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1. Introduction

The moderator summary of the maintenance-related issues raised in the submitted contributions for Rel.17 NR\_FeMIMO maintenance is given below.

An initial assessment on each of the issues is given (but can be revised based on the outcome of the discussion during the preparation week). The assessment will be used as a basis companies’ views checking for further discussion in the upcoming weeks.

* *High priority (H):* this includes high-priority item (essential, pending issues, broken spec components) and proposed editorial changes that either enhance the clarity of the specs or correct mistakes
* *Non-essential (N)*: this includes all other purposes such as spec optimization and low priority issues
* *Editorial (E)*: this includes editorial issues that will be handled as editorial CRs

Company’s comments are requested **before Monday 23:59 UTC.**

* Subject to Mr. Chairman’s discretion, we need to wrap up this phase by end of Day2 (or earlier if possible). Once the issues are identified, additional email threads will be created.

1. Maintenance issues

The issues are summarized in the following table:

**Table 1 Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue (summary of CR proposal)** | **Companies** | **FL assessment** | **Company inputs (if any)** |
| **Sub-Item 1 – Unified TCI Framework** | | | | |
| 1-1 | Clarify that PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id value being equal to zero is used as PL-RS when a UE is configured with dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17 and the pathlossReferenceRS-Id is absent in the indicated TCIState, or when a UE is configured with dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17 and UL-TCIState and the pathlossReferenceRS-Id is absent in the indicated UL-TCIstate. (R1-2208534, R1-2208535)  FL note 1: The above for default PL-RS, if PL-RS is not configured, can be assumed as an optimized solution for a specific case, and whether the update is essential may need to be justified.   * BTW, using ‘pathlossReferenceLinking’ for enabling cross-CC PL-RS configuration in R1-2208535 can be handled together with Issue 1-6.   FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | Spreadtrum | N  (H: 3, N: 7)  Pls: check FL\_V18 | Lenovo: We understand that *pathlossReferenceRS-Id* should always be configured in the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*.  MediaTek: Same understanding as Lenovo that a PL-RS should be always provided in each TCI state, as agreed in RAN1#105.  Agreement from RAN1#105  On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, a PL-RS (configured for path-loss calculation) is either included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.  QC: PL RS should always be in TCI as agreed  Spreadtrum: As we mentioned in cover sheet: In 38.331, as the parameter *pathlossReferenceRS-Id* is **optionally configured** in *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstat*e. UE does not know which RS resource is used for downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS when *pathlossReferenceRS-Id* is absent in joint TCI state or UL TCI state.  We are fine with the understanding on always configuration for the parameter *pathlossReferenceRS-Id*.  While a conclusion is preferred if the majority share the same common understanding for this issue to avoid potential misalignment or misunderstanding with 38.331.  TCI-State ::= SEQUENCE {  tci-StateId TCI-StateId,  qcl-Type1 QCL-Info,  qcl-Type2 QCL-Info OPTIONAL, -- Need R  ...,  [[  additionalPCI-r17 AdditionalPCIIndex-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R  pathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17 PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id OPTIONAL, -- Cond JointTCI  ul-powerControl-r17 Uplink-powerControlId-r17 OPTIONAL -- Cond JointTCI    ]]  }  TCI-UL-State-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  tci-UL-State-Id-r17 TCI-UL-State-Id-r17,  servingCellId-r17 ServCellIndex OPTIONAL, -- Need R  bwp-Id-r17 BWP-Id OPTIONAL, -- Cond CSI-RSorSRS-Indicated  referenceSignal-r17 CHOICE {  ssb-Index-r17 SSB-Index,  csi-RS-Index-r17 NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId,  srs-r17 SRS-ResourceId  },  additionalPCI-r17 AdditionalPCIIndex-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R  ul-powerControl-r17 Uplink-powerControlId-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R  pathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17 PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R  ...    }  LG: Fine with the FL’s assessment  Google: Agree with QC  Ericsson: not needed  Huawei, HiSilicon: We think an action is necessary (assessment should be changed to “H”):  Agree with other companies that *pathlossReferenceRS-Id* should always be configured.However,we noticed that in 38.331, *pathlossReferenceRS-Id* is optional Need R in both TCI-State (when joint TCI state is configured) and TCI-UL-state. **This means that, if the field is not signaled, the UE will release it and will not apply any value. Therefore, we think that “optional Need R” should change to “optional Need M” and RAN1 should inform RAN2 about RAN1 preference.**  Samsung: Not needed    Intel: Agree with other companies that PL-RS should be configured.  Apple: We are fine to conclude that PL-RS is always present in configuration. We are open to capture a conclusion for this if any confusion. On the agreement quoted by MTK, we do not think it means PL-RS is always configured as the conclusion says ‘a PL-RS (configured for path-loss calculation) is either included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.’ The ‘associated with…’ can be interpreted as ‘implicit manner’ as proposed by Spreadtrum.  FL\_V18: Majority companies’ preference is very clear, but @all, please review Huawei’s way-forward suggestion: in *TCI-UL-State-r17*, ‘**“optional Need R” should change to “optional Need M” and RAN1 should inform RAN2 about RAN1 preference.**’. Is that okay for everyone?  Docomo: We are fine with FL V18 suggestion.  Nokia: w.r.t the FL proposal, if this is a RAN2 correction, it should be left to them and no action in RAN1.  MediaTek2: We are fine to have a conclusion on PL-RS is always present in TCI-State (when joint TCI state is configured) and TCI-UL-state and send LS to RAN2. Whether RAN2 take action on this can be up to RAN2 decision. Regarding the agreement in RAN1#105, sorry I didn’t paste complete agreement, but “whether PL-RS is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ was left to RAN2” is also captured in the agreement, and RAN2 has made the decision on explicit manner to our understating.  Spreadtrum2: Support FL V18 suggestion to inform RAN2 about RAN1 majority understanding, or a conclusion is also preferred in RAN1. Otherwise, if no action is adopted in RAN1, the misalignment or misunderstanding between RAN1 and RAN2 has already been there, and may be lasted in future. |
