covers this configuration. |
| Spreadtrum | #1 : Agree  #2 : Disagree  #3 : Agree | #2 : We only agreed that SS/PBCH block associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell can be as QCL source. |
| QC | #1 (and 3): Ok  #2: Disagree | #2: We are not sure why Rel-17 unified TCI is discussed in this AI. |
| OPPO | #1 : Agree  #2 : Disagree  #3 : Agree | #2 : We think the TP is edundant. |
| DOCOMO | #1 : Agree  #2 : Disagree  #3 : Agree | #2 : Not needed. |
| ZTE | #1 : Partially agree  #2 : Agree  #3 : Agree | #1 : We agree with it in principle, but the condition of the collision should be further clarified. Hence we suggest:  If SSB collides with DL signals associated with the same PCI in same OFDM symbol(s), gNB should ensure the DL signals and SSB are QCLed with QCL-TypeD. |
| Samsung | #1 (3) : Redundant  #2 : Disagree | #1 (3) : We think it is redundant. Nothing related to different PCIs or AdditionalPCIInfo is in the corresponding texts in 214. |
| LG | #1 : Agree  #2 : Disagree  #3 : Agree | #2 : it can be supported without TP by using regacy QCL chain. |
| Futurewei | #1 : Ok but not needed  #2 : Agree  #3 : Ok but not needed | #2 is needed for higher flexibility, otherwise the additional cell cannot configure CSI-RS as the reference RS of an inter-cell SRS. |
| CMCC | #1 : Agree  #3 : Agree | #2 : It seems that companies have the following two different understandings.  Alt1 : a CSI-RS QCLed with an SS/PBCH block associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell can be supported by current spec.  Alt2 : a CSI-RS QCLed with an SS/PBCH block associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell cannot be as QCL source.  Suggest to check which understanding is correct. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | #1/3 : Question  #2 : Disagree | #1/3: The meaning of « associated with the same PCI » is unclear and needs to be clarified.  #2: The quoted specs seems related to R17 unified TCI in 8.1.1 which is not related to inter-cell mTRP in 8.1.2.2 (designed based on R15/16 TCI framework). |
| Vivo | #1 :  #2 : disagree  #3 : | #1, #3 : can be discussed |
| Nokia, NSB | #1: (Disagree)  #2: (Disagree)  #3: (Agree) | #1 statement is very generic.  #2 is not needed for mTRP inter-cell operation. |
| Xiaomi | #1 : Agree  #2 : Agree  #3 : Agree | #2 : We have reached an agreement about reusing Rel-15/16 QCL rule between the source and target RS/channel for non-serving cell RS/channel in mTRP inter-cell operation. Then, SSB can not be used as an direct QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDSCH. Namely, SSB associated with a PCI different from that of serving cell can only be used as an indirect QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDSCH, in which case there exists at least one other source signal on the QCL chain between the SSB and the PDSCH, and this ‘other source signal’ is CSI-RS. Accordingly, we prefer to support #2. |
| InterDigital | #1/3 : Not needed | Similar view as Samsung. |
| Moderator | #1, #3 : majority of companie are fine however 3 companies expressed that although agree in principle but not needed.  #2 : 3 comapnies agree and 10 companies disagree,  I would like to check whether TP along #3 is acceptable, wording can be further discussed.  -- unchanged part omitted—  *If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block associated with the same PCI in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with ‘typeD’, if ‘typeD’ is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.*  --unchanged part omitted— | |
| QC | Ok with the TP. Given that we are discussing this part, do we also need the same description for “*Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block associated with the same PCI,*”?  In case of different PCIs, we do not do PDSCH rate matching. Hence, DMRS may collide with SSB. | |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK with the TP. And OK with QC’s comment. | |
| Samsung | It is not essential. Not sure why we need the TP as inter-cell is not in the context. | |
| Apple | Support the TP. | |
| ZTE | OK with the TP. And OK with QC’s comment. | |
| OPPO | Support the TP.  @Samsung: Without this TP, PDSCH from serving cell cannot be transmitted in the same symbol as neighboring cell SSB, since they are not QCLed. That is not consistent with previous agreement, where serving cell PDSCH is not rate-matched by neighboring cell SSB. | |
| Lenovo | Support the TP. | |
| Spreadtrum | Support, also fine with QC’s revision. | |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the TP and the additional TP proposed by QC. | |
| Futurewei | Do we need to define what it means by “associated with the same PCI”? Or all companies are already clear about it? For SSB and RS QCLed with a SSB, they are clearly associated with the PCI. But for other RS not (directly) QCLed with a SSB, how does one determine if it is associated with the PCI? Or maybe it should be specified as direct or indirect QCL relation with the same PCI? Please clarify.  For #2, we agree with Xiaomi and our understanding is Alt 1 described in CMCC. | |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments, it seems majority is fine with the TP.  @Samsung, do you still have strong concern?  @Futurewei, good point, would like to check with group on the meaning of “associated with the same PCI”.  Updated TP#3  -- unchanged part omitted—  *If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block associated with the same PCI in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with ‘typeD’, if ‘typeD’ is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block associated with the same PCI, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.*  --unchanged part omitted— | |
| Samsung | Thanks OPPO for the explanation, we are fine with the restriction. Some clarifications seem needed first. From our understanding, the association is through SSB. | |
| OPPO | Regarding the comment from Futurewei, our understanding is that if the indicated TCI state for a PDSCH is associated with additional PCI, the PDSCH is associated with the PCI; Otherwise, the PDSCH is associated with the serving cell PCI. Hope companies have common understanding. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are confused by the description of “associated with the same PCI”. In our view, from UE perspective, all PDSCH are from serving cell, so thereby associated with serving cell PCI. With inter-cell mTRP, some PDSCH may be indirectly QCLed to SSB with PCI different from serving cell. We suggest clarifying the meaning of “associated with the same PCI” first. | |
| Ericsson | Support. | |
| Nokia, NSB | OK | |
| OPPO1 | Considering the concern from Furturewei and Huawei, may I propose the following wording:  Updated TP#3  -- unchanged part omitted—  *If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block in the same OFDM symbol(s), and the indicated TCI state for the PDSCH and the SS/PBCH block are associated with the same PCI, then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with ‘typeD’, if ‘typeD’ is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.*  --unchanged part omitted—  It should be noticed that the association between TCI state and PCI has been specified in 5.1.5 of 38.214. | |
| Futurewei | @OPPO: Thank you. We could not find the exact description of the association between PDSCH TCI state and PCI in 5.1.5 of 38.214. Could you please copy/paste the excerpt? | |
| Moderator | How about following revision, does it make clear?  Updated TP#3  -- unchanged part omitted—  *If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block in the same OFDM symbol(s), and the PDSCH is quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block with same PCI, then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with ‘typeD’, if ‘typeD’ is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.*  --unchanged part omitted— | |
| QC | As mentioned before, similar clarification is needed for “Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block”, which seems to be missing from the latest TP. | |
| Moderator | Thanks QC for reminder again, it was unintentional mistake, please find update below  Updated TP#3  -- unchanged part omitted—  *If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block in the same OFDM symbol(s), and the PDSCH is quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block with same PCI, then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with ‘typeD’, if ‘typeD’ is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block, and the PDSCH is quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block with same PCI, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.*  --unchanged part omitted— | |
| OPPO | @Futurewei, I realize that the association in 5.1.5 below is applied only when mDCI based mTRP is configured, which may lead to NBC issue for other cases. Please find a updated proposal below.  5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location  -----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------  If the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI] and with PDCCH-Config that contains two different values of coresetPoolIndex in ControlResourceSet, the UE receives an activation command, as described in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to 8 TCI states to the codepoints of the DCI field ‘Transmission Configuration Indication’ in one CC/DL BWP. When a set of TCI state IDs are activated for a CORESETPoolIndex, the activated TCI states corresponding to one CORESETPoolIndex can be associated with one physical cell ID and activated TCI states corresponding to another coresetPoolIndex can be associated with another physical cell ID.  -----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------  @Moderator, according to current 38.214, a Rel-15 PDSCH may not be (directly) QCLed to a SSB. Then there maybe NBC issue.  Please find a update version, and hope it is acceptable to companies:  Proposed updated TP#3:  -- unchanged part omitted—  *If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with ‘typeD’, if ‘typeD’ is applicable, except when the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI] and the indicated TCI state for the PDSCH and the SS/PBCH block are associated with different PCIs. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block except when the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI] and the indicated TCI state for the PDSCH and the SS/PBCH block are associated with different PCI, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.*  --unchanged part omitted— | |
| ZTE | Agree with the latest updated TP#3 from Moderator | |
| Samsung | We are fine with the restriction, but over the discussions the TPs have become less straightforward. The latest TP#3 from FL could be misinterpreted as direct QCL. So we are fine with the original TP if that is the intention (and to avoid repeated discussions about QCL rule/association with PCI etc.).  Updated TP#3  -- unchanged part omitted—  *If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block associated with the same PCI in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with ‘typeD’, if ‘typeD’ is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block associated with the same PCI, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.*  --unchanged part omitted— | |
| Futurewei | We still feel the TP needs further discussions, related to 1) Rx beams and 2) the meaning of “associated with a PCI”.   1. The TP seems to suggest that the UE is allowed to receive DMRS 1 QCLed Type D with SSB 1 in the same OFDM symbol as SSB2, even if the SSB 1 Rx beam is different from SSB 2 Rx beam. Then the UE has to be able to form 2 beams at the same time. Is this the correct understanding? If yes, then the UE can also receive DMRS 2 and SSB 1 in the same symbol in which the DMRS 2 is not an inter-cell DMRS but is not QCLed Type D with the SSB 1. So please further clarify the intention of this TP. 2. Regarding the meaning of “associated with a PCI”:   The Mod’s suggestion seems to be limited to only the case PDSCH directly QCLed with a SSB, as pointed out by OPPO.  For OPPO’s suggestion, we are still not too clear about what “*the indicated TCI state for the PDSCH and the SS/PBCH block are associated with different PCIs*” means. In our view, the “association” should be accurately defined, which should include both direct and indirect QCL relations. We note that even the spec text in 5.1.5. of 214 quoted by OPPO for coresetPoolIndexes also has the same issue and should also be corrected.  Proposed updated TP#3:  -- unchanged part omitted—  If the UE is configured with [*NumberOfAdditionalPCI*] and with *PDCCH-Config* that contains two different values of *coresetPoolIndex* in *ControlResourceSet*, the UE receives an activation command for CORESET associated with each *coresetPoolIndex*, as described in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to 8 TCI states to the codepoints of the DCI field *'Transmission Configuration Indication'* in one CC/DL BWP. When a set of TCI state IDs are activated for a *coresetPoolIndex*, the activated TCI states corresponding to one *coresetPoolIndex* can be associated with one physical cell ID and activated TCI states corresponding to another *coresetPoolIndex* can be associated with another physical cell ID, in which a TCI state being associated with a physical cell ID means that the QCL source RS of the TCI state is a SS/PBCH block associated with the physical cell ID or is quasi co-located with a SS/PBCH block associated with the physical cell ID.  …  *If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with ‘typeD’, if ‘typeD’ is applicable, except when the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI] and the SS/PBCH block is not the QCL source RS of the indicated TCI state for the DM-RS for the PDSCH or the SS/PBCH block is not the QCL source RS of the QCL source RS of the indicated TCI state for the DM-RS for the PDSCH. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block except when the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI] and the SS/PBCH block is not the QCL source RS of the indicated TCI state for the DMRS or the SS/PBCH block is not the QCL source RS of the QCL source RS of the indicated TCI state for the DMRS, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.*  --unchanged part omitted—  We are also open to other suggestions that can clearly express the intention. | |

* 1. CSS to monitor

Several contributions proposed to exclude Type2 CSS in a CORESET from monitoring when the active TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell PCI. Hence, following is proposed.

