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# Introduction

In RAN#94e, the Rel-18 WID of MIMO evolution for downlink and uplink is approved. In the approved WID, extension of unified TCI framework is a part of the RAN1 objectives, and the detailed scope of this agenda item (AI 9.1.1.1) includes the following highlighted objectives:

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

For the case of simultaneous UL transmission from multiple panels, the operation will only be limited to the objective 6 scenarios. |

# Plan

Based on the contributions from companies [1]-[32], the followings are provided in this document:

* Summary of companies’ views on each of open issues raised by interested companies, where the open issues are categorized as follow:
	+ Issue 1 – General issue for unified TCI extension
	+ Issue 2 – TCI state update and activation
	+ Issue 3 – How to inform UE which indicated TCI state(s) that UE shall apply to target channel/signal
	+ Issue 4 – UL power control for UL MTRP operation
	+ Issue 5 – PDSCH-CJT Tx scheme
	+ Issue 6 – Beam failure recovery and beam reporting
* Observations and recommended proposals based on the summary of companies’ views

# Contact Person

For potential offline discussion, companies/delegates are encouraged to enter the contact information in the table below:

Table 0 Contact Information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point(s) of contact** | **Email address(es)** |
| Apple | Hong  | hhe5@apple.com |
| CEWiT | Vishakha Singh | Vish@cewit.org.in |
| CMCC | Yan | liyanwx@chinamobile.com |
| Ericsson | Claes | Claes.tidestav@ericsson.com |
| FGI | Cubie | wanchen.lin@fginnov.com |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Sutharshun | sutharshun.varatharaajan@iis.fraunhofer.de |
| Fujitsu | Jian | zhangjian1288@fujitsu.com |
| Futurewei | Zhigang | zrong@futurewei.com |
| Google | Alex | alexliou@google.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Keyvan | Keyvan.zarifi@huawei.com |
| Hyundai | Jeongsu Lee | Jeongsu.lee@hyundai.com |
| Intel | Avik | avik.sengupta@intel.com |
| InterDigital | Jonghyun | jonghyun.park@interdigital.com |
| Lenovo | Bingchao Liu | liubc2@lenovo.com |
| LG | Jaehoon | jhoon.chung@lge.com |
| MediaTek | Darcy | darcy.tsai@mediatek.com |
| MediaTek | Rebecca | rebecca.chen@mediatek.com |
| NEC | Peng | guan\_peng@nec.cn |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yuki | yuki.matsumura@docomo-lab.com |
| NTT DOCOMO | Weiqi | sunwq@docomolabs-beijing.com.cn |
| OPPO | Jeffrey | caojianfei@oppo.com |
| Panasonic | Khalid | khalid.zeineddine@eu.panasonic.com |
| Qualcomm | Yan | yanzhou@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Samsung | Dalin | dalin.zhu@samsung.com |
| Sharp | Taka | fukui.takahisa@sharp.co.jp |
| Spreadtrum | Qiyishu Li | qiyishu.li@unisoc.com |
| vivo | Yang | songyang@vivo.com |
| Xiaomi | Mingju LI | limingju@xiaomi.com |
| ZTE | Bo | gao.bo1@ZTE.com.cn |
|  |  |  |

# Proposals to be discussed in the online session

# Discussion

# Issue 1 – General issue for unified TCI extension

Table 1-1 Summary for Issue 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ view and Recommended Proposal** |
| 1.1 | Support of inter-cell (M-DCI based) MTRP operation | **FL note: Based on Tdoc contributions to RAN1#112b [3]-[34], some companies prefer an explicit agreement to support the association between activated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and PCI(s) for inter-cell MTRP since current specification may be applicable only for legacy TCI framework. Thus, Proposal 2.5 is recommended as follows:****Proposal 1.1:** On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP, when the UE is configured with *SSB-MTC-AdditionalPCI*, the activated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) specific to one *coresetPoolIndex* value can be associated with the serving cell PCI and the activated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) specific to another *coresetPoolIndex* value can be associated with a PCI other than the serving cell PCI.**TS 38.214**If the UE is configured with *SSB-MTC-AddtionalPCI* and with PDCCH-Config that contains two different values of *coresetPoolIndex* in *ControlResourceSet*, the UE receives an activation command for CORESET associated with each *coresetPoolIndex*, as described in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to 8 TCI states to the codepoints of the DCI field 'Transmission Configuration Indication' in one CC/DL BWP. When a set of TCI state IDs are activated for a *coresetPoolIndex*, the activated TCI states corresponding to one *coresetPoolIndex* can be associated with one physical cell ID and activated TCI states corresponding to another *coresetPoolIndex* can be associated with another physical cell ID. |
| 1.2 | Support of inter-cell S-DCI based MTRP operation | Question 1: In Rel-18 unified TCI framework extension, whether to support inter-cell S-DCI based MTRP?* Yes: Samsung
* No: vivo, QC, CMCC, OPPO, Xiaomi, Google, Nokia, CMCC, ZTE, Spreadtrum
 |
| 1.3 | Common beam for PDCCH/PDSCH | Question 1: In Rel-17 unified TCI framework, it can be guaranteed that PDCCH and respective PDSCH follow the common beam for DL reception. In Rel-18 unified TCI framework extension, it is possible that PDCCH and respective PDSCH follow different beams for DL reception if they apply different indicated joint/DL TCI states. Then, whether specification should restrict that two indicated joint/DL TCI states must be associated with different TRPs, i.e., following different beams for PDCCH and PDSCH is only allowed for MTRP operation? If yes, proponents can elaborate more on how to enable the restriction.* Yes: Samsung
* No: Google
 |

Table 1-2 Company input for Issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | * Please input your comment to Proposal 1.1, if any.
* Please also update your preference on the question in Issue 1.2.
 |
| OPPO | **On Proposal 1.1**: In our reading of the current related spec as referred by FL, it seems the terminology, i.e. TCI state, can be understood as legacy and unified TCI states. It is also commonly and widely used for other parts in RAN1 spec (e.g. TS 38.214). Moreover, in higher layer spec (e.g. TS 38.331), both legacy and unified TCI state are configured as the same IE. From this sense, the captured spec seems sufficient and valid for the case of inter-cell M-DCI MTRP. Therefore, we believe no more progress needed. **On Issue 1.2**: No extension to the inter-cell S-DCI based MTRP. In our view, the inter-cell S-DCI based MTRP is a totally new feature which hasn’t been supported and specified in Rel.17 yet. Technically, the S-DCI implies the cross-cell DL scheduling that could bring some uncertainty when compared with M-DCI based MTRP.  |
| vivo | Proposal 1.1: Support.@OPPO: Current TS38.214 only considers the MAC CE in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], which doesn’t cover unified TCI states.Issue 1.2: We think supporting inter-cell S-DCI based MTRP is out of scope. Besides, we have an agreement in RAN1#109-e.**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, consider all the intra and inter-cell MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17* Consider, if STxMP is supported, Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP
 |
| QC | For Proposal 1.1, fineFor 1.2, prefer not to support to maintain legacy behavior on this |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1.1: supportProposal 1.2: not support since it is not supported in Rel-16/Rel-17. |
| Mod V05 | Add Issue 1.3 per request, please check. |
| Google | **Proposal 1.1:** Support**Issue 1.2:** This should be deprioritized since it is not supported in legacy. At this stage, we should focus on more essential topics. **Issue 1.3**: No. We don’t see the critical reason to have such restriction.  |
| Nokia | **Proposal 1.1:** Fine1.2: Not to support.  |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.1**: Support**Issue 1.2**: To support inter-cell SDCI based MTRP operation, a TCI state mapped to a TCI codepoint needs to be associated to a PCI. This can already be supported by the current specifications such that a TCI state can be associated to a PCI by providing the additional PCI index in the TCI-State. Based on this, only some corresponding UE’s behaviors such as reception of dedicated/non-dedicated PDSCH and etc. under unified TCI framework need to be specified to make the framework complete, which can also be discussed together with inter-cell MDCI based MTRP operation to avoid duplicating efforts.**Issue 1.3**: This is an important issue, which needs to be addressed first. As pointed out by the FL, if the new [TCI selection field] is present for PDSCH reception, it has become possible that a UE can use two different beams for PDCCH and PDSCH receptions, which may result in the following two cases (assuming that a TCI codepoint corresponds to {TCI #1, TCI #2}):Case 1 (SDCI MTRP):* TCI #1 is for PDCCH Rx from TRP-1
* TCI #2 is for PDSCH Rx from TRP-2

Case 2 (STRP):* TCI #1 is for PDCCH Rx from TRP-1
* TCI #2 is for PDSCH Rx from TRP-1

