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## Introduction

The following in Section 2 and Section 3 (as agreed guidance from preparation phase for R17 multi-beam)) is assigned for discussion on maintenance of Rel-17 Multi-Beam, please provide your comments in corresponding sections.

|  |
| --- |
| [110bis-e-R17-MIMO-04] Email discussion on remaining maintenance issues on multi-beam enhancement by October 17 – Bo (ZTE)·         Issues 1-5, 1-6, 1-7, 1-14, 3-3, 3-4·         Editorial corrections for alignment CR: 1-2, 1-4, 1-9, 1-10, 1-18, 1-19, |

## Summary of High priority (H) issues

### (Switch to reflector) Issue 1-5 Draft CR on PHR with unified TCI in TS 38.213(R1-2208756)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Reason for change:*** | In RAN1#109-e, an agreement was made on power control parameters (i.e., PL-RS, P0, alpha, closed loop index) for calculating Type 1 power headroom based on a reference PUSCH. However, the agreement is not reflected in the specification. This CR proposes to cature the agreement in 38.213.

|  |
| --- |
| **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. |

 |
|  |  |
| ***Summary of change:*** | Capture the texts related to the agreement on power control parameters for calculating the Type 1 power headroom based on a reference PUSCH. |
|  |  |
| ***Consequences if not approved:*** | How to determine the power control parameters for calculating the Type 1 power headroom based on a reference PUSCH is not clear if a UE is provided DLorJoint-TCIState or UL-TCIstate. |

Due to above, the following draft CR is provided in R1-2208756:

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**7.7.1 Type 1 PH report**

<Unchanged parts are omitted>

If the UE determines that a Type 1 power headroom report for an activated serving cell is based on a reference PUSCH transmission then, for PUSCH transmission occasion on active UL BWP of carrier of serving cell , the UE computes the Type 1 power headroom report as

  [dB]

where is computed assuming MPR=0 dB, A-MPR=0 dB, P-MPR=0 dB. TC = 0 dB. MPR, A-MPR, P-MPR and TC are defined in [8-1, TS 38.101-1], [8-2, TS 38.101-2] and [8-3, TS 38.101-3]. The remaining parameters are defined in clause 7.1.1 and, if *ul-powerControl* is not provided, and are obtained using and *p0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId* *=* 0, is obtained using *pusch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id =* 0, and . If *ul-powerControl* is provided, and are obtained by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*, is obtained by PL-RS associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FL note: It is to capture the already agreement in RAN1#109, and last meeting the above CR was quite stable.

Please provide company’s view in the table below.

* If not support, please clarify the reason why not to capture above mentioned agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Google | Support |
| ASUSTeK | Support |
| Ericsson | There is no *DLorJointTCIState* – propose to change to *TCI-State*. Otherwise it’s OK. |
| ZTE | Share the same views with E///. |
| Samsung | Change not needed. The text says: “The remaining parameters are defined in clause 7.1.1” No need to repeat here again.We have this already in clause 7in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, the RS index 𝑞𝑑 for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission is provided by *PL-RS* associated with or included in the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* except for SRS transmission that is not provided *useIndicatedTCIState*in clause 7.1.1, if *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* is provided, the values of 𝑃O\_UE\_PUSCH,𝑏,𝑓,𝑐(𝑗), 𝛼𝑏,𝑓,𝑐(𝑗), and the PUSCH power control adjustment state 𝑙 are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* |
| QC | Support |
| OPPO | Ok |
| Lenovo | We are fine with Ericsson’s suggestion.To Samsung, we understand that the text “The remaining parameters are defined in clause 7.1.1” is just to define , , and in the equation as in Rel-15. And the following text is just to specify the parameter for transmit power calculation in clause 7.1.1 with unified TCI framework. The specification has specified the UE behavior for the PHR calculation based on reference PUSCH transmission when *ul-powerControl* is not configured, therefore, the UE behavior for the case when *ul-powerControl* is configured, which corresponds to the agreement, should be explicitly captured as well.in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, the RS index 𝑞𝑑 for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission is provided by *PL-RS* associated with or included in the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* except for SRS transmission that is not provided *useIndicatedTCIState*in clause 7.1.1, if *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* is provided, the values of 𝑃O\_UE\_PUSCH,𝑏,𝑓,𝑐(𝑗), 𝛼𝑏,𝑓,𝑐(𝑗), and the PUSCH power control adjustment state 𝑙 are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* |
| LG |  Similar view with Ericsson |
| Mod\_v14 | FL Observation: Besides for 1 company, other companies seem fine for this CR. Based on the input, I make the following update for CR:--------------Updated according to E///’s suggestion-----------------where is computed assuming MPR=0 dB, A-MPR=0 dB, P-MPR=0 dB. TC = 0 dB. MPR, A-MPR, P-MPR and TC are defined in [8-1, TS 38.101-1], [8-2, TS 38.101-2] and [8-3, TS 38.101-3]. The remaining parameters are defined in clause 7.1.1 and, if *ul-powerControl* is not provided, and are obtained using and *p0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId* *=* 0, is obtained using *pusch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id =* 0, and . If *ul-powerControl* is provided, and are obtained by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the indicated *~~DLorJoint-TCIState~~**TCI-State* or *UL-TCIstate*, is obtained by PL-RS associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*.-------------------------------------@Samsung, I do understand your concerns which is the same reason why, during last meeting, I mark it as ‘N’ at the very beginning. But, as you see, super majority companies want to clarify this issue in the spec. Please reconsider it.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with Mod\_v14 but the *DLorJoint-TCIState* in the last line needs to be changed to *TCI-State* too.  |
| Apple  | Support the new TP in v14 with implementing HW suggestion. For us, it seems the case of ‘ul-powerControl is not provided’ was explicitly captured here. It is much clearer to also write down the other case that ‘ul-powerControl is provided’ to have a complete description.  |
| ASUSTeK | Support Mod\_v14 in principle.Same view as Huawei, and *UL-TCIstate* shall be changed to *TCI-UL-State* according to current RRC standard.We would suggest:If *ul-powerControl* is provided, and are obtained by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the indicated *~~DLorJoint-TCIState~~**TCI-State* or *~~UL-TCIstate~~ TCI-UL-State*, is obtained by PL-RS associated with the indicated *~~DLorJoint-TCIState~~TCI-State* or *~~UL-TCIstate~~TCI-UL-State*. |
| Mod\_v18 | Thank you so much for nice input. Please find the updated version. Then I will propose to endorse the corresponding CR:--------------Updated -----------------where is computed assuming MPR=0 dB, A-MPR=0 dB, P-MPR=0 dB. TC = 0 dB. MPR, A-MPR, P-MPR and TC are defined in [8-1, TS 38.101-1], [8-2, TS 38.101-2] and [8-3, TS 38.101-3]. The remaining parameters are defined in clause 7.1.1 and, if *ul-powerControl* is not provided, and are obtained using and *p0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId* *=* 0, is obtained using *pusch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id =* 0, and . If *ul-powerControl* is provided, and are obtained by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the indicated *~~DLorJoint-TCIState~~**TCI-State* or *~~UL-TCIstate~~ TCI-UL-State*, is obtained by PL-RS associated with the indicated *~~DLorJoint-TCIState~~**TCI-State* or *~~UL-TCIstate~~TCI-UL-State*.-------------------------------------**Discussion for this issue is switched to RAN1 reflector.** |