Proposal 2.5:

* UE is not required to monitor a Type2 CSS in a CORESET when the active TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell PCI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | OK. To be aligned with agreement in 8.1.1. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| QC | Ok. |
| OPPO | Support. |
| DOCOMO | Support. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Samsung | OK to the proposal. |
| LG | OK to the proposal. |
| Futurewei | OK |
| CMCC | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| vivo | support |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Moderator | There is unanimous support for proposal 2.5  Offline agreement   * UE is not required to monitor a Type2 CSS in a CORESET when the active TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell PCI. |

* 1. UL transmission

Whether to support clarifying of UL channel/signal toward the serving cell associated with additional PCI has been discussed in past meetings without reaching consensus. Another issue of UL transmission in serving cell on the symbols where SSB from the serving cell associated with additional PCI is being transmitted was discussed, also in Rel-17 coverage enhancement agenda, in past RAN1 meetings. Two different issues are discussed in the contributions submitted in this meeting. Please indicate whether you agree/disagree with issue#1 and issue#2, and provide comments in the table, if any.

Issue#1 : the issue of configuring SSB associated with additional PCI as QCL source or spatial relation for UL signal/channel has been discussed in past several meeting. There are 3 contributions proposing followings.

1. Support UL transmission between UE and TRP associated with non-serving cell PCI.
   * Xiaomi
2. Enhancements related to spatial relation are needed to support UL transmission between UE and TRP associated with non-serving cell PCI.
   * Xiaomi
3. SSB from a non-serving cell can be configured as the spatial relation and PL-RS for PUCCH resources and SRS resources.
   * Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
4. Support to use non-serving cell SSB for mobility measurement as the PL-RS for uplink transmission.
   * ZTE

Issue#2 : the issue of UL signal/channel transmission in serving cell on symbols overlapping with SSB from the cell associated with additional PCI has been discussed in previous meetings, and an related issue of available slot determination was discussed in coverage enhancement agenda. Based on contributions submitted in this meeting, following options are listed for down selection in RAN1#108-e.

Option 1: UL signal transmission is not impacted by SSB from cell associated with additional PCI. UE is not expected to receive SSB from cell associated with additional PCI on UL symbol.

Option 2: UE does not transmit UL channel/RS overlapping with SS/PBCH blocks indicated in the union of ssb-PositionsInBurst for the serving cell and the configured ssb-PositionsInBurst associated with the active additional PCI.

Option 3: The UE does not transmit any UL signal/channel if

* + - The SSB is used as a measurement resource by the UE, or
    - The SSB is associated with the active PCI (associated with one or more active TCI states) and the UL signal/channel is associated with the same PCI
      * Association of UL signal/channel with a PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel

Option 4: The UE can only transmit UL signal/channel associated with the serving cell PCI, and does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the active additional PCI.

* + - Association of UL signal/channel with the serving cell PCI or the active additional PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel.

