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# Introduction

In RAN#94e, the Rel-18 WID of MIMO evolution for downlink and uplink is approved [1]. In the approved WID, extension of unified TCI framework is a part of the RAN1 objectives, and the detailed scope of this agenda item (Item 1A) includes the following highlighted objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1:**   1. Specify extension of Rel-17 Unified TCI framework for indication of multiple DL and UL TCI states focusing on multi-TRP use case, using Rel-17 unified TCI framework. 2. Study, and if needed, specify the following items to facilitate simultaneous multi-panel UL transmission for higher UL throughput/reliability, focusing on FR2 and multi-TRP, assuming up to 2 TRPs and up to 2 panels, targeting CPE/FWA/vehicle/industrial devices (if applicable)    * UL precoding indication for PUSCH, where no new codebook is introduced for multi-panel simultaneous transmission      + The total number of layers is up to four across all panels and total number of codewords is up to two across all panels, considering single DCI and multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation.    * UL beam indication for PUCCH/PUSCH, where unified TCI framework extension in objective 2 is assumed, considering single DCI and multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation      + For the case of multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation, only PUSCH+PUSCH, or PUCCH+PUCCH is transmitted across two panels in a same CC. 3. Study, and if justified, specify the following    * Two TAs for UL multi-DCI for multi-TRP operation    * Power control for UL single DCI for multi-TRP operation where unified TCI framework extension in objective 2 is assumed.   For the case of simultaneous UL transmission from multiple panels, the operation will only be limited to the objective 6 scenarios. |

Based on the contributions from companies [2]-[33], the followings are provided in this document:

* Summary of companies’ views on each of open issues raised by interested companies, where the open issues are categorized as follow:
  + Issue 1 – General framework for unified TCI extension
  + Issue 2 – TCI state update and activation
  + Issue 3 – How to associate the indicated TCI state(s) with each target channel/signal
  + Issue 4 – UL power Control for UL MTRP
  + Issue 5 – Beam reporting and beam failure recovery
* Observations and recommended proposals based on the summary of companies’ views

# Issue 1 – General framework for unified TCI extension

Open issues on general framework for unified TCI extension and company views are summarized below.

Table 1-1 Summary for Issue 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **FL note/observation** |
| 1.1 | Whether multiple joint/DL TCI states can be applied simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception(s) | Support: Google, Ericsson, Docomo, ZTE (in principle), Lenovo, Intel (in principle), FGI, Huawei/HiSilicon, CMCC, Samsung, Futurewei, Nokia (in principle, UTCI framework should cover all scenarios)  Concern: vivo, NEC, Fujitsu, IDC, Apple, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm (ok for SFN), LG  Out-of-scope: OPPO, Fraunhofer | Proposal 1.A is provided for this issue  Note that even applying two TCI states for CJT is not supported in current spec. In current spec, UE is required to assume that the PDSCH DM-RS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of two TCI states only for PDSCH-SFN. Thus, this issue must be discussed and decided first before further considering the max number of TCI states for CJT in unified TCI extension. On the other hand, this issue may or may not be out of the Rel-18 MIMO scope. |
| 1.2 | Up to four TCI states can applied in a CC/BWP, including the following possible combinations:   * 2 joint TCI states * 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states * 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state * 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state * FFS: 3 joint TCI states * FFS: 4 joint TCI states * FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states * FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state * FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 UL TCI state | Support: OPPO (not for more than 2 joint TCI states), Docomo (prefer to keep FFS for >2)  Concern: | Proposal 1.B is provided for this issue  Note that we don't discuss whether to consider CJT in unified TCI extension in this issue, which should be decided in Issue 1.1. If Proposal 1.A can be agreed, then these combinations of TCI states (w/o FFS) are naturally supported for CJT, and this group can further discuss whether to support {3 joint TCI states}, {4 joint TCI states}, and other combination(s) for CJT use case. |
| 1.3 | Support joint DL/UL TCI update and separate DL/UL TCI update in a same CC/BWP simultaneously | Support: Intel, FGI, Huawei/HiSilicon, QC, CATT, CMCC, ITRI, Panasonic, TCL, vivo, Xiaomi, Docomo, NEC, IDC, TransHold  Concern: Google, OPPO, Lenovo, LG, Spreadtrum, Nokia, MediaTek, Fraunhofer, ZTE | Some corresponding combinations are added for FFS in Proposal 1.B for this issue  Based on the offline discussion (please check Appendix B), for proponents of the individual TCI update modes for two TRPs in the same CC/BWP, the main use case is that there could be only one of the TRPs suffering from MPE issue. Opponents can further clarify how to handle such case if the individual TCI update modes in the same CC/BWP are not allowed. |
| 1.4 | RRC-configured TCI state lists | Alt1-Reuse Rel-17 design (i.e., one list for joint/DL TCI states and another list for UL TCI states): Apple (S-DCI), Ericsson, CATT (S-DCI), Fujitsu, Panasonic, MediaTek, QC, OPPO, Huawei/HiSilicon, IDC, Futurewei, LG, vivo, TransHold, Nokia, Intel,CMCC  Atl2-Introduce TRP-specific TCI state list(s): Apple (M-DCI), CATT (M-DCI), ZTE, Spreadtrum, TCL, Google Docomo (M-DCI), NEC | If no consensus can be reached in this issue, then Alt1 will be the natural outcome |
| 1.5 | Introduction of TRP-ID/index associated with or included in each TCI state | Support: CMCC, ZTE  Concern: Ericsson, MediaTek, Apple, Docomo, Nokia, CATT, OPPO, LG, Intel, Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo, vivo |  |

**Proposal 1.A**: On unified TCI framework extension, more than one joint/DL TCI states can be applied simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception based on one of the following alternatives:

* Alt1: The UE shall assume that the PDSCH DM-RS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of the more than one joint/DL TCI states with respect to QCL-TypeA
* Alt2: The UE shall assume that the PDSCH DM-RS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of first joint/DL TCI state with respect to QCL-TypeA and the DL RSs of the rest of the more than one joint/DL TCI states with respect to QCL-TypeB

FFS: The maximum number of joint/DL TCI states that can be applied simultaneously for CJT-based PDSCH reception(s)

Note: CJT in Rel-18 targets only FR1

**Proposal 1.B**: On unified TCI framework extension, up to 4 TCI states can be applied to DL receptions and/or UL transmissions in a CC/BWP, where these TCI states are indicated/updated by MAC-CE/DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation

* One of the following combinations can be applied to DL receptions and/or UL transmissions in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation:
  + 2 joint TCI states for joint DL/UL TCI update in the CC/BWP
  + 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states for separate DL/UL TCI update in the CC/BWP
  + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state for separate DL/UL TCI update in the CC/BWP
  + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state for separate DL/UL TCI update in the CC/BWP
* In addition to the above combinations, study whether to support the following combinations:
  + 3 joint TCI states for joint DL/UL TCI update in the CC/BWP
  + 4 joint TCI states for joint DL/UL TCI update in the CC/BWP
  + 1 joint TCI state for joint DL/UL TCI update in the CC/BWP + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states for separate DL/UL TCI update in the same CC/BWP
  + 1 joint TCI state for joint DL/UL TCI update in the CC/BWP + 1 DL TCI state for separate DL/UL TCI update in the same CC/BWP
  + 1 joint TCI state for joint DL/UL TCI update in the CC/BWP + 1 UL TCI state for separate DL/UL TCI update in the same CC/BWP
* Note: 1 joint TCI state is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework
* Note: 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework
* Note: As in Rel-17, a joint TCI state in any above combination is applied for UL transmission only if applicable
* FFS: The possible combination(s) of joint/DL/UL TCI states that can be applied per TRP

**Proposal 1.A-1**: On unified TCI framework extension, decide in RAN1#110 meeting, whether more than one joint/DL TCI states can be applied simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception

* FFS: If supported, how the PDSCH DM-RS port(s) is QCLed with the more than one joint/DL TCI states
* FFS: If supported, the maximum number of joint/DL TCI states that can be applied simultaneously for CJT-based PDSCH reception(s)
* Note: CJT in Rel-18 targets only FR1

**Proposal 1.B-1**: On unified TCI framework extension, up to 4 TCI states can be applied to DL receptions and/or UL transmissions in a CC/BWP, where these TCI states are indicated/updated by MAC-CE/DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation

* FFS: The possible combination(s) of joint/DL/UL TCI states that can be applied to DL receptions and/or UL transmissions in a BWP/CC
* FFS: The possible combination(s) of joint/DL/UL TCI states that can be applied to DL receptions and/or UL transmissions per TRP