### Issue 1-6 Draft CR on PL-RS determination for CA case (R1-2208761, R1-2208535)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Reason for change:*** | 1. Regarding PL-RS in legacy power control scheme, UE determines an RS resource index with a *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* where the RS resource is either on serving cell or, if provided, on a serving cell indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking.*

Regarding PL-RS for unified TCI state in Rel-17, the parameter *pathlossReferenceLinking* should be reused, otherwise, cross-CC PL-RS configuration can not be supported. 1. Note that in legacy power control scheme, if the parameter *pathlossReferenceLinking* is not provided, the serving cell *c* is assumed for CC ID determination for PL-RS. In Rel-15/16, it is clear that the CC which the PUSCH transmission is carried on (similar to Rel-17 TCI state applied CC) is the same as the CC where the SRI is configured (similar to Rel-17 TCI state configured CC). However, in Rel-17, the TCI state applied CC may be not same as TCI state configured CC. It needs to specify “TCI state applied CC” or “TCI state configured CC” when the parameter *pathlossReferenceLinking* is not provided to address the above ambiguity.
* In our views, “TCI state configured CC” leads to lower burden for UE measuring PL compared with “TCI state applied CC”, and is more aligned with concept of common TCI state pool among multiple CCs. We suggest to adopt “TCI state configured CC”.
1. According to TS 38.331h10, RAN2 has decided that PL-RS is included in the indicated TCI state, instead of being associated with the indicated TCI state..
 |
| ***-*** |  |
| ***Summary of change:*** | 1. Clarifying 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*.
2. Removing the pending case that PL-RS is associated with the indicated TCI state.
 |
|  |  |
| ***Consequences if not approved:*** | 1. PL-RS for an indicated TCI state cannot support cross carrier indication. That means that each CC which has TCI state pool configuration should have individual RS configurations for PL measurement, without flexibility of parameter *pathlossReferenceLinking* for Rel-15/16 which can indicate a PCell or a SCell.
2. There is misalignment between descriptions of TS38.213 and TS38.331, regarding the inclusion of PL-RS in the indicated TCI state.
 |

Since having two candidate CRs, let’s try to go with R1-2208535 in this round:

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**7 Uplink Power control**

<Unchanged part omitted>

In the remaining of this clause, if a UE is provided *TCIState* in *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList* or *UL-TCIstate* and for an indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* as described in [6, TS 38.214]

- in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, the RS index for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission is provided by *pathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17 ~~PL-RS~~* ~~associated with or included~~ in the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* except for SRS transmission that is not provided *followUnifiedTCIstateSRS* on a serving cell on which the indicated TCI state is configured, or, if provided, on a serving cell indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking*

<Unchanged part omitted>

----------------------------------------------------------

FL note: The issue identified in the problem is valid, otherwise cross-CC PL-RS indication may be precluded in unified TCI framework.

Please provide company’s view in the table below.

* If not support above CR, please clarify whether/how cross-CC PL-RS indication is support in unified TCI based on current spec.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Google | OK in general, but we think the text “on a serving cell” should be moved after the words “in the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*”. Currently location seems to suggest this “on a serving cell” is for SRS. |
| Spreadtrum | Firstly, to clarify cross-CC PL-RS indication, we support that PL-RS ID is provided by the *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* from a reference BWP of a reference CC.Secondly, it needs to be clarified which serving cell the PL-RS is on. The principle for serving cell determination of PL-RS in 38.213 can be reused. If the UE is provided *pathlossReferenceLinking*, the RS resource is on a serving cell indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking*. Thus, we support reusing the parameter *pathlossReferenceLinking* to indicate the serving cell for PL-RS configured in joint/UL TCI state for CA case.Thirdly, however, there is also ambiguity in the draft CR above, i.e. which *pathlossReferenceLinking* is reused, *pathlossReferenceLinking* configured on the reference CC or *pathlossReferenceLinking* configured on the CC applying the indicated TCI state? We prefer that the parameter *pathlossReferenceLinking* to be determined from the reference CC together with the PL-RS ID.Fourthly, similar to the rule of CC/BWP determination for QCL-TypeA/D source RS in 38.214 as follows, if the parameter *pathlossReferenceLinking* is not provided in the reference CC, the PL-RS is on serving cell applying the indicated TCI state.

|  |
| --- |
| When the *bwp-id* or *cell* for QCL-TypeA/D source RS in a QCL-Info of the TCI state is not configured, the UE assumes that QCL-TypeA/D source RS is configured in the CC/DL BWP where TCI state applies. |