Case 2 is definitely NOT the use case in Rel-18, and is not aligned with the common beam design principle under unified TCI framework. But without any restriction on the network side and also due to the lack of TRP identification/differentiation for SDCI, Case 2 has become possible with the current agreements made in 9.1.1.1 so far. To address this issue, we need to properly identify or differentiate TRPs for SDCI, and one simple way to do it is to configure per TRP resources such as RRC-level TRP-specific TCI state grouping. With this setting, the two indicated/applied TCI states can be respectively from the two TCI state groups, hence the two TRPs. |
| ZTE | Proposal 1.1: SupportQuestion 1: The motivation is unclear for us. Per WID, the inter-cell operation is dedicated to MDCI based mTRP operation. If something is incorrect, please feel free to correct it. |
| CMCC | Proposal 1.1: SupportQuestion 1: Not Support. Inter-cell S-DCI based MTRP has not been supported in Rel-17. |
| Apple  | Proposal 1.1: Support. Question 1 (Issue 1.2): We tend to agree with Samsung that the standard effort is limited to support sDCI-based inter-cell mTRP assuming TCI state framework for intra-cell mTRP is anyway to be specified and can be reused by sDCI inter-cell mTRP. On the other hand, prioritization the TCI framework extension for all existing scenario is explicitly written in WID and should be completed first. Hence, we support to deprioritize sDCI-based inter-cell mTRP at this moment and discuss it if time permits. Question 1 (Issue 1.3):We agree with Samsung that the objective is to extend unified TCI framework defined in Rel-17 from sTRP to mTRP and the Rel-17 unified TCI framework should be kept for a single TRP among the multiple TRPs. In this sense, PDCCH and PDSCH from a single TRP should follow a single DL/joint TCI-state as in Rel-17. On the other hand, the discussion point is whether we relax this and allow different TCI-states for PDCCHs and PDSCHs if the total number of DL TCI-states is still capped at ‘2’ at UE side.  |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 1.1:** Support.**Issue 1.2:** More studies are needed for inter-cell S-DCI based MTRP.**Issue 1.3:** Not support. In our view, such a restriction is unnecessary. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 1.1:** Support.**For issue 1.2**: Not support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1.1:** Support.Note: The text from 38.214 is misquoted. The correct quote is as follows:**TS 38.214**If the UE is configured with *SSB-MTC-AddtionalPCI* and with PDCCH-Config that contains two different values of *coresetPoolIndex* in *ControlResourceSet*, the UE receives an activation command for CORESET associated with each *coresetPoolIndex*, as described in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to 8 TCI states to the codepoints of the DCI field 'Transmission Configuration Indication' in one CC/DL BWP. When a set of TCI state IDs are activated for a *coresetPoolIndex*, the activated TCI states corresponding to one *coresetPoolIndex* ~~can be~~ is associated with ~~one~~ the serving cell physical cell ID and activated TCI states corresponding to another *coresetPoolIndex* can be associated with another physical cell ID.**Issue 1.2:** No. inter-cell S-DCI based MTRP is out of the scope as it is not supported in legacy releases.**Issue 1.3:** We don’t think it is a critical issue. A gNB is expected to indicate appropriate beam(s) for receiving PDCCH and PDSCH. If two different beams are indicated for receiving PDCCH and PDSCH, it wouldn’t change UE behavior whether they are from two different TRPs or the same TRP: UE should simply use the indicated beams to receive the corresponding channels. So, we are not convinced that indicating two different beams from the same TRP for PDCCH and PDSCH must be excluded.  |
| Sharp | Proposal 1.1: SupportIssue 1.2 Question 1: Not support |
| NEC | **Proposal 1.1:** Support.**Issue 1.2:** Seems out of scope.**Issue 1.3:** Support the intention to have common beam since that is why unified TCI is introduced. Restrictions like “UE does not expect different TCI states applied for PDCCH/PDSCH” could be introduced. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1.1: Support.Issue 1.2: Not support. Inter-cell MTRP is not supported in Rel-16/17, we don't konw why it should be supported in Rel-18. |
| CATT | Proposal 1.1: Support.Issue 1.2: Not support. This feature has not been specified in Rel-17, and more discussions are needed for the scheme.Issue 1.3: Not support. This restriction is not needed. |
| vivo2 | Issue 1.3: No, we don’t see any need to have such restriction.For S-DCI based MTRP, the design principle can be extended, i.e., any channels and RSs following the UTCI state including PDCCH, PDSCH, PUCCH, PUSCH, etc., can apply one or both of the two indicated TCI states, as long as the applied TCI state(s) is/are within the two indicated TCI states. Such an extension has its valid use case for DPS which has been supported in Rel-16. Besides, the previous agreements try to avoid explicitly separating the TCI states into groups. Actually, it’s up to network to indicate the TCI states belonging to same TRPs or different TRPs. At the UE side, there is no problem to apply either one for reception since the UE has tracked both indicated TCI states. |
| Docomo | Proposal 1.1: Support.Proposal 1.2: Not support. We think the inter-cell S-DCI based MTRP is a new feature from Rel.17.Proposal 1.2: We don’t think it is a critical issue. We haven’t introduced terminology of “TRP” into sDCI mTRP in spec. But, if the following Rel.16 behaviors are not precluded, we have no concern to discuss the restriction.* Either TRP1 or TRP2 can transmit PDCCH. The PDSCH can be mTRP PDSCH transmitted from both TRP1 and TRP2.
* Either TRP1 or TRP2 can transmit PDCCH. The PDSCH can be sTRP PDSCH transmitted from either TRP1 or TRP2.
 |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1.1: Do not support. This is unnecessary.Proposal 1.2: We should not put any effort to support this. On the other hand, we should not put any effort to forbid it. If the standard supports it without modification, we should not preclude it.Proposal 1.3: Do not see the motivation.   |

# Issue 2 – TCI state update and activation

Table 2-1 Summary for Issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ view and Recommended Proposal** |
| 2.1 | (S-DCI) Switching between STRP and MTRP based on the existing TCI field | Question 1: If the UE receives a TCI codepoint mapped with one single joint TCI state in a serving cell configured with joint DL/UL TCI mode, or receives a TCI codepoint mapped with one single DL and/or UL TCI state in a serving cell configured with separate DL/UL TCI mode, whether the UE shall switch to single-TRP operation in the serving cell?* Yes: vivo, Xiaomi, QC, Fujitsu
* No: ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, Docomo, CMCC, Apple, Sharp, NEC, LG, IDC, FGI, Futurewei, OPPO, Samsung, MediaTek, Spreadtrum

**FL note: Based on the feedback to Q1 in pre-RAN1#112b offline discussion [1] and Tdoc contributions to RAN1#112b [3]-[34], the following conclusion is recommended. Note that this issue has been discussed offline in several meetings and it seems the situation is still not changed in this meeting.****Conclusion 2.1**: On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP operation, there is no consensus to support dynamic switching between single-TRP operation and multi-TRP operation for channels/signals based on the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 |
| 2.2 | (S-DCI) Combinations of joint/DL/UL TCI states that can be mapped to a TCI codepoint of the existing TCI field, and corresponding UE behaviors | **FL note: Based on the previous RAN1 agreement, it should be able to use the existing TCI field to indicate joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) for one of the two TRPs or both TRPs. Thus, Proposal 2.2 is recommended accordingly. Regarding the FFS in this proposal, since there are different proposals (e.g., based on RRC, MAC-CE, or DCI) for indicating/determining that each activated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) is the 1st or 2nd joint/DL/UL TCI state(s), I suggest to leave the sub-issue for further discussion/study (please check Issue 2.3).** **Proposal 2.2:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP operation, support the followings:* For a serving cell configured with joint DL/UL TCI mode, a full-set or any sub-set of {first joint TCI state, second joint TCI state} can be mapped to a TCI codepoint of the existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 by TCI state activation command (MAC-CE)
* For a serving cell configured with separate DL/UL TCI mode, a full-set or any sub-set of {first DL TCI state, first UL TCI state, second DL TCI state, second UL TCI state} can be mapped to a TCI codepoint of the existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 by TCI state activation command (MAC-CE)
* The first/second indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) is updated according to the first/second joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) mapped to the TCI codepoint received by the UE
	+ If the UE receives a TCI codepoint mapped with a sub-set of {first joint TCI state, second joint TCI state} or {first DL TCI state, first UL TCI state, second DL TCI state, second UL TCI state}, the UE shall keep the current indicated first/second joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) not updated by the sub-set
* FFS: How to indicate/determine each activated joint/DL/UL TCI state in TCI state activation command (MAC-CE) corresponds to the first or second joint/DL/UL TCI state
 |
| 2.3 | (S-DCI) How to indicate/determine each activated joint/DL/UL TCI state in TCI state activation command (MAC-CE) corresponds to the first or second joint/DL/UL TCI state | Alt1: Using RRC-level TCI state grouping (i.e., separate the configured joint/DL/UL TCI states into two groups by RRC configuration), so that the UE can determine that each activated joint/DL/UL TCI state in TCI state activation command (MAC-CE) corresponds to the first or second joint/DL/UL TCI state based on RRC-level TCI state grouping* Support: Samsung, ZTE

Alt2: TCI state activation command (MAC-CE) should indicate that each activated joint/DL/UL TCI state in TCI state activation command (MAC-CE) corresponds to the first or second joint/DL/UL TCI state (detail on how to indicate above is up to RAN2 design)* Support: Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT, Futurewei, IDC, Intel, OPPO, Spreadtrum, TransHold, QC, vivo, Xiaomi, Google, Nokia, Sharp, NEC, Docomo

Alt3: Beam indication DCI should also indicate the activated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) mapped to the indicated TCI codepoint is the first or second joint/DL/UL TCI state(s)* Support: Apple, CMCC, NEC
 |
| 2.4 | Timeline to update the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) | Question 1: In Rel-18 unified TCI framework extension for MTRP operation, whether the Rel-17 timeline for updating the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) is retained, i.e., the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) applied to the DL reception or UL transmission is updated based on the Rel-17 beam application time?* Yes: Xiaomi, Google, Docomo, OPPO, IDC, QC, Apple, ZTE, Panasonic, Sharp, CEWiT, Huawei/HiSilicon, Fujitsu, NEC, LG, FGI, Futurewei, MediaTek
* No:

**FL note: Based on pre-RAN1#112b offline discussion [1] and Tdoc contributions to RAN1#112b [3]-[34], the following proposal is recommended:****Proposal 2.4**: On unified TCI framework extension, the Rel-17 timeline for updating the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) is retained, i.e., the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) applied to the DL reception or UL transmission in each slot is updated based on the Rel-17 beam application time |
| 2.5 | Common TCI state ID activation/update for a CC list comprised of a mix of STRP CC(s) and MTRP CC(s) | Question 1: Whether a CC list can be comprised of a mix of STRP CC(s) and MTRP CC(s)?* Yes: OPPO, Spreadtrum, IDC, Huawei/HiSilicon, Hyundai, Google, MediaTek, Docomo, vivo, CATT, LG, Fujitsu, Apple
* No: Xiaomi, QC, NEC, CMCC, ZTE, FGI

Question 2: Whether a CC list can be comprised of a mix of S-DCI based MTRP CC(s) and M-DCI based MTRP CC(s)?* Yes: OPPO, IDC, Huawei/HiSilicon, Hyundai, Google, Docomo, CATT, LG
* No: Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, QC, NEC, CMCC, ZTE, vivo, FGI, MediaTek, Apple

