Companies are to share their inputs on the excel spreadsheet in /tsg\_ran/WG1\_RL1/TSGR1\_106-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1.2.1/PDCCH//RRC/ herein.

## Inputs on initial version

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table

Table 1 Inputs: Initial version

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Samsung | Regarding [twoQCLTypeDforPDCCH], since there is no agreement whether the explicit RRC parameter for the functionality of identifying two different QCL-TypeD properties is used or not, it should be removed and further discussed in the future meeting. |
| CATT | Whether the second parameter can be discussed here or not needs further clarification, since there is no related agreement. The similar issue is decoding assumption (number of BDs) configuration. These two issues can be treated in the same way. |
| Lenovo/MotM | There is agreement that UE reports one [or more] number(s) as required number of BDs for the two PDCCH candidates (Candidate values: 2, 3). Do we need prepare RRC signalling for UE reporting “required number of BDs for the two PDCCH candidates”? Also, the linked RRC parameter is about proposal “RRC configuration for counting two linked PDCCH candidates as 3 BDs is supported” (Not agree in RAN1 #106 e-meeting). Do we need reserve RRC parameter with bracket here similar as “[twoQCLTypeDforPDCCH] or wait for the final decision in the next meeting as Samusng’s suggestion for “[twoQCLTypeDforPDCCH]”? |
| FL | Thanks for providing your inputs. Based on the comments, we can delete [twoQCLTypeDforPDCCH] at this stage and further discuss in the next meeting along with other parameters, e.g., the need for RRC configuration for number of BDs. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Inputs on version 01

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table

....