Table 1-2 Additional inputs for Issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | **Please update your view on those sub-issues in Table 1-1 and check above moderator proposals** |
| QC | For 1.A, as elaborated in last round, it seems only sensible to map the same set of TCI(s) to every PDSCH DMRS port, since every stream is precoded across ALL TRPs in CJT. This can be viewed as extension of R17 SFN PDSCH potentially with > 2 TCIs if it is agreed. So we suggest the following changes to make this clear.  **Proposal 1.A**: On unified TCI framework extension, more than one joint/DL TCI states can be applied simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception, i.e., the UE shall assume that ~~the~~ every PDSCH DM-RS port~~(s)~~ is QCLed with the DL RSs of the ~~two~~ more than one joint/DL TCI states   * FFS: The maximum number of joint/DL TCI states that can be applied simultaneously for CJT-based PDSCH reception(s)   [Mod] Yes, the behavior is the same as SFN to my understanding, and I just copied the same wording from current spec for SFN in this proposal for CJT.  For 1.B, suggest to add 2 DL TCIs in the list. Only 1 activated/indicated DL TCI is allowed in R17 as in 214. Also, the use case for mixed joint and separate TCIs is that one of the 2 TRPs suffers MPE can use the separate TCIs, as elaborated in last round. Prefer not to restrict configuration flexibility.   * One of the following combinations can be applied in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation:   + […]   + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state   + 1 pair of DL TCI states   + FFS: 3 joint TCI states   + […]   [Mod] More clarification on this combination may be needed, i.e., what the difference from the combination of 2 joint TCI states? Please check the newly added note to clarify that a joint TCI state is applied for UL reception only if applicable, as in Rel-17 since in Rel-17, joint TCI state can be used in FR1.  For 1.3, as elaborated in last round, the use case for mixed joint and separate TCIs is that one of the 2 TRPs suffers MPE can use the separate TCIs. Prefer not to restrict configuration flexibility.  For 1.4, Support Alt1 to simplify the configuration. It also provides gNB flexibility to allocate different # of TCIs among the two TRPs. Total configured TCI # can be discussed separately |
| OPPO | For **Proposal 1.A**: as we stated in the pre-meeting discussion, we still couldn’t find clear hint for the necessity of enhancing unified TCI for CJT in the Rel.18 MIMO WID. But if that’s the majority’s view to have it discussed again, we are okay to re-open the box focusing on two indicated joint/DL TCI states for CJT.  Slight modification can be found below. Since in the main bullet, it says “QCLed with the DL RSs of the two joint/DL TCI states”, we suggest to change “more than one” into “two” to be more aligned and clear.  **Proposal 1.A**: On unified TCI framework extension, ~~more than one~~ two joint/DL TCI states can be applied simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception, i.e., the UE shall assume that the PDSCH DM-RS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of the two joint/DL TCI states   * FFS: The maximum number of joint/DL TCI states that can be applied simultaneously for CJT-based PDSCH reception(s)   For **Proposal 1.B**: support in principle. Regarding the first two FFS for CJT, i.e. 3 or 4 joint TCI states, we think joint TCI states should be replaced by DL TCI states. Consider the fact that CJT operates only in DL at FR1 in which UL spatial relation was not specified in Spec.   * + FFS: 3 ~~joint~~ DL TCI states   + FFS: 4 ~~joint~~ DL TCI states   [Mod] Please check the newly added note to clarify that a joint TCI state is applied for UL reception only if applicable as in Rel-17, since joint TCI state can be used in FR1 in Rel-17.  There might be one more issue to be clarified related the following sub-bullet. That is when either 1 DL or UL TCI state is indicated/updated for one TRP, should UE maintain the unchanged UL or DL TCI state for the TRP or only apply the indicated DL or UL TCI state for the TRP?   * + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state   + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 UL TCI state   [Mod] We will need to clarify this issue for sure. |
| Google | On **Proposal 1.A**: We agree with QC’s revision. Since, as mentioned in sub-bullet, the maximum number of joint/DL TCI states that can be applied simultaneously is still FFS, we should change “two” to “more than one”.  On **Proposal 1.B**: As we mentioned in offline, we don’t think per-TRP configuration of joint/separate TCI mode is useful. Even only one TRP is facing MPE issue, it would also impact selection of the beam(s) that can be used to communicate with the other TRP. In addition, supporting this would make the whole discussion quite complicated, where many combinations need to be discussed and justified even without considering CJT. |
| Mod V04 | **Proposal 1.A and Proposal 1.B are revised according to above feedback** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1.A**  We think we need to set the maximum number of indicated TCI states for CJT and not leave it as an FFS since:   1. If we don’t agree on the maximum number of TCI states, we are not sure how the subsequent discussion for TCI activation/indication in MAC-CE and TCI indication in DCI can progress. We think that both MAC-CE design is very much intertwined with the maximum number of TCI states that are mapped to the TCI codepoint (max number of indicated TCIs). 2. Based on our SLS results in R1-2205879, assuming an RSRP gap between coherent TRPs to be up to 10dB, more than 40% of the UEs are connected to 3 or 4 TRPs. If four TCI states are supported, four TRS can be indicated where each TRS is associated with one TRP. From the measurements on independent TRS for each TRP, UE can accurately estimate the delay spread of that TRP. However, if only two TCI states are supported, UE can be indicated with up to two TRS. In such a case, as each TRS is associated with only one TRP, the delay spread of only two TRPs can be measured accurately while the delay spread of the other two TRPs may be ignored or misestimated. This results in the CJT performance loss.   As for Proposal 1.A, we can further clarify that CJT is only concerned with FR1. Also, we prefer to use the original wording by the moderator which was directly taken from the specification for PDSCH-SFN. The text in 38.214 for PDSCH-SFN states that “the UE shall assume that the DM-RS port(s)of the PDSCH is quasi co-located with the DL-RSs of the two TCI states.”  We suggest the following changes:  **Proposal 1.A (updated)**: On unified TCI framework extension, ~~more than one~~ up to four joint/DL TCI states can be applied simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception in FR1, i.e., the UE shall assume that ~~every~~ the PDSCH DM-RS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of ~~the more than one~~ up to four joint/DL TCI states   * ~~FFS: The maximum number of joint/DL TCI states that can be applied simultaneously for CJT-based PDSCH reception(s)~~   [Mod] Capture “in FR1” in the proposal, and I also prefer to use the same description in current spec. Regarding the max number, please note that there is still no consensus on support and how to support CJT with multiple TCI states. If you really believe the suggestion on the max number = 4 can make the proposal easier to be accepted by the group, I can adopt your suggestion later.  **Proposal 1.B:**  We have two concerns about this proposal:   1. In Rel-17 unified TCI framework, any of the following combinations can be indicated to the UE using MAC-CE/DCI:    1. 1 Joint TCI    2. 1 DL    3. 1 UL    4. 1 DL + 1 UL   However, if, for instance, “b” is indicated to the UE by a MAC-CE/DCI at a certain time t0, it does not mean UE’s UL TCI is undetermined after t0+BAT. UE still applies a previously-indicated UL TCI it has been using before t0. Similarly, in our view, UE cannot apply only a “1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state”, as it still needs to apply an UL TCI for the second link even if the UL TCI for the second link is not indicated in the last MAC-CE/DCI. Similar issue holds regarding “1 pair of DL TCI states”. So, if the intention of proposal is actually the applied TCIs, then, for two TRPs, only the following combinations are valid (Note that we are supportive to remove FFS from the third bullet):   * + 2 joint TCI states   + 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states   Note that gNB may update/indicate only a subset of each of the above combinations in a DCI or MAC-CE. For instance, for the second bullet, only an UL TCI state may be indicated to the UE in a DCI.  [Mod] The proposal intends to define the possible combinations that can be applied for DL reception and/or UL transmissions in a CC/BWP. In Rel-17, only two combinations are supported, i.e., one joint TCI state or a pair of DL and UL TCI states. For the combination {1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state} or (1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state), the potential use case is when MTRP operation is only configured for DL or UL, thus no need to provide two DL/UL TCI states in separate TCI update mode. For the possible combinations of TCI states that can be indicated/mapped by/to a TCI codepoint, this will be discussed in Issue 2.   1. As discussed in Proposal 1.A, we don’t think the number of applied TCI states should remain as FFS. When UE operates in CJT scenario, it needs up to 4 TCIs states for the DL and up to 2 TCI states for UL to support legacy UL Tx schemes. As such, following combinations need to be supported:    * 2 joint TCI states + 2 additional DL TCI states    * 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states + 2 additional DL TCI states    * FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 2 additional DL TCI states   Given above discussions, we suggest the following updates in Proposal 1.B:  **Proposal 1.B (updated)**: On unified TCI framework extension, ~~up to 4 TCI states can be applied in a CC/BWP, where these~~ TCI states are indicated/ updated by MAC-CE/DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation   * One of the following combinations can be applied in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation:   + 2 joint TCI states   + 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states   + ~~1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state~~   + ~~1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state~~   + ~~[1 pair of DL TCI states]~~   + ~~FFS: 3 DL TCI states~~   + ~~FFS: 4 DL TCI states~~   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states   + ~~FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state~~   + ~~FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 UL TCI state~~ * For mTRP CJT operation in FR1, in addition to the above combinations, one of the following combinations can be applied in a CC/BWP   + 2 joint TCI states + 2 DL TCI states   + 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states + 2 DL TCI states   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 2 DL TCI states * Note: For any of the above combinations, gNB may indicate/activate only a subset of the combination in a DCI/MAC-CE. * Note: 1 joint TCI state is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework * Note: 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework   [Mod] Before this group reaches consensus on support of more than one TCI states for CJT, I don’t see the reason why the potential combinations for CJT cannot be remained in FFS? Regarding your suggested combinations, could you explain more why UL TCI state and separate TCI update are needed in FR1?  **1.3:**  The separate DL/UL TCI modes serves the scenario where the correspondence between DL and UL beams does not hold due to, for instance, the MPE issues. In the 2 TRP case, it is possible that UL and DL beam correspondence holds only for one of the beam pair links. As an example, the MPE restriction may only be applicable to one UE panel whose UL beam is towards a single TRP. In such a case, the beam pair link between UE’s other panel and other TRP should not be impacted. It is therefore beneficial to support per TRP TCI state mode configuration for the sake of transmission flexibility.  **1.4:**  We don’t see the need to have TRP-specific pool in RRC.  **1.5:**  We don’t see the need for association of TRP Id with each individual TCI state. |
| Docomo | On **Proposal 1.A**: Support.  On **Proposal 1.B**: Re OPPO’s comment, our understanding is that gNB can configure joint TCI state in FR1 in Rel.17. Hence, we suggest to add:   * + FFS: 3 joint TCI states   + FFS: 4 joint TCI states   Note that FG23-1-1(joint TCI) is pre-requisite feature of FG23-10-1(separate TCI). Hence, UE may only support joint TCI.  [Mod] Agree. Please check the newly added note to clarify that a joint TCI state is applied for UL reception only if applicable as in Rel-17. |
| NEC | **Proposal 1.A**  Not support. We don’t see a strong need to use unified TCI states to support CJT operations since CJT may not require fast TCI update mechanism and common beam update for PDCCH/PDSCH.  **Proposal 1.B**  Support.  **Issue 1.4**  We are open to discuss per-TRP TCI state list. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 1.A** not support.  **Proposal 1.B**: As we stated in last round, we think it is unnecessary to support joint DL/UL TCI update and separate DL/UL TCI update in a same CC/BWP simultaneously. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | **Proposal 1.A:** We don’t think unified TCI extension for CJT is within the scope of the work item. Nevertheless, if there is consensus on discussing CJT, at least a clear distinction should be made between the features supported for MTRP and CJT. In that sense, we are OK with proposal 1.A.  **Proposal 1.B:** The proposal seems to mix the discussion for the two use-cases. We are OK with up to 2 TCI-states for MTRP. Moreover, the proposal seems to contradict itself between the main bullet and the FFS sub-bullets. If the values of 3 and 4 are FFS, the main bullet should state that up to 2 are supported. We therefore propose the following revision:  [Mod] For the combination {2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states}, there are four TCI states.  **Proposal 1.B**: On unified TCI framework extension, up to ~~4~~ 2 TCI states can be applied in a CC/BWP, where these TCI states are indicated/ updated by MAC-CE/DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation   * One of the following combinations can be applied in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation:   + 2 joint TCI states   + 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states   + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state   + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state   + [1 pair of DL TCI states]   + FFS: 3 DL TCI states for CJT   + FFS: 4 DL TCI states for CJT   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 UL TCI state   + Note: 1 joint TCI state is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework   Note: 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework |
| ZTE | **Re Proposal 1.A:** Not support.  Considering ideal synchronization across MTRP in CJT (as mentioned in WID), a single TCI state should be assumed as a starting point. When having more than one TCI state indication, if supported, additional TCI state(s) may only provide the portion of QCL assumption, like QCL-TypeB only: ‘Doppler shift’ and ‘Doppler spread’ only for handling different Doppler impacts due to UE mobility.  **Proposal 1.A**: On unified TCI framework extension, more than one joint/DL TCI states can be applied simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception, i.e., the UE shall assume that every PDSCH DM-RS port is QCLed with the DL RS of first joint/DL TCI state w.r.t. QCL TypeA and the DL RSs of the rest of the more than one joint/DL TCI states w.r.t. QCL-TypeB.   * FFS: The maximum number of joint/DL TCI states that can be applied simultaneously for CJT-based PDSCH reception(s)   [Mod] Captured as one alternative to support CJT, please check.  **Re Proposal 1.B:** In our views, the motivation of 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states +1DL/UL TCI state is unclear. Some further clarification is needed. Generally speaking, if providing individual DL/UL TCI state for one TRP with flexibility, the most reasonable solution is to provide separate DL/UL TCI state for a given TRP directly. Then, for mDCI based mTRP operation, it is straightforward that only one joint/a pair of DL/UL is indicated for one CORESET-pool as what we did in Rel-16  **Proposal 1.B**: On unified TCI framework extension, up to 4 TCI states can be applied in a CC/BWP, where these TCI states are indicated/ updated by MAC-CE/DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation   * One of the following combinations can be applied in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation:   + 1 or 2 joint TCI states   + 1 or 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states   + 1 DL TCI state for one TRP   + 1 UL TCI state for one TRP   + [1 pair of DL TCI states]   + FFS: 3 DL TCI states   + FFS: 4 DL TCI states   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 UL TCI state   + Note: 1 joint TCI state is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework   + Note: 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework   [Mod] I would suggest to define the combinations generally for the whole framework (in one BWP/CC rather than in one TRP), then we can discuss the possible combinations per TRP. One FFS is added for this, please check. |
| InterDigital | **Proposal 1.A:** This is premature, in that exact behaviors of CJT should have to be clearly understood first, e.g., on whether the considered CJT scheme is the same as PDSCH-SFN at least in terms of the PDSCH reception behavior at UE.  **Proposal 1.B**: It seems the intention of this proposal is to have a common understanding on “allowed combination” on UTCIs being used at the UE on a given time instance (not about “allowed signaling combination” by one indication, e.g., by a DCI). If this understanding is correct, it seems that the added bullet by Qualcomm “[1 pair of DL TCI states]” needs to be revised as “1 DL TCI state + 1 DL TCI state” to avoid confusions from using “pair”, as we’re using the term ‘pair’ here, only in terms of a pair of DL and UL.  [Mod] Correct understanding. The combination added by QC is removed now. |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 1.A:** Support. As we commented in offline round, supporting multi-TRP and CJT schemes with one unified TCI framework will reduce system complexity.  **Proposal 1.B**: Given the long list of combinations and some of the combinations depending on the outcome of Proposal 1.A and Issue 1.3, we suggest discussing and making decision on Proposal 1.A and Issue 1.3 first before discussing Proposal 1.B.  [Mod] I don’t see the any strong concern on those combinations w/o FFS.  **Issue 1.3:** We are open to support mixed joint and separate TCIs if majority of the group find such flexibility is necessary.  **Issue 1.4:** We prefer Alt 1 which can simplify the RRC configuration. |
| Lenovo | On **Proposal 1.A**:  On CJT PDSCH, we understand that separate TRS are transmitted by different TRPs while the DMRS port(s) are transmitted by all the coherent TRPs with different PDSCH antenna port(s). So we prefer the wording provided by Huawei “the UE shall assume that ~~every~~ the PDSCH DM-RS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of the indicated TCI state(s)”.  [Mod] Please check the revised proposal  Another point is that the number of TRPs used for CJT PDSCH transmission may be dynamically changed. For example, 4 TCI states are indicated while one or two or three or four of them can be dynamically indicated for the CJT PDSCH reception. So we want to add a FFS point on the dynamic TCI indication on the scheduled PDSCH.  **Proposal 1.A**: On unified TCI framework extension, more than one joint/DL TCI states can be applied simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception, i.e., the UE shall assume that ~~every~~ the PDSCH DM-RS port is QCLed with the DL RSs of the ~~more than one~~ indicated joint/DL TCI states   * FFS: The maximum number of joint/DL TCI states that can be applied simultaneously for CJT-based PDSCH reception(s) * FFS: How to indicate/determine the joint/DL TCI states for the CJT-based PDSCH reception(s).   [Mod] How to provide “more than one joint/DL TCI states” can be discussed later.  On **Proposal 1.B**:  Before we discuss the supported TCI combinations for the MAC CE codepoint, it better to clarify that the it targets S-DCI or M-DCI mode since different TCI indication mechanism may be adopted. We understand this proposal applies to S-DCI mode. If so, it’s better to add one option “1 pair of UL TCI states” for UL TCI state(s) only update. Another comment it that it’s better to discuss issue 1.3 before we discuss the FFS points. So we suggest the following update:  **Proposal 1.B**: On unified TCI framework extension, up to 4 TCI states can be applied in a CC/BWP, where these TCI states are indicated/ updated by MAC-CE/DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation   * One of the following combinations can be applied in a CC/BWP for S-DCI MTRP operation:   + 2 joint TCI states   + 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states   + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state   + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state   + [1 pair of DL TCI states]   + 1 pair of UL TCI states   + ~~FFS: 3 DL TCI states~~   + ~~FFS: 4 DL TCI states~~   + ~~FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states~~   + ~~FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state~~   + ~~FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 UL TCI state~~   + Note: 1 joint TCI state is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework   + Note: 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework   [Mod] The proposal intends to define the possible combinations that can be applied for DL reception and/or UL transmissions in a CC/BWP. For the possible combinations of TCI states that can be indicated/mapped by/to a TCI codepoint, this will be discussed in Issue 2. |
| Apple | **Proposal 1A:** It is important to reach a common understanding on the relation between SFN-PDSCH and CJT PDSCH. For instance, whether these schemes are indeed identical or they are assumed to be identifical to facilitate unified TCI framework extension for CJT use case. In our opinion, it seems benefitial to extend unified TCI framework for CJT. However, it is unecessary to optimize for CJT with ‘4’ TRPs use case given the practical challenges and limited use case.  **Proposal 1B**: In general, we support all of possible combinations of two from the sets: {joint}, {DL, UL}, {DL only}, {UL only} states. It is up to gNB to decides how to select and active these combinations with limiting total up to 8.  **Issue 1.3:** Support for the use case of one TRP with MPE issue.More importantly, we did not find strong drawback/complexity to provide this flexibility.  **Issue 1.4:** we support this to decouple the TCI update across TRPs in case of mDCI mTRP with non-ideal backhaul. The Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be fully reused within a TRP such that the standard/spec/testing effort can be minimized. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.A:** we are fine with the current version with the wording updates on “PDSCH SFN”.  **Proposal 1.B:** we support the FL’s proposal, which covers agreeable combinations, though the full list depends on the outcome of whether CJT or mixed TCI types across TRPs should be supported or not.  **Issue 1.3:** we do not see strong use case(s) of mixed TCI types across TRPs, not to mention that the mixture would introduce many combinations unnecessarily complicating TCI state(s) activation/update designs for MTRP.  **Issue 1.4:** we slightly prefer a single list/pool. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 1A:** we support up to 2 joint and/or pair(s) of DL and UL TCI states in proposal 1B. and it can be applied to CJT. We don’t support additional more TCI states for CJT.  **Proposal 1B:** we thought the intention is to restrict the number of TRPs for TCI state indication. But what is mean of “3/4 joint/DL TCI states”? We suggest to discuss proposal 1A and 1B separately first. So for the main bullet, we prefer the following revision.  **Proposal 1.B**: On unified TCI framework extension, up to ~~4 TCI states~~ 2 joint and/or pair(s) of DL and UL TCI states can be applied in a CC/BWP~~, where these TCI states are indicated/ updated by MAC-CE/DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation~~.  It means at most 2 joint TCI states, and at most 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states can be applied.  While for the “TCI states indicated/updated by MAC-CE/DCI”, we think it is another issue. It is about whether a part of these TCI states or all of these TCI states can be updated. And there are many combinations if a part of these TCI states can be updated. For example:   * + 2 joint TCI states   + 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states   + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state   + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state   + [2 ~~pair of~~ DL TCI states]   + 2 UL TCI states   + ~~FFS: 3 DL TCI states~~   + ~~FFS: 4 DL TCI states~~   + ~~FFS:~~ 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states   + ~~FFS:~~ 1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state   + ~~FFS:~~ 1 joint TCI state + 1 UL TCI state   But for the combination with “……+ 1 DL/UL TCI state”, we would like to clarify that is it for DL/UL only TRP, or only update the DL/UL TCI state for TRP with both DL and UL?  [Mod] The proposal intends to define the possible combinations that can be applied for DL reception and/or UL transmissions in a CC/BWP. For the possible combinations of TCI states that can be indicated/mapped by/to a TCI codepoint, this will be discussed in Issue 2. Before that, we need to agree that these TCI states can be updated/activated by what signaling!  On the maximum number, for the combination {2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states}, there are four TCI states. Note that I try not to preclude the possibility to support more than 2 for CJT, thus it can be captured as one potential combination for further study under this proposal.  For issue 1.3, we support joint DL/UL TCI update and separate DL/UL TCI update in a same CC/BWP simultaneously.  For issue 1.4, we prefer to reuse Rel-17 design.  For issue 1.5, we don’t see the motivation to introduce TRP-ID in each TCI state. |
| Mod V19 | **Please check above revised moderator proposals, and my response to some of you as well 😊.**  **Note that the two proposals may be discussed in the 1st day online section.** |
| LG | **Proposal 1A:** Not support. The agreed target use cases (i.e. MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16/17 and STxMP) should be focused with high priority. Also, the relation between PDSCH-SFN and CJT scheme is unclear as mentioned by ZTE, InterDigital and Apple.  **Proposal 1B:** Fine with the current version with the listed combination on joint/DL/UL TCI state |
| ZTE2 | **Proposal 1A:** Support Alt2. Then, we are open to further discuss on QCL Type for TCI state(s) applied to the CJT.  **Proposal 1B:** Since the motivation is for DL reception and/or UL transmission, does it means that for the following cases is just relevant to one TRP with both DL and UL, but another TRP with DL/UL-only.   * + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state   + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state   [Mod] Yes, this is the use case mentioned by some contributions. |
| CATT | Proposal 1.A: Fine.  Proposal 1.B: Fine. As channel characteristics are independent for each link, it is possible that one link may suffer from MPE and the other one does not. The individual TCI update modes should be supported.  For 1.4, for either S-DCI or M-DCI, there is no obvious benefit to support TRP-specific TCI state pool in Rel-18. |
| vivo | **Proposal 1.A:** better to include indication of one TRP for CJT mode, and change Alt1 as   * Alt1: The UE shall assume that the PDSCH DM-RS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of one or more joint/DL TCI states with respect to QCL-TypeA   [Mod] To my understanding, support of one is naturally supported by current spec. Thus, we can focus on whether to support more than one.  **Proposal 1.B:**   1. We agree the two bullets of 3 or 4 DL TCI states listed for CJT are applied for DL, but it should not prevent CJT operating in a joint TCI type.   [Mod] However, why separate TCI mode is needed in FR1, if it is main used for MPE mitigation? Except the combinations listed as FFS for CJT, I added the update mode based on your suggestions.   1. Better to list the unified TCI state types for each bullet   Proposed updates are as follows:   * + For unified TCI state type = joint, 2 joint TCI states   + For unified TCI state type = separate, 2 pairs of DL and UL TCI states   + For unified TCI state type = separate, 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 DL TCI state   + For unified TCI state type = separate, 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states + 1 UL TCI state   + FFS: For unified TCI state type = joint or separate, 3 joint/DL TCI states   + FFS: For unified TCI state type = joint or separate, 4 joint/DL TCI states   + FFS: For unified TCI state type = joint + separate, 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states   + FFS: For unified TCI state type = joint + separate,1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state   + FFS: For unified TCI state type = joint + separate,1 joint TCI state + 1 UL TCI state   + Note: 1 joint TCI state is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework   + Note: 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states is already supported by Rel-17 unified TCI framework   **#1.3:** We are open to this issue. A mixed UTCI type for different TRPs would make the UTCI activation and indication a little bit complicated but provide flexibility.  **#1.4:** Support Alt1. We don’t have explicit TRP-specific TCI state in Rel-16/17, we think this principle should be kept in Rel-18.  **#1.5:** Don’t support. Same reason as #1.4. |
| TransHold | **Proposal 1.A:** Share the similar view as Apple that a common understanding on the relation between SFN-PDSCH and CJT PDSCH should be reached firstly.  **Proposal 1.B:** Firstly, since DL transmission is a more typical scenario, for all the FFS, the following FFS should be considered:   * + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states   + FFS: 1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state   Secondly, if the TCI states of one combination are indicated by a TCI codepoint, it means that one TCI field in DCI, instead of two TCI fields, is used?  [Mod] How to indicate these combinations can be discussed in Issue 2.  For issue 1.3, for scheduling flexibility, we support mixed joint and separate TCIs  For issue 1.4, we prefer to reuse Rel-17 design. |
| Nokia | Proposal 1.A: This proposal is fine in general. However, RAN1 should not waste lot of time on this if other companies views that this is out of scope. The progress should be made focusing on WI objectives first.  Proposal 1.B: OK, but first 1.1 is to be concluded.  Issue 1.3: Prefer similar approach as in Rel17.  Issue 1.4: Support Alt1.  Issue 1.5: We don’t see need to introduce TRP-ID to be included in a TCI state. |
| Intel | **Proposal 1.A:** Ok to discuss further and we support Alt-1 in principle.  From specification standpoint, we think reception in DL CJT is similar to PDSCH-SFN in that there needs to be multiple TCI states for the same PDSCH received from multiple TRPs. In Rel-18 the same concept can be extended to CJT case to support unified TCI extension. We think that transmission of per-TRP TRS can provide flexibility and better DL reception especially if the propagation distances between TRPs are different.  Moreover, we think it’s better to provide as much information as possible to the UE. Alt-2 may be seen as a sub-case of Alt-1 where UE chooses QCL-Type A from only one TCI rather all indicated TCIs.  **Proposal 1.B:** Ok with the listed options, but we think options including combination of joint and separate TCI should also be supported. To this end, we think we should also agree to support MAC-CE configuration of both joint DL/UL TCI and separate DL/UL TCI within the same CC along with dynamic indication.  We can come back to the case of 3/4 joint TCI states after the CJT issue is settled and RAN1 agrees to support 4 TRP clusters for CJT.  Intel’s view updated for Issue 1.4 in the table. |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 1.B:** If we end up agreeing to support per TRP TCI state mode configuration (for the case of MPE issues), then when the unified TCI state type for one TRP is joint and for the other TRP is separate, we should have the following combination:   * 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states   We support to have this option. We propose to agree first whether to support per TRP TCI state mode configuration because this decision will have a clear impact on the design of the unified TCI framework for multi-TRP.  [Mod] Do you have concern to agree on those combinations which are not impact by whether to support per-TRP TCI state mode? |
| FGI | **Proposal 1.B:** In general, we support the proposal with following update since we support indicating joint TCI and DL/UL TCI simultaneously to achieve the scheduling flexibility. However, it seems that we don’t need to list all combinations specifically if we agree to support simultaneous joint TCI and DL/UL TCI with up to 4 TCI states:  **…**  ~~FFS:~~ 1 joint TCI state + 1 pair of DL and UL TCI states  ~~FFS:~~ 1 joint TCI state + 1 DL TCI state  ~~FFS:~~ 1 joint TCI state + 1 UL TCI state  …  Besides, the note for ‘UL reception’ term is unclear. Is it an UL transmission or DL reception? [Mod] Fixed. |
| Mod 29 | **Please check above revised moderator proposals, and my response to some of you as well 😊. Since it seems these two proposals are not stable, I may not treat them in the 1st online section.**  **For Issue 1, as mentioned by several companies, the conclusion will impact the whole framework, however, the progress should not be blocked due to this issue. Therefore, we should aim to conclude this issue in this meeting. Another proposal (Proposal 1.A-1) is provided for this.** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 1.A:** We agree to support CJT for the unified TCI framework. Then we think it’s unfortunate that the normative spec would exclude FR2. How would CJT be supported in FR2? With a single TCI state? If CJT is only supported for FR1, then there is no issue.  **Proposal 1.B:** Support. The bullet can be skipped: the use cases will make it clear what combinations are needed. We also think it’s time to stop talking about three types of TCI states from a signalling point of view: from 331, it is clear that there are only TCI states (which can be used for DL and/or UL channels) and UL TCI states (which can be used for UL channels). |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 1.A and 1.A-1:** We support Proposal 1.A, and are open to discuss 1.A-1 for meeting progress.  **Proposal 1.B:** It is clear only up to 2 TCI states can be applied to UL transmission. If the proposal is to address CJT, including UL transmission in the main bullet only causes confusion. We think this proposal should be focused on CJT and the UL part needs to be removed. We also agree with Ericsson that bullets of allowed TCI states combination should be removed. They can be discussed separately from CJT. |
| Fujitsu | **Proposal 1.A:** The FFS sentence can be removed since it has been already captured in Proposal 1.A-1. Proposal 1.A can just handle how DM-RS is QCLed with more than one joint/DL TCI state.  **Proposal 1.A-1:** We are fine with the proposal.  **Proposal 1.B:** We are not sure whether the last FFS “FFS: The possible combination(s) of joint/DL/UL TCI states that can be applied per TRP” is necessary. If the TCI combinations for mTRP have been determined, the combinations supported per TRP are naturally determined, isn’t it? |
| CMCC | **Proposal 1.A:** Support. We think unified TCI indication for CJT-based PDSCH reception(s) should be supported. Otherwise, UE may need fallback to R15/16 TCI state framework when CJT operation is applied.    **Proposal 1.B:** Support. We think issue 1.2 and 1.3 can be discussed together. From the discussion, per-TRP TCI state mode is necessary when considering MPE issue.  **Issue 1.4:** Prefer Alt1. |
| Mod V37 | **Based on feedback so far, two alternatives 1.A-1 and 1.B-1 to 1.A and 1.B are recommended, respectively.** |
| Panasonic | Proposal 1.B: We can support the combinations in the proposal 1.B. But we do not agree to rule out per-TRP TCI state mode update. And as such, we would like the proposal to capture this, either by FFS to discuss this or by adding a note. |
| Sharp | **Proposal 1.A:** We are open to discuss it in principle  **Proposal 1.B:** Support |