**FL note: Based on feedback to above two questions, more companies are supportive to a CC list including the mix of STRP CC(s) and MTRP CC(s), however, views on support a CC list including the mix of S-DCI based MTRP CC(s) and M-DCI based MTRP CC(s) are quite diverse. Based on above observations, the following proposal is recommended:****Proposal 2.5:** On unified TCI framework extension, support the followings for CA operation:* A CC list (*simultaneousTCI-UpdateListX*) for common TCI state ID activation/update can include CC(s) operating in STRP and CC(s) operating in S-DCI based MTRP
* A CC list (*simultaneousTCI-UpdateListX*) for common TCI state ID activation/update can include CC(s) operating in STRP and CC(s) operating in M-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: How to support common TCI state ID activation/update for above two cases

FFS: Whether/how to support a CC list (*simultaneousTCI-UpdateListX*) for common TCI state ID activation/update can include CC(s) operating in S-DCI based MTRP and CC(s) operating in M-DCI based MTRP |

Table 2-2 Company input for Issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | * Please input your comment to the recommended conclusion and proposals in Issue 2, if any.
* Please also update your preference on those alternatives or questions in Issue 2.1~2.5, if needed.
 |
| OPPO | **Conclusion 2.1**: We are in general fine with it. **Proposal 2.2**: Supportive. If conclusion 2.1 is acceptable, it says no dynamic switch between STRP and MTRP operation for channels/signals. As a consequence, the UE behavior on indicated all set or sub-set of joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) should follow the rules as listed in Proposal 2.2. UE updates the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and maintains the parts not in the indicated set for channel/signals under STRP or MTRP operation. **Issue 2.3**: On Alt.1, it seems the RRC based TCI state grouping conflicts the conclusion RAN1 made in RAN1#110bis-e, assuming the 1st and 2nd joint/DL/UL TCI states refers to 1st and 2nd TRP respectively. **Conclusion**On unified TCI framework extension in Rel-18, there is no consensus to support separate RRC-configured TCI state list(s) for each of TRPs.On Alt.2, the MAC CE based approach aligns with legacy design of TCI state activation in Rel.16. And there seems no issue to reuse it for unified TCI states.On Alt.3, this approach requires large TCI field extension. For example, assuming one separate DL/UL TCI state indicated, it needs at least 2 additional bits to be associated with it. These 2 bits should express the indicated TCI state is 1st DL TCI state, 1st UL TCI state, 2nd UL TCI state or 2nd UL TCI state. **Proposal 2.4**: Support.**Proposal 2.5**: Supportive. For instance, the PDSCH on a CC can be dynamically switched back to S-TRP by using the newly added [TCI selection field]. For flexibility and signalling overhead reduction, this CC should be allowed to be configured in the CC list, e.g. *simultaneousTCI-UpdateListX* with another CC operating under MTRP for PDSCH. If Proposal 2.5 is not agreeable, then the above case is unfortunately not allowed in our understanding.  |
| vivo | Conclusion 2.1: We think dynamic switching the entire system to legacy Rel-17 STRP operation is critical. Other-wise, a lot of RRC reconfiguration signaling per channel/RS may be needed. Considering companies’ preference, can we have the following compromised proposal based on Proposal 2.2?**Updated Proposal 2.2:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP operation, support the followings:* For a serving cell configured with joint DL/UL TCI mode, a full-set or any sub-set of {first joint TCI state, second joint TCI state} can be mapped to a TCI codepoint of the existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 by TCI state activation command (MAC-CE)
* For a serving cell configured with separate DL/UL TCI mode, a full-set or any sub-set of {first DL TCI state, first UL TCI state, second DL TCI state, second UL TCI state} can be mapped to a TCI codepoint of the existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 by TCI state activation command (MAC-CE)
* If the UE receives a TCI codepoint mapped with one single joint TCI state in a serving cell configured with joint DL/UL TCI mode, or receives a TCI codepoint mapped with one single DL and/or UL TCI state in a serving cell configured with separate DL/UL TCI mode, the UE can keep or release the current indicated first/second joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) not updated by the sub-set
	+ If the current indicated first/second joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) not updated by the sub-set is/are kept by UE, the first/second indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) is updated according to the first/second joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) mapped to the TCI codepoint received by the UE
	+ ~~If the UE receives a TCI codepoint mapped with a sub-set of {first joint TCI state, second joint TCI state} or {first DL TCI state, first UL TCI state, second DL TCI state, second UL TCI state}, the UE shall keep the current indicated first/second joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) not updated by the sub-set~~
* FFS: How to indicate/determine whether to keep or release other indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) not updated by the codepoint, and each activated joint/DL/UL TCI state in TCI state activation command (MAC-CE) corresponds to the first or second joint/DL/UL TCI state if other indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) not updated by the codepoint is to be kept

Proposal 2.3: We think Alt2, i.e., MAC CE, is more appropriate for the indication including whether to switch to STRP operation or not. Alt1, the RRC-level TCI state grouping for S-DCI based is not necessary. How to utilize beam indication DCI in Alt3 is not clear to us.Proposal 2.4: Support.Proposal 2.5: Support. |
| QC | For Proposal 2.2, if it is supported, a natural way without RRC reconfig interruption is to use MAC-CE to switch sTRP/mTRP sticky mode? If so, we can accept Proposal 2.2 with MAC-CE switch as part of the proposalFor Conclusion 2.1, not support due to RRC reconfig interruptionFor Proposal 2.3, support Alt2For Proposal 2.4, supportFor Proposal 2.5, not support, unless the FFS rule is clear and simple. In our view, it is sufficient for the reference CC to always be a mTRP CC, and 1st indicated TCI is applied to sTRP CCs. However, we are fine to add a note to say “Mixed sTRP and mTRP CCs are not allowed in the same CC list if no consensus on above FFSs” |
| Xiaomi | Conclusion 2.1 and Proposal 2.2: In Rel-16/Rel-17, dynamic switching between Single-TRP operation and Multi-TRP operation is supported for each channel. Thus we slightly prefer to support it in Rel-18. And we suggest to comprise it by the updated text as below:“……the UE shall keep or release the current indicated first/second joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) not updated by the sub-set according to the UE capability”Issue 2.3: It can be discussed after conclusion 2.1 and proposal 2.2. For down-selection, we prefer Alt 2. Proposal 2.4: we are general fine with it. But we would like to clarify the motivation on the word “in each slot”. In my opinion, it can be removed. Proposal 2.5: We can support the second sub-bullet on STRP CC and M-DCI based MTRP. But for the first sub-bullet on the STRP CC and S-DCI based MTRP, we have a question that, if TCI state of only one TRP is activated for a codepoint of existing TCI field for S-DCI based MTRP CC, does it mean for some S-TRP CC, no TCI state is activated for that codepoint? E.g., * for S-DCI based MTRP CC, {000}=>{TCI#0, TCI#1} , {001}=>{TCI#3, --}, {011}=>{--,TCI#4}……
* so for STRP CC1, {000}=>{TCI#0} , {001}=>{TCI#3}, {011}=>{--}……
* and for STRP CC2, {000}=>{ TCI#1} , {001}=>{--}, {011}=>{TCI#4}……

It means with mixed STRP and S-DCI based MTRP CC grouping, either case 1 or case 2 will occur.* Case 1 is that, S-DCI MTRP CC can support some codepoint map to TCI state of only one TRP, but for some sTRP CCs, less than 8 TCI states will be activated.
* Case 2 is that, 8 TCI states for all sTRP CCs can be activated, but for S-DCI MTRP CCs, each codepoint must map to TCI states of two TRPs.