Based on the above discussion, the following wording from the draft CR (R1-2208535) is recommended.- in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, the RS resource index for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission is provided by *pathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17* associated with or included in the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* except for SRS transmission that is not provided *followUnifiedTCIstateSRS*- if the *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* configurations are absent in a BWP of the CC, the RS resource index is provided by *pathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17* associated with or included in the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* from a reference BWP of a reference CC, where the RS resource is either on serving cell applying the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* or, if provided, on a serving cell indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking* configured on the reference CC. |
| Ericsson | Don’t support. This is incorrect: on which the indicated TCI state is configured It is on the serving cell where the TCI state is applied. |
| ZTE | Regarding Google’s comment, thank you for your nice suggestionRegarding Spreadtrum and E///’s comments, we are fine for either way for determining the serving cell, but we need to make a decision clearly.After that, for *pathlossReferenceLinking* parameter, it is configured per cell (no agreement for enabling this parameter can be derived from reference CC) and we do not identify the reason why we also need to consider the reference CC configuration.Based on above, we have the following update:**7 Uplink Power control**<Unchanged part omitted>In the remaining of this clause, if a UE is provided *TCIState* in *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList* or *UL-TCIstate* and for an indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* as described in [6, TS 38.214] - in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, the RS index for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission is provided by *pathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17 ~~PL-RS~~* ~~associated with or included~~ in the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* on a serving cell on which the indicated TCI state is applied, or, if provided, on a serving cell indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking* except for SRS transmission that is not provided *followUnifiedTCIstateSRS* <Unchanged part omitted> |
| Samsung | Only the first change is needed:in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, the RS index for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission is provided by *pathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17 ~~PL-RS~~* ~~associated with or included~~ in the indicatedThe rest is not needed. This is already described in the respective sections no need to repeat here. |
| QC | The CR seems already supported in spec. To our understanding, this part for PL calculation should be applicable to unified TCI, and this part is in parallel to it and hence should also be applicable to unified TCI. But if only we have such understanding, we are fine for the CR.- is a downlink pathloss estimate in dB calculated by the UE using reference signal (RS) index for the active DL BWP, as described in clause 12, of carrier of serving cell - If the UE is not provided *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS* and *enableDefaultBeamPL-ForSRS*,or before the UE is provided dedicated higher layer parameters, the UE calculates using a RS resource from an SS/PBCH block with same SS/PBCH block index as the one the UE uses to obtain *MIB*- If the UE is configured with a number of RS resource indexes, up to the value of *maxNrofPUSCH-PathlossReferenceRSs*, and a respective set of RS configurations for the number of RS resource indexes by *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS*, the set of RS resource indexes can include one or both of a set of SS/PBCH block indexes, each provided by *ssb-Index* when a value of a corresponding *pusch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* maps to a SS/PBCH block index, and a set of CSI-RS resource indexes, each provided by *csi-RS-Index* when a value of a corresponding *pusch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* maps to a CSI-RS resource index. The UE identifies a RS resource index in the set of RS resource indexes to correspond either to a SS/PBCH block index or to a CSI-RS resource index as provided by *pusch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* in *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS*- If the PUSCH transmission is scheduled by a RAR UL grant as described in clause 8.3, or for a PUSCH transmission for Type-2 random access procedure as described in clause 8.1A, the UE uses the same RS resource index as for a corresponding PRACH transmission- If the UE is provided *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* and more than one values of *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*, the UE obtains a mapping from *sri-PUSCH-PowerControlId* in *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* between a set of values for the SRI field, or for first and second SRI fields if the UE is provided two SRS resource sets in *srs-ResourceSetToAddModList* or *srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2* with *usage* set to 'codebook', or values for a first SRI field and values associated with a second SRI field value corresponding to Tables 7.3.1.1.2-28/29/30/31 of [5, TS 38.212] for a same number of layers as indicated by the first SRI field value if the UE is provided two SRS resource sets in *srs-ResourceSetToAddModList* or *srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2* with *usage* set to 'nonCodebook', in a DCI format scheduling the PUSCH transmission and a set of *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* values and determines the RS resource index , or respective first and second RS resource indexes , from the value of *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* that is mapped to the SRI field value, or from the values of *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* that are mapped to respective first and second SRI field values if the UE is provided two SRS resource sets in *srs-ResourceSetToAddModList* or *srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2* with *usage* set to 'codebook', or from the values of *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* that are mapped to respective first SRI field value and a value associated with the second SRI field value corresponding to Tables 7.3.1.1.2-28/29/30/31 of [5, TS 38.212] for a same number of layers as indicated by the first SRI field value if the UE is provided two SRS resource sets in *srs-ResourceSetToAddModList* or *srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2* with *usage* set to 'nonCodebook', where the RS resource is either on serving cell or, if provided, on a serving cell indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking* |
| OPPO | Do not supportThe newly added part “on a serving cell on which the indicated TCI state is configured, or, if provided, on a serving cell indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking*” is not currecr and not needed too. |
| ZTE | @Samsung, please clarify which is ‘the respective sections’? Just as QC mentioned or not?@QC, we have the same questions for above. But, to be honest, we do not have a common understanding above that if our understanding is correct. For safe, we think that updated CR may be needed. @OPPP, please clarify why you think above is not needed. If so, do you think we need to support cross-CC PL indication/configuration or not? |
| Spreadtrum2 | For CA case of unified TCI framework, if cross-CC PL-RS indication is not clarified, UE behavior is unclear on how to determine PL-RS for the target CC without TCI state configuration.According to our understanding, the following issues need to be clarified:- Whether the cross-CC PL-RS indication is supported;- Whether the PL-RS ID is provided from the reference CC together with the common TCI state ID;- How to determine the PL-RS resource if PL-RS ID is determined from the reference CC;- How to determine the serving cell the PL-RS resource is on, e.g. reusing the parameter *pathlossReferenceLinking*, on the reference CC, or on the target CC?- Which *pathlossReferenceLinking* is reused if this parameter is configured on both reference CC and target CC?Thus, we think this CR is needed to align the common understanding for cross-CC PL-RS in CA case. |
| Mod\_v14 | FL Observation: Current situation is quite diverged, and @opponent companies, please review the replies from ZTE and Spreadtrum.Then, it seems that QC raised a good point which spec he raised can still apply to unified TCI or not?   |
| Apple  | We share the same view as QC that there is no new agreement made in Rel-17 unfied TCI and the legacy rule should be followed as copied below: ‘where the RS resource is either on serving cell or, if provided, on a serving cell indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking*’Regarding the need of CR, if current spec is not clear, ZTE’s CR seems implementing the above legacy behavior well and also aligned with Ericsson’s preference. We are ok to go with ZTE’s CR to implement legacy rule but extending it to unified TCI framework. |
| Mod\_v18 | No update. Look forward to other inputs. |

### (Switch to reflector) Issue 1-7 Draft CR on SRS closed loop power control shared with PUSCH in TS 38.213 (R1-2208762)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Reason for change:*** | If a UE is provided unified TCI State in Rel-17, UL power control parameters are determined based on the indicated TCI state. In current spec, closed loop power control parameter is provided in a same format for PUSCH, PUCCH and SRS, as follows.

|  |
| --- |
| P0AlphaSet-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {p0-r17 INTEGER (-16..15) OPTIONAL, -- Need Ralpha-r17 Alpha OPTIONAL, -- Need RclosedLoopIndex-r17 ENUMERATED { i0, i1 }} |

For PUSCH or PUCCH, i0 and i1 clearly indicate the first and second closed loop power control respectively. However, for SRS, it can support separate SRS closed loop power control or shared closed power control with PUSCH (either one PUSCH closed power control, i0, or i1). In Rel-17, there are two types of SRS: * Case-1: SRS following unified TCI. In such case, the SRS tends to share closed loop power control with PUSCH,
* Case-2: SRS not following unified TCI. Then, besides for codebook or non codebook transmission, the SRS may be used for beam management which should have separate closed loop power control. Either way, the closed loop power control parameter is individually indicated using Rel-17 TCI state, instead of by legacy Rel-15/16 mechanisms of separate MAC-CE or RRC signaling.

Therefore, closed loop power control parameter associated with TCI state for SRS should support both separate and shared closed loop power control. In order to minimize RRC impact, we suggest the following changes:1. For both SRS following unified TCI and SRS not following unified TCI, specify 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*.
2. For both SRS following unified TCI and SRS not following unified TCI, specify that an absence of the parameter *closedLoopIndex-r17* indicates a separate SRS closed loop power control. Note that this may need to change the property of parameter closedLoopIndex-r17 to be “OPTIONAL”.
 |
|  |  |
| ***Summary of change:*** | 1. For both SRS following unified TCI and SRS not following unified TCI, specify 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.
2. For both SRS following unified TCI and SRS not following unified TCI, specify that an absence of the parameter *closedLoopIndex-r17* indicates a separate SRS closed loop power control.
 |
|  |  |
| ***Consequences if not approved:*** | 1. For both SRS following unified TCI and SRS not following unified TCI, separate SRS closed loop power control could not be supported.
2. Whether RRC configured SRS closed power control parameter refers shared closed loop power control or not is not clear.
 |

Due to above, the following draft CR is provided in R1-2208756:

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**7 Uplink Power control**

<Unchanged part omitted>

In the remaining of this clause, if a UE is provided *TCIState* in *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList* or *UL-TCIstate* and for an indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* as described in [6, TS 38.214]

- in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, the RS index for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission is provided by *PL-RS* associated with or included in the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* except for SRS transmission that is not provided *followUnifiedTCIstateSRS*

- in clause 7.1.1, if *p0AlphaSetforPUSCH* is provided, the values of , , and the PUSCH power control adjustment state are provided by *p0AlphaSetforPUSCH* associated with the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*

- in clause 7.2.1, if *p0AlphaSetforPUCCH* is provided, the values of and the PUCCH power control adjustment state are provided by *p0AlphaSetforPUCCH* associated with the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*

- in clause 7.3.1, if *p0AlphaSetforSRS* is provided,

- if *followUnifiedTCIstateSRS* is provided for a SRS resource set, the values of , , and SRS power control adjustment state are provided by *p0AlphaSetforSRS* associated with the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState.* The SRS power control adjustment state is the PUSCH power control adjustment state if the parameter *closedLoopIndex-r17* is provided; otherwise, if the parameter *closedLoopIndex-r17* is not provided, the SRS power control adjustment state is a separate SRS power control adjustment state.