# Issue 2 – TCI state update and activation

Table 2-1 Summary for Issue 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **FL note/observation** |
| 2.1 | TCI state update for M-DCI based MTRP  Alt1: Reuse the same TCI state update scheme for S-DCI based MTRP  Atl2: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *coresetPoolIndex* values to indicate the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) corresponding to the same *coresetPoolIndex* value  Alt3: Use the existing TCI field in any DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to indicate all joint/DL/UL TCI states corresponding to both *coresetPoolIndex* values  Alt4: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *coresetPoolIndex* values to indicate joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) corresponding to the same or different *coresetPoolIndex* value | Alt1: Ericsson, Sharp, IDC(as unified design)  Alt2: Apple, Nokia, CATT, CEWiT, CMCC, Docomo, MediaTek, FGI, Fraunhofer, Fujitsu, Futurewei, Huawei/HiSilicon, Intel, LG, OPPO, Panasonic, Qualcomm, Samsung. Sharp, vivo, NEC, IDC(as default), Lenovo  Alt3: FGI, TransHold  Alt4: ZTE, FGI, Fraunhofer, Spreadtrum, TransHold, Xiaomi, Google, IDC (depending on MAC-CE) | Given the majority view, Proposal 2.A is recommended for this issue  How to activate TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP can be discussed later |
| 2.2 | For S-DCI based MTRP, introduce/re-interpret DCI field(s) other than the existing TCI field for TCI state update | Support: FGI, Google, Huawei/HiSilicon, Samsung, NEC, LG  Concern: Intel, QC, OPPO, vivo, TransHold |  |
| 2.3 | For S-DCI based MTRP, increase the max number of TCI field bits (i.e., support more (>8) combinations of activated TCI states mapped to the TCI codepoints) | Support: Apple, Nokia, Docomo, FGI (if not support additional field for TCI state update), ITRI, Panasonic, Samsung  Concern: Futurewei, Lenovo, OPPO (not for joint DL/UL TCI update), vivo, QC, Huawei/HiSilicon, IDC, TransHold |  |

**Proposal 2.A:** On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP, use the existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *coresetPoolIndex* values to indicate **at least** the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) associated with the same *coresetPoolIndex* value

* FFS: Whether and how to indicate the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) associated with another *coresetPoolIndex* value, e.g., reusing the same TCI state update scheme for S-DCI based MTRP or the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 can inform the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) is associated with which *coresetPoolIndex* value

**Support (20): Qualcomm, OPPO, Huawei/HiSilicon, Docomo, NEC, Spreadtrum, Fraunhofer, Futurewei, Lenovo, Apple, LG, CATT, vivo, Nokia, Intel, Panasonic, FGI, Fujitsu, CMCC, ZTE**

**Concern (6): Google, InterDigital, Xiaomi, TransHold, Samsung(?), Ericsson**

Table 2-2 Additional inputs for Issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | **Please update your view on those sub-issues in Table 2-1 and check above moderator proposal** |
| QC | For 2.1, support Alt2. To our understanding, sDCI focuses on joint scheduling, while mDCI is mainly for separate scheduling, where the TRP ID (CORESETPoolIndex) simplifies the design a lot for mDCI. So we believe following the legacy per-CORESETPoolIndex TCI indication is most efficient for mDCI. For Alt3 & 4, the use case for cross-TRP TCI indication seems not strong for mDCI and may also increase DCI overhead to affect reliability.  For Proposal 2.A, ok for current form. Btw, “Proposal 1.B” in row 2.1 seems should be “Proposal 2.A”  For 2.2 and 2.3, we think current TCI field with 8 codepoints are sufficient for sDCI |
| OPPO | For **Proposal 2.A**: Support.  Recall the difference between S-DCI and M-DCI MTRP operations in legacy release (w.o. CORESETPoolIndex or w. CORESETPoolIndex) and implementations (ideal backhaul with joint scheduling or non-ideal backhaul with independent scheduling), we may not need to pursue unified solution for UTCI state indication/update. Finding the most applicable UTCI indication/update scheme(s) for each MTRP operation can be a good choice.  For **Issue 2.2**, whether to introduce/re-interpret DCI field(s) for UTCI indication/updating can be related to other aspects, such as MAC CE for activating UTCI states for MTRP. Without clear justification on its purpose and necessity, we by now are hesitate to change the existing DCI format which could increase UE’s decoding complexity. |
| Google | On **Proposal 2.A**: We disagree with this proposal. Actually, cross-TRP beam indication has been supported in Rel-16 M-DCI. We wonder why Rel-18 unified TCI extension would be less flexible than Rel-16 beam indication.  [Mod] Cross-TRP beam indication is captured in FFS, i.e., it is not precluded.  On **Issue 2.2** and **2.3**: They are a bit related. Our first preference is to add an additional TCI field. However, increasing more bits for existing TCI field is OK to us if it is majority view. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 2.A:** We support this proposal.  **Issue 2.2:** We think it is beneficial to introduce another TCI field for DCI to indicate additional TCI state in mTRP. Comparing introduce DCI field and re-interpret, for the case of DCI with data scheduling, it is hard to re-interpret fields since most of fields have necessary functionality. To achieve a unified design, we prefer to introduce a 3 bit length TCI field. |
| Docomo | Proposal 2.A: Support. Since M-DCI can be used non-ideal backhaul, cross TRP beam indication is not suitable.  We don’t understand Google’s comment (*cross-TRP beam indication has been supported in Rel-16 M-DCI*). In our understanding, in Rel.16 M-DCI, one scheduling DCI of a CORESETPoolIndex indicates one TCI state of one scheduled PDSCH.  On issue 2.3: Not only for increasing, but also decreasing the size of TCI state field in DCI format 1\_1 can be discussed. In Rel.15-17, the size of TCI state field in DCI format 1\_1 is 0 or 3 bit. Sometimes, gNB only activates limited number of TCI states. It is beneficial that RRC can configure the size of TCI state field in DCI format 1\_1 = {0,1,2,3}, similar as DCI format 1\_2. |
| NEC | **Proposal 2.A**  We support this proposal as one of the possible update methods, but we also support cross-TRP TCI state update. The applied update method can be configured by NW.  **Issue 2.2**  We support using additional field(s) in DCI. The intention is to enable the update TCI state(s) for only one/subset of TRPs. Because it is not always needed to update all TCI states.  **Issue 2.3**  We are also open to discuss more bits considering the limited number of TCI state combinations can be indicated by a 3-bit field. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.A** Considering the flexibility of TCI indication, the cross-TRP TCI indication could be discussed. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | **Proposal 2.A:** Fine with the proposal. Ok with further study on cross-TRP TCI indication. |
| ZTE | **Re Proposal 2.A:** In our views, cross-TRP TCI indication may also be needed even for M-DCI.  To be more specific, in order to support dynamic TCI update for one failed TRP with assistance of another TRP (already supported in Rel-16), even for M-DCI MTRP operation, dynamically indicating TCI state(s) from which TCI state pool(s) activated in MAC-CE is still needed for updating the DL/UL channel(s)/RS(s) corresponding to the TCI state pool(s). Otherwise, once beam failure occurs in one TRP, another TRP can be incapable of updating the TCI state applied to the failed TRP by dynamic signaling.   * For instance, in the MAC level, we may have separate activated TCI state pools corresponding to respective *CORESETPoolIndex*, and the in DCI level, we need to indicate *CORESETPoolIndex*/TRP index along with TCI codepoint index. |
| InterDigital | **On Proposal 2.A**, it seems premature to agree this. Alt.1 and Alt.4 may not be exclusive options depending on how MAC-CE activation on each TCI codepoint in a TCI field can be enhanced in Rel-18. For example, via MAC-CE, a TCI codepoint can be associated with indicating which *CORESETPoolIndex(s)*/TRP index(s) to be applied by the codepoint, which corresponds to Alt.4. Since M-DCI based MTRP is not solely based on strict non-ideal backhaul scenario, the flexibility that can be brought from Alt.1(to indicate multiple UTCIs at once) and Alt.4(for cross-TRP indication) should not be removed at first place.  [Mod] Alt1 is included in FFS now, please check. |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 2.A:** Support.  **Issue 2.3:** We don’t see the need to increase the max number of TCI field bits. |
| Google | Regarding Docomo’s comment on Proposal 2.A: For R16 M-DCI PDSCH, you may be right. However, for other channels, cross-TRP beam indicated is supported in R16. For example, in M-DCI mode, it seems no restriction for one TRP updating CORESET beam of the other TRP.  In addition, we also agree with ZTE’s and IDC’ views. |
| Lenovo | For **Proposal 2.A**: Support. |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.A:** Support.  **Issue 2.3:** With single TRPin Rel-17, up to 8 TCI-states combinations can be activated by MAC-CE. For mTRP in Rel-18, the number of TCI states combinations may need to increase more than 8 if we want to keep a same flexibility for a given TRP as in Rel-17. We are open to discuss the necessity of increasing bitwidth. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.A**: we think cross-TRP beam indication is viable for MDCI – unlike SDCI which targets for ideal-backhaul, MDCI works for both ideal and non-ideal backhauls (so both joint and separate schedulings are possible). In case that one TRP fails, using the working TRP to indicate beam(s) for the failed TRP can facilitate beam recovery. Associating the indicated TCI state(s) for the same or different pool index can be configured.  **Issue 2.2** and **Issue 2.3** are correlated except that using additional DCI field(s) can separately update beam(s) for each TRP. For **Issue 2.2**, we prefer repurposing reserved DCI field(s) in 1\_1/1\_2 to indicate TCIs for DCI without DL assignment (there are more than enough bits/fields that can be repurposed). For DCI with DL assignment, we can only use the existing TCI field (with or without increasing the maximum number of bits) to indicate the MTRP beams. In this way, the DCI payload is unchanged for both with or without DL assignment (or even, the same as in Rel-17), meanwhile providing more flexibility/beam combinations for MTRP operation. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 2A:** we prefer Alt 4 to support cross-TRP beam indication in the case of TRP beam failure.  [Mod] It is not precluded yet.  **Issue 2.2 and 2.3**: we don’t see the strong motivation to increase the number of TCI codepoint or the bits of TCI field. |
| Mod V19 | **No revision to Proposal 2.A** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.A:** Support.  **Issue 2.2:** It seems beneficial to introduce new DCI field or re-interpret DCI field where flexible application to different DL/UL channels/RSs can be done by configuring/indicating the linkage between the TCI states and the channels/RSs with the various configuration of M/N. For example, SRS set selection field in S-DCI can be used to indicate a specific TCI state between the two indicated TCI states or to indicate both TCI states. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.A: support. We are fine to further discuss cross-TRP beam indication.  For 2.2, support. For flexibility, we should try to decouple beam indication and DL/UL transmission. At least for PDSCH, a new DCI field is necessary. |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.A:** Support. For the FFS, we don’t think it is necessary to indicate the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) associated with another *coresetPoolIndex* value. Firstly, it doesn’t work for M-DCI based MTRP with non-ideal backhaul which could have even worse as backhauling delay of 50ms as agreed in Rel-16 EVM for MTRP, because one TRP can hardly acquire the instant desired unified TCI state of the other TRP. Secondly, current spec doesn’t support TCI state indication cross different *coresetPoolIndex* values either. The TCI state indicated in the DCI associated with a *coresetPoolIndex* is one of the activated TCI states by MAC CE belonging to the same *coresetPoolIndex*. Besides, for inter-cell multi-TRP, 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*.  **#2.2:** Don’t support. Existing TCI field is enough to indicate pairs of TCI states as Rel-16.  **#2.3:** Don’t support. We don’t see the need to increase the TCI states compared with Rel-16. |
| TransHold | **Proposal 2A:** For flexibility and robustness of TCI indication, we support cross-TRP TCI indication for M-DCI. In addition, we also agree with Google, ZTE, IDC and samsung’ views.  **Issue 2.2 and 2.3**: We think current TCI field with 8 codepoints are sufficient. Instead, the unified TCI states activation MAC CE can be enhanced so that one TCI codepoint can be mapped to two TCI states for two TRPs. |
| Nokia | Proposal 2.A : Support  Issue 2.2 : we may have to support Rel-16 s-DCI mTRP features even with unified TCI state, and using TCI field for beam indication may loose certain functionalities supported by Rel-16. These should be carefully addressed for s-DCI scenario.  Issue 2.3: As discussed in our contribution we think it would be feasible to increase the number of TCI field bits to as the TCI codepoint may have e.g. four TCI states. |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.A:** OK to support  **Issue 2.3:** Current unified TCI design should be re-used. Reinterpreting DCI fields may only be feasible for beam indication DCI without DL grant which has many reserved fields. For normal DCI 1\_1/2 reinterpretation of fields is not clear and should not lead to different solutions for different DCI types. |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 2.A:** Given the distinction made between single DCI multiTRP (ideal backhaul) and multiDCI multiTRP (nonideal backhaul) in release 16, we believe that the multi DCI multiTRP case can be designed separately to follow the legacy per coresetPoolIndex TCI indication. We support the proposal.  **For issue 2.3**, whether to increase the maximum number of TCI field bits, this depends on what combinations are allowed for DL receptions and/or UL transmissions in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation (Proposal 1B) and whether the DCI can update the beams separately for each TRP or not. We propose to discuss this issue after progress is done regarding proposal 1B. |
| FGI | **Proposal 2.A:** Support.  **Issue 2.2:** Support to introduce a new field since it can reuse the previous TCI mapping design to an additional field.  **Issue 2.3:** Whether the max number of TCI field bits needs to be increase may depend on the decision related to the support of an additional TCI field. If the additional TCI field can be supported, one of the benefits from the additional field is simplify the mapping between one codepoint and the different combinations of TCI states (joint TCI +DL TCI +UL TCI). |
| Mod 29 | **Please check the revised Proposal 2.A.**  **Re companies who has concern on Proposal 2.A, cross-TRP beam indication is not precluded due to the “at least” in the main bullet.** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2.A:** It is unclear what “indicate at least the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) associated with the same *coresetPoolIndex* value” means. We propose the following modification:  **Proposal 2.A:** On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP, use the existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *coresetPoolIndex* values to indicate the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) for a subset of the channels/signals  Issue 2-2: we believe that this can be considered, and may simplify unification of sDCI and mDCI modes.  Issue 2-3: seems very attractive to have the same length of the TCI field bits for sDCI and mDCI.  [Mod] A *coresetPoolIndex* value can be associated with joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) according to this proposal, and the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) is provided by the DCI received on the *coresetPoolIndex* value. This is the intension to my understanding. Your suggestion will remove the association between a *coresetPoolIndex* value and joint/DL/UL TCI state(s). |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 2.A:** OK with the update. |
| Fujitsu | **Proposal 2.A:** We are fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.A:** Support the proposal.  **Issue 2.2：**We think the purpose of using or re-interpreting additional field(s) in DCI should first be clarified. From companies’ reply, we think the intentions are different. We agree to introduce/re-interpret DCI field(s) for selecting the TCI state(s) for S-TRP and M-TRP. |
| ZTE3 | **Proposal 2.A:** For progress, we can live with this proposal, if we are on the same page that cross-TRP beam indication for M-DCI can be further reviewed in the following meeting.  [Mod] Thanks for your flexibility. It will be discussed in this and later meetings. |
| Mod V37 | **No revision to Proposal 2A** |
|  |  |