Please provide your views/comments in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company |  | Comments (if any) |
| Apple | #1 : Disagree the issue  #2 : Support Option 3 | #1 : This has been discussed multiple times and it does not look to be a valid issue in maintenance phase  #2 : We support option 3 in principle, but we think how to count ‘SSB is used as a measurement resource by the UE’ could be FFS |
| Spreadtrum | Issue#1 : Disagree  Issue#2 : Support option 3 | Issue #2 : We support option 3 in principle. But we think that   * The first bullet should be FFS or deleted. We think it even belongs to single TRP issue. * The sub-bullet of 2nd bullet needs to be clarified. We have agreed that the association between PDCCH/PDSCH and PCI depends on TCI state. We are not clear that why the association between UL channels and PCI could not depend on TCI state/spatial information, but bases on PL RS. |
| QC | #1: Support.  #2: Support Option 3 or modified Option 2 | #2: Our first preference is Option 3, which is more efficient. Our second preference is modified Option 2 below (given that UE may do measurements also on the non-active PCIs):  Modified Option 2: UE does not transmit UL channel/RS overlapping with SS/PBCH blocks indicated in the union of ssb-PositionsInBurst for the serving cell and the configured ssb-PositionsInBurst associated with ~~the active~~ additional PCI(s).  Option 1 clearly does not work as explained in our Tdoc. Option 4 does not make sense for multi-DCI based mTRP in which UL can be transmitted to any of the TRPs. |
| OPPO | #1 : Disagree  #2 : Support Option 1 | Issue#2 :  For Option 2, it is not justified that neighboring cell SSB should have higher priority than UL signal of serving cell considering the UL performance.  For Option 3/4, we don’t think it is valid. It is difficult to associate UL signal with a PCI via pathloss RS of the UL signal. When SRI is not included in DCI or SRI-PUSCH-power-control not configured, the default pathloss RS is the same (the first configured pathloss RS) for PUSCH/PUCCH associated with different values of *CORESETPoolindex*. A pathloss RS cannot be associated with different PCIs. Without enhancement for spatial relation and uplink power control, the feasibility of the options is very low. |
| DOCOMO | #1: Support.  #2: Support Option 3 | #1 : support.  #2 : support. Support Option 3 in principle. |
| ZTE | #1: Support Option c) and d)  #2: Partially support Option 4 | Issue#2 : Agree with option 4 with the following elaborations.  Regarding option 1, the UE behavior is unclear in the case where the SSB of an additional PCI and UL signal/channels of the same additional PCI are in same OFDM symbol.  Regarding option 2 and 3, an SSB of the additional PCI has higher priority than the UL signal/channels of the serving cell. It leads to unnecessary low resource efficiency compared with Rel-15. The UE behavior is also unnecessary different compared with Rel-15 UE.  Regarding option 4, the UL signal/channels of serving cell has higher priority than SSB of the additional PCI. It ensure same UE behavior and same efficiency compared with Rel-15. In addition, the UE behavior is clear in the case where the SSB of an additional PCI and UL signal/channels of the same additional PCI are in same OFDM symbol. The SSB of the addition PCI has higher priority than UL signals/channels of the same additional PCI. It makes sure that the UE can measure/track the SSB of the addition PCI in time. |
| Samsung | #1: Disagree  #2: Prefer Option 4 | #2 : Higher priority of UL signals/channels associated with the serving cell PCI is preferred. In addition, share similar understandings that further discussions on the association with PL-RS are needed. |
| Ericsson | #1: Support |  |
| LG | Issue#1: Disagree  Issue#2: Question for Option 3/4 | Issue#1 : CSIRS with virtual cell ID can be used as spatial relation RS to support MTRP UL transmission. Therefore, additional enhancement is not needed.  Issue#2 : Further discussion is needed in this meeting  Option2 : Droppinig UL signal due to SSB associated with I PCI auses UL performance loss.  Option3 and 4 : In Option3 and 4, UE can only transmit UL signal/channel associated with the serving cell PCI, and does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the active additional PCI. However, it is not clear to us why this restriction is needed. From our understanding, if serving cell with the additional PCI does not support full duplex, it will avoid scheduling the UL signal in the SSB symbols. Also, if serving cell with the additional PCI supports full duplex, then it can schedule UL signal and UE can transmit UL signal associated with the additional PCI. |
| Futurewei | #1 : Too late  #2 : Option 4 | We have proposed to discuss inter-cell UL issues from the I of the WI but even the UL TA was not agreed to be considered in this WI. We think it is way too late to discuss UL at this stage as there can be quite some details and many options. For R17 we think only the most limiting UL transmission can be supported, which is Option 4. |
| CMCC | Issue#1: Support  Issue#2 :Support Option 1 | Issue#2 : We think UL performance is also important. We do not think an SSB of the additional PCI should have higher priority than the UL signal/channels of the serving cell. |
| ZTE2 | #1: Support Option c) and d)  #2: Partially support Option 4 | Issue#2 : @ LG  Thanks for your comments. First, it is very hard for a UE to support full duplex, so the specific defines the priority between the SSB and UL channels/signals for serving cell in Rel-15. Second, in the non full duplex scenario, avoiding scheduling the UL signal in the SSB symbols means that any UL signal isn’t transmitted in the SSB symbols of additional PCI. It leads unnecessary low resource efficiency, different UE behaviors and low scheduling flexibility compared with Rel-15/Rel16 when the UL signals/channels are from serving cell. In addition, it is difficult and low scheduling flexible to avoid this scheduling especially for CG type I. So we need to define the priority among UL channels/signals of serving cell, SSB of additional PCIs and UL channels/signals of the additional PCIs as what is done in Option 4.  @ CMCC, thanks for your comments, we agree with you that an SSB of the additional PCI shouldn’t have higher priority than the UL signal/channels of the serving cell. So option 2 and 3 should be excluded. In addition, we think the SSB of the additional PCI should have higher priority than the UL channels/signals of the additional PCI to ensure the UE measure/track SSB without interruption from lower priority signals/channels. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Issue #1: Disagree  Issue #2: Option 1 or 4 | Issue #2 can be handled by NW implementation. |
| Vivo | Issue #1 : agree  Issue #2 : agree | Issue #1 : if there is consensus among the group, we can support  Issue#2 : all the options can be discussed |
| Nokia, NSB | Issue #1 : Agree to discuss.  Issue #2 : Option 2. | On Issue #2, ok with QC revision. |
| Xiaomi | #1: Support  #2: Support option 3 | #1 : We think that UL transmission between UE and TRP associated with non-serving cell PCI should be supported at least for the reason of reusing the separate HARQ-ACK feedback mechanism. And then, whether some necessary enhancements related to spatial relation are needed can be further discuss. |
| InterDigital | #1: Disagree  #2: Option 4 | #1: Seems to be out of the scope for R17.  #2: Prefer Option 4, UL transmission to other cells with active additional PCI is not in the scope. |
| Moderator | Issue#1: 8 companies agree to support or discuss, 8 companies disagree. This issue has been discussed for many times in past and the situation hasn’t changed.  Issue#2: everyone agrees to address this issue, following is the situation on support for different options.  Option1: 4 companies support  Option2: 3 companies support  Option3: 7 companies support  Option4: 7 companies support  Given there are more companies supporting option 3 or 4, I would suggest to focus on these 2 options in second round of discussion.  Further discuss and down select between following options, wording can be fine tuned.  Option 3: The UE does not transmit any UL signal/channel if   * + - The SSB is used as a measurement resource by the UE, or     - The SSB is associated with the active PCI (associated with one or more active TCI states) and the UL signal/channel is associated with the same PCI       * Association of UL signal/channel with a PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel   Option 4: The UE can only transmit UL signal/channel associated with the serving cell PCI, and does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the active additional PCI.   * + - Association of UL signal/channel with the serving cell PCI or the active additional PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel. | |
| QC | Support Option 3 or modified Option 2 mentioned before. How can UE transmit separate HARQ-Ack in Option 4 for multi-DCI? How out-of-order PUSCH can be supported in Option 4 for multi-DCI? | |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Option 3. Agree with QC’s comment. | |
| LG | Our 1st preference is Option 1 but we are open for the QC’s modified Option 2 or Option 4.  Question on second bullet for Option 3: is UL transmission still possible for the collision between SSB and UL signal associated with different PCI? What if UL signal with serving cell PCI collides with SSB associated with active additional PCI or vice versa? | |
| Samsung | We prefer Option 4. | |
| Apple | It seems option 3 and 4 can be similar, which depends on the exact definition of “SSB used as a measurement resource” in option 3 and “active additional PCI” in option 4. | |
| ZTE | Support option 4 with the following change  Option 4: In the OFDM symbol of an SSB of an active additional PCI, I UE can only transmit UL signal/channel associated with the serving cell PCI, and does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the same active additional PCI.   * + - Association of UL signal/channel with the serving cell PCI or the active additional PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel.   @QC and NTT DOCOMO, your concern is not relevant to this issue, because either separate feedback or out-of-order PUSCH still can be transmitted on the UL signals/channels associated with the active addition PCI in OFDM symbol(s) without the SSB of the active additional PCI.  @Apple, one important difference between option 3 and option 4 is that the UL signals/channels of serving cell can be transmitted in the OFDM symbol of the SSB of the activated PCI in option 4, but it is not supported in option 3 | |
| Lenovo | We support option 3.  More clarification is needed on the association between UL signal/channel with the PCI, does it implied that SSB associated with additional PCI can be configured as the PL-RS or the as the source QCL RS of the PL-RS for the UL signal/channel? | |
| CATT | Support option 4. | |
| Ericsson | There’s major difference between option 3 and option 4. Option 3 support UL transmission associated with additional PCI, Option 4 doesn’t. If nothing gets agreed, the outcome is option 1. We are OK with option 3, can also accept option 1. | |
| Futurewei | Support Option 4.  Option 3 and Option 4 seem to be about different issues. We are not sure why they are considered together. Option 4 does not seem to be relevant to “Issue#2 : the issue of UL signal/channel transmission in serving cell on symbols overlapping with SSB from the cell associated with additional PCI”, whereas Option 3 is about Issue#2. Please clarify.  Also Option 3 is not clear. Shouldn’t it say something like “UE does not transmit any UL signal/channel on a symbol overlapping with a SSB if …”? As of now we cannot understand Option 3. | |
| ZTE2 | If the first condition ‘The SSB is used as a measurement resource by the UE’ in option 3 is deleted, the option 3 and option 4 is same in principle. The first condition should be deleted because the measured SSB is RRC configured. The gNB may configure a large measured SSB set to avoid beam failure and RRC reconfiguration. The measured SSB can includes SB of up to 7 PCIs. Not all of the measured SSB has high received energy at the UE side. If any UL channels/signals are not transmitted in OFDM symbols of all these measured SSBs, it leads low scheduling flexibility and low resource efficiency. So we try to take following option 5 as a way forward which merge the Option 3 and Option 4.  Option 5: In the OFDM symbol of an SSB associated with one or more active TCI states of an PCI, the UE does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the same PCI.   * + - Association of UL signal/channel with a PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel | |
| Moderator | Current situation of support for option3 and 4:  Option3: 4 companies  Option4: 5 companies  Is this proposal from ZTE acceptable, if we cannot reach consensus then the outcome is option 1.  Option 5: In the OFDM symbol of an SSB associated with one or more active TCI states of an PCI, the UE does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the same PCI.   * + - Association of UL signal/channel with a PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel | |
| Apple | It seems such operation should consider SSB configured for L1-RSRP measurement as well.  In addition, we do not have full duplex UE, so our understanding is that UE should not transmit any uplink signal, right?  Last, it seems this should not be defined only in symbol level, usually for DL and UL, there should be a gap. Maybe we can define it in slot level.  So we suggest the following change.  In the slot with ~~OFDM symbol of~~ an SSB associated with one or more active TCI states of an additional PCI or SSB configured for L1-RSRP measurement or SSB from serving cell, the UE does not transmit UL signal/channel ~~associated with the same PCI~~.   * + - ~~Association of UL signal/channel with a PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel~~ | |
| OPPO | For Option 5, we have two comments:   * In the OFDM symbol of an SSB associated with additional PCI, can UE transmit UL signal associated with serving cell PCI? If yes, how can UE without full duplex receive the SSB? * When SRI is not included in DCI or SRI-PUSCH-power-control not configured, the default pathloss RS is the same (the first configured pathloss RS) for PUSCH/PUCCH associated with different values of CORESETPoolindex. How can the pathloss RS associate with different PCIs in this case?   For Option 6, the UL performance loss should be considered.  We think option 1 is a better solution and gNB should avoid UE to measure SSB in a UL symbol via scheduling implementation. | |
| CMCC | For the description of issue#2, it says “the issue of UL signal/channel transmission in serving cell on symbols overlapping with SSB from the cell associated with additional PCI”, hence we think “UL signal transmission” in option 1 means UL signal transmission in serving cell. If so, option 1 is the same as option 4. But it seems that some companies are discussing the issue of UL signal/channel transmission associated with additional PCI. We hope the Mod could clarify the scope of issue 2. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Option 4, or fallback to Option 1. | |
| Ericsson | The discussion is rolling on but not converge. We are fine with option 5 proposed by ZTE, and can accept option 1. | |
| Nokia,NSB | Similar view as E///. | |
| LG | From my understanding, in Option 5, UE can transmit UL signal associated with additional PCI in SSB symbols associated with serving cell PCI. However, in that case, UE may have trouble in RLM monitoring and sync tracking, which is based on SSB associated with serving cell PCI. If this understanding is correct, we cannot support Option 5. | |
| ZTE | Support Option 5  @Apple, the granularity should be symbol level instead of slot level. It just solves the collision between SSB and UL channels/signals. It doesn’t cause additional switching between DL and UL. For the SSB configured for L1-RSRP measurement should be discussed in AI 8.1.1  @OPPO  For your first question, actually, the Option 1 is captured by Option 5 if UL channels/signals in Option 1 is associated with serving cell PCI. Option 5 just specify the UL channels/signals of the same PCI isn’t transmitted, where other UL channels/signals of the different PCIs have no restriction. If the gNB schedules UL channels/signals of serving cell PCI in an SSB symbol of an additional PCI, the UE should transmit the UL channels/signals of serving cell PCI. Whether the UE receives the SSB of the additional PCI depends on UE capability of full duplex. The UE doesn’t receive the SSB when the UE doesn’t support duplex. The UE can receive the SSB when the UE supports full duplex. In addition, most/all UEs has no full duplex capability.  For your second question, if the PCI of UL channels/signals cannot be known by the UE, the default serving cell PCI can be used. The way by avoiding configuring UL channels/signals in SSB symbol by scheduling implementation is difficulty and inefficient, especially for period UL channels/signals.  @ LG, thank you for providing an important scenario, so we update Option 5 as following.  Option 5: In the OFDM symbol of an SSB associated with one or more active TCI states of an PCI, the UE does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the same PCI. In the OFDM symbol of an SSB of an serving cell PCI, the UE doesn’t transmit any UL signal/channel.   * + - Association of UL signal/channel with a PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel | |
| OPPO1 | We need to clarify that we are not proposing “avoiding configuring UL channels/signals in SSB symbol by scheduling implementation”. If a SSB is from serving cell, current spec. can cover the case for collision between SSB and UL signal. Option 1 is for the case that the SSB is from neighboring cell. For option1, UE would transmit UL signal even when there are SSBs from neighboring cell configured in that symbol, that is, UL signal should have higher priority than neighboring cell SSB. | |
| QC | We still need to consider non-active PCIs as UE performs measurements on those SSBs. In our view, (modified) option 2 or option 3 are the only complete solutions. We can live with Option 5 from ZTE above with the following FFS:  Option 5: In the OFDM symbol of an SSB associated with one or more active TCI states of an PCI, the UE does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the same PCI. In the OFDM symbol of an SSB of an serving cell PCI, the UE doesn’t transmit any UL signal/channel.   * + - Association of UL signal/channel with a PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel     - FFS: SSBs of non-active PCIs used by UE for measurements.   Question to OPPO regarding “For option1, UE would transmit UL signal even when there are SSBs from neighboring cell configured in that symbol, that is, UL signal should have higher priority than neighboring cell SSB.”: How does neighbor cell receive that UL signal if it is transmitting the SSBs? Are you assuming full-duplex TRPs? If not, gNB cannot just drop SSBs in favor of some UE’s UL channel. What would be the impact to other UEs in the system, mobility, initial access, etc.? | |
| Futurewei | We have the same question/understanding as CMCC. The current Option 1 is not very clear and requires clarification. As of now we can only accept Option 4. | |
| Moderator | It seems there are strong concerns on option1, we have more days until the second check point, let’s continue discuss option4 and option5 as below. I think there are some commonality in option4 and option5, let’s see if we can merge them into one.  Option 4: The UE can only transmit UL signal/channel associated with the serving cell PCI, and does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the active additional PCI.   * + - Association of UL signal/channel with the serving cell PCI or the active additional PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel.   Option 5: In the OFDM symbol of an SSB associated with one or more active TCI states of an PCI, the UE does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the same PCI. In the OFDM symbol of an SSB of an serving cell PCI, the UE doesn’t transmit any UL signal/channel.   * + - Association of UL signal/channel with a PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel     - FFS: SSBs of non-active PCIs used by UE for measurements. | |
| OPPO | We cannot find the practical difference between option 1 and option 4. If the UE can only transmit UL signal/channel associated with the serving cell PCI, and the UL signal/channel has higher priority than neighboring cell SSB, the option 1 should be the result. The UL signal/channel transmitted targeting serving cell can be transparent to UE and ensured by gNB if gNB doesn’t support full duplex. Option 4 introduces an association between UL signal/channel and PCI which is meaningless to UE in our understanding. And as we mentioned before, the pathloss RS cannot be used to be associated with a PCI in some scenarios of mDCI based mTRP transmission.  @Qualcomm, for neighboring cell, the gNB should ensure that the SSB and UL signal would not overlap in the same symbol. Considering mDCI based PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions are scheduled by DCI, we think it is feasible at gNB. | |
| ZTE | Support Option 5.  First we want to confirm the condition of Option 4. If the condition of Option 4 is “In the OFDM symbol of an SSB associated with one or more active TCI states of an additional PCI”, we think the Option 4 is captured by Option 5. In addition, the Option 5 is more general and has backward compatibility of Rel-15/Rel-16. | |

