Companies are to share their inputs on the excel spreadsheet:

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1.2.4/RRC>

## Inputs on initial version

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

Table 1 Inputs: Initial version

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| ZTE | Regarding the FG on simultaneousTCI-UpdateList1, simultaneousTCI-UpdateList2, we suggest removing it for now as we may use the existing Rel-16 parameters to update TCIs of CORESETs in the CC group. From our perspective, it is sufficient to reuse the existing prameters. |
| Moderator | Re ZTE  Just to clarify the intention of this row. You are right that we don’t have agreement on new RRC parameters, but even the parameters are agreed to be reused from Rel-16, RAN1 still needs to inform RAN2 about their new usage for RAN2 specification update. “New or existing” column with “FFS” should address your concern, but it is OK to remove the row as well. |
| vivo | Regarding the RRC parameters for SFN PDCCH and SFN PDSCH, we don’t have agreement on whether using the common parameter for both of them, or using separate parameters in the previous meeting. However, in the RRC list now, there are two rows showing the SFN PDCCH and SFN PDSCH’s RRC parameters (i.e., sfnSchemePdcch and sfnSchemePdsch) seperately. In our view, it depends on which combinations of PDCCH and PDSCH would be supported. We should further discuss it before determining the final RRC parameter(s). Therefore, it would be better to add FFS before sfnSchemePdcch and sfnSchemePdsch and note: depend on further discussion about whether using common RRC parameter for SFN PDCCH and SFN PDSCH indication or not in the list. |
| Samsung | We agree with Moderator’s view on simultaneous update. For *sfnSchemePdcch*, given the discussion so far, it can be even per CORESET, so “per CORESET” can be also included in “Per (UE, cell, TRP, …)” column as an FFS. |
| CATT | We have similar views as Samsung. Since we don’t have agreement on detail configuration for *sfnSchemePdcch*, “Per (UE, cell, TRP, …)” column should include “per UE”, “per CC”, “per CORESET” and “per BWP” as an FFS. |
| Lenovo/MotM | We also agree with Samsung’s comment about the possibility of configuring *sfnSchemePdcch* per CORESET, and hence we also prefer adding “per CORESET” to “Per (UE, cell, TRP, …)” as an FFS. For “simultaneousTCI-UpdateList1” and “simultaneousTCI-UpdateList2”, we believe it should be left to RAN2 on whether/how this is captured |
| Moderator | RE Samsung, CATT, Lenovo/MotM: RRC parameter list is updated according to your comment.  RE vivo:  1. In RAN1#105-e we have agreed as FFS whether the same RRC parameter should be used for PDSCH and PDCCH. If you take this FFS literally, separate parameters for PDCCH and PDSCH are assumed as baseline and common is FFS.  2. In RAN1#106-e we have agreed to support different transmission schemes for PDCCH and PDSCH (single TRP for PDCCH and SFN for PDSCH). RRC configuration in this case should have flexibility to configure SFN for PDSCH (by configuring sfnSchemePdsch parameter), but not for PDCCH (by not configuring sfnSchemePdcch parameter). This appraoch seems to be also future proof for possibly different configuration granularities (e.g. per CORESET may not work for PDSCH) mentioned by other companies above.  In any case, I have added FFS in the last column to address your conern. Hope it is OK. |
| Ericsson | We prefer to add “TRP-based pre-compensation (sfnSchemeB) is applicable for FR1 only” into the description column for *sfnSchemePdcch* and *sfnSchemePdsch.* This information can help RAN2 to decide the proper signaling name/structure in the RRC.  On *sfnSchemePdcch* we need further discussion and clarification in RAN1. We are fine with putting the controversial part in FFS. |
| vivo2 | To Moderator:  Thanks for sharing your understanding.  1. In our view, that FFS using the same RRC parameter is equivalent to FFS using separate parameters, since only one of these two opposite solutions would be choosed finally.  2. Regarding the case (single TRP for PDCCH and SFN for PDSCH), assuming PDSCH and PDCCH are configured with the same RRC paramerter of SFN, the number of TCI states in the codepoint in MAC CE is another determinant, as we have agreed in RAN1#105-e. If the number of TCI states is one, PDCCH would be still STRP-based, though configured with the RRC parameter of SFN.  **Agreement**  Enhanced SFN PDCCH transmission scheme (scheme 1 or TRP-based pre-compensation) is identified by the number of TCI states activated per CORESET and RRC parameter   * FFS: Configuration detail of RRC parameter   + Including whether the same RRC parameter is used for PDCCH and PDSCH   Therefore, from the above perspectives, it’s better to FFS the controversial part and further discuss in the future. |
| Moderator | Re Vivo  I don’t think it is good use of RAN1 time debating for 1 bit RRC signaling overhead especially with the clear agreement that common RRC parameter is FFS. In any case, I will update the RRC list according to your suggestion.  Re Ericsson  The FR1 restriction is captured. I have also added that FR2 is FFS for TRP based pre compensation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Inputs on version 01

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

....