# Issue 3 – How to associate the indicated TCI state(s) with each target channel/signal

Table 3-1 Summary for Issue 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **FL note/observation** |
| 3.1 | Down-selection from the following alternatives for the association between joint/DL TCI state(s) and PDCCH reception in S-DCI based MTRP  Atl1: Use RRC configuration to inform the mapping/association between a configured or indicated joint/DL TCI state and a CORESET or a CORESET group  Alt2: Use RRC configuration to inform the mapping/association between a configured or indicated joint/DL TCI state and a search space set  Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the mapping/association between an activated or indicated joint/DL TCI state and a CORESET or a CORESET group  Alt4: Use DCI to inform the mapping/association between an indicated joint/DL TCI state and a CORESET or a CORESET group  Alt5: Based on a fixed mapping/association rule, e.g., the first indicated joint/DL TCI state always applies to PDCCH receptions | Alt1: Apple, Nokia (PDCCH repetition), CATT, ZTE (CORESET group), MediaTek, Docomo, Fraunhofer (for non-SFN), Fujitsu (STRP), Futurewei, Lenovo, LG, NEC, OPPO, Qualcomm, Samsung (CORESET group), vivo (CORESET group), Xiaomi (PDCCH w/o repetition/SFN), TransHold, Intel, FGI  Alt2: Apple, Ericsson  Alt3: Google, Huawei/HiSilicon (switching between SFN and non-SFN), Xiaomi, IDC  Alt4:  Alt5: Nokia (STRP and PDCCH-SFN), CEWiT, Huawei (PDCCH repetition), Fujitsu (STRP), Futurewei, Intel, ITRI, Lenovo, OPPO, Panasonic, Samsung (PDCCH repetition), IDC | Given the majority view, Proposal 3.A with the down-selection is recommended for this issue |
| 3.2 | DG-PDSCH and SPS-PDSCH in S-DCI based MTRP, inform the UE at least the following:   * Apply one (i.e., STRP) or multiple (i.e., MTRP) indicated joint/DL TCI states to the PDSCH reception(s) | Alt1-Use an indicator field other than the existing TCI field (could be an existing DCI field or a new DCI field) in the scheduling DCI: Apple, Nokia, CATT, ZTE, CMCC, Docomo, MediaTek, Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo, Qualcomm, Sharp, vivo, LG, TransHold, FGI  Alt1-1-Reuse existing TCI field (number of indicated joint/DL TCI state(s)) in the scheduling DCI: OPPO, Fraunhofer  Alt2-Use an RRC-based association: Ericsson | Proposal 3.B is provided for this issue |
| 3.3 | DG-PUSCH and Type-2 CG-PUSCH in S-DCI based MTRP, inform the UE the followings:   * Apply one (i.e., STRP) or two (i.e., MTRP) indicated joint/UL TCI states, and the ordering to the PUSCH transmission(s) * If apply only one, which indicated joint/UL TCI state to the PUSCH transmission(s) | Alt1-Use an indicator field (could be an existing DCI field or a new DCI field) in the scheduling DCI: Apple, Nokia (non-fallback DCI), CATT, CMCC, Docomo, MediaTek, Intel (for indicating a TCI codepoint different from that for DL), Lenovo, OPPO, Sharp, vivo, Xiaomi, QC, ZTE, LG, FGI  Alt2-Follow the spatial domain transmission filter(s) used for applying to the SRS resource(s) indicated by SRI(s): Huawei/HiSilicon~~,~~ Ericsson (?)  Alt3-Use an RRC-based association: Nokia (Type-1 CG) | Proposal 3.C is provided for PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI 0\_1/0\_2 (including DG-PUSCH and Type-2 CG-PUSCH)  The association scheme for Type-1 CG-PUSCH and PUSCH activated/scheduled by DCI 0\_0 can be further studied |
| 3.4 | Dedicated PUCCH resource or PUCCH resource group in S-DCI based MTRP, inform the UE the followings:   * Apply one (i.e., STRP) or two (i.e., MTRP) indicated joint/UL TCI states to the PUCCH transmission(s) * If apply only one, which indicated joint/UL TCI state to the PUCCH transmission(s) | Alt1-Use an RRC-based association: Apple, Ericsson, MediaTek, Lenovo, Xiaomi, QC, OPPO, ZTE, LG, vivo  Alt2-Use a MAC CE-based association: CATT, Huawei/HiSilicon (switching between repetition and non-repetition), Xiaomi  Alt3-Use a DCI-based association: Docomo (for PUCCH triggered by DCI 1\_1/1\_2), Intel (introduce an TCI field in DCI 0\_1/0\_2 to indicate a TCI codepoint different from that for DL) | Proposal 3.D is provided for this issue |
| 3.5 | PDCCH in M-DCI based MTRP (neither PDCCH repetition nor PDCCH-SFN is enabled) | Alt1-For PDCCH on a CORESET associated with a *coresetPoolIndex* value, follow the indicated TCI state corresponding to the *coresetPoolIndex* value: Apple, Nokia, Futurewei, Lenovo, vivo, MediaTek, QC, OPPO, Docomo, ZTE  Alt2-Reuse the same association scheme for S-DCI based MTRP: Ericsson | A proposal for this issue will be provided in a later version with sufficient input from companies  Whether PDCCH repetition/SFN can be supported together in M-DCI based MTRP can be further discussed |

**Proposal 3.A:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE for PDCCH repetition, PDCCH-SFN, and PDCCH w/o repetition/SFN, down-selection at least one alternative from the followings:

* Alt1-1: Use RRC parameter(s) in a CORESET configuration to inform whether/which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on the CORESET
  + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE
* Alt1-2: Use an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the UE shall apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group(s) to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on the CORESET
  + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the CORESET group(s)
  + FFS: How to associate the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) with each CORESET group
* Alt2: The association between a CORESET and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is determined based on a fixed rule
  + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE
* Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform whether/which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on a CORESET
  + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE

**Proposal 3.B:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE and enable dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP operations for PDSCH reception, down-selection one alternative from the followings:

* Alt1: Use an indicator field other than the existing TCI field (could be reusing an existing DCI field or introducing a new DCI field) in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 to inform which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2
  + FFS: PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0
* Alt2: Reuse the existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2, i.e., the UE shall apply the joint/DL TCI state(s) mapped to the TCI codepoint indicated by the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2
* Alt3: Use RRC parameter(s) in a PDSCH configuration in a DL BWP to inform which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to PDSCH reception in the DL BWP
  + Note: Dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP operations can be achieved by indication of all the same or different joint/DL TCI states
* Alt4: Use an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is associated with each CORESET group. When a scheduling/activation DCI is received in a CORESET group, the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group is applied to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by the scheduling/activation DCI.

**Proposal 3.C:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, for PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, down-selection one alternative from the followings:

* Alt1: Use an indicator field (could be reusing an existing DCI field or introducing a new DCI field) in a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to inform which joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by MAC-CE/DCI the UE shall apply to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2
* Alt2: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 follows the spatial domain transmission filter(s) used for the SRS resource(s) indicated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2

FFS: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_0 and Type-1 CG-PUSCH

**Proposal 3.D:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE for PUCCH transmission, down-selection at least one alternative from the followings:

* Alt1: Use RRC configuration to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) and a PUCCH resource/ group
* Alt2: Use RRC configuration to inform the association between a CORESET group and a PUCCH resource/group, and the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group applies to the PUCCH resource/groupAlt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) and a PUCCH resource/group
* Alt4: Use DCI to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) and a PUCCH resource/group