| 1-2 | In earlier versions of 38.331 used the name DLorJoint-TCIState for the new TCI state introduced in Rel-17, but this was merged into legacy RRC parameter of TCI state. Similar issue for ‘*TCI-UL-State*’.Although we already made some update for those issues, based on the latest 38.331, some further alignment seems to be necessary. (R1-2208751, R1-2210079, R1-2210081, R1-2210088, R1-2210089, R1-2210216)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem may be valid and editorial, but some of them may be incorrect. Combo CR(s) for above seem necessary.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | Lenovo, E///, ASUSTeK, Huawei | E  (E:12) | Lenovo: Support  MediaTek: Okay to discuss these alignments  QC: Fine to discuss  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  LG: Fine to discuss  Google: OK with the alignments  Ericsson: OK  vivo: OK to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Support  Samsung: OK to discuss  Intel: OK to discuss  Apple: OK to discuss.  Nokia: OK to discuss. |
| 1-3 | Clarify that, for non-codebook based transmission, when the UE is configured *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList* or *UL-TCIState*, the UEdoes not expect to be configured with both *TCIState* or *UL*-*TCIState* for SRS resource and *associatedCSI-RS* in *SRS-ResourceSet* for SRS resource set, and does not except to be configured with both *followUnifiedTCIstateSRS* for SRS resource set and *associatedCSI-RS* in *SRS-ResourceSet* for SRS resource set. (R1-2208753)  FL note 1: Technically speaking, the above clarification is valid in unified TCI framework. But considering that it may be up to gNB implementation, whether the update is essential may need to be justified.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | Lenovo | N  (H: 7, E:1, N: 5) | Lenovo: We think it should be ‘H’ since the same principle was clearly stated in Rel-15 specification for the UE to have clear behavior. Without this description, a UE may be configured with an SRS resource set for nCB with both *UL-TCIState* and *associatedCSI-RS*, which may lead to a unclear UE behaviour.  MediaTek: Fine to discuss  QC: Not critical. gNB can handle the issue.  OPPO: It is good clarification to be made  Spreadtrum: Agree with QC.  LG: Fine with the FL’s assessment  Google: Support to discuss.  Ericsson: this is editorial, and should be captured.  vivo: We share similar view with QC that gNB can handle the issue. In FR2, the gNB either ensures that associated CSI-RS and UL TCI state are not configured for UE at the same time, or ensures that their spatial information is consistent. In FR1, both associated CSI-RS and UL TCI state could be configured simultaneously if they have the same spatial information. If only associated CSI-RS is configured, the PL-RS associated with the SRS cannot be acquired according to the associated CSI-RS with 32 ports.  Huawei, HiSilicon: We are OK to discuss. However, how to determine the PL-RS in the case that only the *associatedCSI-RS* is configured needs to be also discussed.  Samsung: Not essential.  Intel: Ok to discuss  Apple: Ok to discuss. We prefer to either capture it into spec or at least draw some conclusion in chairman note to avoid any potential IoDT issue. It happens frequently that IoDT test was created with arguing it was NOT explicitly prohibited by specification.  Docomo: Not essential.  Nokia: not critical, gNB can handle this issue. |
| 1-4 | Change the reference of MAC CE for beam indication of SRS resource from 6.1.3.47 to 6.1.3.59 or 6.1.3.60 on unified TCI framework. (R1-2208754)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem may be valid and editorial.  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | Lenovo | E  (E:12) | Lenovo: Support  MediaTek: OK to the correction  QC: Fine to discuss  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  LG: Fine to discuss  Google: Agree with FL  Ericsson: OK  vivo: OK to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: OK to discuss.  Samsung: OK to discuss  Intel: OK to discuss  Apple: Fine to discuss.  Docomo: OK.  Nokia: OK to discuss |
| 1-5 | To capture the agreement on power control parameters (i.e., PL-RS, P0, alpha, closed loop index) for calculating Type 1 power headroom based on a reference PUSCH (R1-2208756)  FL note 1: It is to capture the already agreement in RAN1#109, and last meeting the above CR was quite stable.  **Agreement**  To calculate the Type 1 power headroom based on a reference PUSCH, the UE uses the PUSCH power control parameters (i.e., PL-RS, P0, alpha, closed loop index) associated with the indicated joint/UL-TCI state.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | Lenovo | H  (H:12, N:1) | Lenovo: Support  MediaTek: Support  QC: Fine to discuss  OPPO: ok  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  LG: Fine to discuss  Google: We do not think this is necessary, but we are fine with majority’s view.  Ericsson: ok to discuss. Note that there is no RRC IE *DLorJoint-TCIState*  vivo: Not necessary.  Huawei, HiSilicon: OK to discuss.  Samsung: OK to discuss  Intel: OK to discuss  Apple: Ok to discuss.  Docomo: OK.  Nokia: OK to discuss |