* 1. BFR for inter-cell MTRP

Proposal 2.7: Whether to Apply Rel-17 BFR enhancement for mTRP also for inter-cell mTRP

* For multi-DCI based MTRP inter-cell, if Rel-16 per-cell BFR is configured, SSB associated with additional PCI can be configured as NBI-RS.
* For multi-DCI based MTRP inter-cell, if Rel-17 per-TRP BFR is configured, SSB associated with additional PCI can be configured as NBI-RS in the NBI-RS set associated with corresponding CORESETPoolIndex.

Please provide your views/comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments (if any) |
| Apple | Support |
| QC | Support in principle, but it may be better to be discussed under 8.1.2.3. |
| DOCOMO | Support.  The first bullet is related to per-cell BFR + inter-cell, hence, it should be discussed here. |
| ZTE | Suport |
| Samsung | This proposal is about mTRP BFR. Suggest to discuss it under 8.1.2.3 – for (inter-cell) mTRP BFR, additional design aspects to NBI RS configuration need to be discussed, which seems more appropriate to be discussed in 8.1.2.3. |
| LG | We can discuss this issue under 8.1.2.3. |
| Futurewei | Discuss this in 8.1.2.3. |
| CMCC | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Suggest to discuss it under 8.1.2.3. |
| vivo | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |
| Xiaomi | support |
| Moderator | Everyone supports the proposal, however there are number of companies suggesting to discuss this issue in AI 8.1.2.3. I would like to check with Mr. Chair on this regard. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree the 2nd bullet is related to per-TRP BFR and can be discussed in 8.1.2.3.  However, for the 1st bullet, since it is Rel-16 per-cell BFR, it should be discussed here. |
| Samsung | 8.1.2.3 is the right place to discuss this issue. Not sure why Rel. 16 cell-specific BFR is mentioned here. |
| Apple | It seems at least the first bullet should be discussed in this agenda, since it is only for R16 BFR related enhancement. R15/R16 BFR is also applicable to mTRP. |
| ZTE | Agree with comment from NTT DOCOMO. |
| Lenovo | Agree with apple and DOCOMO that the 1st bullet should be discussed here, and the second bullet can be discussed in AI 8.1.2.3 |
| CATT | Suggest to discuss in AI 8.1.2.3 |
| Ericsson | Support in principle. |
| Moderator | Based on the comments discussion on second bullet is moved to AI 8.1.2.3. If there is no comments for next 24 hours, I assume it is agreeable.  Updated Proposal 2.7: Whether to Apply Rel-17 BFR enhancement for mTRP also for inter-cell mTRP   * For multi-DCI based MTRP inter-cell, if Rel-16 per-cell BFR is configured, SSB associated with additional PCI can be configured as NBI-RS. |
| Apple | Support. |
| Samsung | The proposal is unclear. We are not sure what the Rel. 16 per-cell BFR corresponds to in the context of inter-cell (mDCI) mTRP (the main bullet says applying Rel. 17 MTRP BFR enhancements). If it is about configuring NBI RS, this will also be discussed in 8.1.2.3 as previously agreed, so we are not sure what would be the difference. It is also unclear how to associate higher layer configured NBI RS with the additional PCI. Some clarifications/discussions are needed. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Generally support.  But the main bullet is a bit ambiguous. Hence, we can try the sub-bullet directly.  Updated Proposal 2.7:   * For multi-DCI based MTRP inter-cell, if Rel-16 per-cell BFR (i.e., one BFD-RS set) is configured, SSB associated with additional PCI can be configured as NBI-RS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Slightly prefer not to add new functionality at maintenance stage. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSb | Ok |
| LG | We have similar view with Huawei. Also, virtual cell ID based CSI-RS can be configured as NBI-RS in Rel-16 and it can be used for inter-cell NBI purpose even without the Proposal 2.7. For this reason, we don’t think this proposal is essential. |
| ZTE | Support updated proposal 2.7  @Samsung, it means that the RRC signaling could configure additionalPCIindex for a NBI RS to enable per TRP BFR when inter-cell MTRP operation. |
| QC | For Rel-16 per-cell BFR (in the absence of Rel-17 per-TRP BFR), what is the motivation of this proposal? If BFR happens, all beams have failed. Then why would UE try to find a new beam from neighbor cell to recover? Shouldn’t UE first find a beam from serving cell, and only after beam failure is recovered, try to find a beam from neighbor cell (through regular L1-RSRP mechanisms)?  Furthermore, how does this work in PCell with CBRA-based BFR? Is UE transmitting RACH to neighbor TRP? Can UE receive MSGB (CSS Type 1 for PDCCH) from neighbor cell? |
| Moderator | It seems there is no consensus yet on the updated proposal 2.7. Please continue discussion until second check point. |
| ZTE | @QC,  Regarding your first question, in inter-cell MTRP case where two CORESET pool indexes are associated with two PCI respectively, then the beams of CORESETs includes beams of two PCIs. Then it is nature to support the new beam also can be selected from beams of the two PCIs when all beams of CORESETs of the two PCIs fail. It doesn’t mean only select an new beam of the additional PCI. Any one beam of the two PCIs can be selected. Regarding your second question, we can only first focus CFRA-based BFR.  So we suggest  Updated Proposal 2.7:  For multi-DCI based MTRP inter-cell, if Rel-16 per-cell BFR (i.e., one BFD-RS set of a serving cell) is configured, SSB associated with additional PCI can be configured as NBI-RS.   * For PCell, only support CFBA-based BFR. |
| Samsung | When beams of the serving cell PCI and the additional PCI fail, we don’t see the use case of identifying a new beam from the additional PCI. The UE should anyways recover a new beam from the serving cell PCI. This is different from per-TRP BFR for inter-cell MTRP. |
| Futurewei | We are generally fine with ZTE’s updated proposal, but we think the system can still work even if the proposal is not agreed. |
| LG | We have similar understanding with Samsung and QC. The motivation to find a new beam from SSB associated with additional PCI is not clear. Also, if finding new beam from serving cell with additional PCI is needed, we can use virtual cell ID based CSI-RS, instead of SSB associated with additional PCI. |

* 1. Text proposals

Based one contributions, following TPs are proposed for discussion/agreement.

TP#1: for TS 38.214

**5.1.4 PDSCH resource mapping**

<unchanged parts are omitted>

When receiving the PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI and the system information indicator in DCI is set to 0, the UE shall assume that no SS/PBCH block is transmitted in Res used by the UE for a reception of the PDSCH.

When receiving the PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI and the system information indicator in DCI is set to 1, RA-RNTI, MSGB-RNTI, P-RNTI or TC-RNTI, the UE assumes SS/PBCH block transmission according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* and if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted.

A UE expects a configuration provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *ServingCellConfigCommon* to be same as a configuration provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1*.

When receiving PDSCH scheduled by PDCCH with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or PDSCHs with SPS, the Res corresponding to the configured or dynamically indicated resources in Clauses 5.1.4.1, 5.1.4.2 are not available for PDSCH. Furthermore, the UE assumes SS/PBCH block transmission according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources, the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted when the UE is not configured with [*NumberOfAdditionalPCI*]. When the UE is configured with [*NumberOfAdditionalPCI*], if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing a candidate SS/PBCH block corresponding to a SS/PBCH block index provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *AdditionalPCIInfo* with same physical cell identity as the one associated with a RS having same quasi-collocation properties as the PDSCH, the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted.

A UE is not expected to handle the case where PDSCH DM-RS Res are overlapping, even partially, with any RE(s) not available for PDSCH*.*

For operation with shared spectrum channel access, SS/PBCH block transmission according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* represents all of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks corresponding to SS/PBCH block indices provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* as described in Clause 4.1 of [6, TS 38.213].

<unchanged parts are omitted>

TP#2: for TS 38.214

5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location

-----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------

For a CSI-RS resource in an *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition,* the UE shall expect that a TCI-State indicates one of the following quasi co-location type(s):

- ‘typeA’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, ‘typeD’ with the same CSI-RS resource, or

- ‘typeA’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, ‘typeD’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition*, or

- ‘typeC’ with an SS/PBCH block and, when applicable, ‘typeD’ with the same SS/PBCH block, the reference RS may additionally be an SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell. UE can assume center frequency, SCS, SFN offset are the same for SS/PBCH block from the serving cell and SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the serving cell.