Table 3-2 Additional inputs for Issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | **Please update your view on those sub-issues in Table 3-1 and check above moderator proposals** |
| QC | For Proposal 3.A, ok for current form. For dynamic association via MAC-CE/DCI, we think RRC to change association for CORESET is sufficient. This is similar to RRC configured CORESETPoolIndex. Dynamic association will also impact overhead.  For Proposal 3.B, some clarification for Alt2 would be good. Does it mean DCI indicating same TCIs will imply sTRP operation? If so, gNB may need to send another DCI later to resume the mTRP operation.  For Proposal 3.C, suggest the following wording. To our understanding, reusing existing SRS resource set indicator is sufficient.   * Atl1: ~~Introduce~~ Use an indicator field (could be an existing DCI field or a new DCI field) in a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to inform which joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by MAC-CE/DCI the UE shall apply to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2   [Mod] Done  For Proposal 3.D, ok for the current form. Support Alt1. The use case for dynamic update the association seems not strong.  For 3.5, support Alt1, which is more efficient for mDCI due to the use of CORESETPoolIndex |
| OPPO | For **Proposal 3.A**: Support.  For **Proposal 3.B**: In our view, the PDSCH dynamic switch between STRP and MTRP should be supported with unified TCI state(s). Without changing the DL DCI format, UE can identify STRP/MTRP PDSCH reception by the number of indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) in DCI, though not applicable yet. Afterwards, UE applies the applicable joint/DL TCI state(s) for corresponding PDSCH reception (either STRP or MTRP). Specifically, 1 indicated joint/DL TCI state in DCI implies STRP PDSCH and 2 indicated joint/DL TCI states in DCI implies MTRP PDSCH.  Along with the two listed alternatives, can we suggest another Alt1-1 for the group to consider? Thanks.  **Proposal 3.B:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE and enable dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP operations for PDSCH reception, down-selection one alternative from the followings:   * Atl1: Introduce an indicator field other than the existing TCI field (could be an existing DCI field or a new DCI field) in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 to inform which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2   + FFS: PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0 * Alt1-1: Reuse the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2, i.e. the number of indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) to imply either STRP or MTRP PDSCH reception * Alt2: Introduce RRC parameter(s) in a PDSCH configuration in a DL BWP to inform which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to PDSCH reception in the DL BWP   + Note: Dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP operations can be achieved by indication of all the same or different joint/DL TCI states   [Mod] Captured, please check.  For **Proposal 3.C**: Support in principle.  In our reading, Alt.3 (RRC-based association) may not conflict with Alt.1 (introduced indicator field in UL DCI). For instance, the association between SRS resource set(s) (for STRP/MTRP in Rel.17 MTRP PUSCH) and joint/UL TCI state(s) via RRC configuration can be the basis for Alt.1 (using an existing DCI field, i.e. SRS resource set). Perhaps Alt.3 can be clarified or merged with Alt.1.  For **Proposal 3.D**: Support.  For **Issue 3.5**, it seems overlapped with issue 2.1 and we add our preference in Table 3-1. |
| Google | On **Proposal 3.A**: Not support. Please note that from Rel-15, beam indication for PDCCH has been done by MAC-CE activation for a CORESET. Why we want to back to RRC configuration indication? Another one issue is in Rel-17, PDCCH-SFN and PDCCH w/o SFN can be dynamically switched by MAC-CE. How this can be achieved if we adopt RRC configuration to indicate beam?  [Mod] Add MAC-CE based scheme in Alt3.  On **Proposal 3.B**: Support. And Alt1 is our preference.  On **Proposal 3.C**: Support. We prefer Alt1, which is quite similar to existing behavior introduced in Rel-17 MTRP PUSCH.  On **Proposal 3.D**: Support. And we should go with Alt2 since PUCCH resource has been indicated beam by MAC-CE from the very beginning.  On **Issue 3.5**: it seems related to Issue 2.1. We should consider them together. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 3.A:**  In the case of PDCCH repetition, each of the two CORESETs corresponding to the two linked search spaces should adopt one of the two indicated TCI states. To associate the pair of indicated TCI states to the pair of CORESETs, a simple rule may be adopted. For example, the first (second) indicated TCI state is applied to the CORESET with the smaller (larger) ID. Therefore, Alt2 is good choice for PDCCH repetition  In the legacy TCI framework, UE can determine a CORESET is for sTRP or SFN transmission according to the type of the MAC-CE, i.e., Rel-15 MAC-CE which indicates one TCI state for a CORESET or Rel-17 MAC-CE which indicates two TCI states for a CORESET. However, in unified TCI framework, PDCCH can directly follow the indicated TCI state and the legacy TCI state activation MAC-CE for CORESET is no longer used. While for a CORESET used for sTRP transmission only one of the two indicated TCI states should be adopted, for a CORESET used for the SFN transmission, both of the two indicated TCI states should be used. Alt 1-1 with the following slight modification for the sake of clarity and accuracy, could address this issue:  Atl1-1: Introduce RRC parameter(s) in a CORESET configuration to inform whether/which one or both indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on the CORESET  However, we prefer such an information be provided in MAC-CE to support more dynamic switching between s sTRP and SFN transmission of PDCCH which is beneficial in the high mobility case.  Overall, we suggest following modifications in Proposal 3.A  **Proposal 3.A (modified):** On unified TCI framework extension, to inform the association with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE for PDCCH repetition, PDCCH-SFN, and PDCCH w/o repetition/SFN, down-selection at least one alternative from the followings:   * Atl1-1: Introduce RRC parameter(s) in a CORESET configuration to inform whether/which one or both indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on the CORESET   + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE * Alt1-2: Introduce an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/DL TCI state is 1-to-1 associated with each CORESET group   + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the CORESET group(s) * Atl1-3: Use a MAC-CE to inform whether/which one or both indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on the CORESET   + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE * Alt2: The association between a CORESET and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is determined based on a fixed rule   + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE * Note: Different alternatives may be selected for different PDCCH transmission schemes.   [Mod] Add MAC-CE based scheme in Alt3. Regarding the note, “down-selection at least one” in the main bullet doesn’t preclude it. Regarding “one or both”, since the number of TCI states that can be indicated to a CC/BWP is not concluded, I suggest keeping it open.  **Proposal 3.B:**  Support with a slight modification for the sake of accuracy:  **Proposal 3.B (modified):** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE and enable dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP operations for PDSCH reception, down-selection one alternative from the followings:   * Atl1: Introduce an indicator field other than the existing TCI field (could be an existing DCI field or a new DCI field) in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 to inform which one or both indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2   + FFS: PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0 * Alt2: Introduce RRC parameter(s) in a PDSCH configuration in a DL BWP to inform which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to PDSCH reception in the DL BWP   + Note: Dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP operations can be achieved by indication of all the same or different joint/DL TCI states   [Mod] Since the number of TCI states that can be indicated to a CC/BWP is not concluded, I suggest keeping it open.  **Proposal 3.C:**  Our view in t-doc is not accurately reflected. We don’t support Alt2. To avoid a mismatch between beam and MIMO parameters for UL transmission, we believe that UE should always apply the spatial domain transmission filter associated with the indicated SRI(s) for UL transmission irrespective to the indicated TCI states. As such, we cannot support Proposal 3.C in this form. We suggest the following modification:  **Proposal 3.C (modified):** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with joint/UL TCI state(s) and enable dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP operations for PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, down-selection one alternative from the followings:   * Atl1: Introduce an indicator field (could be an existing DCI field or a new DCI field) in a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to inform which joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by MAC-CE/DCI the UE shall apply to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 * Alt2: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 follows the joint/UL TCI state(s) applying to the SRS resource(s) indicated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 * Alt3: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 follows the spatial domain transmission filter(s) associated with the SRS resource(s) indicated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2   FFS: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_0 and Type-1 CG-PUSCH  [Mod] Alt2 is revised according to your input. Please check.  **Proposal 3.D:**  We support this proposal.  **3.5:**  We support Alt1 |
| Docomo | Proposal 3.A: Support. We think Alt.1-1 is enough. The benefit of Alt.1-2 looks small to us (e.g. a little RRC overhead reduction?).  Re Google, the proposal only discusses “association” between CORESET and multiple indicated TCI states. MAC CE/DCI can update the multiple indicated TCI states, per agreement in RAN1#109e.  On Proposal 3.B: Support. We support Alt1. On Alt.2, it means scheduling DCI cannot control S-TRP or M-TRP (because scheduling DCI cannot indicate the indicated TCI states), which looks worse than Rel.16-17.  On Proposal 3.C: Support. We support Alt1. On Alt.2, it means scheduling DCI cannot control S-TRP PUSCH repetition or M-TRP PUSCH repetition (because scheduling DCI cannot indicate the indicated TCI states), which looks worse than Rel.17.  On Proposal 3.D: Support. We prefer to keep dynamic switching between S-TRP PUCCH repetition and M-TRP PUCCH repetition, as same as Rel.17. In Rel.17, one or two spatial relations can be activated per a PUCCH resource (or, PUCCH resource group) by MAC CE, and PRI field of DCI can select a PUCCH resource. Similar approach can be also considered. For example, MAC CE indicates “the association” between indicated TCI state(s) and each PUCCH resource (or, PUCCH resource group), and different PUCCH resource (or, PUCCH resource group) may have one or two indicated TCI states. Then, PRI field of DCI can indicate S-TRP or M-TRP by selecting a PUCCH resource.  On 3.5, Support Alt.1. |
| NEC | **Proposal 3.A:** support the proposal and we prefer Alt1-1.  **Proposal 3.B:** support the proposal and we prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 3.C:** As Huawei mentioned above, PUSCH beam should be aligned with SRS beam of the SRS resource indicated by SRI field in UL grant. In Rel-17 we have the same issue that both unified TCI and SRI may provide UL beam information and in Rel-18 we need to make it clear that they are aligned.  **Proposal 3.D:** support the proposal and we are fine with Alt1 or Alt2. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 3.A The association between a CORESET (group) and indicated TCI states can be informed by MAC CE as well. Compared with RRC, MAC CE provides a more dynamic indication.  Alt1-3: Use MAC CE to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/DL TCI state is 1-to-1 associated with each CORESET group  [Mod] Add MAC-CE based scheme in Alt3.  Proposal 3.B Support this proposal and prefer Alt 1.  Proposal 3.C We think reuse the existing SRS resource indicator can achieve the association between indicated TCI states and PUSCH as well as enable scheme switching between STRP and MTRP. Agree with the modification of QC.  Proposal 3.D We support this proposal |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Proposal 3.A: Support  Proposal 3.B: Support including Alt. 1-1 as mentioned by OPPO (updated our preference in issue 3.2 as well). The number of TCI-states itself can determine if the transmission is STRP or MTRP.  Proposal 3.C: The source of the joint/UL TCI state(s) should be mentioned similar to other proposals. The main bullet can be changed as follows:  On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE and enable dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP operations for PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, down-selection one alternative from the followings:  [Mod] Since Alt2 doesn’t need any association with joint/UL TCI state(s), a general description should be fine. I remove all the description from main bullet to avoid confusion.  Proposal 3.D: OK |
| ZTE | **Re Proposal 3.A:** If our understanding is correct, the proposal is not relevant to TCI state association for CORESET(s) in mDCI-mTRP, right? If so, some clarification in the main bullet of proposal 3.A is needed. Then, we prefer Alt 1-2. The CORESET group(s) can be assumed as an anchor between TCI state and CORESET(s).  **Proposal 3.A:** On unified TCI framework extension in S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE for PDCCH repetition, PDCCH-SFN, and PDCCH w/o repetition/SFN, down-selection at least one alternative from the followings:   * Atl1-1: Introduce RRC parameter(s) in a CORESET configuration to inform whether/which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on the CORESET   + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE * Alt1-2: Introduce an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/DL TCI state is 1-to-1 associated with each CORESET group   + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the CORESET group(s) * Alt2: The association between a CORESET and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is determined based on a fixed rule   + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE   [Mod] Done  **Re Proposal 3.B:** Alt-1 is supported. Then, for Alt-2, to be honest, it is a little bit confusing. We fail to understand how to dynamic indicate the TCI state for the scheduled PDSCH. If a RRC parameter is to indicate which indicated joint/DL TCI state is used for scheduled PDSCH, what is the different from a default rule that always the first TCI state is used. Does it mean that the parameter is per CORESET group or SS set, rather than per CC/BWP.    **Re Proposal 3.C:** Alt-2 is supported.  **Re Proposal 3.D:** If CORESET group is introduced in such case, we think that the Alt-1 can be revised a little bit like:   * Atl1: Use RRC configuration to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s)/CORESET group and a PUCCH resource/ group   [Mod] Done. One candidate is added. |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 3.A:** Support in principle and we are fine with ZTE’s updates **s**ince this proposal is related to Issue 3.1, which is for S-DCI based MTRP.  **Proposal 3.B:** We are fine with Oppo’s updated proposal.  **Proposal 3.C:** We are fine with Huawei’s modified proposal.  **Proposal 3.D:** Support. |
| Google | Regarding Docomo’s comment on Proposal 3.A: As mentioned by Spreadtrum, the association can be informed by MAC-CE as well. In our views, when informing association between a CORESET and an indicated TCI state, it’s one kind of “beam indication”. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 3.A:** Support. We prefer Alt 1-1.  **Proposal 3.B:** OK with the proposal and we support Alt1.  **Proposal 3.C:** We share similar view with QC that the existing SRS resource set indicator is sufficient. We prefer the following update:  On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with joint/UL TCI state(s) and enable dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP operations for PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, down-selection one alternative from the followings:   * Atl1: ~~Introduce~~ Using an indicator field (could be an existing DCI field or a new DCI field) in a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to inform which joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by MAC-CE/DCI the UE shall apply to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 * Alt2: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 follows the joint/UL TCI state(s) applying to the SRS resource(s) indicated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2   FFS: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_0 and Type-1 CG-PUSCH  [Mod] Done.  On the updated Proposal 3.C, we support Alt 1.  **Proposal 3.D:** OK with the proposal and we support Alt 1 or Alt 2. |
| Apple | **Proposal 3.A: Support.**  Among the three alternatives, Alt.1-1 is preferred for sDCI mTRP and Alt.1-2 is preferred for mDCI mTRP.  On the switching between SFN-PDCCH and PDCCH w/o SFN, our view is that it can be achieved through DCI format, which is even faster than MAC-CE approach in Rel-16. For instance, if two unified TCI states are indicated, SFN-PDCCH can be assumed for a CORESET and non-SFN-PDCCH is assumed if a single TCI-state is updated by DCI format latter.  **Proposal 3.B: Support.**  Our preference is Alt.1. On Alt.2, the benefit over Alt.1 is unclear as it clearly increases the size of MAC-CE used for activation.  **Proposal 3.C: Support.** We prefer Alt.1 in general.  **Proposal 3.D: Support.**  The overall thought is to associate the PUCCH resources with one (i.e., sTRP) or two unified TCI states (i.e., mTRP) and use the PRI in DCI to select the proper PUCCH dynamically such that the swtich between sTRP and mTRP can be achieved. |
| Samsung | For **Proposal 3.A**, we support RRC configuration to inform the association. If we understand Alt1-2 properly, we prefer to add the following texts for better clarity.   * Alt1-2: Introduce an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is ~~1-to-1~~ associated with each CORESET group. When the beam indication DCI is received in a CORESET group, the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group is applied for PDCCH reception(s).   [Mod] Regarding how to associate an indicate TCI state with a CORESET group, I saw several proposals from the contributions, which can be further studied.  For **Proposal 3.B**, we would like to add the following Alt3, which is inherited from Alt1-2 in **Proposal 3.A**. The basic idea is that when the scheduling DCI is received in a CORESET group, the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group is applied for receiving the scheduled PDSCH. A CORESET group can be associated with a single joint/DL TCI state or multiple joint/DL TCI states so dynamic STRP and MTRP switching can also be supported depending on which CORESET group the scheduling DCI is received.   * Alt3: Introduce an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is associated with each CORESET group. When the scheduling DCI is received in a CORESET group, the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group is applied for receiving the scheduled PDSCH.   [Mod] Done.  For **Proposal 3.C**, support with the following wording   * Atl1: ~~Introduce~~ Use an indicator field (could be using an existing DCI field or introducing a new DCI field) in a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to inform which joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by MAC-CE/DCI the UE shall apply to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2   [Mod] Done.  For **Proposal 3.D**, support.  Furthermore, if an updated proposal has more than two alternatives, suggest to add “at least” in the main bullet for down-selection. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 3A:** with proposal 3A, we are wondering how to support dynamic switching between S-TRP PDCCH and SFN PDCCH/PDCCH repetition which can be supported by MAC CE in Rel-17? We suggest to add Alt 3 “use MAC CE to inform……”  **Proposal 3B:** support Alt 1. With Alt 2, if the dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP is achieved by indication of all the same or different joint /DL TCI states, does it mean all channels will switch to STRP when same Joint/DL TCI states are indicated?  **Proposal 3C:** support  **Proposal 3 D:** support  **For issue 3.5,** we prefer Alt 1 |
| Mod V19 | **Please check above revised moderator proposals, and my response to some of you as well 😊.** |
| LG | We support all the current proposals and provide our preference in Table 3-1. One minor editorial comment is to modify ‘atl’🡪’alt’ on most sub-bullets of proposals. [Mod] Done |
| ZTE | Support the updated Proposal 3.A/B/C/D |
| CATT | Proposal 3.A: Support. We agree with QC’s view, i.e. RRC to change association for CORESET is sufficient. Different to Rel-16, where the applied TCI state on CORESET could only be updated by MAC-CE, for unified TCI, the actual applied TCI state on CORESET depends on MAC-CE/DCI, which is even flexible than that of Rel-16. Because the TCI state of CORESET could be dynamically changed by DCI. RRC configuration aims to indicate association, not to update TCI state of CORESET.  Proposal 3.B: Support. We prefer Alt1.  Proposal 3.C: Support. We prefer Alt1. Since SRS may not follow the indicated TCI states, Alt2 will result in that PUSCH could not follow unified TCI.  Proposal 3.D: support. We prefer to use RRC configuration (Alt.1). |
| vivo | **Proposal 3.A:** Support. Prefer Alt1-1 or Alt1-2.  **Proposal 3.B:** Support. Prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 3.C:** Support. Prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 3.D:** Support. Slightly prefer Alt1. |
| TransHold | **Proposal 3.A:** Support. We prefer Alt 1-1.  **Proposal 3B:** support Alt 1. With Alt 2, since the joint/DL TCI states can be applied to other channels, the number of TCI states cannot indicate PDSCH STRP or MTRP as Rel-16.  **Proposal 3.C:** We prefer Alt 1.We share similar view with QC that the existing SRS resource set indicator is sufficient.  **Proposal 3 D:** support |
| Nokia | Proposal 3.A: Ok with the proposal. Support Alt. 1.  Proposal 3. B: Ok in principle. Alt. 1 seems to be a clean solution. We do not think some alternatives makes sense. For example, Alt. 3 is unclear and dynamic switching (similar level of dynamic switching operation supported in Rel-16) is not supported to our reading. Alt. 4 seems to be bit complicated as well. We should not spend so much time on this issue and should follow Rel-17 PUSCH like method.  Proposal 3.C: ok in principle. Alt.1 with Rel-17 resource set indicator field can indicate the joint/UL beam.  Proposal 3.D: ok with the proposal. Suggest not listing many alternatives. We are open to Alt.2 and Alt.3, since Alt. 1 would not offer the flexibility of legacy operations where e.g., in Rel-17 MAC CE is used to indicate/update a PUCCH resource (and thus PUCCH resource group) with one or two spatial relation info.  [Mod] I would like to! But it seems every alternative has its proponents ☹.  Issue 3.5: Support Alt1 as a logical solution. |
| Intel | **Proposal 3.A:** Ok to discuss further so support in current form. We think Alt-1 should be enough. Flexible mapping of different number of TCI states to MAC-CE codepoints can address the issue of switching between sTRP and mTRP modes. When single TCI is indicated by DCI, UE interprets sTRP and in case of more than 1 TCI activated by DCI, UE interprets mTRP.  **Proposal 3.B:** OK to support with a preference for Alt-2.  **Proposal 3.C:** Alt-1 is our preference. However, we also think support of UL beam indication using UL DCI should be introduced in Rel-18 and used in conjunction with Alt-1. Linking the PUSCH beam to SRS is not necessary and is against the general principle of unified TCI framework with common beams.  **Proposal 3.D:** We prefer Alt-2. MAC-CE based indication of PUCCH beam is not necessary in unified TCI framework. |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 3.A:** We are okay with the proposal. We support using RRC parameter(s) in a CORESET configuration to inform whether~~/which~~ indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) the UE shall apply to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on the CORESET. However, if the indicated TCI states apply, then we support that the association between a COREST and a TCI state to be done according to a fixed rule. So we do not see Alt1-1 and Alt2 as mutually exclusive.  **Proposal 3.B:** We support the proposal to down select from the provided alternatives. However, we think that for Alt2, depending what we agree on in the general framework section, is able to support dynamic switching.  **Proposal 3.C:** We support this proposal. Our preference is Alt1.  **Proposal 3.D:** We support this proposal. Our preference is Alt3 because in Release17, one or two spatial relations can be activated per a PUCCH resource by MAC CE, and PRI field of DCI can select a PUCCH resource. We can use a similar approach to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) and a PUCCH resource/group. |
| FGI | **Proposal 3.A:** We slightly prefer Alt 1-1 and Alt 1-2 since the RRC configuration is just used to indicate whether the indicated joint TCI could be applied to the PDCCH rather than update the TCI state for the PDCCH. In other words, we could still update the TCI state for PDCCH by the MAC CE. Perhaps we can clarify the views that each company on this proposal.  On the other hand, for Alt 1-2, we want to clarify if we need to introduce a new RRC parameter for ‘CORESET group’ term? Also, how to associate the CORESET group with each CORESET needs to be further discussed (For example, to associate a CORESET group with some CORESET indices using a list or a similar indication as CORESETPoolIndex?).  [Mod] Based on the main bullet “Use Introduce an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s)”, my understanding is there will be a parameter liker *coresetPoolIndex* included in a CORESET.  **Proposal 3.B:** We support Alt 1. Moreover, switching between STRP and MTRP can benefit from simply using another field other than the existing field to associate STRP with one field (the existing field) and associate MTRP with two or more fields.  **Proposal 3.C:** We slightly prefer Alt 1 but it’s ok to discuss the details of Alt.2. It seems that Alt.1 can provide a more unified solution with TCI indication for PDSCH.  **Proposal 3.D:** For the joint TCI state for PUCCH transmission, can we associate the same TCI state with the one which is used for the corresponding DCI (including PRI) from a CORESET? For the UL TCI, we slightly prefer Alt.3. |
| Mod 29 | **Only some editorial corrections to the moderator proposals** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 3.A:** support. Propose to join Alt1 and Alt2 – they are quite similar. On the other hand, option 3 and 4 are different. Then we have 3 options: RRC, fixed, MAC CE.  **Proposal 3.B:** Two of the good things with the unified TCI framework was that we avoided the default rules (different ehavior before and after a threshold), and that we only have one way to steer the beams. The proposals to introduce special DCI fields to perform sTRP/mTRP for PDSCH on a per DCI basis would bring back the “default” issue. It would also lead to that we have yet another level of signaling: RRC, MAC CE, DCI1, DCI2. There is no agreement to support sTRP/mTRP switching in the same way as is R16. We are reluctant to list options that are targeting to introduce such functionality.  Proposal 3.C: OK  Proposal 3.D: Essentially OK. Propose to combine Alt1 and Alt2.  Issue 3.5: “indicated TCI state corresponding to the CORESETPoolIdx value” is unclear. Are the “indicated” TCI states split based on CORESETPoolIdx? Proposal 1B states “up to 4” – it would seem that we would need to agree on a split first, which I guess would effectively make it impossible to perform x-TRP TCI state update. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 3.A:** Support. We prefer Alt-1.  **Proposal 3.B:** Support. We prefer Alt-1.  **Proposal 3.C:** Support. We prefer Alt-1.  **Proposal 3.A: S**upport. We prefer Alt-1. |
| Samsung2 | For RRC based configuration in **Proposal 3.A**, for better clarity, we prefer to separate different beam indication methods for PDCCH reception with CORESET “grouping” in SDCI, which are provided as Alt1-2 and Alt1-3 below (the FFSs can still be kept).   * Alt1-2: Use an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is associated with each CORESET group; the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) associated with a CORESET group is applied for PDCCH reception(s) in the CORESET group.   + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the CORESET group(s)   + FFS: How to associate the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) with each CORESET group * Alt1-3: Use an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is associated with each CORESET group; when the beam indication DCI is received in a CORESET group, the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group is applied for PDCCH reception(s).   + FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the CORESET group(s)   + FFS: How to associate the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) with each CORESET group   [Mod] It seems Alt1-3 is a subset of Alt1-2, and it is one possible scheme to associate the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) with a CORESET group. I would suggest to keep this detail open. |
| Fujitsu | **Proposal 3.A:** We are fine with the proposal. We think both Alt-1-1 and Alt2 can be supported, e.g., for different PDCCHs including sTRP PDCCH, PDCCH repetition and SFN PDCCH.  **Proposal 3.B:** We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Alt2.  **Proposal 3.C:** We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 3.A:** We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Alt1 or Alt3. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 3.A:** Support. Prefer RRC-level configuration with Alt1-2.  **Proposal 3.B:** Support. Prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 3.C:** Support. Prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 3.D:** Support. Slightly prefer Alt2. |
| ZTE3 | **Proposal 3.A:** Support. Slightly prefer RRC-level configuration with Alt1-2.  **Proposal 3.B:** Support. Prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 3.C:** Support. Prefer Alt2.  **Proposal 3.D:** Support. Prefer Alt2. |
| Mod V37 | **Proposal 3.A-3.D are quite stable** |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 3.A:** We are still confused about Alt2 mainly because of the ambiguity of the word ‘association’ in Alt 2. We can support Alt 1-1 instead if we can add an FFS on ‘how to do the mapping between a CORESET to a DCI-indicated TCI state.’ |
| Sharp | **Proposal 3.A:** Support. Prefer Alt1-1.  **Proposal 3.B:** Support. Prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 3.C:** Support. Prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 3.D:** Support. Prefer Alt1. |