If without mixed STRP and S-DCI based MTRP CC grouping, in addition to case 1 and case 2, case 3 can be supported. But case 3 can’t be supported with mixed CC grouping.* Case 3 is that, 8 TCI states for all sTRP CCs can be activated. And for S-DCI MTRP CCs, some codepoint can map to TCI state of only one TRP.
 |
| Google | **Conclusion 2.1:** Support. In our understanding, this conclusion refers to switch of STRP operation and MTRP operation in the serving cell. If it’s now MTRP operation and the number of TCI states indicated by existing TCI field is two, dynamic switching of STRP transmission scheme and MTRP transmission scheme can be still performed for PDSCH and PUSCH via DCI field. **Proposal 2.2:** SupportIssue 2.3: We support Alt2, which is more straightforward and simple. Alt1 seems to be essentially separate RRC-configured TCI state list(s), which already concluded no consensus in RAN1#110b. **Proposal 2.4:** Support **Proposal 2.5:** Support. But one question on the FFS. If the FFS is supported, does it mean a CC list can possibly contain S-TRP, S-DCI M-TRP and M-DCI M-TRP? [Mod] Yes |
| Nokia | **Conclusion 2.1:** Ok**Proposal 2.2:** SupportIssue 2.3: Support Alt2.**Proposal 2.4:** Support**Proposal 2.5:** Support |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.2**: it is fine to first specify the TCI codepoint mapping, and then specify means to identify each activated joint/DL/UL TCI state in MAC CE being the first or second joint/DL/UL TCI state (issue 2.3). But it is not a correct discussion order to specify the TCI codepoint mapping first without specifying how the indicated TCI states of a TCI codepoint are associated to different TRPs (i.e., issue 1.3) – this has been the hanging issue since the first meeting. Regarding the corresponding UE behaviors of subset level TCI state update (i.e., the third bullet), we are generally fine.**Issue 2.3**: we are open to MAC CE or DCI based solution to identify an activated TCI state in the MAC CE as the first or second joint/DL/UL TCI state. To our understanding, the main intention of the RRC-level TRP specific TCI state grouping is not to identify an activated TCI state in the MAC CE as the first or second. As explained in our comments to issue 1.3, the main intention of introducing the RRC-level TRP specific TCI state grouping is to retain the common beam principle of unified TCI framework in Rel-18.**Proposal 2.4**: OK**Proposal 2.5**: not support. We do not see clear benefit nor emergency of supporting mixing STRP and MTRP CCs for TCI state update. It seems that it would only complicate things not simplifying them. |
| ZTE | **Conclusion 2.1**: Support**Proposal 2.2**: Support. **Issue 2.3**: Technically speaking, semi-static mapping between a TCI state and ‘a TRP’ should be assumed as a baseline. Otherwise, we have to experience that a TCI state may correspond to a first state in a codepoint, but then for another codepoint it can corresponds to another state. In other words, the dynamic update (in L1/L2 level) of mapping a TCI state to first/second state may be out of WID scope (like sTRP scenario). Therefore, we prefer Alt1.**Proposal 2.4**: Support. **Proposal 2.5**: After rethinking the companies’ feedback, we can understand the motivation of this proposal. For progress, we can agree with sTRP+S-DCI/M-DCI cases, but sTRP+S-DCI+M-DCI seems to be too complicated. |
| LG | Conclusion 2.1: SupportProposal 2.2: SupportProposal 2.4: SupportProposal 2.5: Support |
| CMCC | Conclusion 2.1: SupportProposal 2.2: Support.Issue 2.3: Support Alt3. If MAC CE indicates each activated joint TCI state in TCI state activation command corresponds to the 1st joint TCI state or 2nd joint TCI state, additional bits are needed for the indication depends on the number of TCI states for each codepoints, and the flexibility of TCI state activation is restricted compared to DCI indication. If DCI indicates the single joint TCI state in existing TCI field corresponds to the 1st joint TCI state or 2nd joint TCI state, the 2-bit [TCI selection field] can be further reused to indicate the mapping to not increased the DCI overhead.Proposal 2.4: Support.Proposal 2.5: Not support. If a CC list can be comprised of a mix of STRP CC(s) and MTRP CC(s), the freedom to transmit PDCCH/PDSCH from either of the TRP1 or TRP2 will be lost. For example, there are two mixed CC lists corresponding to TRP1 and TRP2: {mDCI CC1, STRP CC2} and {mDCI CC1, STRP CC3}. TCI state for CORESET pool 0 of mDCI CC1 is updated together with STRP CC2, and TCI state for CORESET pool 1 of mDCI CC1 is updated together with STRP CC3. STRP CC2 is always transmitted from TRP1, when CORESET pool 0 is associated to the CC list of {mDCI CC1, STRP CC2}, then the reference RS of TCI state for CORESET pool 0 must be from TRP1, and PDCCH and PDSCH associated to CORESET pool 0 will be ALWAYS transmitted from TRP1 and CANNOT transmitted from TRP2. |
| Apple  | **Conclusion 2.1:** Support **Proposal 2.2**: Ok for progress. **Proposal 2.3**: Our preference is Alt.3 to provide the best flexibility. We are also fine to go with Alt.2 if we can make progress on this issue. Compared to MAC-CE approach, Alt.3 allows NW to select which TCI-state pair to update when transmitting the DCI 1-1 and 1-2 at the cost of 1-bit signaling overhead. **Proposal 2.4**: Support. **Issue 2.5: adding our position for Q1 and Q2.** Our understanding is that for mix of sTRP CC and mTRP CC, NW will select two pairs of TCI-states targeting from mTRP CC. Then, one of these pairs will be used to update the TCI-states for sTRP CC. On Q2, different TCI-state update frameworks are specified for sDCI-based mTRP and mDCI-based mTRP. We did not find a way to update TCI-state of mDCI-based by using the indicated TCI-states from CC with sDCI-based mTRP and vice versa.  |
| Google2 | In addition to TCI activation/update in Proposal 2.5, we may also need to discuss/clarify reference TCI state list configuration. For example, if RRC-configured TCI state list is absent in *PDSCH-Config* for a MTRP CC, whether it can be referred to a RRC-configured TCI state list in a reference CC, which is a STRP CC, vice versa.  |
| Futurewei | **Conclusion 2.1:** Support.**Proposal 2.2:** Support.**Issue 2.3:** We prefer Alt2 (MAC-CE based approach). As pointed out by other companies, Alt1 is against the conclusion made in RAN1 #110b-e meeting that “there is no consensus to support separate RRC-configured TCI state list(s) for each of TRPs”. **Proposal 2.4:** Support.**Proposal 2.5:** Support. |
| Spreadtrum | **Conclusion 2.1**: Support**Proposal 2.2**: Support.**Proposal 2.4:** Support.**Proposal 2.5:** Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Conclusion 2.1:** Support.There should be a mechanism to switch between mTRP and sTRP though. We prefer a MAC-CE based mechanism (not RRC-based). **Proposal 2.2:** Support in principle. This is aligned with Conclusion 2.1 and Rel-17 behavior: In Rel-17, it is possible that only a DL (UL) uTCI is updated in which case UE keeps using the current UL (DL) uTCI. However, the sub-bullet to the third bullet may be misinterpreted. We suggest the following change:**[…]*** + If the UE receives a TCI codepoint mapped with a sub-set of {first joint TCI state, second joint TCI state} or {first DL TCI state, first UL TCI state, second DL TCI state, second UL TCI state}, the UE shall use the indicated ~~keep the current indicated first/second~~ joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) in the sub-set to update the corresponding applied joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and shall keep other applied joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) that are not updated by the received TCI codepoint ~~sub-set~~

 […]**Issue 2.3:** Support Alt2. Our understanding is that the conclusion brought to our attention by OPPO in fact precludes Alt1. Alt2 is more straightforward and can also be used to switch between mTRP and sTRP schemes. A MAC-CE based switching between sTRP and mTRP is much lighter and faster than a RRC-based switching.**Proposal 2.4:** Support. **Proposal 2.5:** Support. As discussed in details in R1-2302370 Section 2.3, supporting a mix of mTRP and sTRP CC groups include reduces the number of required CC lists and the signaling overhead of TCI configuration/activation/indication. As for the first FFS, this can be addressed using a simple rule. For instance, a mTRP CC may be configured in two CC groups and a sTRP CC in only one CC group. Let’s, as an example, assume that a sDCI-based mTRP CC1 is the reference CC for both *simultaneousTCI-UpdateListx* and *simultaneousTCI-UpdateListy* where (1<=x<y<=4). Then, the first joint (or pair of UL/DL) TCI state of CC1 applies to all sTRP CCs in *simultaneousTCI-UpdateListx* (the first group that CC1 is a member of) and the second joint (or pair of UL/DL) TCI state of CC1 applies to all sTRP CCs in *simultaneousTCI-UpdateListy* (the second gropu that CC1 is a member of). **@ Xiaomi:** Thanks for the analysis. We think the original intention of grouping CCs into CC lists is to reduce the number of beams that UE has to maintain for each TRP. If there is no CC list, UE has to maintain up to 8 activated beams for each CC. However, if multiple CCs are associated with the same TRP, in most practical scenarios, UE does not need to maintain 8 beams for each of those CCs as, in practice, the same beams are used to communicate with the TRP in all those CCs. In other words, CC grouping reduces the number of unique beams that UE needs to maintain from up to 8 per CC to up to 8 per TRP. With mixed CC grouping of mTRP and sTRP, UE can show exactly the same behavior: UE keeps 8 beams corresponding to each of TRP1 and TRP2. Then, for sTRP CCs, an activated beam corresponding to one of the TRP1 or TRP2 (whichever that corresponds to the sTRP CC) is applied and for mTRP CCs, one of the activated beams corresponding to each of the TRP1 and TRP2 is applied (totally two beams). In other words, in a mixed grouping, UE still maintains 8 beams per TRP although it may not maintain 8 beams per every sTRP CC within a group. We think that if the CC groups are restricted to sTRP CCs only and mTRP CCs only, then, the total number of maintained beams for each TRP can increase to up to 16. For instance, {TCI1,…,TCI8} are activated for sTRP CC with TRP1 and {(TCI9,TCIx1),…(TCI16,TCIx8)} are activated for mTRP CC with TRP1 and TRP2. Then, UE needs to maintain 16 beams corresponding to {TCI1,…,TCI16} for TRP1. This would be too complex for the UE and is not aligned with the legacy behavior.  |
| Sharp | Conclusion 2.1: We are fine with the conclusion.Proposal 2.2: SupportIssue 2.3: Support Alt 2.Proposal 2.4: SupportProposal 2.5: Support |
| NEC | **Conclusion 2.1**: OK, and we believe that newly introduced TCI selection field can do the job for PDSCH.**Proposal 2.2**: We think it should be discussed together with Issue 2.3, otherwise it is not complete.**Issue 2.3**: we are fine with Alt2 and Alt3, and added our position in the table.**Proposal 2.4:** Support.**Proposal 2.5:** OK. |
| Fujitsu | Conclusion 2.1: We think it is important to keep the option of switching according to number of indicated TCI states as in Rel-16.Proposal 2.2: Support. Issue 2.3: Alt2 is preferred.Proposal 2.4: Support.Proposal 2.5: Support. And one small correction to point out is that the CC list of unified TCI states is *simultaneousU-TCI-UpdateListX*, while *simultaneousTCI-UpdateListX* is for a legacy CC list. |
| CATT | Conclusion 2.1: Support.Proposal 2.2: Not support. This feature has not been specified in Rel-17, and more discussions are needed for the scheme.Issue 2.3: Not support. This restriction is not needed.Proposal 2.4: SupportProposal 2.5: Support |
| Docomo | **Conclusion 2.1:** Fine. We hope MAC CE can be used for switching between Rel.17 unified TCI state mode and Rel.18 unified TCI state mode, to avoid frequent RRC reconfiguration.**Proposal 2.2:** We should clarify whether “2nd joint/DL/UL TCI only” can be indicated or not, because it impacts MAC CE design. If we want to indicate “2nd joint/DL/UL TCI only”, MAC CE should have a field to indicate “1st or 2nd” for each TCI state ID. If we don’t need to indicate “2nd joint/DL/UL TCI only”, i.e. if one joint/DL/UL TCI is indicated, it means “1st joint/DL/UL TCI only”, MAC CE does not need to have no field of “1st or 2nd” per TCI state ID field.From our perspective, we think we don’t need to indicate “2nd joint/DL/UL TCI only”, to save MAC CE field size.**Issue 2.3**: We prefer Alt.2. If one TCI ID is indicated per a TCI codepoint, it means 1st TCI. If two TCI IDs are indicated per a TCI codepoint, it means 1st TCI and 2nd TCI.**Proposal 2.4**: Support to reuse Rel.17 BAT. However, we’d like to add smaller values than *timeDurationForQCL* as the threshold between DCI and PDSCH for the dynamic switching b/w sTRP and mTRP, especially, adding value less than 14 symbol for 120kHz SCS to enable self-slot scheduling with the dynamic indication.***Proposal 2.5***: Support. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Ericsson | Conclusion 2.1: SupportProposal 2.2: We would prefer not to allow this partial update, but this is the reasonable way to support the previous agreement, and it is an extension of the R17 rule, which becomes *really* messy in the mTRP case. Issue 2.3: Support Alt2, it’s the R17 way.Proposal 2.4: SupportProposal 2.5: Do not support as it’s written. The functionality is relevant, but I understand from my RAN2 colleagues there is much nicer way to capture this in RRC: as an index in each serving cell configuration. We propose to send an LS to RAN2 to describe the desired functionality. |