| 1-6 | To clarify that the CC of PL-RS for an indicated TCI state can be the CC on which the indicated TCI state is configured, or, if provided, on a CC indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking*. (R1-2208761, R1-2208535)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem is valid, otherwise cross-CC PL-RS indication may be precluded in unified TCI framework.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | Spreadtrum, ZTE | H  (H:8, N:3) | Lenovo: Fine to discuss.  QC: Seems no need. To our understanding, the current linking description in 213 is in parallel to the general PL RS description and hence is applicable to unified TCI as well.  where the RS resource is either on serving cell c or, if provided, on a serving cell indicated by a value of pathlossReferenceLinking  OPPO: ok to discuss. We see this is an issue but not because of cross-CC indication, but it is the TCI state of reference BWP/CC.  Spreadtrum: Support to discuss. For unified TCI framework in CA case, if the *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* configurations are absent in a BWP of the CC, the UE can apply the *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* configurations from a reference BWP of a reference CC. This means that PL-RS ID is obtained by the *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* from a reference BWP of a reference CC.  However, it needs to be clarified which serving cell the PL-RS is on. In current spec, the ambiguity is whether the serving cell for this PL-RS is indicated by the parameter pathlossReferenceLinking configured on the reference CC or the parameter pathlossReferenceLinking configured on the CC applying the indicated TCI state.  As a unified understanding, we prefer that the parameter pathlossReferenceLinking to be determined from the reference CC together with the PL-RS ID.  ZTE: support to discuss. I am afraid that we cannot agree with QC that the current linking description is applicable to unified TCI as well. It is obvious that PL-RS for unified TCI is described at the beginning of section 7 in 38.213, and can be interpreted separately from legacy scheme.  Google: OK to discuss.  Ericsson: not needed  vivo: Support to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: OK to discuss.  Samsung: Not essential  Intel: OK to discuss  Apple: OK to discuss.  Docomo: OK. We think this is essential issue for unified TCI framework in CA.  Nokia: OK to discuss whether clarification is needed. |
| 1-7 | To clarify that a parameter closedLoopIndex-r17 indicates a shared closed loop power control for PUSCH with index of 0 or 1 for value of i0 or i1, and then an absence of the parameter closedLoopIndex-r17 indicates a separate SRS closed loop power control. (R1-2208762)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem is valid. For SRS, 3 closed loop state(s) should be supported as in Rel-15/16: one separate SRS closed loop power control and two shared closed power control with PUSCH. But, how to interpret the following RRC parameter for SRS closed loop indication is unclear.  P0AlphaSet-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  p0-r17 INTEGER (-16..15) OPTIONAL, -- Need R  alpha-r17 Alpha OPTIONAL, -- Need R  closedLoopIndex-r17 ENUMERATED { i0, i1 }  }  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | ZTE | H  (H:?, N?)  Some companies seems unclear on this issue. Please review proponent’s clarification and FL\_V18, and provide your views ASAP. | Lenovo: It’s not clear why 3 closed loop states should be supported for SRS in Rel-15/16. According to Rel-15, SRS always share the PUSCH power control state.  QC: Seems not critical. The benefit of separate closed loop for SRS is unclear. The agreed 2 loops for all channels should be sufficient and simplify UE implementation. Also, the change requires more or less RRC impact  ZTE: **Separate CL-PC for SRS transmission has been supported since LTE, NR also reuse such scheme,** for at least the following cases:   * Case1: No PUSCH/PUCCH is configured on a BWP/CC, then no shared CL-PC with PUSCH can be used. See 7.3.1.3.4 in 38.212. * Case 2: SRS resource set with usage of beam-management also needs separate CL-PC.   Section 7.3.1 in 38.213 clearly describes that there are 3 SRS CL-PC modes: separate SRS CL-PC, shared PUSCH CL-PC with closed-loop index 0 or 1. BTW. If we only need shared CL-PC for SRS, DCI format 2\_2 is enough, why do we need DCI format 2\_3?  Regarding NR R17 unified TCI, there are two types of SRS:   * first type SRS which follows unified TCI, * second type SRS which does not follow unified TCI, i.e., legacy SRS.   It was agreed that a legacy TCI state/spatial scheme cannot be configured with R17 unified TCI scheme in a same band. And legacy SRS in a CC with R17 unified TCI framework is thus configured with R17 TCI state, and power control parameter is determined by R17 TCI state (although not unified/indicated TCI state).  Therefore, **separate SRS CL-PC at least for legacy SRS must be supported in NR R17 when unified TCI scheme is enabled**. Otherwise, legacy SRS with separate CL-PC cannot work in R17.  LG: Similar view with Qualcomm  Google: OK to discuss.  Ericsson: Don’t understand. Is there an ambiguity how the UE calculates its Tx power?  ZTE: @E///, from spec perspective, we have three PC closed-loops for SRS: one separate SRS closed loop power control and two closed-loop power control(s) shared with PUSCH. Details can be found in Section 7.3.1 in TS 38.213. But, for unified TCI, in RRC, we only have two candidate entries for SRS as follows. How to interpret the following entry becomes ambiguities.  closedLoopIndex-r17 ENUMERATED { i0, i1 }  Huawei, HISILICON: OK TO discuss.  Samsung: Not needed. There is already a separate p0AlphaSetforSRS for SRS, separate from that of PUSCH.  Intel: OK to discuss.  Apple:  **FL\_V18**: Thanks for good discussion. After reviewing inputs, it seems that SRS closed loop may be quite different from PUSCH/PUCCH. Besides for one separate/individual closed-loop, there are two closed-loop tied with PUSCH. That means that there is a total of **3 states** for SRS. But for RRC, there are only two entries. Companies are encouraged to review other companies’ input and provide views herein.   |  | | --- | | **Section 7.3.1 in TS 38.213**  - For the SRS power control adjustment state for active UL BWP of carrier of serving cell and SRS transmission occasion  - , where is the current PUSCH power control adjustment state as described in clause 7.1.1, if *srs-PowerControlAdjustmentStates* indicates a same power control adjustment state for SRS transmissions and PUSCH transmissions; or  -  if the UE is not configured for PUSCH transmissions on active UL BWP of carrier of serving cell , or if *srs-PowerControlAdjustmentStates* indicates separate power control adjustment states between SRS transmissions and PUSCH transmissions, and if *tpc-Accumulation* is not provided, where |   Nokia: Nokia: Seems an issue that needs to be clarified (if deviates from Rel-15/16 behaviour). |