------------------------------------------End of Text Proposal#1 for TS 38.214--------------------------------------

TP#3: for TS 38.214

5.1 UE procedure for receiving the physical downlink shared channel

-----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------

If a UE is configured by higher layer parameter *PDCCH-Config* that contains two different values of *coresetPoolIndex* in *ControlResourceSet*, the UE may expect to receive multiple PDCCHs scheduling fully/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain. The UE may expect the reception of full/partially-overlapped PDSCHs in time, only when PDCCHs that schedule two PDSCHs are associated to different *ControlResourceSets* having different values of *coresetPoolIndex*. For a *ControlResourceSet* without *coresetPoolIndex*, the UE may assume that the *ControlResourceSet* is assigned with *coresetPoolIndex* as 0. ~~When the UE is configured with [~~*~~NumberOfAdditionalPCI~~*~~],~~ *~~ControlResourceSets~~* ~~corresponding to different~~ *~~coresetPoolIndex~~* ~~values may be associated with different physical cell IDs via activated TCI states of the~~ *~~ControlResourceSets~~*~~, where~~ *~~ControlResourceSets~~* ~~corresponding to one~~ *~~coresetPoolIndex~~* ~~can be associated with one physical cell ID and~~ *~~ControlResourceSets~~* ~~corresponding to another~~ *~~coresetPoolIndex~~* ~~can be associated with another physical cell ID.~~ When the UE is scheduled with full/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain, the full scheduling information for receiving a PDSCH is indicated and carried only by the corresponding PDCCH, the UE is expected to be scheduled with the same active BWP and the same SCS. When the UE is scheduled with full/partially-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain, the UE can be scheduled with at most two codewords simultaneously. When PDCCHs that schedule two PDSCHs are associated to different *ControlResourceSets* having different values of *coresetPoolIndex,* the following operations are allowed:

-----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------

TP#4: for TS 38.214

5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location

-----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------

If the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI] and with PDCCH-Config that contains two different values of coresetPoolIndex in ControlResourceSet, the UE receives an activation command, as described in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to 8 TCI states to the codepoints of the DCI field ‘Transmission Configuration Indication’ in one CC/DL BWP. When a set of TCI state IDs are activated for a CORESETPoolIndex, the activated TCI states corresponding to one CORESETPoolIndex can be associated with one physical cell ID and activated TCI states corresponding to another coresetPoolIndex can be associated with another or the same physical cell ID.

-----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------

Please provide your views/comments on the TP in table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company |  | Comments |
| Apple | TP#1 : Disagree  TP#2 : Agree  TP #3 : Open for discussion  TP #4 : Suggest modification. | TP #1 : This should be discussed under issue 2.3  TP #3 : We failed to see motivation. More discussion is needed.  TP #4 : It seems ‘the same PCI’ case is only for both are associated with the serving cell. Some modification for the TP may be needed. |
| Spreadtrum | TP#1 : Agree, but fine to wait issue#2.3  TP#2 : Agree  TP#3 : Disagree  TP#4 : Agree | TP#3 : we also don’t understand the motivation. Clarification is needed. |
| QC | TP#1: Agree  TP#2: Agree  TP#3: Not clear  TP#4: Not needed | TP#1: Ok to discuss this TP under issue 2.3.  TP#4: Agree with Apple. |
| OPPO | TP#1 : Agree  TP#2 : Agree  TP#3 : Disagree  TP#4 : Agree | TP#3 : We don’t think the TP is needed. |
| DOCOMO | TP#1: Agree  TP#2: Agree  TP#3: Not clear  TP#4: Not support | TP#4 : It is better to discuss this issue and have a conclusion/agreement on it first. If activate TCI states of one PCI (serving PCI) can be associated with two CORESETPoolIndex, since different LTE CRS rate-matching pattern can be configured per CORESETPoolIndex, it will become problematic when the 2nd TRP is dynamically switched between serving PCI and additional PCI. |
| ZTE | TP#1 : Partially agree  TP#2 : Agree  TP#3 : Disagree  TP#4 : Agree | TP#1 : Generally agree with follow modification when considering the *ssb-PositionsInBurst* of serving cell isn’t configured in *AdditionalPCIInfo*  When receiving PDSCH scheduled by PDCCH with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or PDSCHs with SPS, the Res corresponding to the configured or dynamically indicated resources in Clauses 5.1.4.1, 5.1.4.2 are not available for PDSCH. Furthermore, the UE assumes SS/PBCH block transmission according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources, the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted when the UE is not configured with [*NumberOfAdditionalPCI*]. When the UE is configured with [*NumberOfAdditionalPCI*], if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing a candidate SS/PBCH block corresponding to a SS/PBCH block index provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *AdditionalPCIInfo* or in *ServingCellConfigureCommon* with same physical cell identity as the one associated with a RS having same quasi-collocation properties as the PDSCH, the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted.  #3 Disagree to delete the reached agreement. Due to Rel-17 inter-cell MTRP is based on Rel-16 MDCI based MTRP, we think the following description can be used to support inter-cell MTRP and intra-cell MTRP.  When the UE is configured with [*NumberOfAdditionalPCI*], *ControlResourceSets* corresponding to different *coresetPoolIndex* values may be associated with different physical cell IDs via activated TCI states of the *ControlResourceSets*, where *ControlResourceSets* corresponding to one *coresetPoolIndex* can be associated with one physical cell ID and *ControlResourceSets* corresponding to another *coresetPoolIndex* can be associated with another physical cell ID or the one physical cell ID |
| Samsung | TP#1 : Agree  TP#2 : Agree  TP#3 : Not clear  TP#4 : Need more discussions |  |
| LG | TP#1 : Agree  TP#2 : Agree  TP#3 : Not clear  TP#4 : Need more discussions | TP#4 : it this for dynamic switching to intra-cell MTRP PDSCH ? |
| Futurewei | #1 : pending 2.3  #2 : Agree  #3 : Unclear  #4 : Agree | #4 : Same PCI is for intra-cell M-TRP which is I supported in R16, and different PCI is for inter-cell M-TRP. This seems to facilitate intra-/inter-cell switching. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | TP#1: Question  TP#2: Agree  TP#3: Not clear  TP#4 : More discussion | TP#1: We find it difficult to understand the condition « if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing a candidate SS/PBCH block corresponding to a SS/PBCH block index provided by ssb-PositionsInBurst in AdditionalPCIInfo with same physical cell identity as the one associated with a RS having same quasi-collocation properties as the PDSCH ».  Question:  What is the RS mentioned in the TP, e.g., CSI-RS that the PDSCH is QCLed to, or SSB that the CSI-RS is further QCLed to?  By «same physical cell identity», does it mean two SSBs are involved in description here? |
| Vivo | #1 : agreed  #2 : agree  #3 : disagree  #4 : agree | #1 : it is based on previous agreement, also depends on outcome of 2.3 |
| Nokia, NSB | TP#1 : Disagree  TP#2 : Agree  TP#3 : Disagree  TP#4 : Disagree | TP#1 is related to 2.3  TP#3 is larifying behavior for CORESETs. Not sure about the intension of deleting it.  TP#4 nothing that seems essential. |
| Xiaomi | TP#1: Agree  TP#2: Agree  TP#3: Agree  TP#4: Agree | TP#3 : RAN1 assumed that there is only one physical layer configuration and that is applied to all the PDCCH associated with TCI state that is associated with either serving cell PCI or another different PCI according to the LS reply R1-2110631 in RAN1 106-bis-e meeting, which means there is no difference for UE to receive PDSCH from serving cell or non-serving except for the transmission beam. For the perspective of UE, it just needs to know that there will be multiple PDCCHs scheduling fully/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain both, whether inter-cell mTRP or intra-cell mTRP is configured. Therefore, the corresponding CR should be removed.  TP#4 : In RAN1 107-e meeting, switching between inter-cell mTRP and intra-cell mTRP is discussed and most companies mentioned that the switching is already supported by MAC CE. Then, the active TCI states corresponding to different CORESETPoolIndex can be associated with either different physical cell ID or same physical cell ID. |
| Moderator | TP#1: 10 companies agree or wait for out come of discussion in section 2.3, disagreeing companies also indicated to wait of 2.3 outcome.  TP#2: everyone agrees with the TP  TP#3: 1 company agrees, and majority of companies either disagree or expressed that the TP is unclear  TP#4: 7 companies agree, 3 companies expressed that more discussion is needed, 3 companies disagree  Offline agreement  TP#2: for TS 38.214  5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location  -----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------  For a CSI-RS resource in an *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition,* the UE shall expect that a TCI-State indicates one of the following quasi co-location type(s):  - ‘typeA’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, ‘typeD’ with the same CSI-RS resource, or  - ‘typeA’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, ‘typeD’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition*, or  - ‘typeC’ with an SS/PBCH block and, when applicable, ‘typeD’ with the same SS/PBCH block, the reference RS may additionally be an SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell. UE can assume center frequency, SCS, SFN offset are the same for SS/PBCH block from the serving cell and SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the serving cell.  ------------------------------------------End of Text Proposal#1 for TS 38.214--------------------------------------  TP#1 is on hold, wait for outcome of discussion in section 2.3  Further discuss in second round whether TP along this line can be agreeable  TP#4: for TS 38.214  5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location  -----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------  If the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI] and with PDCCH-Config that contains two different values of coresetPoolIndex in ControlResourceSet, the UE receives an activation command, as described in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to 8 TCI states to the codepoints of the DCI field ‘Transmission Configuration Indication’ in one CC/DL BWP. When a set of TCI state IDs are activated for a CORESETPoolIndex, the activated TCI states corresponding to one CORESETPoolIndex can be associated with one physical cell ID and activated TCI states corresponding to another coresetPoolIndex can be associated with another or the same physical cell ID.  -----------------------------Unchanged part omitted-------------------------- | |
| QC | For TP4, “same” PCI is for the case that both are associated with the serving cell PCI (Rel-16)? This is not properly captured in the TP. | |
| NTT DOCOMO | For TP4, there will be problem if we directly support TP4 change without considering the enhancement on LTE-CRS rate matching pattern (i.e., the updated proposal 2.3). The reason is as follows.  In Rel-16, LTE-CRS rate matching pattern is configured per CORESETPoolindex.  For TP4, it supports following configuration.   * CORESETPoolindex=0: associated with activate TCI states from serving PCI * CORESETPoolindex=1: associated with some activate TCI states from serving PCI, and some activate TCI states from an additional PCI   If different LTE-CRS rate matching pattern should be considered for serving cell and additional PCI cell, different LTE-CRS rate matching patterns are configured associated with different CORESETPoolIndex.  If DCI from CORESETPoolindex=1 indicates TCI state from additional PCI for scheduled PDSCH, the configured LTE CRS rate matching can be applied appropriately. However, if DCI from CORESETPoolindex=1 indicates TCI state from serving PCI for scheduled PDSCH, the configured LTE CRS rate matching cannot be applied as this LTE CRS rate matching pattern is for 2nd cell, not for serving cell.  Hence, TP4 should not be agreed directly. To support TP4, the updated proposal 2.3 should be supported as well. In that case, the LTE CRS rate matching is not associated with CORESETPoolindex, instead, it is associated with PCI. | |
| LG | We first need to clarify the intention of TP4. If the intention is to allow two PCIs to be associated with one CORESETPoolIndex as DOCOMO mentioned, Rel-16 CORESETPoolIndex based operation such as CRS rate matching/scrambling/separateA/N/OOO does not work anymore. | |
| Samsung | Share similar views to QC. In addition, we do not think this TP4 is essential/needed. | |
| Apple | Support TP #2. It seems TP #4 is not that necessary according to companies’ comments above. | |
| ZTE | Support TP 4 with the following modification to capture the following agreement endorsed in RAN1#106-e meeting.   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**   * For inter-cell mTRP, one PCI associated with one or more of activated TCI states for PDSCH/PDCCH is associated with one CORESETPoolIndex, another PCI associated with one or more of activated TCI states for PDSCH/PDCCH is associated with another CORESETPoolIndex * FFS: The association between PCI and CORESETPoolIndex when switching between intra-cell mTRP and inter-cell mTRP |   If the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI] and with PDCCH-Config that contains two different values of coresetPoolIndex in ControlResourceSet, the UE receives an activation command, as described in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to 8 TCI states to the codepoints of the DCI field ‘Transmission Configuration Indication’ in one CC/DL BWP. When a set of TCI state IDs are activated for a CORESETPoolIndex, the activated TCI states corresponding to one CORESETPoolIndex can be associated with one physical cell ID and activated TCI states corresponding to another coresetPoolIndex can be associated with another or the same physical cell ID. Only one PCI associated with one or more of activated TCI states for PDSCH/PDCCH is associated with one CORESETPoolIndex. | |
| OPPO | Agree with QC that Rel-16 operation is already supported and the TP is not essential. | |
| Lenovo | Agree with QC. And this TP is not essential. | |
| Xiaomi | TP#4 : We think that the active TCI states corresponding to different CORESETPoolIndex can be associated with either different physical cell ID or same physical cell ID. Because switching between inter-cell mTRP and intra-cell mTRP is discussed and most companies mentioned that the switching is already supported by MAC CE in RAN1 107-e meeting. That’s the intention of TP4. If whether to support the switching between inter-cell mTRP and intra-cell mTRP is not clear, we are OK to further discuss it. | |
| Spreadtrum | For TP#4, in our understanding it has the assumption that the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI]. It is different from Rel-16. Thus, we are fine with TP#4. | |
| CATT | Support TP#4 with ZTE’s modification. | |
| Futurewei | TP#4: Agree.  We think the CRS rate matching pattern issue does not exist. Our understanding is a little different from DOCOMO. When CORESETPoolindex=1, it can be associated with set 1 of TCI states from serving PCI and set 2 of TCI states from an additional PCI, and only one set of the TCI states can be activated at a time. Please let us know if we missed anything. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with ZTE’s version. | |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not think this is needed. | |
| Moderator | It seems there is no consensus yet on necessity of TP#4. However, we can continue discussion until second check point. Please also check revision provided by ZTE above. | |
| ZTE | Support | |
| LG | The previous agreement has already been captured exactly in current specification, so we fail to see need of CR. | |