- else, if *followUnifiedTCIstateSRS* is not provided for a SRS resource set and for a SRS resource from the SRS resource set, the values of , , and SRS power control adjustment state are provided by *p0AlphaSetforSRS* associated with *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set and a RS index for obtaining a pathloss estimate for the SRS transmission is provided by PL-RS associated with or included in the *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set. The SRS power control adjustment state is the PUSCH power control adjustment state if the parameter *closedLoopIndex-r17* is provided; otherwise, if the parameter *closedLoopIndex-r17* is not provided, the SRS power control adjustment state is a separate SRS power control adjustment state.

<Unchanged part omitted>

----------------------------------------------------------

FL note: Since now, some companies mentioned in the preparation phase summary that they may not be clear for above issue. For sake of presentation, proponent companies’ clarification is copied herein:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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?

|  |
| --- |
| **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  |

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.  |

Please provide company’s view in the table below

* Question: Do you agree above issue/ambiguity for SRS closed loop RRC configuration: a total of 3 closed loop states, but for RRC, there are only two entries.
	+ If yes, do you agree with above CR or any other views.
	+ If no, how to interpret the two candidate entries in current RRC parameter ‘closedLoopIndex-r17 ENUMERATED { i0, i1 }’ for SRS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Google | There could be potential misunderstanding without the CR. We do not see any issue to endorse the CR. |
| Ericsson | Do not support. There is no ambiguity.  |
| ZTE | @Ericsson, could you nicely clarify how to the two candidate entries in current RRC parameter ‘closedLoopIndex-r17 ENUMERATED { i0, i1 }’ for SRS, if you think there is no ambiguity? |
| Samsung | This is not needed. The higher layer parameter, PowerControlAdjustmentStates, can be reused to determine whether or not SRS follows PSUCH CLPC.  |
| QC | There seems no ambiguity at UE side. If it is unified TCI, UE will only use one of the two closed loop index as in the TCI for SRS, as mentioned below. This closed loop index is newly introduced for unified TCI, and does not belong to PUSCH closed loop index or legacy separate closed loop index for SRS.- in clause 7.3.1, if *p0AlphaSetforSRS* is provided, - if *followUnifiedTCIstateSRS* is provided for a SRS resource set, the values of , , and SRS power control adjustment state are provided by *p0AlphaSetforSRS* associated with the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState*- else, if *followUnifiedTCIstateSRS* is not provided for a SRS resource set and for a SRS resource from the SRS resource set, the values of , , and SRS power control adjustment state are provided by *p0AlphaSetforSRS* associated with *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set and a RS index for obtaining a pathloss estimate for the SRS transmission is provided by PL-RS associated with or included in the *TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource setThe fundamental issue is that we are not clear what is the use case of this legacy mechanism in unified TCI? To our understanding, the main use case of the separate close-loop index for SRS is when there is no PUSCH/PUCCH in the same CC. However, this seems not an issue in unified TCI, since TCI can be associated with SRS even without PUSCH/PUCCH. This seems can also simplify the implementation. |
| OPPO | We think there is no ambiguity too. The proposed text seems to redundant. In unified TCI framework, the UE applies the PC parameters associated with the TCI state on the UL transmission. |
| ZTE | @Samsung, *PowerControlAdjustmentStates* is legacy PC setting configured per SRS resource set, which can provide three states as well. But, the question is that we have already the new RRC parameter for SRS resource set. How to interpret them together. Confusingsrs-PowerControlAdjustmentStates ENUMERATED { sameAsFci2, separateClosedLoop} OPTIONAL, -- Need S***srs-PowerControlAdjustmentStates***Indicates whether hsrs,c(i) = fc(i,1) or hsrs,c(i) = fc(i,2) (if twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates are configured) or separate close loop is configured for SRS. This parameter is applicable only for Uls on which UE also transmits PUSCH. If absent or release, the UE applies the value sameAs-Fci1 (see TS 38.213 [13], clause 7.3).P0AlphaSet-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {p0-r17 INTEGER (-16..15) OPTIONAL, -- Need Ralpha-r17 Alpha OPTIONAL, -- Need RclosedLoopIndex-r17 ENUMERATED { i0, i1 }}@QC, closed loop state is not just a state, and we still need a list of DCI format 0\_0/1/2 and DCI format 1\_1/2/3 and group common DCI for accommodating the corresponding closed loop. To be honest, we do not understand whether/how to support two new closed loop for SRS in the unified TCI framework. Frankly speaking, what we enhanced for unified TCI is just to re-construct the association between the existing closed-loop functions and TCI state(s). @OPPO, please review our reply to Samsung and QC.@all, the motivation of our CR is not to update the current RRC signaling, and alternatively, we may use the same signaling framework as *PowerControlAdjustmentStates* |
| Mod\_v14 | FL Observation: Current situation is quite diverged, and @opponent companies, please review the replies from ZTE.It seems relevant to much details, and let me think about how to make this discussion more efficient, even though rejecting this CR finally.  |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We tend to agree with QC. No spec change seems necessary.  |
| Apple  | In general, we have a same understanding as QC and do not see the need of CR. For us, regardless of ‘*followUnifiedTCIstateSRS’ or not,* the Rel-17 uplink power control configuration used in unified TCI framework allows to provide ‘*p0AlphaSetforSRS*’ for SRS power control. More details, UE either uses the corresponding ‘*p0AlphaSetforSRS*’ values based on the indicated TCI state in case of ‘*followUnifiedTCIstateSRS’.* Alternatively, using the setting associated with TCI state associated with lowest SRS resource ID in caser of not ‘*followUnifiedTCIstateSRS’.* The parameters include p0/alpha and closedloopiindex as well. For PUSCH-less CC and UL BM case, where separate PC for SRS is introduced in Rel-15. The same operation mentioned above is applied as long as the ‘*p0AlphaSetforSRS*’ is provided for the serving cell where SRS is transmitted.  |
| Mod\_v17 | Current situation is quite interesting. The proponent companies seem to believe the current spec can not work, but, for other side, opponent companies think everything is fine.Let’s switch this discussion to RAN1 reflector. Hopefully, it can make this discussion more efficient, even rejecting this CR finally.**Discussion for this issue is switched to RAN1 reflector.** |