| 1-8 | Clarify that, for common TCI state ID update/activation for CA case, if the TCIState or UL-TCIState configurations is absent in a BWP of the CC, power control parameters associated with or included in the indicated TCIState or UL-TCIState from a reference BWP of a reference CC are used. (R1-2208889)  FL note 1: It seems no consensus based on previous discussion (some opponents challenged the necessity of this CR).  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for **TWO meetings**. | LGE | N  (N:4) | Google: Agree with FL  Ericsson: Agree with FL  Samsung: Agree with FL  Intel: Agree with FL  Nokia: no need. |
| 1-9 | In section 5.1.5 of TS 38.214, *complement the “per BWP”* description in the largest number of configured TCI states for Rel-17 unified TCI. (R1-2208918)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem may be valid and editorial.  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | CATT | E  (E:7, N:2) | QC: Fine to discuss  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: Not needed. Note that the PDSCH-Config is inside a BWP. Also, the list provided can actually provide QCL also in other BWPs/CCs.  vivo: OK to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: OK to discuss.  Samsung: Not needed.  Intel: OK to discuss  Apple: OK to discuss.  Nokia: OK to discuss |
| 1-10 | Replace *simultaneousTCI-UpdateList1-r17, simultaneousTCI-UpdateList2-r17, simultaneousTCI-UpdateList3-r17,* and *simultaneousTCI-UpdateList4-r17* with *simultaneousU-TCI-UpdateList1-r17, simultaneousU-TCI-UpdateList2-r17, simultaneousU-TCI-UpdateList3-r17,* and *simultaneousU-TCI-UpdateList4-r17* respectively. (R1-2209539)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem is editorial.  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | Google | E  (E:10) | Lenovo: Support  QC: Fine to discuss  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  Google: Support  Ericsson: Support  vivo: OK to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: OK to discuss.  Samsung: OK to discuss  Intel: OK  Apple: Support.  Docomo: OK.  Nokia. OK |
| 1-11 | To clarify that the same TCI state is expected on PUSCH and SRS resource for codebook-based or non-codebook based PUSCH transmission in unified TCI framework. (R1-2208791, R1-2209559)  FL note 1: It seems no consensus based on previous discussion.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for **TWO meetings**. | OPPO, Apple | N  (H:5, N:4) | Lenovo: Fine to discuss  MediaTek: Not essential  QC: Prefer no further discussion  OPPO: would like to hear why this is not essential? If different TCI states are configured to PUSCH and SRS resource for CB or NCB, then what is the UE behavior?  Google: Support to discuss  Ericsson: Prefer no further discussion  Huawei, HiSilicon: OK to discuss.  Samsung: Agree with FL.  Intel: OK to discuss  Apple: In our view, it is important to complete the design, either excluding the case with different UL TCI state or allow it with a defined UE behavior. We are open to either option. It would be appreciated that opponent companies clarify what is the understanding for this case if we stop discussion, not allowed or something else?  Nokia: no need to discuss |
| 1-12 | Clarify the behaviour of UE when the spatial domain transmit filter provided by TCI-State configurations is mismatched with the spatial domain filter of the SRS resource indicated by SRI.( R1-2209824)  FL note 1: It seems no consensus based on previous discussion.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for **TWO meetings**. | Huawei | N  (H:5, N:5) | Lenovo: Seems it can be discussed together with issue 1-11.  MediaTek: Not essential  QC: Prefer no further discussion  Spreadtrum: Not essential  Google: discuss it together with 1-11.  Ericsson: Prefer no further discussion  Huawei, HiSilicon: Support to discuss.  As we mentioned before, although it is possible to restrict the spatial relation of the SRS resource for CB/NCB transmission to be always the same as the indicated TCI, it results in an undesired restriction as the NW cannot measure UL channel on beams other than indicated TCI state prior to sending the DCI for CB/NCB transmission.  Samsung: Agree with FL  Intel: OK to discuss together with 1-11  Apple: Support to discuss with 1-11.  Nokia: no need to discuss |
| 1-13 | Clarify that #1, for configured grant PUSCH, P0-PUSCH-AlphaSet associated with the configuredGrantConfig is used for CG PUSCH transmission, #2 ul-powerControl in BWP-UplinkDedicated is used, in case that ul-powerControl is not configured for UL TCI state or joint TCI state of the serving cell. (R1-2209825)  FL note 1: Technically speaking, #1 has been discussed last meeting but several opponent companies challenged that reusing PC associating with TCI state is sufficient as in the spec. Let’s see whether some situations change. #2 several companies challenged that the corresponding spec changes are not essential. Let’s see whether companies change their views this meeting.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | Huawei | N  (H:2, N:7) | Lenovo: Not necessary.  MediaTek: Not essential  QC: For 1st issue, seems not critical. gNB can choose PC parameters accordingly if CG is URLLC. The case with both URLLC and heavy eMBB is rare to our understanding. For 2nd issue, fine to clarify simply based on the agreement. The CR seems mixed both issues together.  Google: Agree with FL  Ericsson: It is sufficient that this is captured in 38.331.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Support to discuss.  For the 1st issue, in current 38.331, p0-PUSCH-Alpha is mandatory present in ConfiguredGrantConfig. If reusing PC associating with TCI state is sufficient, why such RRC configuration is necessary and how UE would interpret this configuration? For the 2nd issue, it may have RRC impact and is related to PC in R18 UTCI for mTRP. Discussion is necessary.  Samsung: Not essential  Intel: Agree with FL.  Apple: Share similar view as Qualcomm. The issue #1 can leave for gNB implementation by properly setting power control parameters. For issue #2, we are open to discuss a simple CR.  Nokia: not necesary |