* 1. Others

Various issues are raised in the contributions, the issues listed below either have been discussed in previous meetings or single company proposals. Please indicate which ones do you agree or disagree in the table below.

#1: UE is not expected to track a SSB with additional PCI which is not associated with any activated TCI state unless the SSB is configured for L1 measurement.

#2: Add FG16-2a as prerequisite feature group for FG 23-4. Add FG 16-2a-0 to FG 2a-10 as optional prerequisite feature groups for FG 23-4.

#3: For downlink signals associated with a serving cell associated with additional PCI, if virtual cell ID is not configured, the default ID should be the additional PCI.

#4: At most one PCI is associated with the activated TCI states for PDSCH/PDCCH associated with one CORESETPoolIndex.

#5: Support inter-operation, e.g., switching, between intra-cell MTRP and inter-cell MTRP

* One PCI associated with activated TCI states can be associated with more than one CORESETPoolIndex and one CORESETPoolIndex can be associated with only one PCI associated with activated TCI states

#6: Support inter-cell multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation, for both cases of CORESETPoolIndex is configured and not configured

* When CORESETPoolIndex is configured, multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation is applied regardless that CORESETPoolIndex values are associated with the same PCI or different PCIs. i.e. inter-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP or intra-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP operations.
* When CORESETPoolIndex is not configured but CORESETs are associated with two different PCIs, multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation is applied assuming that as if CORESETPoolIndex would be configured and CORESETPoolIndex are associated to different PCI.

#7: During the intermediate state (during the switching) between serving cell and different PCI, the UE is not required to monitor scheduling from a CORESET with associated with different PCI if the TCI state is associated with different PCI than the latest activated TCI state under the same CORESETpoolindex

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company |  | Comments (if any) |
| Apple | #1: Agree (Change expect into required)  #3: Agree  #5: Disagree  #6: Disagree | #2 : Should be discussed in UE feature  #4 : It seems this has already been agreed ?  #5/6 : It seems this is not aligned with previous agreements.  #7 : Suggest more discussion on the motivation |
| QC | #1-7: Not needed. | Some of these have been discussed before and are not essential, while others can be discussed as part of UE capability. |
| DOCOMO | #4: agree  #5: disagree | Better to discuss #4 and #5 and to have a clear conclusion/agreement on it. It is also related to TP#4 in Session 2.8. |
| ZTE | #1:partially agree  #2 : Agree  #3 : Agree  #4 : Agree  #5 : Agree  #6 : Disagree  #7 : Disagree | #1: Agree in principle other than the part of “unless the SSB is configured for L1 measurement”, which should be discussed in AI 8.1.1. |
| LG | #4: Agree  #5: Agree  #6: Disagree | #2 : it can be discussed in UE feature session.  #6 : MDCI based MTRP PDSCH is not working without two COERSETpools. |
| Futurewei | #1-#7 : not needed | The proposals seem not needed, either can be done already or not necessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | #1~7: Not needed | Not essential or to be discussed in UE feature. |
| Nokia, NSB | #1: not needed  #2 : UE feature discussion  #3 : not needed  #4 : not needed  #5 : Agree  #6 : Agree  #7 : Agree | Some of these issues are open issues and need some discussion.  #6: Allows flexibility with not configuring CORESETpoolindex. If not, the UE may have to always assume intra-cell mTRP mode as default operation (not sTRP operation) even in the scenarios that network only support inter-cell mTRP.  #7: TCI state activations for all CORESETs may not send simultaneously. So, without agreeing on UE behavior, this feature is open and UE behavior is not defined as the gNB will not send the activation commands at the same time. |
| Moderator | Views from companies are diverging and 4 companies expressed that #1-#7 are not needed. | |

1. Previous agreements

RAN1 #102-e:

**Agreement**

Study the following aspects of QCL /TCI-related enhancement to enable inter-cell multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation.

* Details on configuration of non-serving cell RS;
* Allowed source and target RS types for RS transmitted from the non-serving cell TRP ;
* Allowed QCL types for RS transmitted from the non-serving cell TRP ;
* Measurement and reporting related to QCL /TCI enhancement except for that in 8.1.1, if any;
* Clarification on potential UE behavior for associating/multiplexing non-serving cell RS with other RS/channels;

Other details not precluded.

RAN1#103-e:

**Agreement**

For QCL /TCI related enhancement for enhanced inter-cell multi-TRP operations, support RRC configuration of non-serving cell information

* Non-serving cell information can be associated with the TCI state and/or QCL -info at least when “neighbor cell SSB” is used as “QCL referenceSignal ”
  + FFS : Whether beam indication enhancement is needed in addition to QCL -info enhancement
  + FFS : Whether the association is explicit or implicit

**Agreement**

The information provided by SSB-Configuration-r16/ssb-InfoNcell-r16 and/or MeasObject can be starting point for providing non-serving cell information

**For future meetings**

Consider rate matching behavior related to non-serving cell SSB.

RAN1#104-e:

**Agreement**

Non-serving cell information at least includes non-serving cell PCI to support inter-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP operation

* FFS: Whether the indication of PCI is implicit or explicit

**Conclusion**

Reuse Rel-15/16 QCL rule between the source and target RS/channel for non-serving cell RS/channel.

**Agreement**

At least following non-serving cell SSB information are needed in inter-cell MTRP operation

* SSB time domain position
* SSB transmission periodicity
* SSB transmission power

FFS: Other non-serving cell information

FFS: Whether indication of these information is implicit or explicit

**Agreement**

For inter-cell MTRP operation, further discuss following options and down select in RAN1#104bis-e

* Option1: Indicate/associate non-serving cell PCI in the TCI state
  + FFS other non-serving cell information
* Option2: Introduce a flag to indicate whether a TCI state/QCL information is associated with non-serving cell information or serving cell
  + FFS: how the flag is linked to non-serving cell
* Option3: Explicit or implicit grouping of TCI states associated with non-serving cell information corresponding to the serving cell and the non-serving cell respectively.
  + FFS: Each group is associated with a CORESETPoolIndex value.
  + FFS: how to link the group of TCI states to non-serving cell.
* Option4: Re-index the non-serving cell RS, e.g., in the TCI state/QCL-Info, so that the UE can differentiate between a serving cell RS and a non-serving cell RS
  + Example: serving cell RSs are indexed from #0, #1, …, #N-1, while non-serving cell RSs are re-indexed from #N, #N+1, …
  + FFS: detailed re-indexing rule(s) of non-serving cell RSs
* Option5: Introduce a new indicator (e.g., re-index the non-serving cell) to indicate the non-serving cell information that a TCI state/QCL information is associated with
  + FFS: how the indicator is linked to non-serving cell
  + Note: when there is only one non-serving cell, it means the same as Option2.

**Agreement**

Agree on scheme1

* Scheme1: PDSCH/PDCCH from non-serving cell (PCI) associated with TCI state and/or QCL-info is rate matched around non-serving cell SSB with the same PCI
* FFS: whether PDSCH /PDCCH from serving cell (PCI) is rate matched around non-serving cell SSB
* FFS: whether PDSCH/PDCCH from non-serving cell (PCI) associated with TCI state and/or QCL-info is rate matched around serving cell SSB

**Conclusion**

The UE may assume received DL transmission from multiple TRP within a CP in FR1 and FR2.

* Note: This does not imply that RAN1 intends to ask RAN4 to tighten network synchronization requirements.