# Issue 4 – UL power Control for UL MTRP

Open issues on UL power control for UL MTRP are summarized below.

Table 4-1 Summary for Issue 4

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **FL note/observation** |
| 4.1 | How to determine the UL PC parameter setting(s) if one or both indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) is not associated with an UL PC parameter setting (including P0, alpha for PUSCH, and closed loop index) for PUCCH/PUSCH | Alt1-Follow the UL PC parameter setting(s) provided in the corresponding UL BWP, i.e., support two default UL PC parameter settings configured in *BWP*-*UplinkDedicated*: Huawei, Qualcomm, MediaTek, TransHold, Xiaomi, OPPO, Docomo, Apple, LG, vivo, Intel, FGI  Alt2-Follow the one single UL PC parameter setting provided in in *BWP*-*UplinkDedicated* regardless the UL PC parameter setting is absent from one or both of indicated joint/UL TCI states: Ericsson  Alt4- Not support any default rule for the case that one or both indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) is not associated with an UL PC parameter setting: ZTE | A proposal for this issue will be provided in a later version with sufficient input from companies |
| 4.2 | Enhance Type-1 PHR for MTRP with TCI-specific UL PC parameter setting | Support: Qualcomm, Docomo, vivo  Concern: Huawei/HiSilicon |  |

**Proposal 4.A:** On unified TCI framework extension, if one or both of indicated joint/UL TCI states applying to PUSCH/PUCCH transmission occasions in an UL BWP at least for S-DCI based PUSCH/PUCCH repetition with TDM is/are not associated with UL PC parameter setting (including P0, alpha for PUSCH, and closed loop index) for PUCCH/PUSCH, down-selection one alternative from the followings:

* Alt1: Support two default UL PC parameter settings configured in *BWP-UplinkDedicated*, and the UE should apply the one or two default UL PC parameter settings configured in the corresponding UL BWP
  + FFS: 1-to-1 association between an indicated joint/UL TCI state and a default UL PC parameter setting
* Alt2: No change from Rel-17 unified TCI framework, i.e., the UE should apply the one single default UL PC parameter setting configured in the corresponding UL BWP regardless the UL PC parameter setting is absent from one or both of indicated joint/UL TCI states
* Alt3: A joint/UL TCI state for PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is always associated with a UL PC parameter setting for PUCCH/PUSCH

Table 4-2 Additional inputs for Issue 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | * **Please update your view on those sub-issues in Table 4-1** * **Share additional inputs here, especially for open issue that needs to be addressed with higher priority but is not captured in Table 4-1** |
| QC | For Proposal 4.A, we think Alt1 will provide same flexibility as legacy R17, which already supports two UL PC parameter sets.  For 4.2, we think the same principle agreed for sTRP is also beneficial for mTRP |
| OPPO | For **Proposal 4.A**: For MTRP PUCCH/PUSCH, it seems more reasonable to apply the two default UL PC parameter settings (specified in Rel.17 MTRP PUCCH/PUSCH), otherwise as implied by Alt2, UE has to fallback to UL PC for STRP. Our preference added in Table 4-1.  Moreover, since STxMP (if supported) can be considered with extension of UTCI in Rel.18, we think STxMP (not only PUCCH/PUSCH repetition with TDM) should be considered in Proposal 4.A as well. |
| Huawei, HiSi | * 1. **and Proposal 4.A:**   We support Alt 1 in 4.1 and we think the same mechanism is also applicable to other UL transmission scenarios in mTRP, e.g. m-DCI.  **4.2:**  Since the TCI-specific PC was introduced in Rel-17, we don’t see the necessity to enhance the PHR in mTRP as the power control is still TCI-specific. |
| Docomo | Our views added in the table.  For Proposal 4.A, we prefer Alt.1. Two default power control parameter settings are supported in Rel-17 M-TRP and should also be supported with unified TCI framework. Alt.1 which extends the configuration of default PC parameter setting in Rel-17 unified TCI is a straightforward way.  For 4.2, we support to study enhancement on PHR considering per TRP PC parameter setting. In Rel-17 M-TRP, per TRP PC parameter is supported in PHR and it should also be considered with unified TCI. |
| NEC | **Issue 4.1:** we agree the high-level concept that two default PC parameter settings are needed if both TCI states are not linked to any PC parameters settings. |
| ZTE | **Issue 4.1:** Since either-way the association between one of candidates and joint/UL TCI state should be determined, why we directly support the explicit configuration for the association directly. Then we support Alt-4.  [Mod] To my understanding, if no further spec change is made for this issue, Alt2 will be the natural outcome. However, based on your description, you would prefer that each joint/UL TCI state in unified TCI extension is always associated with UL PC setting, is that correct understanding? I add one alternative for this in Proposal 4.A, please check.  **Issue 4.2:** We are open to any necessary enhancement for Type-1 PHR for MTRP. The enhanced MTRP related PHR report may need to be justified in unified TCI framework for mTRP. |
| Futurewei | **Issue 4.1:** Support Alt 1. |
| Lenovo | For proposal 4.A, we prefer Alt1.  For 4.2: two PHRs corresponding to two TRPs has been supported in Rel-17, it’s reasonable to support TRP-specific PHR in Rel-18 with eUTCI. Further, STxMP should be considered as well if it was agreed to be supported in Rel-18. |
| Apple | **Issue 4.1:** Our intention is also to reuse the xisting default power control mechanism for mTRP. So, we update our position to go with Alt.1. |
| Samsung | We support single default PC setting.  Support of two default PC settings needs further clarification how UE understand which TCI state is associated to which UL PC settings while it is unclear whether we need any enhancements for default mode operation. |
| Xiaomi | **Issue 4.1:** Support Alt.1.  For S-DCI M-TRP UL TDMed transmission, TRP specific power control is supported in R17 based R15/16 framework. Now, TRP specific power control should be also supported when the Rel-17 Unified TCI framework is extended to multi-TRP. Therefore, two UL PC parameter settings should be configured for S-DCI M-TRP UL TDMed transmission when the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) is not associated with an UL PC parameter { P0, alpha, closed loop index }.  In addition, we want to know whether the power control for STxMP should be discussed in this agenda, or in agenda 9.1.4.1.  [Mod] Per Chairman’s guidance, power control (at least if related to TCI state) is discussed in this agenda. |
| CATT | For proposal 4.A, we think Rel-17 legacy method can be extended to determine the two default UL PC parameter settings of MTRP PUSCH/PUCCH, our reference is added in Table 4.1. |
| vivo | **Proposal 4.A:** Support Alt1. |
| TransHold | **Proposal 4.A**: we prefer Alt1 as it is a straightforward solution of Rel-17 default UL PC parameter settings.  **Issue 4.2:** We are open to any necessary enhancement for Type-1 PHR for MTRP. |
| Nokia | Proposal 4.A: same method as in Rel-17 PUSCH TDM, i.e., use of default power control parameters sets shall be used. |
| Intel | **Proposal 4.A:** OK with Alt-1 |
| FGI | **Proposal 4.A:** Regarding Proposal 4.A, we share the similar view as QC, i.e., Rel-17 already supports two UL power control sets. Thus, we think Alt.1 is a reasonable solution. |
| Mod 29 | **Three alternatives are added in Proposal 4.A according to companies input** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 4.A:** Do not support. It’s too early to discuss what happens if one parameter is not specified. It really feels like a detail. Note that RAN2 has chosen a quite effective representation of PC parameters, so Alt5 may be quite ok.  [Mod] RAN1 still needs to decide whether to support two default settings. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 4.A:** OK with Alt-1 or Alt-3. |
| Fujitsu | **Proposal 4.A:** We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Alt3. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 4.A:** Support the proposal. Prefer Alt1. |
| ZTE | **Proposal 4.A:** Support. We prefer Alt3. |
| Sharp | **Proposal 4.A:** We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Alt1. |

# Issue 5 – Beam reporting and beam failure recovery

Open issues on beam reporting and BFR enhancements and company views are summarized below.