| 1-14 | Specify to use the indicated TCI for a cross-carrier scheduled CC as the corresponding default beam, regardless the indicated TCI is associated with non-serving PCI or not (R1-2209937)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem may be valid and some further discussion seems to be needed.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | QC | H  (H:10, N:2) | Lenovo: Fine to discuss.  MediaTek: Okay to discuss  QC: Support to discuss. Good to clarify UE behavior for this scenario.  OPPO: not essential.  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  LG: Fine to discuss  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: Ok to discuss  vivo: OK to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Fine to discuss.  Samsung: Not needed  Intel: OK to discuss  Docomo: Support.  Nokia: OK to discuss |
| 1-15 | Clarify that for R17 unified TCI state, UE expects same power control parameters for the two SRS resource sets configured by srs-ResourceSetToAddModList and srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2 if at least one SRS resource set does not follow the indicated unified TCI state. (R1-2209938)   * Note: the two SRS resource sets mentioned above are for sTRP operation, not for mTRP operation, and hence it is a R17 issue.   FL note 1: It seems no consensus based on previous discussion.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for **TWO meetings**. | QC | N  (H:5, N:4) | Lenovo: Not necessary.  QC: Support to discuss. The main solid technical reason “SRS resource set for DCI 0-2 is a subset of the first SRS resource set for DCI overhead reduction. No such issue” in final summary (R1-2208052) seems not valid. Because the lowest SRS source IDs can still be different in the two sets. If the issue is left to gNB implementation to ensure, can we at least have a conclusion? Don’t see any company saying the PC parameters should be different.  Conclusion:  For R17 unified TCI state, UE expects same power control parameters for the two SRS resource sets configured by srs-ResourceSetToAddModList and srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2 if at least one SRS resource set does not follow the indicated unified TCI state.  Spreadtrum: OK to clarify that the PC parameters of the two SRS resource sets are the same.  Google: Agree with FL’s assessment  Ericsson: Should be discussed  vivo: Support to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Not critical, it can be solved by NW implementation.  Samsung: As this issue has already been discussed for two meetings, no need to discuss again.  Apple: Support to discuss. |
| 1-16 | For PUSCH power control with unified TCI, UE also resets the accumulation of power control adjustment state for the closed loop index whose associated p0 or alpha is reconfigured by NW (R1-2209939)  FL note 1: Technically speaking, the current spec seems fine, considering that and are provided by corresponding parameters of UE-specific P0 and alpha, respectively, as clarified in the very beginning of Section 7.  A UE resets accumulation of a PUSCH power control adjustment state for active UL BWP of carrier of serving cell to  - If a configuration for a corresponding value is provided by higher layers  - If a configuration for a corresponding value is provided by higher layers  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | QC | N  (H:1, N:6) | Lenovo: Not necessary.  QC: Support to discuss the issue. We think current close loop index determination may not be applicable to unified TCI, so at least good to clarify this in red  A UE resets accumulation of a PUSCH power control adjustment state for active UL BWP of carrier of serving cell to  […]  where , if ul-powerControl-r17 is not provided by higher layers, is determined from the value of as  - If j>1 and the UE is provided higher SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl, l is the sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex value(s) configured in any SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl with the sri-P0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId value corresponding to j  - […]  Google: Agree with FL’s assessment  Ericsson: this looks like a reasonable solution, but it is hardly essential  vivo: Agree with FL’s assessment  Huawei, HiSilicon: Agree with FL’s assessment. No need to discuss  Samsung: Not essential  Intel: Agree with FL  Nokia: Seems that spec is currently fine and no need to discuss. |
| 1-17 | In the unified TCI framework, all channels configured with followUnifiedTCIState follow the TCI state that is indicated at the point in time when that signal is transmitted.  In 38.213, there are a few paragraphs that indicate that the TCI state of the PDSCH is the same as the TCI state of the scheduling PDCCH.  Statements that state the TCI state of the PDSCH is the same as the TCI state of the scheduling PDCCH are removed. (R1-2210090)  FL note 1: The following highlighted paragraph is drafted according to the previous agreement if my understanding is correct. Then, if removing them, UE behavior of PDSCH following unified TCI or not may become much more unclear.  For a CORESET with index 0,  - if the UE is provided *TCIState* and if *followUnifiedTCIstate* = '*enabled*' for the CORESET, the UE assumes that a DM-RS antenna port for PDCCH receptions in the CORESET and a DM-RS antenna port for PDSCH receptions scheduled by DCI formats provided by PDCCH receptions in the CORESET are quasi co-located with the reference signals provided by the indicated *TCIState* [6, TS 38.214]  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | E/// | N  (H:2, N:9) | Lenovo: Not necessary  MediaTek: No need to remove  QC: Seems clearer to keep  Spreadtrum: Not necessary  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: the current specification indicates that the TCI state of the PDSCH is the same as the scheduling PDCCH. This is incorrect: the PDSCH follows the indicated TCI  vivo: Not necessary.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Agree with FL’s assessment. No need to make any change.  Samsung: Not needed  Intel: Agree with FL  Apple: Agree with FL.  Nokia: no need to discuss |