# Issue 3 – How to inform UE which indicated TCI state(s) that UE shall apply to target channel/signal

A plan for discussion in this meeting on the TCI selection scheme for each target channel/signal and remaining issues is provided in the following table, including both S-DCI and M-DCI based MTRP operation:

Table 3-0 Summary of TCI selection scheme for each target channel/signal in S-DCI/M-DCI based MTRP operation

|  |
| --- |
| **S-DCI based MTRP operation** |
| **Channel/signal** | **Conclusion** | **TCI selection scheme** |
| PDCCH | Yes | RRC configuration per CORESET (FFS: whether to reuse Rel-17 rule/parameter, discussed in Issue 3.1) |
| PDSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 if the [TCI selection field] is present in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 | Yes | [TCI selection field] in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (FFS: details including whether/how to use the codepoint “11”, RRC-configured per CORESET/BWP/cell, and the applying/mapping order if applies both, discussed in Issue 3.9) |
| PDSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 if the [TCI selection field] is not present in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 | No | Discussed in Issue 3.2 |
| PDSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0 (including DG and SPS) | No | Discussed in Issue 3.3 |
| PDSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 before threshold for the UE doesn’t support the capability of two default beams for S-DCI based MTRP in FR2 | No |  |
| PUSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 (including DG and Type2 CG) | Yes | The existing SRS resource set indicator in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 (FFS: behaviors for SDM and SFN based PUSCH Tx schemes for the codepoint "10" and/or “11”) |
| PUSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 0\_0 (including DG and Type2 CG) | No | Discussed in Issue 3.4 |
| Type1 CG-PUSCH | No | Discussed in Issue 3.5 |
| PUCCH | Yes | RRC configuration per PUCCH resource/resource group (FFS: the applying/mapping order if applies both) |
| AP CSI-RS for CSI/BM | No | Discussed in Issue 3.7 |
| SRS for CB/NCB/AS and AP SRS for BM | No | Discussed in Issue 3.8 |
| **M-DCI based MTRP operation** |
| **Channel/signal** | **Conclusion** | **TCI selection scheme** |
| PDCCH | Yes | According to *coresetPoolIndex* value |
| PDSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0/1\_1/1\_2 | Yes | According to *coresetPoolIndex* value corresponding to scheduling PDCCH |
| PUSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 0\_0/0\_1/0\_2 (including DG and Type2 CG) | Yes | According to *coresetPoolIndex* value corresponding to scheduling PDCCH |
| PUCCH | No | Discussed in Issue 3.6 |
| Type1 CG-PUSCH | No | To be discussed after RAN1 has decision on the adoption of Opt1 or Opt2 for PUCCH transmission (note: either Opt1 or Opt2 must be supported) |
| AP CSI-RS for CSI/BM | No |
| SRS for CB/NCB/AS and AP SRS for BM | No |

Table 3-2 Summary for Issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ view and Recommended Proposal** |
| 3.1 | (S-DCI) PDCCH, whether Rel-17 rule/parameter is reused when provide the RRC configuration for TCI selection | Question 1: Whether Rel-17 rule/parameter is reused when provide the RRC configuration to inform the TCI selection for PDCCH reception?* Yes: Huawei/HiSilicon, Xiaomi, Google, IDC, CMCC, ZTE, vivo, CATT, LG, Fujitsu, FGI, Fraunhofer. Spreadtrum, Samsung, Panasonic, Apple
* No: Docomo (not reuse *followUnifiedTCIstate*), QC (not reuse *followUnifiedTCIstate*)

**Proposal 3.1:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP:* If a CORESET other than a CORESET with index 0 is associated only with USS sets and/or Type3-PDCCH CSS sets, the CORESET is configured by RRC to apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state, the second indicated joint/DL TCI state, or both first and second indicated joint/DL TCI states to PDCCH reception on the CORESET
* If a CORESET other than a CORESET with index 0 is associated at least with CSS sets other than Type3-PDCCH CSS sets and *followUnifiedTCIstate* = 'enabled' is configured for the CORESET, the CORESET is configured by RRC to apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state, the second indicated joint/DL TCI state, or both first and second indicated joint/DL TCI states to PDCCH reception on the CORESET
* If a CORESET with index 0 is configured with *followUnifiedTCIstate* = 'enabled':
	+ If the CORESET is associated with SS#0 for Type 0/0A/2 CSS sets, the CORESET is configured by RRC to apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state or the second indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH reception on the CORESET
	+ Otherwise, the CORESET is configured by RRC to apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state, the second indicated joint/DL TCI state, or both first and second indicated joint/DL TCI states to PDCCH reception on the CORESET

**FL note: PLEASE note that this issue has been discussed in several meetings. If no consensus can be reached, we may conclude the status in this meeting.** |
| 3.2 | (S-DCI) PDSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 if the [TCI selection field] is not present in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 | Alt1: Using RRC configuration to inform that the UE shall apply the first one, the second one, or both of two indicated joint/DL TCI states to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception* Support: Apple, CEWiT, Docomo, MediaTek, FGI, Huawei, HiSilicon, ITRI, NEC, OPPO, Panasonic, Sharp, Samsung, TransHold

Alt2: The UE shall apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception* Support: CATT, OPPO, Spreadtrum, vivo

Alt3: The UE shall apply both indicated joint/DL TCI states to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception* Support: Docomo, Huawei, HiSilicon, Intel, NEC, Nokia, OPPO, Samsung, TCL, MTK, ZTE

Alt3A: The UE shall apply the same joint/DL TCI state(s) that is applied to the PDCCH reception with the scheduling/activation DCI to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception* Support: CMCC, Fraunhofer, Google

Alt4: Which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is/are applied to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception is determined according to the existing TCI field of the most recently applied beam indication DCI* Support: CEWiT, LG, Qualcomm

**FL note: Given that Alt1 is the majority view and some proponents of Alt3 also support Alt1, Proposal 3.2 is recommended.****Proposal 3.2:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, for PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 configured w/o the [TCI selection field], using RRC configuration to inform that the UE shall apply the first, the second, or both indicated joint/DL TCI states to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception |
| 3.3 | (S-DCI) PDSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0 (including DG and SPS) | Alt1: If the UE is configured with PDSCH-SFN/PDSCH-CJT, the UE shall apply both indicated joint/DL TCI states to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0. Otherwise, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0.* Support: CMCC, Docomo, Panasonic, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, Sharp

Alt2: The UE shall apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0.* Support: Huawei/HiSilicon, Fujitsu, Nokia, Qualcomm, vivo, OPPO, LG

Alt3: Using RRC configuration to inform that the TCI selection for PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0* Support: Ericsson, Docomo, OPPO, Apple , Sharp

Alt4: The UE shall apply the same joint/DL TCI state(s) that is applied to the PDCCH reception with the scheduling/activation DCI to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception* Support: Samsung, ZTE, Google, Spreadtrum, NEC

**FL note: It seems more discussions are needed for issue, please input your preference and view on this issue. Some companies prefer to have the same TCI selection scheme for Issue 3.2 and Issue 3.3.** |
| 3.4 | (S-DCI) PUSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 0\_0 (including DG and Type2 CG) | Alt1: The UE shall apply the first indicated joint/UL TCI state to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by DCI format 0\_0.* Support: Ericsson, Fujitsu, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek, Panasonic, Qualcomm, vivo, LG, ZTE (fine), Apple

Alt2: UE shall apply the joint/UL TCI state that is applied to the PUCCH resource with lowest ID to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by DCI format 0\_0.* Support: ~~ZTE~~, Google

**FL note: Given that Alt1 is the majority view, the following proposal is recommended:****Proposal 3.4:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/UL TCI state to PUSCH transmission(s) scheduled/activated by DCI format 0\_0 (including DG and Type2 CG) |
| 3.5 | (S-DCI) Type1 CG-PUSCH | Alt1: An RRC configuration is provided to a Type1 CG configuration to inform that the UE shall apply the first, the second, or both indicated joint/UL TCI states to the corresponding CG-PUSCH transmission* Support: Apple, CATT, Ericsson, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek, Nokia, Panasonic, Xiaomi, OPPO, Google, QC (fine), ZTE (fine), Sharp

Alt2: If two SRIs/TPMIs are provided to Type1 CG configuration, the UE shall apply both indicated joint/UL TCI states to the corresponding CG-PUSCH transmission. Otherwise, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/UL TCI state to the corresponding CG-PUSCH transmission.* Support: ~~Qualcomm~~