Table 5-1 Summary for Issue 5-1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **Moderator notes/observation** |
| 3.1 | Enhance/extend group-based reporting to support simultaneous UL transmission | Support: QC, Docomo, ZTE, vivo, Nokia  Concern: OPPO, Huawei/HiSilicon | This issue can be discussed once any Rel-18 MTRP scheme for STxMP is agreed |
| 3.2 | Enhance/extend Rel-17 UE capability index reporting to support simultaneous UL transmission | Support: QC, OPPO, Docomo, NEC, ZTE, IDC, LG, Nokia  Concern: Huawei/HiSilicon | This issue can be discussed once any Rel-18 MTRP scheme for STxMP is agreed |
| 3.3 | Enhancement to TRP-specific BFR under unified TCI framework | Support: QC, OPPO, Huawei/HiSilicon, Docomo, NEC, ZTE, IDC, vivo, Nokia  Concern: |  |

Table 5-2 Additional inputs for Issue 5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | * **Please update your view on those sub-issues in Table 5-1** * **Although Issue 5 will be treated with lower priority in this meeting, companies still can share additional inputs here** |
| QC | Support 3.1 and 3.2, but fine to wait till STxMP decision is clear  Support 3.3. We think the same principle agreed for sTRP is also beneficial for mTRP |
| OPPO | For Issue 3.1, we understand the group-based beam reporting was for DL MTRP operation, while the STxMP is for UL only. It seems unnecessary to combine these two features.  Support Issue 3.2 and 3.3. It seems reasonable to discuss Issue 3.2 when STxMP is agreeable. |
| Huawei, HiSi | **3.1 and 3.2:**  We agree with the moderator and prefer to wait the progress of 9.1.4.1.  **3.3:**  we support such enhancement. |
| Docomo | Our views added in the table.  For 3.1 and 3.2, we support the enhancements on beam reporting to support STxMP, and fine to wait for progress in 9.1.4.1.  For 3.3, we support to study it. |
| NEC | We support to have enhancements as said in 3.2 and 3.3 |
| ZTE | Our views are provided in the table. BTW, for group based reporting, we think that, for STxMP, the UE capability report should be based on group based report rather than non-group. |
| InterDigital | Our views are updated in the table. |
| Futurewei | For Issues 3.1 and 3.2, we agree with moderator that the discussions should wait for decisions in agenda item 9.1.4.1. |
| Samsung | We prefer to complete STxMP discussion before go into details for 3.1 or 3.2. And we prefer 3.1 as staring point, if STxMP is supported.  Support 3.3. |
| Xiaomi | Support 3.1 and 3.2, ok to discuss the details till STxMP is agreed.  Support 3.3 for mTRP case. |
| CATT | Support 3.1 and 3.2.  For Issue 3.3, detailed issues to be discussed need to be clarified. |
| vivo | Agree with Moderates’ notes. |
| TransHold | Support 3.1 and 3.2, fine to discuss the details till STxMP is agreed.  For 3.3, we support to study it. |
| Nokia | 3.1 and 3.2: Enhancement to beam reporting is needed to provide network information about feasibility of STxMP but this can discussed when STxMP schemes are more clear.  3.3: enhancements needed to BFR operation should be studied to cover the unified TCI extension to mTRP BFR specified in R17. |
| Ericsson | Issue 3.1: This has nothing to do with the unified TCI framework: it’s a reporting enhancement.  Issue 3.2: Nothing to do with the unified TCI framework. Having said that, we have concerns on (some) extensions of the capability index reporting.  Issue 3.3: Low prio. Editorial updates can be considered. |
| CMCC | For 3.1 and 3.2, we think they are important issues to facilitate STxMP, but we are not sure whether they should be discussed in unified TCI framework.  For 3.3, agree with Ericsson. Editorial updates can be considered. |

# Other potential issues

Table 6 Inputs for other potential issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | **Please share your view if there is any open issue that need to be addressed with higher priority but is not captured in above sections** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Considering enhancements for common TCI state update for mTRP where sTRP and mTRP CCs can be configured in the same CC list. |

# Appendix A: Agreements before/in RAN1#110

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#109e** |
| **Agreement**  On unified TCI framework extension, consider all the intra and inter-cell MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17   * Consider, if STxMP is supported, Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP   **Agreement**  On unified TCI framework extension at least for single-DCI based MTRP, the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) can indicate multiple joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list   * FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI state ID(s) to a TCI codepoint, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI state IDs that can be mapped to a TCI codepoint * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits * Note: This doesn't imply that support of one additional TCI field or a field associating the TCI field to the TRP(s) is precluded   Note: The term TRP is used only for the purposes of discussions in RAN1 and whether/how to capture this is FFS  **Agreement**  On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP, consider the following alternatives for TCI state update:   * Alt1: Reuse the same TCI state update scheme for S-DCI based MTRP * Atl2: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) corresponding to the same *CORESETPoolIndex* value * Alt3: Use the existing TCI field in any DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to indicate all joint/DL/UL TCI states corresponding to both *CORESETPoolIndex* values   + Study the association between the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value * Alt4: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) corresponding to the same or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value.   + Study whether the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) applies to the channels/signals associated with the same *CORESETPoolIndex* value or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value is indicated by DCI   **Agreement**  On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, consider at least the following alternatives to map/associate a joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH reception(s)   * Atl1: Use RRC configuration to inform the mapping/association between a configured or indicated joint/DL TCI state and a CORESET or a CORESET group * Alt2: Use RRC configuration to inform the mapping/association between a configured or indicated joint/DL TCI state and a search space set * Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the mapping/association between an activated or indicated joint/DL TCI state and a CORESET or a CORESET group * Alt4: Use DCI to inform the mapping/association between an indicated joint/DL TCI state and a CORESET or a CORESET group * Alt5: Based on a fixed mapping/association rule, e.g., the first indicated joint/DL TCI state always applies to PDCCH receptions   Consider above alternatives for PDCCH repetition, PDCCH-SFN, PDCCH w/o repetition/SFN, and potential support of dynamic switching between S-TRP and M-TRP for PDCCH. It is not precluded to adopt one single alternative or multiple alternatives to support these cases.  **Agreement**  On unified TCI framework extension, if an indicated joint or UL TCI state applies to a PUSCH/PUCCH transmission occasion at least for S-DCI based PUSCH/PUCCH repetition with TDM and the indicated joint or UL TCI state is associated with an UL PC parameter setting for PUSCH /PUCCH (including P0, alpha for PUSCH, and closed loop index) and a PL-RS, the UE should apply the UL PC parameter setting and the PL-RS for the PUSCH /PUCCH transmission occasion.   * FFS: How to extend to other Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP, if supported * FFS: UL PC enhancement for CB and non-CB SRS in above case   FFS: The applied UL PC parameter setting if one or both indicated joint or UL TCI state(s) is not associated with an UL PC parameter setting (including P0, alpha for PUSCH, and closed loop index) for PUCCH/PUSCH  **Agreement**  On UE power limitation for STxMP for FR2, send LS to RAN4 to check the followings:   * Whether it is feasible to assume power limitation per panel for STxMP (Assumption 1) * Whether it is feasible to assume a total power limitation per UE over all UE panels used for STxMP (Assumption 2) * In either of Assumption1 or Assumption 2, whether the total power limitation per UE over all UE panels used for STxMP or the sum of per-panel power limitation for STxMP can be different from (greater than) the existing power limitation for a given power class? * If both Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 are feasible, whether both assumptions can be applied to a same UE, and what is the relationship between the per-panel power limitation and total power limitation if both are applied (e.g., the sum of per-panel power limitation can be larger than the total power limitation per UE, or should be always the same)?   FFS: Detail of exact LS if agreed  Note: Scenarios of above include at least single carrier scenario for FR2  Note: Above power limitation includes both total radiated power and EIRP  LS to RAN4 is endorsed in R1-2205639. |
| **RAN1#110** |
|  |