| 1-18 | The indicated TCI state provided by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 could be 1 DL TCI state and 1 UL TCI state according to MAC CE. However, text in current TS 38.214 merely cover 1 indicated DL TCI state or 1 indicated UL TCI state, and does not cover 1 indicated DL TCI state and 1 indicated UL TCI state. (R1-2210083)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem is valid and editorial.  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | ASUSTeK | E  (E:10) | Lenovo: OK  MediaTek: Okay to the correction  QC: Fine to discuss  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: OK to discuss  vivo: OK to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: OK to discuss.  Samsung: Not essential.  Intel: OK to discuss  Nokia: OK |
| 1-19 | *TCI-State* is changed to *tci-StatesToAddModList* in two occasions in Clause 5.1.5 of 38.214 to clarify the actual intention of the spec that Rel-17 unified TCI state and the legacy TCI state cannot be simultanuously configured in the same band. (R1-2210215)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem is valid and editorial.  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | Huawei | E  (E:11) | Lenovo: OK  MediaTek: Prefer to correct  QC: Fine to discuss  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  LG: Fine to discuss  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: Support  vivo: OK to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Support to discuss.  Samsung: OK to discuss  Intel: OK to discuss  Nokia: Ok |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Item 2 – L1/L2 Centric Inter-Cell Mobility | | | | |
| 2-1 | To handle ambiguity in current specification for PDSCH reception scheduled by CORSET with *followUnifiedTCIstate* not enabled regarding whether to consider it is an error case when there is an indication with TCI state associated with PCI different from serving cell PCI. (R1-2208588, R1-2208589)  FL note 1: Generally speaking, PDSCH reception scheduled by CORESET with *followUnifiedTCIstate* not enabled should follow the legacy Rel-15/16 behavior (i.e., it is an error case when the PDSCH is indicated with TCI with PCI different from serving cell PCI). Then, whether a CR or a conclusion is needed should be justified.  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | vivo | N  (H:3, N:5) | Lenovo: Fine to have a conclusion that it’s an error case.  MediaTek: OK to discuss  QC: Seems not an issue. The concern seems that non-UE-dedicated PDSCH may follow a TCI state associated with a non-serving PCI (R1-2208589). To our understanding, the CORESET not sharing the unified TCI must associate with CSS except Type3. As in 38.213->10.1, when such CORESET schedule non-UE-dedicated PDSCH in CSS except Type2, it has to use fallback DCI format 1-0, which has no TCI field. So the non-UE-dedicated PDSCH has to follow the CORESET QCL based on legacy rule, and will not follow the indicated TCI with non-serving PCI  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  Google: Agree with FL  Huawei, Hisilicon: Agree with FL. Not essential.  Samsung: Not essential  Intel: Agree with FL  Nokia: prefer to discuss and conclude |
|  | Clarify that, for the rate match pattern for PDSCH, in FR1, it should take all of the SSB for inter-cell beam measurement into account (R1-2208590，R1-2208591).  FL note 1: In RAN1#109, we had the following WA and sent an LS to RAN4, and then receiving the reply LS from RAN4 R4-2215029. Therefore, concluding this issue (e.g., to confirming WA or not, and corresponding CR or not) seems essential.  **Working assumption**  On inter-cell beam management, the PDCCH /PDSCH should be rate matched around the SSBs indicated by ssb-PositionsInBurst-r17 for the same PCI as that associated with TCI state of the PDSCH /PDCCH  Send LS to RAN4 on whether there is requirements in RAN4 that assumes UE to measure SSB for L1-RSRP measurement and receiving PDSCH /PDCCH on the same RE in FR1. Revisit this issue after there is RAN4 feedback.   * The LS to RAN4 on SSB measurement for L1-RSRP on inter-cell BM is endorsed in R1-2205640.   FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | vivo | N  (H:4, N:4)  Pls review FL\_V18 | Lenovo: Prefer to confirm the WA  MediaTek: Okay to confirm the WA  QC: No need. This is already in spec (only PDSCH is copied below)  Furthermore, the UE assumes SS/PBCH block transmission according to ssb-PositionsInBurst if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources, and the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block associated with the same PCI is transmitted.  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: Agree with QC  vivo: Support to discuss the CR and the working assumption combined with the reply LS from RAN4.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Not needed. Agree with Qualcomm.  Samsung: Not needed  Intel: Agree with QC  FL\_V18: Majority companies’ preference is very clear. Although we may not need any CR(s), confirming the following WA or not is definitely needed from the perspective of 3GPP progress since having reply LS from RAN4:  **Proposal (from FL):** Confirm the following working assumption  On inter-cell beam management, the PDCCH /PDSCH should be rate matched around the SSBs indicated by ssb-PositionsInBurst-r17 for the same PCI as that associated with TCI state of the PDSCH /PDCCH  Docomo: OK with FL proposal. |
| 2-3 | While in current TS 38.214, only the case of SS/PBCH having a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell is described, in other words, the case of SS/PBCH from the serving cell is missed. Some corresponding clarification is needed (R1-2209228)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem may be valid and editorial.  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | NEC | N  (E:2, N:8) | Lenovo: Fine.  MediaTek: It is clear that w/o the additional description “have a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell”, an SSB in spec should be the one from serving cell. It is not be necessary to further clarify. Otherwise, we may not to change every spec that includes SSB.  QC: Prefer no change. The 1st SSB in the paragraph with change refers to the serving cell SSB to my understanding.  Spreadtrum: Agree with MediaTek.  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: Agree with MTek. “where SS/PBCH block may have a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell” does not mean that the PCI must be different.  vivo: Agree with MediaTek.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Not necessary to discuss as multiple companies pointed out.  Samsung: Not essential  Intel: Does not seem necessary  Nokia: not necessary to change |