### Issue 1-14 Draft Rel-17 CR on default beam with unified TCI for cross-carrier scheduling(R1-2209937)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Reason for change:*** | As agreed in RAN1 #109e, the default beam follows the lowest CORESET ID in the latest monitored slot if the indicated TCI is associated with non-serving PCI. However, it is possible for a cross-carrier scheduled CC has indicated TCI associated with non-serving PCI and without CORESET. In this case, the default beam is unspecified.**Agreement**If scheduling offset < threshold (*timeDurationForQCL*), regardless of configuration of *followUnifiedTCIstate* 1. If the indicated TCI is associated with PCI different from serving cell PCI (i.e. inter-cell),
	1. UE should apply Rel.15 default QCL assumption for both non-UE dedicated and UE dedicated PDSCH (i.e. QCL assumption of the lowest CORESET ID in the latest slot)
	2. If the QCL-TypeD property for default beams in a slot for CCs in a band are different, the default beam for the CC with lowest ID is prioritized, i.e. the default beam for the CC with lowest ID is applied to all the CCs in a band
2. If the indicated TCI is associated with serving cell PCI (i.e. intra-cell), UE always uses indicated TCI for both UE-dedicated/non-UE-dedicated PDSCH (i.e. no need to consider default QCL)

The same approach as above is applied to default beam for aperiodic CSI-RS.Note: UE is not expected to receive a non-UE dedicated PDSCH if the source RS of the TCI state of the corresponding PDSCH is not associated with the serving cell PCID.  |
|  |  |
| ***Summary of change:*** | 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 |
|  |  |
| ***Consequences if not approved:*** | The corresponding default beam is unspecified if a cross-carrier scheduled CC has indicated TCI associated with non-serving PCI and without CORESET |

Due to above, the following draft CR is provided in R1-2209937:

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location**

< Unchanged parts are omitted >

If the PDCCH carrying the scheduling DCI is received on one component carrier, and a PDSCH scheduled by that DCI is on another component carrier:

- The *timeDurationForQCL* is determined based on the subcarrier spacing of the scheduled PDSCH. If µPDCCH < µPDSCH an additional timing delay is added to the *timeDurationForQCL*, where *d* is defined in 5.2.1.5.1a-1, otherwise *d* is zero;

- When the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is not provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, if the offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is less than the threshold *timeDurationForQCL,* or if the DL DCI does not have the TCI field present, the UE obtains its QCL assumption for the scheduled PDSCH from the activated TCI state with the lowest ID applicable to PDSCH in the active BWP of the scheduled cell.

- When the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, if the offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is less than the threshold *timeDurationForQCL*, or if the DL DCI does not have the TCI field present, the UE obtains its QCL assumption for the scheduled PDSCH based on the indicated TCI state for the active BWP of the component carrier with the scheduled PDSCH.

< Unchanged parts are omitted >

**5.2.1.5.1 Aperiodic CSI Reporting/Aperiodic CSI-RS when the triggering PDCCH and the CSI-RS have the same numerology**

< Unchanged parts are omitted >

- If the scheduling offset between the last symbol of the PDCCH carrying the triggering DCI and the first symbol of the aperiodic CSI-RS resources in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured without higher layer parameter *trs-Info* is smaller than the UE reported threshold *beamSwitchTiming,* as defined in [13, TS 38.306], when the reported value is one of the values of {14, 28, 48} and *enableBeamSwitchTiming* is not provided, or is smaller than 48 when the UE provides *beamSwitchTiming-r16*, *enableBeamSwitchTiming* is provided and the *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* is configured with the higher layer parameter *repetition* set to 'off' or configured without the higher layer parameter *repetition,* or is smaller than the UE reported threshold *beamSwitchTiming-r16,* when *enableBeamSwitchTiming* is provided and the *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* is configured with the higher layer parameter *repetition* set to 'on'.

- If a UE is configured with *enableDefaultTCI-StatePerCoresetPoolIndex* and the UE is configured by higher layer parameter *PDCCH-Config* that contains two different values of *coresetPoolIndex* in *ControlResourceSet*

< Unchanged parts are omitted >

- else if there is any other DL signal with an indicated TCI state in the same symbols as the CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption of the other DL signal also when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS. The other DL signal refers to PDSCH scheduled with offset larger than or equal to the threshold *timeDurationForQCL,* as defined in [13, TS 38.306], periodic CSI-RS, semi-persistent CSI-RS, aperiodic CSI-RS in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* scheduled with offset larger than or equal to the UE reported threshold *beamSwitchTiming* when the reported value is one of the values {14,28,48} and when *enableBeamSwitchTiming* is not provided or the *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* is configured with the higher layer parameter *trs-Info* , aperiodic CSI-RS in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configuredwith the higher layer parameter *repetition* set to 'off' or configured without the higher layer parameters *repetition* and *trs-Info* scheduled with offset larger than or equal to 48 when the UE provides *beamSwitchTiming-r16* and *enableBeamSwitchTiming* is provided, aperiodic CSI-RS in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configuredwith the higher layer parameter *repetition* set to 'on' scheduled with offset larger than or equal to the UE reported threshold *beamSwitchTiming-r16* and *enableBeamSwitchTiming* is provided;

- else if the UE is not provided *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, and if at least one CORESET is configured for the BWP in which the aperiodic CSI-RS is received, when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption used for the CORESET associated with a monitored search space with the lowest *controlResourceSetId* in the latest slot in which one or more CORESETs within the active BWP of the serving cell are monitored;

- else if the UE is provided *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17* and if the indicated TCI state is associated with a PCI different from the serving cell, regardless of configuration of *followUnifiedTCIstate*, and if at least one CORESET is configured for the BWP in which the aperiodic CSI-RS is received, when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption used for the CORESET associated with a monitored search space with the lowest *controlResourceSetId* in the latest slot in which one or more CORESETs within the active BWP of the serving cell are monitored. In the CA case, if the 'QCL-TypeD' of the aperiodic CSI-RSs from respective CCs in a band are different in a slot, the QCL-TypeD assumption of the CSI-RS in the CC with lowest CC ID in the band is applied to all the aperiodic CSI-RSs in the CCs in the band;

- else if the UE is provided *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17* and the indicated TCI state is associated with the PCI of the serving cell, regardless of configuration of *followUnifiedTCIstate*, the indicated TCI state is applied to the aperiodic CSI-RS;

- else if the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is not provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, and when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption of the lowest-ID activated TCI state applicable to the PDSCH within the active BWP of the cell in which the CSI-RS is to be received.

- else if the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, and when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption based on the indicated TCI state for the active BWP of the cell in which the CSI-RS is to be received.