Alt3: No enhancement is needed for Type1 CG-PUSCH* Support: ~~ZTE~~

**FL note: Given that Alt1 is the majority view, the following proposal is recommended:****Proposal 3.5:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, an RRC configuration is provided to a Type1 CG configuration to inform that the UE shall apply the first, the second, or both indicated joint/UL TCI states to the corresponding CG-PUSCH transmission* If the first or the second indicated joint/UL TCI state is applied, the UE shall apply the first or the second indicated joint/UL TCI state to all PUSCH antenna port(s) of corresponding PUSCH transmission occasions(s)
* If both indicated joint/UL TCI states are applied, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/UL TCI state to the PUSCH transmission occasions(s) associated with the first SRS resource set for CB/NCB or to the PUSCH antenna port(s) corresponding to the SRS port(s) of the indicated SRS resource in the first SRS resource set for CB/NCB, and the second indicated joint/UL TCI state to the PUSCH transmission occasions(s) associated with the second SRS resource set for CB/NCB or to the PUSCH antenna port(s) corresponding to the SRS port(s) of the indicated SRS resource in the second SRS resource set for CB/NCB
 |
| 3.6 | (M-DCI) PUCCH | Opt1: A *coresetPoolIndex* value can be provided per PUCCH resource/resource group, and the UE shall apply the indicated joint/UL TCI state specific to the *coresetPoolIndex* value to the corresponding PUCCH transmission* Support: CATT, CMCC, Docomo, Fraunhofer, Fujitsu, Futurewei, Intel, Lenovo, TCL, Xiaomi, ZTE, OPPO, Spreadtrum

Opt2: An RRC configuration can be provided per PUCCH resource/resource group to inform that the UE shall apply the first or the second indicated joint/UL TCI state to the corresponding PUCCH transmission, where the first and the second indicated joint/DL TCI states correspond to the indicated joint/UL TCI states specific to *coresetPoolIndex* value 0 and value 1, respectively.* Support: Ericsson, Nokia, MediaTek, Panasonic, QC, Samsung, Spreadtrum, TransHold, LG, Google, NEC

Opt3: For a PUCCH transmission triggered by PDCCH on a CORESET when the UCI in the PUCCH transmission carries HARQ-ACK information only, the UE shall apply the indicated joint/UL TCI state specific to a *coresetPoolIndex* value to the PUCCH transmission, where the *coresetPoolIndex* value is determined from the one associated with the CORESET. Otherwise, either Opt1 or Opt2 is adopted.* Support: Apple (with Opt1), Futurewei (with Opt1), Huawei/HiSilicon (with Opt2), OPPO (with Opt1), Sharp, vivo

Opt4: For a PUCCH transmission with an LRR trigged for either the first BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,0}$) or the second BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,1}$) when the UE is provided only one or two *schedulingRequestID-BFR* configuration, the UE shall apply the indicated joint/UL TCI state specific to a *coresetPoolIndex* value to the PUCCH transmission, where the *coresetPoolIndex* value is 1 when the LRR is trigged for the first BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,0}$) and the *coresetPoolIndex* value is 0 when the LRR is trigged for the second BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,1}$). Otherwise, either Opt1 or Opt2 is adopted.* Support: Futurewei (with Opt1), Huawei/HiSilicon (with Opt2), vivo

**FL note: Proponents of Opt1 are slightly more than proponents of Opt2. Since these two alternatives achieve the same purpose, I would suggest to adopt at least Opt1 based on the current status. Also, the outcome (selection between Opt1 and Opt2) may impact the design for Type1 CG, AP CSI-RS, and SRS. Therefore, Proposal 3.6 is recommended. Note that Opt3 and Opt4 are not precluded by this proposal.****Proposal 3.6:** On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP, support at least Opt1 for PUCCH transmission, and Opt2 is not supported* Note: Opt3 and Opt4 are not precluded

Support: OPPO, vivo, QC, Xiaomi, ZTE, CMCCConcern: LG, Nokia, Samsung |
| 3.7 | (S-DCI) AP CSI-RS for CSI/BM | Alt1: For all CSI/BM cases, using RRC configuration to inform the TCI selection for an AP CSI-RS resource set* Support: ZTE, vivo (also for two Resource Groups for NCJT CSI), QC, Fujitsu, Sharp, Docomo, IDC, OPPO, Samsung, Intel, CATT, Ericsson, Nokia, Spreadtrum

Alt2: For special case(s), e.g., NCJT CSI and/or enhanced group-based beam report, using a fixed rule to determine the TCI selection for an AP CSI-RS resource set. For other CSI/BM cases, using RRC configuration to inform the TCI selection for an AP CSI-RS resource set.* Support: Huawei/HiSilicon, CMCC, Apple, LG, FGI, Futurewei

**FL note: Considering only there are 3 meetings remained, I would suggest to make down-selection from above two alternatives in this meeting instead of just listing/agreeing on the alternatives. Based on pre-RAN1#112b offline discussion [1] and Tdoc contributions to RAN1#112b [3]-[34], # of proponents to above two alternatives are quite closed.** * **According to comments from proponents of Alt2, one major concern on Alt1 is it may not be able to properly support two beams applying to an AP CSI-RS resource set configured for NCJT CSI with two Resource Groups, which are associated with different TRPs, respectively.**
* **According to comments from proponents of Alt1, the issue from NCJT CSI can be resolved by providing qcl-info to AP CSI-RS resource set, i.e., each CSI-RS resource in the AP CSI-RS resource set is RRC-configured with a joint/DL TCI state instead of following the indicted joint/DL TCI state. However, additional signaling and inflexibility can be seen in order to align the beams used for PDSCH and NCJT CSI.**
* **According to comments from proponents of Alt1, there is no issue from enhanced group-based reporting since NW can properly assign different indicated joint/DL TCI states to the two CMR sets by Alt1.**

**Based on above observations, one potential compromise proposal between Alt1 and Alt2 is recommended as follows:****Proposal 3.7:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, if an aperiodic CSI-RS resource set for CSI/BM is configured to follow unified TCI state, an RRC configuration can be provided in *CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo* of *CSI-AperiodicTrigger State* for the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set to inform that the UE shall apply the first or the second indicated joint/DL TCI state to the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set* For an aperiodic CSI-RS resource set configured with two Resource Groups for NCJT CSI and configured to follow unified TCI state, if above RRC configuration is not provided to the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state to the CSI-RS resource(s) in Group 1 and the second indicated joint/DL TCI state to the CSI-RS resource(s) in Group 2.
 |
| 3.8 | (S-DCI) SRS for CB/NCB/AS and AP SRS for BM | Opt1: For a P/SP/AP SRS resource set for CB/NCB/AS or an AP SRS resource set for BM, if the SRS resource set is configured to follow unified TCI state, using RRC configuration to inform the TCI selection for the SRS resource setOpt2: If two SRS resource sets for CB/NCB are configured, and if the two SRS resource sets for CB/NCB are configured to follow unified TCI state, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/UL TCI state to the first SRS resource set for CB/NCB (the one with lower resource set ID) and the second indicated joint/UL TCI state to second SRS resource set for CB/NCB. Otherwise, Opt1 is adopted.Support Opt1 only: Apple, Ericsson, Qualcomm, vivo, Google, ZTESupport Opt1+Opt2: Huawei/HiSilicon, OPPO, Panasonic, Xiaomi, CMCC, Docomo**FL note: More discussions are needed for issue, please input your preference and view on this issue.** |
| 3.9 | (S-DCI) PDSCH scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2, details of the [TCI selection field] in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 | Question 1: Whether to use the codepoint “11” of the [TCI selection field]?* Yes: CMCC, FGI, LGE, Spreadtrum, vivo, ZTE, Docomo (for TDM)
* No (reserved): ITRI, Samsung, OPPO, QC, Xiaomi, Nokia, Sharp Docomo (for SDM/SFN)

**FL note: The outcome of Q1 may impact the design of applying/mapping order of two indicated joint/DL TCI states if both are applied, e.g., Rel-16 rules is reused, or the order can be changed according to the codepoints “10” and “11”**Question 2: Presence of the [TCI selection field] is RRC-configured per CORESET, per BWP, per serving cell, or others?* Per CORESET: CMCC, ZTE
* Per BWP: vivo (per DCI format 1\_1/1\_2), QC, Xiaomi, Nokia, Docomo
* Per CC:
* Others:
 |
| 3.10 | How to handle the case that the spatial Tx filter(s) determined from the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) applied to a PUSCH transmission is different from the spatial Tx filter(s) used for the SRS transmission corresponding to the SRS resource(s) indicated to the PUSCH transmission | Alt1: The UE uses the spatial Tx filter(s) determined from the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) applied to the PUSCH transmission in this case* Support: ZTE, vivo (meaning no special handing in spec), MTK

Alt2: The UE uses the spatial Tx filter(s) used for the SRS transmission corresponding to the SRS resource(s) indicated to the PUSCH transmission in this case, i.e., the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) for the PUSCH transmission is ignored* Support: ZTE, NEC

Alt3: The case can be avoided by NW implementation, i.e., no special handing in specification to this case is needed* Support: Docomo, Huawei/HiSilicon, OPPO, Spreadtrum, QC, CMCC, Xiaomi, Google, Apple, Sharp
* Concern: ZTE

**FL note: More discussions are needed for issue, please input your preference on above alternatives.** |

Table 3-3 Company input for Issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | * Please update your preference and share your view on those issues in Issue 3, especially Issue 3.3, 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10, which require more discussions and input. Recommended proposals for Issue 3.3, 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10 will be provided according to more input from companies later.
* Please input your comment to the recommended proposals in Issue 3, if any.
 |
| OPPO | **Question 1**: We see no problem to reuse the Rel.17 RRC parameter *followUnifiedTCIstate* as a flag based on which additional RRC configuration can signal to follow 1st, 2nd or both for a CORESET. Of course, it could be up to RAN2 to have a more compact RRC parameter, which controls UE behavior on applying 1st, 2nd, both or none of indicated DL/joint TCI state(s). We are fine either way.**Proposal 3.2**: Supportive. Since the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 configured w/o the [TCI selection field], it implies NW doesn’t want to conduct dynamic TRP switch. As in Alt4, UE has to follow the most recently applied TCI state(s). It may force UE to switch between TRPs or between S-TRP and M-TRP. Hence, we prefer more static fashion as in Alt.1, Alt.2 or Alt.3. **Issue 3.3**: Our multiple preferences added. **Proposal 3.4**: Fine.**Proposal 3.5**: Slightly prefer Alt.1 and thus fine with this proposal.**Proposal 3.6**: Supportive. If we are not going to pick up one from Opt.3 and Opt.4, we are also fine with Opt.1. **Proposal 3.7**: It seems a fair enough compromise in the middle ground.**Q1 of Issue 3.9**: No, the codepoint “11” can be reserved. At least for PDSCH fully or partially overlapped in time domain (e.g. PDSCH SFN, PDSCH SDM), the order of PDSCH seems invalid. |
| vivo | Proposal 3.1: Support.Proposal 3.2: The RRC configuration makes it complicated. What if the RRC configuration informing the applied joint/DL TCI state(s) to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception is absent either? In our view, redundant configuration is not a good way to go. We still prefer Alt2.Proposal 3.3: Support Alt2 for non-SFN PDSCH. While PDSCH-SFN should be separately discussed, which may be dependent on whether dynamic switching between SFN and STRP for PDSCH is supported or not.Proposal 3.4: Support.Proposal 3.5: Support in principle. An FFS should be added as a sub-bullet:* FFS: indicated joint/UL TCI states application for SDM/SFN schemes for STxMP.