| 2-4 | To capture the existing agreement that TCI state for CORESET B (CSS only) when DCI indicates unifiedTCIstate associated with cell with different PCI than serving cell and CORESET is configured with CSS. (R1-2210056)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem is valid. But, based on input from last meeting, companies’ views are diverged.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting.   |  | | --- | | QC: Seems no issue. The current spec follows the following agreement (#107e), which does not differentiate intra or inter-cell BM. We think this should work. gNB can configure whether to follow or not to follow for intra or inter-cell BM, respectively.  • For any PDCCH reception on a ‘CORESET B’ and the respective PDSCH reception, whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state associated with the serving cell is determined per CORESET by RRC  Google: Agree with QC.  MTK: Okay to discuss  vivo: Seems no issue, since it has been specified in TS38.213 that a UE is not required to monitor PDCCH candidates for a Type0/0A/1/2-PDCCH CSS set when the active TCI state for a corresponding CORESET is not associated with *physCellId* in *ServingCellConfigCommon*.  Nokia: Should be captured for inter-cell case. B can be configured to follow in intra-cell BM but not in inter-cell BM.  OPPO: whether it is inter-cell BM or not is configured in RRC. If it is inter-cell BM, then DCI-indicated TCI state will not be applied to CORESETB, which is in the agreement. Do not see the necessaty to discuss this issue.  Docomo: Ok to discuss.  Lenovo: Agree with QC.  Apple: Ok to discuss.  Spreadtrum: Not sure if it’s necessary. The issue can be avoided by gNB implementation, e.g. configure CORESET B not to follow common TCI.  CATT: Ok to discuss. For inter-cell BM, CORESETB can not follow the indicated TCI state.  Huawei, HiSi: We tend to agree with QC’s comment.  Ericsson: agree with QC  SS: Agree to discuss | | Nokia | N  (H:3, N:7) | MediaTek: Still fine to discuss  QC: Not critical. gNB can avoid such issue  Spreadtrum: Not necessary. The issue can be avoided by gNB implementation, e.g. configure CORESET B not to follow the indicated TCI state.  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson. Not needed. We already have  A UE is not required to monitor PDCCH candidates for a Type0/0A/1/2-PDCCH CSS set when the active TCI state for a corresponding CORESET is not associated with physCellId in ServingCellConfigCommon.  vivo: We share similar view with QC.  Huawei, HiSilicon: No need to discuss. Spec is clear.  Samsung: Fine to discuss  Intel: Agree with FL assessment  Nokia: It is not preferred to limit network configuration options. The unified is used for intra-cell beam indication purposes as well as inter-cell BM. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Item 3 – Dynamic TCI Update Signalling | | | | |
| 3-1 | To clarify that the DCI in CORESET not configured to follow the indicated Rel-17 TCI state does not indicate a Rel-17 TCI state so that the agreement is implemented in the specification. (R1-2208789)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem is valid, otherwise we may experience the error case that the ‘non-UE-dedicated DCI scheduling PDSCH’ or, alternatively, ‘DCI in CORESET with *followUnifiedTCIstate* not enabled’ can update/indicate the unified TCI as well.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | OPPO | N  (H:3; N:8) | Lenovo: We understand that when a CORESET if not configured to follow the indicated Rel-17 TCI state only means that the UE shall receive the PDCCH associated with this CORESET by the TCI state determined by legacy MAC-CE/RRC/RACH signalling mechanism, does not mean this DCI cannot not be used to indicate unified TCI state.  MediaTek: We don’t see why NW cannot use a CORESET not following unified TCI state to update unified TCI state, which should be up to NW implementation.  QC: Seems no issue. If the concern is that non-UE-dedicated PDSCH may follow non-serving TCI, then pls check our comment to 2-1.  OPPO: Question to companies thinking that is not an issue: take one example, a DCI 1\_1 in PDCCH of CORESET#0 and CORESET#0 not following the unified TCI. Then the TCI state indicated by TCI field in this DCI 1\_1 shall be applied to which one of the PDSCH:   * The PDSCH scheduled by this DCI 1\_1? * or all the PSCH scheduled by UE-specific PDCCH?   Per RAN1 previous agreement, the TCI state indicated here follows the legacy signalling method and it is only applied to the scheduled PDSCH. Without this correction, the spec is broken.  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  LG: Similar understanding with MediaTek  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: Not needed. The paragraph in the CR describes how and when the TCI state is applied. What channels follow the indicated TCI is another issue.  vivo: Similar understanding with MediaTek.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Not needed. Agree with MediaTek and Ericsson.  Samsung: Not needed  Intel: We would have to agree with MediaTek on this issue. Discussion is not needed. |
| 3-2 | To clarify that in Rel-17 unified TCI framework, the indicated TCI state(s) is based on the activated TCI states in the slot with TCI state indication DCI.(R1-2208790)  FL note 1: Based on previous discussion, companies have the same understanding: the indicated TCI state(s) is based on the activated TCI states in the slot of scheduled PDSCH. Pls review companies inputs last meeting   |  | | --- | | QC: Seems no ambiguity. To our understanding, both the activated and indicated TCI application times are well defined. UE just checks the corresponding definitions at beginning per slot.  Google: Open to discuss. It seems there is an agreement that the timing for TCI activation follows what is defined in R16.  MTK: Okay to discuss, but we tend to agree with QC that current spec may be sufficient to avoid the ambiguity  vivo: Agree with “H”.  Nokia: we do not see ambiguity here  OPPO: agree with the assessment of FL  Docomo: OK to discuss.  Lenovo: Fine to discuss.  Apple: Ok to discuss. But tend to agree with QC’s assessment.  LG: Agree with FL’s assessment  Spreadtrum: Not sure if it’s necessary. Agree with QC’s assessment.  CATT: Agree with QC. It seems no ambiguity.  Huawei, HiSi: We don’t see any ambiguity  Ericsson: agree with QC  Samsung: Not critical  Intel: Don’t think there is any ambiguity |   FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for **TWO meetings**. | OPPO | N  (H:2; N:7) | Lenovo: Seems no ambiguity.  MediaTek: Current spec is sufficient to avoid the ambiguity  QC: Spec seems clear  OPPO: please explain what is the UE behavior when the DCI first indicate {DL TCI state A, UL TCI state B} and then later on DCI indicates {DL TCI state C} if the spec has no ambiguity.  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: Spec seems clear. For the example, it would be DL TCI state-3.  vivo: OK to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: Not needed. We don’t see any ambiguity in the current spec.  Samsung: Not needed  Intel: Agree with FL  Nokia: no need |