< Unchanged parts are omitted >

**5.2.1.5.1a Aperiodic CSI Reporting/Aperiodic CSI-RS when the triggering PDCCH and the CSI-RS have different numerologies**

When the triggering PDCCH and the triggered aperiodic CSI-RS are of different numerologies, the behavior defined in 5.2.1.5.1 for the case where the numerologies are the same applies with the following exceptions:

Beam switch timing:

< Unchanged parts are omitted >

- if one of the associated trigger states has the higher layer parameter *qcl-Type* set to 'typeD',

- if there is any other DL signal with an indicated TCI state in the same symbols as the CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption of the other DL signal also when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS. The other DL signal refers to PDSCH scheduled with offset larger than or equal to the threshold *timeDurationForQCL,* as defined in [13, TS 38.306], periodic CSI-RS, semi-persistent CSI-RS, aperiodic CSI-RS scheduled with offset larger than or equal to *beamSwitchTiming* + *d*  in CSI-RS symbols when the reported value is one of the values {14,28,48} and when *enableBeamSwitchTiming* is not provided or the *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* is configured with the higher layer parameter *trs-Info*, aperiodic CSI-RS in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configuredwith the higher layer parameter *repetition* set to 'off' or configured without the higher layer parameters *repetition* and *trs-Info* scheduled with offset larger than or equal to 48+ in CSI-RS symbols when the UE provides *beamSwitchTiming-r16* and *enableBeamSwitchTiming* is provided, aperiodic CSI-RS in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configuredwith the higher layer parameter *repetition* set to 'on' and scheduled with offset larger than or equal to *beamSwitchTiming-r16* + *d* in CSI-RS symbols when *enableBeamSwitchTiming* is provided;

- else,

- if at least one CORESET is configured for the BWP in which the aperiodic CSI-RS is to be received, when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption used for the CORESET associated with a monitored search space with the lowest *controlResourceSetId* in the latest slot in which one or more CORESETs within the active BWP of the serving cell are monitored.

- else if the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is not provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption of the lowest-ID activated TCI state applicable to the PDSCH within the active BWP of the cell in which the CSI-RS is to be received.

- else if the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption based on the indicated TCI statefor the active BWP of the cell in which the CSI-RS is to be received.

< Unchanged parts are omitted >

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FL note: After reviewing current spec, from the FL perspective, the above issue is valid.

* BTW, ‘dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17’ is incorrect and has been replaced by legacy TCI state. But, in this round, let’s focus on the logic/technical issue of this CR, and once above can be supported in general, I will make the corresponding update accordingly.

Please provide company’s view in the table below

* + If not support, please clarify the UE behavior for cross-carrier scheduling (whether/how in unified TCI framework based on current spec)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Google | It seems the CR is not aligned with the agreements. In the agreement, the default beam is different for inter-cell and intra-cell. In addition, the highlighted text below seems to be unnecessary.When the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, if the offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is less than the threshold *timeDurationForQCL*, or if the DL DCI does not have the TCI field present, the UE obtains its QCL assumption for the scheduled PDSCH based on the indicated TCI state for the active BWP of the component carrier with the scheduled PDSCH. |
| Ericsson  | Support, with two comments:* Note that we do not include a suffix -r17 in RRC field names if there is no risk for ambiguity. So please replace *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17* with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList*
* Why do we need the statement

if the offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is less than the threshold *timeDurationForQCL* doesn’t the UE always apply the indicated TCI in this case? |
| ZTE | We are okay for the direction of this CR. But we think that the following bullet may not be necessary, and seems to be duplicated with the general description for PDSCH and CSI-RS, i.e., apply the indicated TCI for PDSCH/CSI-RS. Anything new?- When the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, if the offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is less than the threshold *timeDurationForQCL*, or if the DL DCI does not have the TCI field present, the UE obtains its QCL assumption for the scheduled PDSCH based on the indicated TCI state for the active BWP of the component carrier with the scheduled PDSCH.…- else if the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, and when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption based on the indicated TCI state for the active BWP of the cell in which the CSI-RS is to be received.…- else if the UE is configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* and is provided with *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList-r17*, when receiving the aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE applies the QCL assumption based on the indicated TCI statefor the active BWP of the cell in which the CSI-RS is to be received. |
| Samsung | This seems to be defining a new behavior that goes beyond the agreement. We don’t support introducing this in the maintenance phase. |
| QC | Based on FL and Yushu’s suggestion, the proposal is described below in red on top of agreement. If the proposal is agreeable, the CR can be polished accordingly. To SS, we think UE needs to know what to do in this case. What you proposed seems to say default beam is not supported in this case. But I think this is even worse than R16 and should also be stated in spec, e.g. offset should > threshold.**Proposal in red on top of agreement**If scheduling offset < threshold (*timeDurationForQCL*), regardless of configuration of *followUnifiedTCIstate* 1. If the indicated TCI is associated with PCI different from serving cell PCI (i.e. inter-cell),
	1. UE should apply Rel.15 default QCL assumption for both non-UE dedicated and UE dedicated PDSCH (i.e. QCL assumption of the lowest CORESET ID in the latest slot)
	2. If there is no CORESET on CC with scheduled PDSCH in case of cross-carrier scheduling, UE uses indicated TCI for scheduled PDSCH
	3. If the QCL-TypeD property for default beams in a slot for CCs in a band are different, the default beam for the CC with lowest ID is prioritized, i.e. the default beam for the CC with lowest ID is applied to all the CCs in a band
2. If the indicated TCI is associated with serving cell PCI (i.e. intra-cell), UE always uses indicated TCI for both UE-dedicated/non-UE-dedicated PDSCH (i.e. no need to consider default QCL)

The same approach as above is applied to default beam for aperiodic CSI-RS. |
| OPPO | Do not support the CR. The change does not align with the agreement. We can not have new design here. The purpose of the CR is to capture the agreement, not to make new agreement. |
| Google | We suggest the following change on top of the version from Yan to be aligned with the agreement.If scheduling offset < threshold (*timeDurationForQCL*), regardless of configuration of *followUnifiedTCIstate* 1. If the indicated TCI is associated with PCI different from serving cell PCI (i.e. inter-cell),
	1. UE should apply Rel.15 default QCL assumption for both non-UE dedicated and UE dedicated PDSCH (i.e. QCL assumption of the lowest CORESET ID in the latest slot; for cross-carrier scheduling, if *enableDefaultBeamForCCS* is configured, the default PDSCH beam is based on the activated TCI with lowest ID in the active BWP of the CC with the PDSCH)
	2. ~~If there is no CORESET on CC with scheduled PDSCH in case of cross-carrier scheduling, UE uses indicated TCI for scheduled PDSCH~~
	3. If the QCL-TypeD property for default beams in a slot for CCs in a band are different, the default beam for the CC with lowest ID is prioritized, i.e. the default beam for the CC with lowest ID is applied to all the CCs in a band
2. If the indicated TCI is associated with serving cell PCI (i.e. intra-cell), UE always uses indicated TCI for both UE-dedicated/non-UE-dedicated PDSCH (i.e. no need to consider default QCL)
 |
| Mod\_v14 | FL Observation: Current situation is quite diverged, and @opponent companies, please review the updated proposal from QC and Google. From FL’s perspective, it may not good to introduce a new feature unless having a clear consensus, but correcting some error for making the unified TCI work well for ‘cross-carrier scheduling, if enableDefaultBeamForCCS is configured, the default PDSCH beam is based on the activated TCI with lowest ID in the active BWP of the CC with the PDSCH)’ seems fine. Then, can we assume that the following conclusion is sufficient for all cross-carrier scheduling (of course, regardless of ‘enableDefaultBeamForCSS’ or not).**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.
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer to continue discussion on this. The original CR is not aligned with the current agreement and further discussion seem necessary before adjusting the agreement based on QC or Google proposals. |
| Apple  | We prefer to first conclude whether needs to introduce new agreement. On the PDSCH cross-carrier scheduled on SCell, it is all UE-dedicated PDSCH. Following design principle, it is nature to follow the indicated TCI state as proposed by QC. On the other hand, we are not sure whether CR addresses all potential issues. For example, two CCs, CC1 is scheduling CC and CC2 is a scheduled CC. There are two overlapped PDSCH#1 on CC1 and PDSCH#2 on CC2, where the offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is less than the threshold timeDurationForQCL. Following the proposed CR, PDSCH#1 follow legacy rule and TCI state is determined based on the recent PDCCH. While PDSCH#2 TCI is determined based on the indicated TCI state. What is the UE behavior if these two TCI states are different? With this consideration, it seems make sense to keep a consistent behavior for scheduling CC and scheduled CC. Therefore, CR maybe not needed. In any case, the conclusion proposed by FL is unclear for us and therefore not preferred. We thanks FL great efforts and fully understand the intention is to find something in the middle to progress. However, it makes thing a bit unclear. For example, in CA framework, even a serving cell can configure ‘CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig’ IE with setting ‘own’ value since LTE phase, which is claimed by infra-vendor to align the DCI sizes between scheduling CC and scheduled CC with both including CIF field and benefits scheduler design. In this case, the conclusion is directly contradicted with the existing agreement since the indicated TCI is applied to the scheduling CC even the gap is smaller than timeDurationForQCL. In summary, we prefer to focus on the CR and candidate proposal, which can directly address the problem. We are open to other conclusion e.g., support or not support this enhancement to avoid confusion.  |
| Mod\_v18 | No update. Thanks for Huawei and especially Apple’s clarification. Look forward to other inputs. @QC, any way-forward suggestions? |