[Mod] I tried to capture the application to SDM/SFN by the application to “PUSCH antenna port” in the proposalProposal 3.6: Support. Agree with FL’s assessment on Opt1. We think Opt3 and Opt4 should also be supported.Proposal 3.7: For AP CSI-RS configured with two Resource Groups for NCJT CSI and configured to follow unified TCI state, a flexible configuration with different TCI state application orders for two Resource Groups is desired.**Updated Proposal 3.7:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, if an aperiodic CSI-RS resource set for CSI/BM is configured to follow unified TCI state, an RRC configuration can be provided in *CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo* of *CSI-AperiodicTrigger State* for the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set or Resource Group to inform that the UE shall apply the first or the second indicated joint/DL TCI state to the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set or Resource Group* ~~For an aperiodic CSI-RS resource set configured with two Resource Groups for NCJT CSI and configured to follow unified TCI state, if above RRC configuration is not provided to the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state to the CSI-RS resource(s) in Group 1 and the second indicated joint/DL TCI state to the CSI-RS resource(s) in Group 2.~~

Proposal 3.8: We think one SRS resource set shared between among TRPs can save the configuration of SRS resource sets for each individual TRP. Therefore, if the RRC configuration is not provided, the AP SRS can apply the indicated joint/UL TCI state corresponding to the indicated joint/DL TCI state applied to the CORESET carrying the triggering DCI at least for the case of only one SRS resource set for CB/NCB configured, which is the typical case for S-DCI based MTRP in Rel-16. Thus, Opt1 can be updated to:Opt1: For a P/SP/AP SRS resource set for CB/NCB/AS or an AP SRS resource set for BM, if the SRS resource set is configured to follow unified TCI state, using RRC configuration to inform the TCI selection for the SRS resource set. If the RRC configuration is not provided for AP SRS, the AP SRS shall apply the indicated joint/UL TCI state corresponding to the CORESET carrying the triggering DCI.Issue 3.9: Our preference on Q2 has been added.Issue 3.10: Alt1 should be the UE behavior and no special handling is spec is needed. We think the joint/UL TCI states for PUSCH and for latest SRS resource are unnecessarily to be same. |
| QC | For Proposal 3.1, fineFor Proposal 3.2, not support. Not clear why we need RRC to inform which TCI to use by default. Why not simply switch to sTRP mode if RRC wants to use 1 TCI? In our view, Alt4 is default as in current spec for application time if no consensusFor Proposal 3.4, supportFor Proposal 3.5, supportFor Proposal 3.6, supportFor Proposal 3.7, supportFor 3.9, Q1: prefer no use like legacy. Q2: prefer per BWPFor 3.10, prefer to leave to NW implementation |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 3.1: supportProposal 3.2: we prefer Alt 3 and we think RRC configuration is not needed.Proposal 3.3: Prefer Alt 1. Alt 2 can’t be used for UE configured with PDSCH-SFN and not support dynamic SFN. In addition, RRC in Alt 3 is not needed for default TCI state and for Alt 4 is not preferred since it is possible the scheduling PDCCH not follow unified TCI state. Proposal 3.4: support Proposal 3.5: support and fine with the FFS proposed by vivoProposal 3.6: support the proposal Proposal 3.7: supportProposal 3.8: at lease support Opt 1 and Opt 2 can be supported if no RRC configuration. Proposal 3.9: ‘no’ for Q1 and prefer ‘per BWP’ for Q2Proposal 3.10: prefer Alt 3 |
| Google | **Proposal 3.2:** We support Alt3A. Our position seems to be wrongly captured. We should not introduce different behavior from the legacy, which results in further effort on discussion and SPEC change. **Proposal 3.3:** We support Alt4 such that default beams on PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 without [TCI selection field] and DCI format 1\_0 are the same, which is similar to legacy. **Proposal 3.4:** We support Alt2 to follow similar way in legacy. **Proposal 3.5:** Alt1. **Proposal 3.6:** Opt2. **Proposal 3.8:** Support Opt1. Opt 2 can also be achieved by Opt1. **Proposal 3.10:** Support Alt3.  |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 3.1:** Support**Proposal 3.2:** Not to support. If the UE is configured with the mTRP unified TCI framework, it’s expected that the UE is having two joint/DL TCI states. **Proposal 3.4:** Support**Proposal 3.5:** SupportOn 3.6: We agree that Option 1 and Option 2 would basically achieve same outcome, and their main difference is in the configuration of PUCCH resources/ resource groups, i.e., whether to rely on a direct association to CORESETPoolIndex or to configure follow first indicated TCI state or follow second indicated TCI state where the first and second indicated TCI states correspond to CORESETPoolIndex #0 and #1, respectively. However, since the concept of CORESETPoolIndex is more defined for DL, we think it would be better to support Option 2. Even more, Option 2 is in line with the option agreed for single-DCI case (see agreement copied below), so that configuration could also be used for the multi-DCI mode here.**Proposal 3.7:** SupportIssue 3.9: * Q1: For PDSCH no need.
* Q2: Per BWP

Issue 3.10: Alt3 |
| Samsung | Proposal 3.1: supportIssue 3.2 and Issue 3.3: we should strive to have a unified solution for both cases, which would avoid segmented designs between similar issues.Proposal 3.5: fineProposal 3.6: not support. CORESETPoolIndex is used/introduced for DL channels/signals, not sure why we need to link it to PUCCH transmission. A RRC configuration, i.e., Alt. 2, should be enough and aligned with MDCI case.Proposal 3.7: support in principle |
| ZTE | **Proposal 3.1:** Support**Proposal 3.2:** Unclear for us. As agreed in last meeting, we also need to split this proposal into two different categories, FR1&FR2 with scheduling offset > a threshold, and FR2 with scheduling offset < a threshold. If our understanding is correct, this proposal is just for the former, and the RRC is configured per CC/BWP rather than per CORESET, right? If so, we are still wondering why the RRC configuration is useful? Either way, if going with Alt3, we still can use MAC-CE to change the order of first/second TCI state(s).**Proposal 3.3:** For either FR1 and FR2, we still need to let the gNB to use DCI format 0\_0 for TRP-specific scheduling as legacy. If going with Alt2 or Alt3, the legacy procedure is precluded. We can NOT live with those. **Proposal 3.4:** For progress, we can live with majority companies’ views.**Proposal 3.5:** Again, we can compromise to the proposal 3.5, if having majority support. But, in our views, the remaining issue as mentioned in Issue 3.10 is still there.[Mod] Thanks for your flexibility.**Proposal 3.6:** Support. **Proposal 3.7:** Support the main bullet but not for first sub-bullet. For CSI acquisition, it may not be only relevant to the current transmission state, but also the subsequent TCI state to be switched. * + Therefore, it is also the reason why we may have more than 1 resource groups, i.e., several candidates of RS pairs for NCJT.
	+ Besides, for CJT, we may have up to 4 CSI-RS resources, do we need to provide another association rule of 2 TCI state(s) to 4 resource(s).