RAN1#104b-e:

**Agreement**

* For intercell MTRP operation, 1 additional PCI different from the serving cell PCI is supported per CC
  + The additional PCI is the one associated with one or more TCI states that are activated for [CSI-RS for CSI]/PDSCH/PDCCH, per CC.
  + Applicable at least for non-cross carrier QCL indication
    - FFS: Cross carrier scheduling QCL indication
* RAN1 to decide on the maximum number of PCIs different from the serving cell PCI per CC and/or across all CCs that can be RRC-configured for multi-DCI based inter-cell multi-TRP
* Above should be specified by reusing R15 QCL rules as concluded in RAN1#104-e

**Conclusion**

Configuration of CSI-RS for mobility as QCL source for intercell MTRP operation is not supported from Rel-17 specification point of view

**Agreement**

For intercell MTRP operation, downselect one or more of the following alternatives in RAN1#105-e

* Alt1: one PCI associated with one or more of activated TCI states for [PDSCH]/PDCCH can be associated with only one CORESETPoolIndex
* Alt2: one PCI associated with one or more of activated TCI states for [PDSCH]/PDCCH can be associated with more than one CORESETPoolIndex
* Alt3: one PCI associated with TCI states for [PDSCH]/PDCCH via QCL relationship without association with CORESETPoolIndex

Note: This agreement is not related to the down-selection of one of the 5 options from RAN1#104-e

Note: Above should be specified by reusing Rel-15/Rel-16 QCL rules as concluded in RAN1#104-e

RAN1#106-e

**Agreement**

Introduce a new RRC indicator/signalling (e.g., re-index the non-serving cell) to indicate the non-serving cell information that a TCI state/QCL information is associated with, where the new indicator/signaling is not the exact PCI value

* Detailed signalling design is up to RAN2

**Agreement**

Rel. 17 inter-cell MTRP, the maximum number of additional RRC -configured PCIs per CC is denoted X and can be reported as a UE capability

* For the report value of X, multiple candidate values including 1 is supported.
  + FFS : Which values to support other than 1.
  + Values larger than 7 are precluded
  + RAN1 needs to agree on value(s) of X other than 1
* Down-select one of the following alternatives:
  + Alt 1: A single value of X is reported as UE capability for any possible SSB time domain position and periodicity
  + Alt 3: At least Two independent X values (X1, X2) are reported as a UE capability for at least two different assumptions on SSB time domain position and periodicity with respect to serving cell SSB
* The serving cell PCI is always associated with active TCI states, only 1 additional PCI can be associated with the active TCI States

**Agreement**

* For inter-cell mTRP , one PCI associated with one or more of activated TCI states for PDSCH/PDCCH is associated with one *CORESETPoolIndex* , another PCI associated with one or more of activated TCI states for PDSCH/PDCCH is associated with another *CORESETPoolIndex*
* FFS : The association between PCI and *CORESETPoolIndex* when switching between intra-cell mTRP and inter-cell mTRP

**Agreement**

For a CSI-RS QCLed with a neighboring cell SSB, the CSI-RS EPRE is calculated based on *powerControlOffsetSS* and the SSB transmission power in the neighboring cell information.

**Agreement**

LS to RAN2 on multi-TRP inter-cell is endorsed in R1-2108633.

RAN1#106b-e

**Agreement**

* Center frequency, SCS, SFN offset are assumed to be the same for SSBs from the serving cell and the configured  SSBs with PCI different from the serving cell for inter-cell multi TRP operation.
* The information related to “SSB time domain position” for  SSB with PCI different from the serving cell consists of [halfFrameIndex and] ssb-PositionsInBurst

**Agreement**

Support two independent X values (X1, X2) are reported as a UE capability for two different assumptions on additional SSB time domain position and periodicity with respect to serving cell SSB.

* X1 (Case 1)= The maximum number of configured additional PCIs when each configuration of SSB time domain positions and periodicity of the additional PCIs is the same as SSB time domain positions and periodicity of the serving cell PCI
* X2 (Case 2)= The maximum number of configured additional PCIs when the configurations of SSB time domain positions and periodicity of the additional PCIs is not according to Case 1
* Note: By definition, Case 1 and Case 2 cannot be enabled simultaneously
* Supported values for X1 and X2 include~~s~~ at least 0,1,2,3 and 7. FFS on other values
* This UE capability has FR1 and FR2 differentiation (FFS : Whether this UE capability is per UE or per band)

RAN1#107-e

**Agreement**

UE is not required to monitor a Type0/0A/1[/2] CSS in a CORESET when the active TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell PCI.