### Issue 3-3 Draft CR 38.214 Rel-17 multi-beam enhancements\_beam switch HARQ (R1-2210057)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Reason for change:*** | The current specification is not clear on the application time of the beam indication (indicated TCI state). |
|  |  |
| ***Summary of change:*** | 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. |
|  |  |
| ***Consequences if not approved:*** | The specifications would be incomplete regarding the DCI based beam switch when applied under the Rel-17 unified TCI framework. |

Due to above, the following draft CR is provided in R1-2210057:

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location**

< Unchanged parts are omitted >

When the UE would transmit the last symbol of a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information corresponding to the latest in time DCI carrying the TCI State indication and without DL assignment, or corresponding to the PDSCH scheduling by the DCI carrying the TCI State indication, and if the indicated TCI State is different from the previously indicated one, the indicated *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* should be applied starting from the first slot that is at least symbols after the last symbol of the PUCCH. The first slot and the symbols are both determined on the carrier with the smallest SCS among the carrier(s) applying the beam indication.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FL note: Last meeting the above CR was quite stable, and let’s see whether we can approve above CR quickly.

Please provide company’s view in the table below.

* If not support, please clarify the reason why not to capture above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Google | If we consider the CA operation, UE may receive DCI from multiple CCs. In that case, how to count the “latest in time” for the DCIs received from multiple CCs? |
| Ericsson | Support |
| ZTE | We are fine in general. A short question for clarification: what’s difference if not having ‘latest in time’? Eitherway, the corresponding PUCCH with HARQ-ACK should be the same, right? |
| Samsung | I am afraid that this adds more ambiguity. When we say “latest in time”, is it the time of beam application, or the time of HARQ-ACK reply. If UE receives DCI A at time t1. It acknowledges DCI A at time t2 and the beam should be applied at time t3=t2+BAT. Now if the UE receives a second DCI at time t4, where t4 is less than t3, is that DCI considered the latest in time.We sympathize the need for this change to make the specs clearer, maybe we can say:When the UE would transmit the last symbol of a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information corresponding to the ~~latest in time~~ DCI carrying the TCI State indication and without DL assignment, or corresponding to the PDSCH scheduling by the DCI carrying the TCI State indication, and if the indicated TCI State is different from the previously indicated one, the indicated *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* should be applied starting from the first slot that is at least symbols after the last symbol of the PUCCH. The first slot and the symbols are both determined on the carrier with the smallest SCS among the carrier(s) applying the beam indication. The UE applies the indicated *TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* of the latest in time DCI that satisfies the condition. |
| QC | Support in principle. However, the latest DCI may still have ambiguity. Is it based on the start or end of DCI, especially with DCI repetition? Therefore, we suggest to the following change, which is based on the start of DCI, e.g. UE obeys the DCI whose start is latest. information corresponding to the latest ~~in time~~ occasion across CCs with DCI carrying |
| Google | QC’s suggest may still have some problems. There can be multiple DCIs from the CCs at the same time. Maybe it can be revised as follows:information corresponding to the latest ~~in time~~ occasion across CCs with DCI carrying, if there are multiple DCIs, the one in the CC the lowest ID is applied |
| LG | Similar understanding with ZTE |
| Mod\_v14 | @ZTE and LGE, it should be better if proponent companies can clarify this issue. From my perspective, if my understanding is correct, this CR is relevant to the case that the PUCCH is related to a list of DCI(s) carrying the respective indicated TCI state(s). Then, which TCI state should be assumed as a valid TCI state. If so, it is not relevant to BAT timeline at all.Then, can we go with original version, and then for CA case, we may have a separate discussion? But of course, if supported by majority companies now, it is definitely good that we can make it done right now. |
| Apple  | We support the modification from Google, which seems more complete. The following wording is provided for consideration: information corresponding to the lowest CC ID in the latest ~~in time~~ occasion in which one or more DCIs carrying |
| Mod\_v18 | No update. Initially I thought that we only focused on the basic issue for a serving cell case (afraid that it may be over-designed), but it seems a lot of companies are interested in the CA case. Then let’s check the following two candidates. Look forward to any further inputs.Option-1(from QC):… information corresponding to the latest ~~in time~~ occasion across CCs with DCI carrying…Option-2 (from Apple and Google)… information corresponding to the lowest CC ID in the latest ~~in time~~ occasion in which one or more DCIs carrying… |

### (Switch to reflector) Issue 3-4 Clarification on active BWP for beam application time(R1-2208871)

Since the BAT is considered based on all active BWPs from the target CCs for the indicated TCI state, it is possible that the active BWPs for some CCs could be different at different time as shown in Figure 1. The BWP change could be known by the gNB, e.g. based on BWP switching signaling, or unknown by the gNB, e.g. timer UE-autonomous BWP switching.



**Figure 1: Potential issue for BAT determination for active BWP counting**

It is necessary to clarify the active BWP to determine the BAT based on one of the following options:

* 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: During last meeting online section, above issue was mentioned. Then, the companies are encouraged to provide your view on above two options. After stable, I can provide the corresponding CR if needed.