# Appendix B: Pre-meeting offline discussion on Issue 1

Table 1-1 Summary for Issue 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **FL note/observation** |
| 1.1 | Whether to support applying multiple joint/DL TCI states simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception(s) | Support: Google, Ericsson, Docomo, ZTE(in principle), Lenovo, Intel(in principle), FGI, Huawei/HiSilicon  Concern: vivo, NEC, Fujitsu, IDC, Apple, Spreadtrum, QC (ok for SFN)  Out-of-scope: OPPO | This is not supported in current spec, so it must be discussed and decided first before further considering CJT in unified TCI extension. On the other hand, this issue may be out of the Rel-18 MIMO scope. |
| 1.2 | For the target use cases agreed in RAN1#109e, up to 2 sets of TCI states (TCI set) can be indicated and applied in a CC/BWP   * Each TCI set comprises one joint TCI state for joint DL/UL TCI update, or one DL TCI state and/or one UL TCI state for separate DL/UL TCI update * The joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) within each TCI set is indicated/updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation | Support: Docomo, vivo, ZTE, OPPO, NEC, Fujitsu, Lenovo, LG Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, QC  Concern: Google, Ericsson, IDC (premature and no need to use “sets”), Huawei/HiSilicon (OK with 2nd sub-bullet) | We can focus on the target use cases agreed in RAN1#109e first, and the max number for CJT (up to 4 TRPs can be supported for Rel-18 CJT) can be further discussed if there is any agreement on Issue 1.1. Note that whether to prioritize or only support NTRP = {1,2} over {3,4} is also an on-going discussion in AI 9.1.2. |
| 1.3 | How to configure/determine the exact number of TCI states that UE needs to apply in a CC/BWP? | Based on a unified configuration/determination scheme (e.g., RRC configuration, TCI state activation, or the indicated TCI codepoint):  Based on the configuration/enabling of MTRP scheme(s) in the CC/BWP:  Others: | Note that indicated/applied TCI states in a CC/BWP may be shared by multiple DL/UL channels with different STRP/MTRP schemes  Conclusion on Issue 1.3 may impact the later design(s) on mapping/ association between the indicated TCI state(s) and target channel(s)/signal(s) |
| 1.4 | Whether joint DL/UL TCI update and separate DL/UL TCI update can be supported in a same CC/BWP simultaneously?  For the use case e.g., one TRP with joint DL/UL TCI update and another with separate DL/UL TCI update. | Support: Intel, FGI, Huawei/HiSilicon, QC  Concern: Google, OPPO, Lenovo, LG, Spreadtrum |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Google | Issue 1.1: Given the introduction of CJT in R18, it seems hard to overlook the fact of 4 TRPs.  Issue 1.2: We are afraid it is too risky to say up to 2 TCI sets can be indicated/applied in a BWP/CC. At least for FR2, we should support up to 4 TCI sets considering CJT.  Issue 1.4: In our views, there are few cases that UE communicates with one TRP using separate TCI, and on the other hand, communicates with the other one using joint TCI. |
| Ericsson | Issue 1.1: It would seem unfortunate to exclude CJT, since the specification impact would be very small, considering that we already agreed to support 2 DL + 2 UL TCI states.  Issue 1.2: The definition of a “TCI set” is not motivated.  Issue 1.3: Unclear. Why should we determine the exact number of TCI states? The UE needs to determine which TCI states to apply, and the number of TCI states will follow automatically. In our understanding, the UE should be able to apply one, two, three of four TCI states, based on a combination of RRC configuration, MAC CE activation, and DCI indication.  Issue 1.4: This can be discussed later. |
| Docomo | Issue 1.1: We believe unified TCI should support CJT. If CJT is supported by only Rel.15/16 TCI state/spatial relation, we have concern, because it means gNB needs to select either CJT or other Rel.17/18 features using unified TCI state per a band. This was the reason why we need to extend unified TCI framework for M-TRP in Rel.18.  Issue 1.2: We think the intention is to focus on M-TRP operation and keep open for CJT. We are fine, but we should clarify as “up to 2 sets of indicated TCI states (indicated TCI set)”.  By the way, if this proposal is controversial, perhaps we can skip this issue for now. For example, we can discuss using terminology of “M indicated TCI states (FFS: the value of M)”.  Issue 1.3: Question is not clear to us. In our understanding, UE can understand the number of indicated TCI states based on DCI/MAC CE/RRC beam indication. However, even if two TCI states are indicated, two TCI states cannot be applied to some CH/RS (e.g. S-TRP PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/PUSCH, non-SFN CORESET, CSI-RS, SRS). In that case, UE should select one TCI state from the two indicated TCI states.  Issue 1.4: We are not opposing to specify such operation, but its discussion priority in AI9.1.1.1 is not high. |
| Vivo | Issue 1.1: A better way to go is to first focus on MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17, and potential Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP to avoid new CJT schemes making the discussion complicated. We are fine to have a parallel discussion specific to CJT, but CJT should try to follow the eUTCI framework for MTRP without impacting eUTCI framework for Rel-16/17 MTRP.  Issue 1.2: Agree with FL’s observation on CJT.  Issue 1.3: Unclear issue to us. In our mind, it should be a channel-specific determination for MTRP scheme as Rel-16 and Rel-17. When a UE is indicated with two UTCI states for DL or UL, whether each individual channel apply one or two UTCI states is separately determined.  Issue 1.4: We are open to this issue. But a mixed UTCI type for different TRPs would make the UTCI activation and indication a little bit complicated but provide flexibility. |
| ZTE | Issue 1.1: For CJT, a single TCI state should be assumed as a starting point, and then we are open to further consider more-than-one-TCI state indication if a clear usage/benefit can be justified. Even having more than one TCI state, we think that the QCL-Type should be justified. QCL-TypeA + QCL-TypeA or we need to consider a principle TCI state and secondary TCI state(s) for some parts of QCL assumption, as what we did for SFN, quite like what we need to handle in the CJT.  Issue 1.2: A good starting point for facilitating the subsequent discussion for the separate indication like ‘DL TCI + UL TCI’ for one TRP and ‘DL TCI + UL TCI’ for another TRP. For CJT, we may discuss the corresponding UE behavior later. Although from TCI indication perspective CJT is quite like mTRP, if we concentrate on a DL/UL transmission, CJT is almost the same as sTRP operation. We may need to handle this case carefully, e.g.,, CJT + CJT.  Issue 1.3: Technical speaking it is a good question, and anyway we need to make a clear decision for a given UE transmission. But, it may be relevant to roadmap/way-forward for making progress on this topic. We slightly prefer to use the typical roadmap: case-by-case discussion for TCI activation/indication and the subsequent association for each DL or UL channel/RS. If above is clear, this issue can be well handled with transparent manner.  Issue 1.4: The motivation is unclear for us. Could any proponents nicely clarify why/how two TRPs need to be treated differently in terms of joint and separate indication? |
| OPPO | Issue 1.1: In the WID of Rel.18 MIMO enhancement (RP-213598), it says “Study, and if justified, specify enhancements of CSI acquisition for Coherent-JT targeting FR1 and up to 4 TRPs”. Clearly, the specification effort should focus on CSI. We failed to see any hint in the WID that UE has to boost its capability for up to 4 DL TCI states simultaneously.  With ideal backhaul and synchronization, this CJT enhancement targets on FR1 (e.g. 700MHz) in which UE can apply very wide Rx beam(s) for DL receptions from different directions. Therefore, 1 or 2 legacy (Rel.15/16) TCI state(s) specified for MTRP PDSCH in Rel.16 would also work well. In our view, it seems out of scope and unnecessary to be enhanced.  Issue 1.2: the concept of indicated TCI set seems a good starting point for unifying the beams in a TRP-specific manner. The terminology “TCI set” may cause inconvenience among the group, but we think at least “TCI set” can be used for discussion purpose and how to capture it is up to editor.  Issue 1.3: it is highly likely that the TCI state(s) indication for MTRP follow the conventional way, i.e. RRC + MAC CE + DCI as in Rel.17 for STRP. Regarding on how determine the exact number of indicated TCI state(s), we tend to believe it should be done on a per channel basis, depending on the transmission scheme of each channel. For instance, if 2 DL/joint TCI states are indicated, only 1 of the 2 indicated TCI states will apply to STRP PDSCH, whereas 2 indicated ones will apply to MTRP PDSCH.  Issue 1.4: we also failed to see strong motivation on mixed mode of TCI states, i.e. configuring joint TCI states for one TRP and separate DL/UL TCI states for the other TRP. It seems no additional complexity for following the configuration rule in Rel.17 for STRP. |
| NEC | Issue 1.1: According to WID, it is out of scope. Also, we don’t think CJT operation requires fast TCI update schemes like what is/will be specified in Rel-17/18. In addition, the unified TCI state is motivated by the need of “common beam”, but we don’t think in CJT we will support the common beam of PDCCH/PDSCH.  Issue 1.2: Support.  Issue 1.3: Generally speaking, the exact number of applied TCI states should be determined based on TCI state activation/indication signaling. But we are also not sure about the exact intension of this question.  Issue 1.4: We are open to it. |
| Fujitsu | Issue 1.1: In the WID, unified TCI is explicitly mentioned for STxMP but not mentioned for CJT. There could be different understandings on the scope. At least it is not clear to us whether it is in scope or not.  Issue 1.2: We are fine with this design principle.  Issue 1.3: If our understanding is correct, we think it is addressing some cases where the number of TCI states indicated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 and the number of TCI states required by sTRP/mTRP schemes do not match. We support to study these, and we think a pre-defined association rule can be also considered.  Issue 1.4: We do not see the necessity, but we are open to discussing this. |
| Lenovo | Issue 1.1: We there are enough similarities between CJT and mTRP NCJT PDSCH to justify incorporating CJT in the R18 eUTI.  Issue 1.2: Excluding CJT, 2 sets of TCI states are sufficient to support mTRP schemes of R16/17.  Issue 1.3: It is not clear the question is raised at what level: DCI, MAC-CE or RRC? Please clarify.  Issue 1.4: This is in direct violation with the TCI framework of previous releases. We do not see a strong motivation for such configuration. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Issue 1.1: TCI indication for CJT is not part of the WID. At the very least, we prefer that CJT considerations are not brought into the MTRP discussions regarding the number of indicated TCI states and the TCI-state mapping. If any agreement to support CJT is made, the discussions can be had with lower priority separate from the unified TCI framework for MTRP.  Issue 1.2: Agree in principle.  Issue 1.3: Slightly prefer to have it based on the MTRP scheme enabled.  Issue 1.4: Use-case unclear. Discussion should be of low priority. |
| Intel | Issue 1.1: CJT should use unified TCI framework and the beam indication aspects should be discussed in this agenda item since CSI is not going to discuss beam management. Otherwise, CJT may have to default to older TCI framework which would be unfortunate. RAN1 can further discuss whether 4 TCI states are needed to be indicated. We can agree to support CJT for eUTCI with the current agreement i.e., up to 2 TCI states as a starting point.  Issue 1.2: Not sure why we need to define “TCI Sets”. The formulation from last meeting i.e., combination of joint and or separate DL/UL TCI states is OK.  Issue 1.3: Motivation is unclear in current form. Based on MAC-CE codepoint, UE should be able to implicitly derive the number of TCI states to apply.  Issue 1.4: This should be supported in Rel-18. The restriction to configure via RRC in Rel-17 was an artificial one and was agreed due to no consensus in the case of single TRP, but for mTRP, we do not see why such restriction is needed. |
| CMCC | Issue1.1: We think unified TCI indication for CJT-based PDSCH reception(s) can be supported. Otherwise, UE may need fallback to R15/16 TCI state framework when CJT operation is applied.  Issue 1.2: We agree with FL that the related discussion is on-going in AI 9.1.2. We can discuss this issue when AI 9.1.2 has the decision for whether to prioritize or only support NTRP = {1,2} over {3,4}.  Issue 1.3: We think the exact number of applied TCI states should be determined per channel. But we should first discuss whether the number of indicated TCI states can be different with the TCI states be applied.  Issue 1.4: We think it can be supported. Since MPE issue may be occurred for only one of the TRPs, the TRP with MPE issue can use separate TCI mode, and the other TRP can use joint TCI mode. |
| SS | Issue 1.1: We are open to discuss beam indication aspects for CJT. As we commented in the last meeting, if needed, separate discussions on CJT and Rel-16/17 MTRP schemes can be carried out.  Issue 1.2: We are fine for the definition of TCI sets (for discussion purpose). Up to 2 TCI sets should be supported for the Rel-16/17 MTRP schemes extensions. We would like to ask for clarifications regarding possible TCI states combinations between the two sets if they are indicated (e.g., joint+joint, and etc.), and how this issue is related to Issue 1.4.  Issue 1.3: This issue is a bit unclear to us. To our understanding, this issue is about how to interpret/apply the indicated TCI states for different channels or different applications (otherwise, the number of indicated TCI states can be derived from the MAC CE activated TCI codepoints). As commented by other companies, the number of indicated TCI states applied in a CC/BWP can depend on the specific channel (e.g., one out the indicated two is used for SDCI PDCCH reception(s)) or a specific application scenario (e.g., dynamic STRP/MTRP switching or only one of the indicated TCI states gets updated). We are open to discuss how to interpret/apply the indicated TCI states based on a channel/RS type or (additional) indication.  Issue 1.4: The use cases of mixing the TCI types across TRPs are unclear to us. |
| FGI | Issue 1.1: Support of CJT operation for eUTCI framework might make the whole system consistent and complete. Thus, we suggest that we keep the CJT related discussion in this agenda but with lower priority than mTRP related discussion.  Issue 1.2: It may depend on the decision made for issue 1.1. We share the same view that the ‘TCI set’ is a little bit confusing.  Issue 1.3: The number of TCI states that UE needs to apply can be determined per-channel basis to ensure the scheduling flexibility. In other words, the number of TCI states can vary based on the applied channels, which shares the similar concept with Rel-16/Rel-17 mTRP operation.  Issue 1.4: In terms of providing greater flexibility, we support to update joint DL/UL TCI update and separate DL/UL TCI update in a same CC/BWP simultaneously, but the applicable scenarios should be further clarified considering the potential complexity. |
| LG | Issue 1.1: It seems better to focus on MTRP schemes in Rel-16/17 and STxMP schemes. If CJT needs to be considered, it should be low priority.  Issue 1.2: We agree with the FL’s assessment. For ‘TCI set’, it could be better to express ‘the combination of joint and/or separate TCI states’ to avoid the confusion of terminology.  Issue 1.3: It should be possible that the indicated TCI states via MAC-CE and/or MAC-CE + DCI can be differently applied for different channels/RSs or enabled MTRP schemes.  Issue 1.4: The use case needs to be clarified first for different mode of TCI state (joint/separate) across TRPs. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 1.1: since for issue 1.2, we support up to 2 sets of TCI states. And we think it can also be applied for CJT. It means that up to 2 TCI states can be used for CJT.  Issue 1.2: support up to 2 sets of TCI states.  Issue 1.3: we guess it means the number of indicated TCI states. According to FL’s summary, there are two alternatives. Alt 1 is to determine it based on MTRP schemes. Take joint TCI state as an example, if there is at least one channel configured as MTRP scheme, the number of joint TCI state will be always 2. And additional signaling will be used to indicate the mapping/association between the 2 indicated TCI states and each channel. Alt 2 is based on unified configuration scheme. It means that even at least one channel is configured with MTRP scheme, the number of indicated TCI state can be 1 when gNB schedules all channel as STRP transmission. In this case, the additional signaling to indicate the mapping/association will be unnecessary.  Issue 1.4: we think it can be supported for the case of DL only TRP/UL only TRP/MPE. |
| InterDigital | Issue 1.1: CJT specific issue should at least not be a dominating factor to progress this AI. In the following Issue 1.2 (suggested below), we can agree to support up to X indicated UTCIs which may not need to be based mainly on CJT usage at the first place. CJT specific issues should be treated separately (and with not a higher priority in this AI).  Issue 1.2: It’s confusing/premature and unnecessary to use the term “sets”. We can just reuse the last version of FL proposal (focused on what to support first) in the last meeting like:   * + Support up to X indicated joint TCI states in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update   + Support up to X indicated DL TCI states and up to X indicated UL TCI states in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update   X can be at least 2, and is not yet excluded to be more than 2 (e.g., for CJT use case, if agreed further).  This kind of principle on what to support is desired to be agreed first. And, further details on whether to be based on a sort of “set” structure can be discussed later.  Issue 1.3: It’s better to discuss more directly, case by case, after agreeing first on Issue 1.2. For example, if we agree on Issue 1.2, e.g., at least X=2, then, it means the UE can be indicated via a TCI codepoint of the TCI field in a DCI, where the TCI codepoint can be mapped to either one UTCI or two UTCIs (according to the MAC-CE activation which may need to be enhanced anyway). Then, how to enhance the MAC-CE and how to interpret the indicated 1 UTCI or X UTCIs can be further discussed, case by case, e.g., for STRP case, MTRP case, etc.  Issue 1.4: This can be discussed later in orders (at least after Issue 1.2). We tend to agree with views from CMCC and Xiaomi, in that no need to restrict gNB’s configurability to cope with various situations including MPE, MTRP usages, and so on. |
| Apple | Issue 1.1: In last meeting, it was agreed to target for ‘intra and inter-cell MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17’ and ‘Rel-18 STxMP (if supported)’, which does not scope in the Rel-18 CJT use case. The standard effort needs to be carefully evaluated to add this into Rel-18 scope, taking into account limited TU.  Issue 1.2: In principle, we agree the procedure for sDCI-based mTRP. But, no need of ‘TCI set’ concept even for discussion purpose. For mDCI-based mTRP, the Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be fully reused for each TRP including RRC-based TCI state list configuration, MAC-CE based TCI association and DCI-based TCI update.  Issue 1.3: In our view, Rel-17 three-stage approach can be reused by combining RRC+MAC+DCI signaling. The exact number of TCI states can up to 4 for sDCI-based mTRP (e.g., separate DL/UL mode where 2 TCI state per TRP) and up to 2 for mDCI-based mTRP.  Issue 1.4: We are generally supportive for this combination due to potential flexibility benefit e.g., when MPE issue occurs for one TRP, instead of both. |
| Futurewei | **Issue 1.1:** We support applying the unified TCI framework extension in Rel. 18 to CJT. Our view is that supporting multi-TRP and CJT schemes with one unified TCI framework will reduce system complexity.  **Issue 1.2:** The term “TCI set” is unclear and needs clarification.  **Issue 1.3:** Our view is that the TCI states that a UE needs to apply to a channel/signal should be decided based on a combination of RRC configuration, MAC CE activation, and DCI indication.  **Issue 1.4:** We fail to see a strong motivation to support one TRP with joint DL/UL TCI update and another with separate DL/UL TCI update. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Issue 1.1 In RAN1#109e, it has been agreed that up to four cooperating TRPs are supported for CJT based CSI report in FR1. Although TRPs may perform CJT transmission to each UE, we don’t think transmission of a single coherent TRS would be a practical solution to estimate the delay spread of all links: Different UEs are associated with different TRP sets and transmitting TRS coherently means that UE-specific coherent TRS is needed, which introduces a large TRS overhead in MU-MIMO scenario. Therefore, cell-specific non-coherent TRS in which one TRS is associated with one TRP is a more reasonable method to reduce TRS overhead. It means that, in general, for a CJT with four TRPs, up to 4 joint or DL TCI states should be indicated; at least for FR1.  Issue 1.2 We don’t think we need to specify “TCI sets”. We may use this terminology only to facilitate discussion. Further, our strong preference is to first conclude the issue 1.1. In its current form, we cannot agree with “up to 2 sets of TCI states (TCI set)” in Issue 1.2. We are generally OK with the last bullet of Issue 1.2 as it follows the same design as in Rel-17 unified TCI.  Issue 1.3 We are not sure we clearly understand the intention of the question. In Rel-17, depending on the activation MAC-CE and the TCI codepoint in DCI, one or two TCIs are applied for a single TRP. In Rel-18, and assuming two TRPs in FR2, a similar principle can be used: depending on the activation command(s) and TCI codepoint(s) in DCI(s), up to 4 TCIs are applied.  Issue 1.4 We think joint DL/UL TCI update and separate DL/UL TCI update can be supported in a same CC/BWP simultaneously. Extending the unified TCI framework to mTRP requires indicating m (pairs of) TCI states to the UE. It is possible that the UL and DL beam correspondence may hold only for some of the m beam pair links (in FR2, m=2). As an example, the MPE restriction may only be applicable to one UE panel whose UL beam is towards a single TRP. In such a case, the beam pair link between UE’s other panel and other TRP(s) should not be impacted. It is therefore beneficial to support per TRP TCI state mode configuration for the sake of transmission flexibility. |
| CATT | Issue 1.1: We prefer to focus on Rel-16/17 mTRP and STxMP in this agenda item. It seems that the question on whether 4 TCI states are needed is related to CJT only. So, as commented by FL for issue 1.2, we also think it’s better to discuss CJT separately.  Issue 1.2: We are fine with the definition of TCI set. Alternatively, the formulation used in the last meeting, i.e., combination of joint and or separate DL/UL TCI states, is also acceptable to us.  Issue 1.3: This issue is not quite clear to us. For flexibility, the number of applied TCI states per CC/BWP should be determined per channel. Namely, each channel could determine its sTRP or mTRP transmission separately. For sTRP, only one TCI set is applied. For mTRP, two TCI sets should be applied.  Issue 1.4: As mentioned by some other companies, for mTRP, it is possible that one link may suffer from MPE and the other one does not. Then, hybrid configuration of joint TCI and separated DL/UL TCI seems necessary to be supported in Rel-18. |
| Spreadtrum | Issue 1.1: CJT aims to FR1 and is not included in WID, so we fail to see a strong motivation to study the TCI indication for CJT.  Issue 1.2: Supportive about the design principle.  Issue 1.3: To determine the exact number of TCI states, the number of RRC-configured TCI states and the MAC CE format design should be discussed firstly, then, the number of exact applied TCI states can be determined per channel according to different transmission scheme.  Issue 1.4: negative about the issue, since the use case is unclear. |
| QC | For 1.1, we think it would be good to align on the following issues. In short, we believe either 1 TCI state or SFN-PDSCH with multiple TCIs can work. For SFN-PDSCH, we prefer to stick to max TCI # of 2. Up to 4 can be considered if we have more time.   * Issue 1: For CJT, whether every PDSCH DMRS port should have the same set of TCI(s)?   + Our preference is Yes. To our understanding, CJT means each stream is always precoded across ALL TRPs, not only across a subset of TRPs, which is NCJT. So it is sensible for same set of TCI(s) applied to every DMRS port, which is transmitted by all TRPs. This is not like R16 SDM NCJT that different TCIs applied to different CDM groups. * Issue 2: For CJT, what is the suitable TCI indication schemes?   + If same set of TCI(s) are applied to every DMRS port, we think both 1 TCI state are SFN-PDSCH can work. The 1 TCI state is essentially SFN-TRS, where a single TCI is applied to all DMRS ports with the corresponding TRS jointly transmitted by all TRPs. The SFN-PDSCH can be viewed as an extension of R17 SFN-PDSCH with maximum TCI state number increased from 2 to 4. However, the design for supporting up to 4 indicated TCI states is non-trivial, and we prefer to limit the maximum indicated TCI state number to be 2 for all considered mTRP schemes in R18. Open to extension for 4 TCIs if having more time.   **Proposal: For unified TCI framework extension to FR1 CJT, SFN-TRS and SFN-PDSCH can be considered**   * **In SFN-TRS, a single TCI state is applied to all DMRS ports with the corresponding TRS jointly transmitted from all TRPs** * **In SFN-PDSCH, a same set of TCI state(s) can be applied to all DMRS port(s) with the maximum number of TCI states in the set as 2**   For 1.2, support up to 2 TCI sets. Our understanding is that the set here is for discussion purpose. Up to 4 TCI sets can be studied if have time. 2 TCIs for CJT can also work for the scenario with 2 TRP groups with closely located TRPs per group, like sectors. Open to consider 4 widely separately TRPs but with lower priority.  For 1.3. I guess the question means that when 2 TCIs are indicated, how to determine the TCI(s) per applied channel/RS per BWP/CC? If so, our preference is to individually determine the TCI # for each channel/RS. For example, for RRC configured channel/RS, gNB can also configure whether this channel/RS should use the 1st, 2nd, or both indicated TCI. For dynamically scheduled channel/RS, the DCI can indicate whether the scheduled channel/RS should use the 1st, 2nd, or both indicated TCI  For 1.4, we support no restriction on the combination of TCI types across two TRPs. For Joint TCI for TRP 1 + separate DL/UL TCI for TRP 2, this would be beneficial in the scenario where one TRP, e.g. TRP 2 in the following figure, has the best DL beam suffering MPE issue, while the other TRP does not. To our understanding, every combination seems have its use case.    **Figure: One TRP has the best DL beam suffering MPE issue, while the other TRP does not** |
| Mod | One clarification for my plan in this meeting. Not only Issue 1, I will treat those important topics in parallel for Issue 1, 2, 3, and 4, mostly based on the following table (I have revised some topics and changed the order according to your feedback):    The following is my observation from your input and good discussion:  On Issue 1.1: It seems it is still quite controversial. We can continue the discussion in this meeting, and a proposal will be provided accordingly.  On Issue 1.2: Most of the companies are fine with those max numbers proposed for target use cases we agreed in RAN1#109e, but several companies have concern on the terminology of “TCI set”. Although my intension is for facilitating discussion, it will be better to focus on the maximum numbers first. A proposal will be provided accordingly, without using of “TCI set”.  On Issue 1.3: Based on the inputs from companies, one potential outcome of this issue would be that the exact number of TCI states that UE needs to apply in a CC/BWP can be determined according to both of the followings:   * The number of TCI states indicated by MAC-CE/DCI analogous to Rel-17 TCI state activation and update procedure * The number of TCI states associated with each channel/RS based on an association signaling/rule   Then, since the association doesn't have to be provided through the TCI state indication, one question came up naturally is whether the number of TCI states indicated to a BWP can be different from the total number of TCI states associated with channels/RSs in the BWP? If it is allowed, what’s the UE behavior? This question could be a next-level detail, and we can discuss it later if this group has more conclusions on Issue 3.  On Issue 1.4: For the proponent of supporting mixed TCI update modes for two TRPs simultaneously in the same CC/BWP, the main motivation is that there could be only one of the TRPs suffering from MPE issue. Opponents can further clarify how to handle such case if mixed TCI update modes in a same CC/BWP are not allowed. |
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