1. Reference

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**R1-2200931**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200931.zip) | Remaining issues on inter-cell multi-TRP operation in Rel-17 | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| Proposal 1: Support the following values for X1 and X2 on RRC-configured PCI(s) different from serving cell PCI   * + The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X1 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are the same as time domain positions and periodicity of the serving cell SSBs, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};   + The maximum number of configured additional PCIs is X2 when time domain positions and periodicity of configured SSBs with additional PCIs are different with time domain positions and periodicity of the serving cell SSBs, with candidate values {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7};   Proposal 2: Do not support additional rate matching behaviour for inter-cell multi-TRP operation. | | |
| [**R1-2200993**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200993.zip) | Inter-cell multi-TRP operation | FUTUREWEI |
| Proposal 1: Inter-cell CSI-RS should also be allowed to be the reference RS for SRS, and modify TS 38.214 to as “If the UE is configured with [TCI-State]s with [tci-StateId\_r17], the reference RS may additionally be an SS/PBCH block associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell, or a CSI-RS QCLed with an SS/PBCH block associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell.” | | |
| [**R1-2201080**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201080.zip) | Maintenance on inter-cell MTRP operation | vivo |
| **Proposal 1:**   * It is proposed to discuss and conclude the UE behavior on PUSCH/PUCCH transmission in the serving cell on the symbols where SSB from TRP associated with different PCI than serving cell PCI is being transmitted in RAN1#108-e.   **Proposal 2:**   * Support the TP in section 3 above. | | |
| [**R1-2201187**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201187.zip) | Remaining issues on multi-TRP inter-cell operation | ZTE |
| **Observation:** Collision handling between UL channels/signals and non-serving cell SSBs needs to be specified in Rel-17 feMIMO session.  **Proposal 1:** In the set of symbols indicated to a UE by ssb-PositionsInBurst in SSB associated with the active additional PCI, down-select one option as follows in Rel-17:   * Option 1: The UE does not transmit any UL signal/channel. * Option 2: The UE can only transmit UL signal/channel associated with the serving cell PCI , and does not transmit UL signal/channel associated with the active additional PCI.   + Association of UL signal/channel with the serving cell PCI or the active additional PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel.   The following Rel. 15/16 procedures are based on a selected option from Option 1 or 2 above:   * Procedure 1: When SSB overlaps with UL channel/RS, UE does not transmit the UL channels/RS [38.213, Section 11.1]. * Procedure 2: UE does not expect the set of SSB symbols to indicated as uplink symbols either semi-statically or dynamically (by SFI ) [38.213, Section 11.1 and Section 11.1.1]. * Procedure 3: SSB symbols are assumed to be invalid symbols in a nominal repetition for PUSCH repetition Type B [38.214, Section 6.1.2.1]. * Procedure 4: For determination of the N PUCCHRepeat slots in the case of PUCCH repetition, i.e., a slot is not counted toward the N PUCCHRepeat slots if the PUCCH resource in that slot overlaps with a SSB [38.213, Section 9.2.6].   **Proposal 2:** Additional information for the cell with SSB associated with different PCI should include rate matching pattern,, LTE-CRS rate matching pattern, and RNTI.  **Proposal 3:** Support to use non-serving cell SSB for mobility measurement as the PL-RS for uplink transmission. | | |
| [**R1-2201225**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201225.zip) | Enhancement on inter-cell multi-TRP operation | OPPO |
| ***Proposal 1: UE is not expected to track a SSB with additional PCI which is not associated with any activated TCI state unless the SSB is configured for L1 measurement.***  ***Proposal 2: UL signal transmission is not impacted by neighboring cell SSB. UE is not expected to receive neighboring cell SSB in UL symbol.***  ***Proposal 3: Apply the above TP for SSB and PDSCH associated with the same PCI and transmitted in the same symbol.***  *If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block associated with the same PCI in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with 'typeD', if 'typeD' is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.* | | |
| [**R1-2201330**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201330.zip) | Discussion on remaining issues on inter-cell operation for multi-TRP/panel | CATT |
| Observation-1: MAC CE based switching between intra-cell and inter-cell mTRP has already been supported without additional spec impact.  Proposal-1: PDSCH/PDCCH from serving cell is rate matched around non-serving cell SSB. PDSCH/PDCCH from non-serving cell is rate matched around serving cell SSB.  Proposal-2: UE is not required to monitor a Type2 CSS in a CORESET when the active TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell PCI. | | |
| [**R1-2201428**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201428.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP inter-cell operation | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| Proposal 1: SSB from a non-serving cell can be directly configured in QCL-info and SSB-InfoNcell-r16/SSB-Configuration-r16 are used to provide the non-serving cell’s information for the UE to obtain the correct SSB information.  Proposal 2: The non-serving PCID configured in SSB-InfoNcell-r16/SSB-Configuration-r16 is associated with a neighboring cell configured in a CSI-ReportConfig.  Proposal 3: SSB from a non-serving cell can be configured as the spatial relation and PL-RS for PUCCH resources and SRS resources. | | |
| [**R1-2201465**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201465.zip) | Remaining issues on inter-cell multi-TRP operation | NTT DOCOMO, INC. |
| Proposal 1   * + The information related to “SSB time domain position” for SSB with PCI different from the serving cell consists of halfFrameIndex.   Proposal 2   * + For each cell with additional PCI, LTE CRS pattern for rate matching can be configured.   Proposal 3   * + At most one PCI is associated with the activated TCI states for PDSCH/PDCCH associated with one CORESETPoolIndex.   Proposal 4   * + UE is not required to monitor a Type 2 CSS in a CORESET when the active TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell PCI.   + Adopt following TP for TS 38.213.  |  | | --- | | 10 UE procedure for receiving control information […]  If a UE is not provided TCI-State\_r17, the UE is not required to monitor PDCCH candidates for a Type0/0A/1/2-PDCCH CSS set when the active TCI state for a corresponding CORESET is not associated with physCellId in ServingCellConfigCommon. |   Proposal 5   * + For multi-DCI based MTRP inter-cell, if Rel-16 per-cell BFR is configured, SSB associated with additional PCI can be configured as NBI-RS.   + For multi-DCI based MTRP inter-cell, if Rel-17 per-TRP BFR is configured, SSB associated with additional PCI can be configured as NBI-RS in the NBI-RS set associated with corresponding CORESETPoolIndex. | | |
| [**R1-2201536**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201536.zip) | Discussion on enhancements on multi-TRP inter-cell operation | Spreadtrum Communications |
| Proposal 1: For inter-cell multi-TRP operation, PDSCH/PDCCH from the serving cell should not be rate-matched around non-serving cell SSB.  Proposal 2: For inter-cell multi-TRP operation, PDSCH/PDCCH from non-serving cell (PCI) associated with TCI state and/or QCL-info is not rate matched around serving cell SSB.  Proposal 3: The information related to “SSB time domain position” for  SSB with PCI different from the serving cell consists of halfFrameIndex.  Proposal 4: Suggest to adopt the following text proposal#1 in 38.214.  ------------------------------------------Start of Text Proposal#1 for TS 38.214-------------------------------------- 5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location -----------------------------Unchanged part omitted--------------------------  For a CSI-RS resource in an *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition,* the UE shall expect that a TCI-State indicates one of the following quasi co-location type(s):  - 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with the same CSI-RS resource, or  - 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition*, or  - 'typeC' with an SS/PBCH block and, when applicable, 'typeD' with the same SS/PBCH block, the reference RS may additionally be an SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell. UE can assume center frequency, SCS, SFN offset are the same for SS/PBCH block from the serving cell and SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the serving cell.  ------------------------------------------End of Text Proposal#1 for TS 38.214-------------------------------------- | | |
| [**R1-2201569**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201569.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP inter-cell operation | LG Electronics |
| Proposal #1: PDSCH/PDCCH from serving cell should be rate matched around non-serving cell SSB and PDSCH /PDCCH from non-serving cell should be rate matched around serving cell SSB.  Proposal #2: halfFrameIndex for non-serving cell SSB is not needed for inter-cell MTRP operation.  Proposal #3: UE is not required to monitor a Type 2 CSS in a CORESET when the active TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell PCI. | | |
| [**R1-2201621**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201621.zip) | Finalizing Multi-TRP inter-cell operation | Ericsson |
| [Proposal 1 Add the SSB transmission offset and SSB transmission power to SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17.](#_Toc95761912)  [Proposal 2 The value maxNrofAddionalPCI-r17 is 7.](#_Toc95761913)  [Proposal 3 Change the field name ssb-ToMeasure to ssb-PositionInBurst in SSB-MTCAdditionalPCI-r17.](#_Toc95761914)  [Proposal 4 Add FG16-2a as prerequisite feature group for FG 23-4. Add FG 16-2a-0 to FG 2a-10 as optional prerequisite feature groups for FG 23-4.](#_Toc95761915) | | |
| [**R1-2201684**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201684.zip) | Maintenance of multi-TRP inter-cell operation | Intel Corporation |
| Proposal-1: Extend current UE behavior of not transmitting UL channel/RS overlapping with SS/PBCH block indicated in ssb-PositionsInBurst (for the serving cell) to SS/PBCH blocks indicated in the union of ssb-PositionsInBurst for the serving cell and the configured ssb-PositionsInBurst associated with the active additional PCI (option-1).  Proposal-2: Remove the brackets from “UE is not required to monitor a Type0/0A/1[/2] CSS in a CORESET when the active TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell PCI” | | |
| [**R1-2201760**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201760.zip) | Views on Rel-17 Inter-cell multi-TRP operation | Apple |
| Proposal 1: If SSB collides with DL signals associated with the same PCI, gNB should ensure the DL signals and SSB are QCLed with QCL-TypeD.  Proposal 2: For downlink signals associated with a non-serving cell, if virtual cell ID is not configured, the default ID should be PCI for the non-serving cell. | | |
| [**R1-2201846**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201846.zip) | Remaining issues of enhancements on Multi-TRP inter-cell operation | CMCC |
| Proposal 1: Revise the agreement of RAN1#107-e meeting as follows.  UE is not required to monitor a Type0/0A/1/2 CSS in a CORESET when the active TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell PCI.  Proposal 2: A new RRC IE can be introduced to configure the information for SSB associated with PCI different from the serving cell if the related information is not configured in MeasObject.  Proposal 3: In the set of symbols indicated to a UE for SSBs with PCI different from the serving cell, the UE can only transmit UL signal/channel associated with the serving cell PCI. | | |
| [**R1-2201941**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201941.zip) | Maintenance on multi-TRP Inter-cell Operation | Xiaomi |
| Proposal 1: Adopt the following TP to TS 38.214 Clause 5.1.4  ============================ Unchanged part omitted ===========================  **5.1.4 PDSCH resource mapping**  When receiving PDSCH scheduled by PDCCH with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or PDSCHs with SPS, the REs corresponding to the configured or dynamically indicated resources in Clauses 5.1.4.1, 5.1.4.2 are not available for PDSCH. Furthermore, the UE assumes SS/PBCH block transmission according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources, the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted. When UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI], the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources configured in CSI-ResourceConfig with physical cell ID different from that of serving cell are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted.  ============================ Unchanged part omitted ===========================  Proposal 2: The following TP related to TS38.214 clause 5.1 is provided.  **5.1 UE procedure for receiving the physical downlink shared channel**  …  If a UE is configured by higher layer parameter *PDCCH-Config* that contains two different values of *coresetPoolIndex* in *ControlResourceSet*, the UE may expect to receive multiple PDCCHs scheduling fully/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain. The UE may expect the reception of full/partially-overlapped PDSCHs in time, only when PDCCHs that schedule two PDSCHs are associated to different *ControlResourceSets* having different values of *coresetPoolIndex*. For a *ControlResourceSet* without *coresetPoolIndex*, the UE may assume that the *ControlResourceSet* is assigned with *coresetPoolIndex* as 0. ~~When the UE is configured with [~~*~~NumberOfAdditionalPCI~~*~~],~~ *~~ControlResourceSets~~* ~~corresponding to different~~ *~~coresetPoolIndex~~* ~~values may be associated with different physical cell IDs via activated TCI states of the~~ *~~ControlResourceSets~~*~~, where~~ *~~ControlResourceSets~~* ~~corresponding to one~~ *~~coresetPoolIndex~~* ~~can be associated with one physical cell ID and~~ *~~ControlResourceSets~~* ~~corresponding to another~~ *~~coresetPoolIndex~~* ~~can be associated with another physical cell ID.~~ When the UE is scheduled with full/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain, the full scheduling information for receiving a PDSCH is indicated and carried only by the corresponding PDCCH, the UE is expected to be scheduled with the same active BWP and the same SCS. When the UE is scheduled with full/partially-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain, the UE can be scheduled with at most two codewords simultaneously. When PDCCHs that schedule two PDSCHs are associated to different *ControlResourceSets* having different values of *coresetPoolIndex,* the following operations are allowed:  ============================ Unchanged part omitted ===========================  Proposal 3: Adopt the following TP to TS 38.214 clause 5.1.5.  **5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location**  …  If the UE is configured with [NumberOfAdditionalPCI] and with PDCCH-Config that contains two different values of coresetPoolIndex in ControlResourceSet, the UE receives an activation command, as described in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to 8 TCI states to the codepoints of the DCI field 'Transmission Configuration Indication' in one CC/DL BWP. When a set of TCI state IDs are activated for a CORESETPoolIndex, the activated TCI states corresponding to one CORESETPoolIndex can be associated with one physical cell ID and activated TCI states corresponding to another coresetPoolIndex can be associated with another or the same physical cell ID.  Proposal 4: Support UL transmission between UE and TRP associated with non-serving cell PCI.  Proposal 5: Enhancements related to spatial relation are needed to support UL transmission between UE and TRP associated with non-serving cell PCI. | | |
| [**R1-2201998**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201998.zip) | Maintenance on Rel-17 Inter-cell Multi-TRP | Samsung |
| **Proposal 1:** *Support inter-operation, e.g., switching, between intra-cell MTRP and inter-cell MTRP*   * *One PCI associated with activated TCI states can be associated with more than one CORESETPoolIndex and one CORESETPoolIndex can be associated with only one PCI associated with activated TCI states* | | |
| [**R1-2202124**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202124.zip) | Remaining details of Multi-TRP inter-cell operation | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| Proposal 1: Adopt the following TP to capture the existing agreement:  ============TP for 38.214 Section 5.1.4 ====================================  --Unchanged part omitted------------------------  When receiving PDSCH scheduled by PDCCH with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or PDSCHs with SPS, the REs corresponding to the configured or dynamically indicated resources in Clauses 5.1.4.1, 5.1.4.2 are not available for PDSCH. Furthermore, the UE assumes SS/PBCH block transmission according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources, the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted. If PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *AdditionalPCIInfo* with same physical cell identity as the one associated with a RS having same quasi-collocation properties as the PDSCH, the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted.  A UE is not expected to handle the case where PDSCH DM-RS REs are overlapping, even partially, with any RE(s) not available for PDSCH*.*  ===============================================================  Proposal 2: In the set of symbols indicated to a UE by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *AdditionalPCIInfo*   * Alt1 (more efficient): UE does not transmit UL signal/channel if   + The SSB is used as a measurement resource by the UE, or   + The SSB is associated with the active PCI (associated with one or more active TCI states) and the UL signal/channel is associated with the same PCI     - Association of UL signal/channel with a PCI is derived based on PL-RS for the UL signal/channel * Alt2 (simpler): UE does not transmit UL signal/channel irrespective of whether the SSB is associated with the active PCI or not and irrespective of association of the UL signal/channel with a PCI * The following Rel. 15/16/17 procedures are based on a selected Alt from Alt 1 or Alt 2 above:   + Procedure 1: When SSB overlaps with UL channel/RS, UE does not transmit the UL channels/RS [38.213, Section 11.1].   + Procedure 2: UE does not expect the set of SSB symbols to indicated as uplink symbols either semi-statically or dynamically (by SFI) [38.213, Section 11.1 and Section 11.1.1].   + Procedure 3: SSB symbols are assumed to be invalid symbols in a nominal repetition for PUSCH repetition Type B [38.214, Section 6.1.2.1].   + Procedure 4: For determination of the  slots in the case of PUCCH repetition, i.e., a slot is not counted toward the  slots if the PUCCH resource in that slot overlaps with a SSB [38.213, Section 9.2.6].   + Procedure 5: For available slot counting for PUSCH introduced in Rel-17 coverage enhancement agenda item [38.214, Section 6.1.2.1]. | | |
| [**R1-2202318**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202318.zip) | Maintenance of enhancements enabling inter-cell multi-TRP operations | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| **Observation 1:** MAC CE based switching is already supported  **Proposal 1:** Support inter-cell multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation, for both cases of CORESETPoolIndex is configured and not configured.   * When CORESETPoolIndex is configured, multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation is applied regardless that CORESETPoolIndex values are associated with the same PCI or different PCIs. i.e. inter-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP or intra-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP operations. * When CORESETPoolIndex is not configured but CORESETs are associated with two different PCIs, multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation is applied assuming that as if CORESETPoolIndex would be configured and CORESETPoolIndex are associated to different PCI.   **Proposal 2:** Don’t support additional rate matching behaviour for inter-cell multi-TRP operation.  **Proposal 3:** During the intermediate state (during the switching) between serving cell and different PCI, the UE is not required to monitor scheduling from a CORESET with associated with different PCI if the TCI state is associated with different PCI than the latest activated TCI state under the same CORESETpoolindex.  **Proposal 4:** Apply Rel-17 BFR enhancement for mTRP also for inter-cell mTRP. | | |