Please provide company’s view on above two options in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Google | We are open to either option 1 or 2, as long as there is no ambiguity. |
| ASUSTeK | Slightly prefer option 2, which is closer to applying timing, but would be fine with majority. |
| Ericsson | Either option is OK |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 2. |
| Samsung | We think option 1 is natural, as the UE makes the decision when it receives the TCI indication or shortly after that based on processing latency. |
| QC | Prefer Option 2, which is closer to the application time. Also, is it possible for the BWP of one applying CC to change in the middle of the ACK slot, e.g. ACK is sent on 60 kHz while applied CC has 120 kHz? If so, it might be more accurate to check the BWP SCS at a particular time, e.g. end of ACK transmission.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~~ at the end of PUCCH/PUSCH carrying the HARQ-ACK for the TCI indication |
| OPPO | Either way is ok. |
| Google2 | We suggest we go with majority’s view – option 2. Indeed, QC’s revision looks better. |
| LG | Either way is fine |
| Mod\_v14 | Thank you for being flexible. Let’s have an agreement firstly, and then review whether we need to have a CR or not. Based on companies input, can we go with majority views:***Proposal: On beam application time for unified TCI framework, the active BWP is determined based on the active BWP with the smallest SCS among the active BWP(s) from the applying CCs at the end of PUCCH/PUSCH carrying the HARQ-ACK for the TCI indication*** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with Mod\_v14 proposal. |
| Apple  | Support FL’s proposal in v14.  |
| ASUSTeK | Support FL’s proposal in v14. |
| Mod\_v18 | Looks stable, and let’s switch to RAN1 reflector **Discussion for this issue is switched to RAN1 reflector.** |

## Summary of Editorial (E) issues

The related/updated editorial CR(s) are provided in:

[**https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\_ran/WG1\_RL1/TSGR1\_110b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1(NR\_feMIMO)/Multi-Beam/Round%201/Editorial%20issues**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1%28NR_feMIMO%29/Multi-Beam/Round%201/Editorial%20issues)

Companies are to share their inputs on the editorial CR for the following issues herein.

### Issue 1-2

* Draft CR for TCI state parameter name alignment in TS 38.214 (Combo CR based on R1-2208751, R1-2210081, R1-2210089, R1-2210216)
* Draft CR for TCI state parameter name alignment in TS 38.213 (Combo CR based on R1-2210079, R1-2210088)

Table 1 Companies’ inputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Mod\_V00 | The updated combo draft CRs are in:[Issue 1-2, R1-221xxxx draft CR for TCI state parameter name alignment in TS 38.213\_v0.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1%28NR_feMIMO%29/Multi-Beam/Round%201/Editorial%20issues/Issue%201-2%2C%20R1-221xxxx%20draft%20CR%20for%20TCI%20state%20parameter%20name%20alignment%20in%20TS%2038.213_v0.docx)[Issue 1-2, R1-221xxxx draft CR for TCI state parameter name alignment in TS 38.214\_v0.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1%28NR_feMIMO%29/Multi-Beam/Round%201/Editorial%20issues/Issue%201-2%2C%20R1-221xxxx%20draft%20CR%20for%20TCI%20state%20parameter%20name%20alignment%20in%20TS%2038.214_v0.docx) |
| ASUSTeK | We found typos in reason for change in cover sheet of 213 combo CR.It shall be “TS 38.213” rather than “TS 38.214”, and sorry for causing confusion. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Samsung | Support. Please fix typo pointed out by ASUSTek |
| QC | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Mod\_v14 | Thank you so much. Please review the update for 213 combo CR: v1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| ASUSTeK | Support |
| Mod\_v18 | Updated with Tdoc number. |

### Issue 1-4

* Draft CR on reference of MAC CE in TS38.321 for SRS resource on unified TCI framework to TS38.214 (Lenovo)

Table 2 Companies’ inputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Mod\_V00 | The draft CR for endorsement is in:[Issue 1-4, R1-221xxxx Draft CR on reference of MAC CE in TS38.321 for SRS resource on unified TCI framework to TS38.214\_v0.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1%28NR_feMIMO%29/Multi-Beam/Round%201/Editorial%20issues/Issue%201-4%2C%20R1-221xxxx%20Draft%20CR%20on%20reference%20of%20MAC%20CE%20in%20TS38.321%20for%20SRS%20resource%20on%20unified%20TCI%20framework%20to%20TS38.214_v0.docx) |
| ZTE | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Mod\_v14 | Seems quite stable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| ASUSTeK | Support |
| Mod\_v18 | Updated with Tdoc number. |

### Issue 1-9

* On joint DLUL TCI state update in unified TCI framework (CATT)

Table 3 Companies’ inputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Mod\_V00 | The draft CR for endorsement is in:[Issue 1-9, R1-221xxxx On joint DLUL TCI state update in unified TCI framework\_v0.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1%28NR_feMIMO%29/Multi-Beam/Round%201/Editorial%20issues/Issue%201-9%2C%20R1-221xxxx%20On%20joint%20DLUL%20TCI%20state%20update%20in%20unified%20TCI%20framework_v0.docx) |
| ZTE | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Mod\_v14 | Seems quite stable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| ASUSTeK | Support |
| Mod\_v18 | Updated with Tdoc number. |

### Issue 1-10

* Correction on beam activation and update for multiple CCs (Google)

Table 4 Companies’ inputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Mod\_V00 | The draft CR for endorsement is in:[Issue 1-10, R1-221xxxx Correction on beam activation and update for multiple CCs\_v0.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1%28NR_feMIMO%29/Multi-Beam/Round%201/Editorial%20issues/Issue%201-10%2C%20R1-221xxxx%20Correction%20on%20beam%20activation%20and%20update%20for%20multiple%20CCs_v0.docx) |
| ZTE | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Mod\_v14 | Seems quite stable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| ASUSTeK | Support |
| Mod\_v18 | Updated with Tdoc number. |

### Issue 1-18

* Correction on indicated TCI state (ASUSTeK)

Table 5 Companies’ inputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Mod\_V00 | The draft CR for endorsement is in:[Issue 1-18, R1-221xxxx Correction on indicated TCI state\_v0.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1%28NR_feMIMO%29/Multi-Beam/Round%201/Editorial%20issues/Issue%201-18%2C%20R1-221xxxx%20Correction%20on%20indicated%20TCI%20state_v0.docx) |
| ZTE | Support |
| Samsung | Not need. A or B is true if A only is true or B only is true is both A and B are true. Adding “and” is redundant. |
| QC | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| LG | Fine |
| Mod\_v14 | If companies have concerns on this CR finally, we may have rejected it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| ASUSTeK | ProponentWe think it would be better to capture this editorial change to align the logic in another description (shown below) in Sec. 5.1 in current TS 38.214.If the activation command maps *TCIState* and/or *UL-TCIState* to only one TCI codepoint, the UE shall apply the indicated *TCIState* and/or *UL-TCIState* to one or to a set of CCs /DL BWPs, and if applicable, to one or to a set of CCs /UL BWPs once the indicated mapping for the one single TCI codepoint is applied as described in [11, TS 38.133].Given majority company seems fine with this editorial change, could Samsung be flexible on this editorial change? |
| Mod\_v18 | @Samsung, please review ASUSTek’s reply. Can you be flexible based on current situation and ASUSTek’s reply? |

### Issue 1-19

* Clarifying ambiguous usage of *TCI-State* (Huawei)

Table 6 Companies’ inputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Mod\_V00 | The draft CR for endorsement is in:[Issue 1-19, R1-221xxxx Clarifying ambiguous usage of TCI-State\_v0.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1%28NR_feMIMO%29/Multi-Beam/Round%201/Editorial%20issues/Issue%201-19%2C%20R1-221xxxx%20Clarifying%20ambiguous%20usage%20of%20TCI-State_v0.docx) |
| ZTE | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Mod\_v14 | Seems quite stable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| ASUSTeK | Support |
| Mod\_v18 | Updated with Tdoc number. |

## Conclusion
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