| 3-3 | In section 5.1.5 of 38.214 it should be clarified that the UE applies the Indicated TCI state carried in the latest-in-time DCI for which the UE sends HARQ-ACK. (R1-2210057)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem is valid.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | Nokia | H  (H:10) | Lenovo: Fine  QC: Fine to discuss  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  LG: Fine to discuss  Google: OK to discuss  Ericsson: OK to discuss  vivo: OK to discuss.  Huawei, HiSilicon: OK to discuss.  Samsung: OK to discuss  Intel: OK to discuss  Docomo: OK. If multiple DCI indicates TCIs across different CCs, we may need priority rule in freq. domain as well. |
| 3-4 | To clarify the active BWP to determine the BAT based on one of the following options (R1-2208871)   * Option 1: The active BWP is determined based on the active BWP with the smallest SCS among the active BWP(s) from the applying CCs in the slot with the TCI indication * Option 2: The active BWP is determined based on the active BWP with the smallest SCS among the active BWP(s) from the applying CCs in the slot with the HARQ-ACK for the TCI indication   FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem may be valid and essential.  FL note 2: This issue has NOT been discussed. | Google | H  (H:9) | Lenovo: Fine to discuss  MediaTek: Okay to clarify  QC: Fine to discuss  Spreadtrum: OK to discuss.  Google: Support  Ericsson: OK to discuss  Huawei, HiSilicon: OK to discuss.  Samsung: OK to discuss  Intel: OK to discuss  Docomo: OK.  Nokia: OK to discuss |
| 3-5 | To capture the following conclusion in current spec (R1-2210202)  **Conclusion**  On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, if a UE is configured with CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig for a serving cell the value of the DCI field ‘carrier indicator’ corresponds to the value indicated by CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig.   * The codepoint indicated by the DCI field ‘Transmission Configuration Indicator’ is applied to the carrier indicated by the DCI field ‘carrier indicator’ and all CCs configured in a same CC list as that carrier, and corresponds to indicated TCI state configured and activated for that carrier and all CCs, respectively.   FL note 1: As a compromise, we had the above conclusion instead of an agreement, and then it seems that we do not need to further discuss this concluded issue again.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | Huawei | N  (H:4, N:6) | Lenovo: Support FL assessment.  MediaTek: Agree with FL assessment.  QC: Agree with FL  Spreadtrum: Agree with FL assessment.  Google: Agree with FL  Ericsson: We prefer that this is captured in the spec.  vivo: Agree with FL.  Huawei, HiSilicon: The conclusion clarified UE’s expectation/behavior for the case when cross-carrier scheduling is enabled and a CC different from the scheduling CC is indicated by ‘carrier indicator’ in the DCI for TCI indication. We think this issue should be captured in the spec.  Fine to discuss. We think that the capturing the conclusion in the spec is good for clarity  Intel: Ok to discuss  Docomo: OK.  Nokia: agree with FL |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Item 4 – MP-UE | | | | |
| 4-1 | Define the behaviour under which the UE selects ‘SRS resource indicator’ and ‘precoding information and number of layers’ associated to a capability value set index corresponding to the indicated UL or joint TCI state. This assumes that multiple ‘SRS resource indicator’ and ‘precoding information and number of layers’ are configured (per CG Type 1 configuration), each associated to a capability value set index via RRC. (R1-2207537)  FL note 1: The issue identified in the problem is controversial (it seems that as a basic assumption, the further enhancement on parameter update in MP-UE is precluded), but anyway let’s check other companies’ views.  FL note 2: This issue has been discussed for one meeting. | Nokia | N  (N:9) | MediaTek: Agree with FL assessment.  QC: Agreed with FL  Spreadtrum: Agree with FL assessment.  Google: Agree with FL  Ericsson: Agree with FL  vivo: Agree with FL.  Huawei: Agree with FL.  Samsung: Agree with FL  Intel: Agree with FL |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Item 5 – MPE | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. Observation

From the inputs shared by participating companies during the preparation phase, the following **observation** can be made:
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| 33 | [**R1-2210088**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2210088.zip) | Draft CR to 38.213 on UL TCI state parameter naming | Ericsson |
| 34 | [**R1-2210089**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2210089.zip) | Draft CR to 38.214 on UL TCI state parameter naming | Ericsson |
| 35 | [**R1-2210090**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2210090.zip) | Draft CR to 38.213 on unified TCI for PDSCH | Ericsson |
| 36 | [**R1-2210202**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2210202.zip) | Correction on DCI based TCI indication for cross carrier scheduling | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| 37 | [**R1-2210215**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2210215.zip) | Clarifying the ambiguous usage of TCI-State | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| 38 | [**R1-2210216**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2210216.zip) | UL TCI state parameter name alignment | Huawei, HiSilicon |
|  |  |  |  |