In our initial thought, we prefer to have a general solution (rather than being corresponding to a given case).**Proposal 3.8:** Support Opt1 only**Proposal 3.9:** Question-1: Support. It can be used for changing the order of two TCI state(s)Question-2: We prefer ‘per CORESET’ as what we did for TCI\_present\_In\_DCI.**Proposal 3.10:** It is quite confusing for us why this issue can be avoided by NW implementation. In typical case, we have periodic SRS for NCB/CB transmission (e.g., a periodicity of 10ms). Does it mean that the TCI state update should only be aligned with SRS transmission periodicity? If going like that, we fail to see the latency reduction of unified TCI framework.  |
| LG | **Proposal 3.1:** Support**Proposal 3.2:** Not support. From NW perspective, it is natural that a TRP that wants to update its serving beam is more likely to send DL traffic since, for the UE having no data to send or to receive, it is not urgent/critical to update a beam. If RRC configuration or pre-defined rule is adopted as Alt 1-3, the above is not or restrictively operated. As an exemplary scenario, the following figure is illustrated for better understanding which assumes PDSCH2 is scheduled by DCI2 from TRP#2. In this case, if pre-defined/configured rule is applied , it leads that both PDSCH1 and PDSCH2 needs to be received from a same set of TRP(s). **Figure. Example of the PDSCH beam applicability with DCI format 1\_1/1\_2**In this regard, Alt4 or Alt3A is better option. Between these two, we think thatAlt4 is better since Alt3A does not support heterogeneous deployment scenario that one specific TRP (e.g. a TRP with large coverage) serves as a TRP sending/receiving control info and another TRP (e.g. a TRP with small coverage) serves as a TRP sending/receiving data only.**Proposal 3.3:** Support Alt2**Proposal 3.4:** Support the proposal**Proposal 3.6:** Not support. It is not directly to use *coresetPoolIndex* in order to align design for both S-DCI MTRP and M-DCI MTRP, i.e. Opt2.**Proposal 3.7:** Fine  |
| CMCC | Proposal 3.1: SupportProposal 3.2: Support Alt3A to support dynamic switching between STRP1, STRP2 and MTRP transmission.Proposal 3.3: Support Alt1. For PDSCH-SFN or PDSCH-CJT, apply both first and second indicated joint/DL TCI states is aligned with the channel of PDSCH and improve channel estimation performance. For other cases, S-TRP transmission can be assumed for PDSCH reception, and whether 1st TRP or 2nd TRP is transmission can be left to gNB implementation depending on the 1st TCI state indication.Proposal 3.4: Support.Proposal 3.5: Support.Proposal 3.6: Support.Proposal 3.7: Support. If aperiodic CSI-RS is for enhanced group-based beam reporting or NCJT CSI measurement, the indicated joint/DL TCI state applied to the aperiodic CSI-RS is determined based on a fixed rule. For example, if two CSI-RS resource sets are configured, the first indicated TCI state or TCI state corresponding to TRP 0 can be applied to the RS set with lower ID and the second indicated TCI state or TCI state for TRP 1 can be applied to the other RS set.Proposal 3.8: Support Opt1+Opt2.Proposal 3.9-3.10: Add our preference in the table. |
| Apple  | **Proposal 3.1**: Support. Adding our position. **Proposal 3.2**: Support. **Proposal 3.3**: We prefer Alt.3 to specify a unified UE behavior for all PDSCH cases without ‘TCI selection’ field, regardless based on RRC configuration or fallback DCI scheduling. We do not see reason to define different UE behaviors for these two cases. **Proposal 3.4**: Alt.1 is fine. **Proposal 3.5**: Support. **Proposal 3.6**: Support. **Proposal 3.7**: Fine for progress. It is indeed a ‘arbitrary’ compromise to pick one from ‘group-based reporting’ and ‘NCJT’ case as both can apply a ‘fixed’ rule without need of configuration.  **Proposal 3.8**: Fine to continue discuss. **Proposal 3.9**: On Q2, our preference is to configure ‘per BWP’, which simplifies different aspects, e.g., DCI alignments and also is sufficient to achieve the design goal. **Proposal 3.10**: Alt.3 is preferred. This is aligned with Rel-17 design principle.  |
| Google2 | **Proposal 3.7:** We are not sure why we need additional RRC configuration to indicated TCI state for AP CSI-RS. Doesn’t *qcl-info* already serve the same purpose? On the other hand, if we really want to introduce such RRC configuration, it should be per resource, instead of per resource set.  |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 3.1:** Support in principle.**Proposal 3.2:** Support.**Issue 3.3:** We prefer Alt2.**Proposal 3.4:** Support.**Proposal 3.5:** Support.**Proposal 3.6:** Both Opt 3 and Opt 4 should also be supported as they are intended for scenarios where neither Opt 1 nor Opt 2 can work properly.**Proposal 3.7:** We are not sure how the main bullet can work for NCJT CSI case where different joint/DL TCI state associated with different TRP should be applied to each CSI-RS resource of a resource pair, respectively, within the same CSI-RS resource set. However, in the main bullet, all the CSI-RS resources of the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set will be applied a single (the first or the second) indicated joint/DL TCI state.**Issue 3.8:** We support Opt1+Opt2.**Issue 3.10:** We prefer Alt3. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 3.1**: Support**Proposal 3.2**: Support and prefer Alt2.**For issue 3.2**, the TCI selection filed is absent, how many and which indicated TCI state(s) is (are) selected for PDSCH needs to be determined. However, **for issue 3.3**, the TCI field does not exist, so the first question needs to be handled is how to determine the indicated TCI state(s), then, we need to discuss how many and which TCI should be applied. Thus, the same TCI selection scheme for issue 3.2 and 3.3 may not appropriate since the problems involved in issue 3.2 and 3.3 are not identical.Refer to the TS 38.213 the existing solution could be reused as much as possible: **Alt 1, Alt 4 are preferred.****Proposal 3.4:** Support the proposal**Proposal 3.5:** Support.**Proposal 3.6**: Support Opt2 or Opt 1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 3.1:** Support.As discussed in details in Section 2.2.1 of R1-2302370, the Rel-18 TCI selection parameter for CORESET needs to be configured in companion with the R17 parameter ‘*followUnifiedTCI-r17*’. Otherwise, when the transmission mode falls back from mTRP mode to sTRP mode, gNB needs to take the following two actions: * To Perform RRC reconfiguration to configure the Rel-17 RRC parameter *followUnifiedTCI-r17* to replace the Rel-18 TCI selection parameter;
* Use MAC-CE/DCI to indicate to the UE to apply only one TCI state.

Above two-step procedure may cause some problems:* RRC reconfiguration may introduce a large delay which is not efficient for the transmission mode switching.
* Above two actions may have different timelines. For example, as shown in the following figure, consider a scenario where the Rel-18 TCI selection parameter is set to ‘both’ (i.e., Rel-18 mTRP mode) prior to T1. At T1, network decides to inform the UE to fall back to the Rel-17 sTRP mode. For such a scenario, the application time of the TCI state indication (T2) may be earlier than the application time of the RRC reconfiguration (T3). Then, in the interval between T2 and T3, while only one TCI state is indicated via MAC-CE/DCI, the Rel-18 TCI selection parameter is still configured and set to ‘both’; causing an error case.

Since, anyway R17 parameter ‘*followUnifiedTCI-r17*’ is configured together with the Rel-18 TCI selection parameter, it can be used to indicate whether the CORESET should follow or not follow the unified TCI and the Rel-18 TCI selection parameter only need to indicate that the CORESET should follow the first/second/both of the two unified TCI.**Proposal 3.2:** Support**Issue 3.3:** Regarding Alt3: We don’t think Alt3 would work since DCI 1\_0 may be used when RRC configuration is not established. Regarding Alt4: This deviates from the legacy behavior at least for the case that *sfnSchemePdcch* set to 'sfnSchemeA' and *sfnSchemePdsch* is not configured:

|  |
| --- |
| 38.214, Clause 5.1.5For PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0, 1\_1, 1\_2, when a UE is configured with sfnSchemePdcch set to 'sfnSchemeA' and sfnSchemePdsch is not configured, and there is no TCI codepoint with two TCI states in the activation command, and if the time offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is equal or larger than the threshold timeDurationForQCL if applicable and the CORESET which schedules the PDSCH is indicated with two TCI states, the UE assumes that the TCI state or the QCL assumption for the PDSCH is identical to the first TCI state or QCL assumption which is applied for the CORESET used for the PDCCH transmission within the active BWP of the serving cell. |

We think Alt1 and Alt2 are more reasonable choices but even them seem to need some modifications. Alt2 does not consider the PDSCH-SFN (and PDSCH-CJT) scheduled by DCI 1\_0 for which two TCI states may be used:

|  |
| --- |
| 38.214 Clause 5.1.5When a UE is configured with both sfnSchemePdcch and sfnSchemePdsch scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 or by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2, if the time offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH of a serving cell is equal to or greater than a threshold timeDurationForQCL if applicable:- if the UE supports sfn-DefaultDL-BeamSetup-r17 for DCI scheduling without TCI field, the UE assumes that the TCI state(s) or the QCL assumption(s) for the PDSCH is identical to the TCI state(s) or QCL assumption(s) whichever is applied for the CORESET used for the reception of the DL DCI within the active BWP of the serving cell regardless of the number of active TCI states of the CORESET. If the UE does not support sfn-SchemeA-DynamicSwitching-r17 or sfn-SchemeB-DynamicSwitching-r17, the UE should be activated with the CORESET with two TCI states. - else if the UE does not support sfn-DefaultDL-BeamSetup-r17 for DCI scheduling without TCI field, the UE shall expect TCI field present when scheduled by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2. |

In turn, Alt 1 requires that PDSCH-SFN (and PDSCH-CJT) scheduled by DCI 1\_0 to apply two TCI states all the time. This also deviates from the legacy behavior for PDSCH-SFN scheduled by DCI 1\_0 (see the above excerpt from 38.214). We think a reasonable way forward would be the following:**Alt 2A:** The UE shall apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0 at least when the UE is not configured with PDSCH-SFN/PDSCH-CJT. * FFS: Applied TCI state(s) when the UE is configured with PDSCH-SFN/PDSCH-CJT

**Proposal 3.4:** Support**Proposal 3.5:** We think, at least at the moment, SDM/SFN cases cannot be simply captured by adding “the PUSCH antenna port(s) corresponding to the SRS port(s) of the indicated SRS resource in the first (second) SRS resource set for CB/NCB” to the last bullet of the proposal. There is a parallel discussion in 9.1.4.1 for the case of shared digital ports and, for this case, PUSCH antenna port(s) may only be a subset of the indicated SRS ports. Therefore, we think vivo’s suggestion is reasonable and suggest the following modification:**Proposal 3.5 (modified):** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, an RRC configuration is provided to a Type1 CG configuration to inform that the UE shall apply the first, the second, or both indicated joint/UL TCI states to the corresponding CG-PUSCH transmission* If the first or the second indicated joint/UL TCI state is applied, the UE shall apply the first or the second indicated joint/UL TCI state to all PUSCH antenna port(s) of corresponding PUSCH transmission occasions(s)
* If both indicated joint/UL TCI states are applied, for TDM based PUSCH Tx scheme, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/UL TCI state to the PUSCH transmission occasions(s) associated with the first SRS resource set for CB/NCB ~~or to the PUSCH antenna port(s) corresponding to the SRS port(s) of the indicated SRS resource in the first SRS resource set for CB/NCB,~~ and the second indicated joint/UL TCI state to the PUSCH transmission occasions(s) associated with the second SRS resource set for CB/NCB ~~or to the PUSCH antenna port(s) corresponding to the SRS port(s) of the indicated SRS resource in the second SRS resource set for CB/NCB~~
* FFS: indicated joint/UL TCI states application for STxMP based SDM/SFN schemes.

**Proposal 3.6**: Not support.Between Opt1 and Opt2, we have a strong preference towards 2. Note that, for sDCI case, we have already agreed to introduce an RRC parameter in PUCCH resource/group to indicate that the PUCCH resource/group should adopt the 1st/2nd/both joint/UL TCI states:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, use RRC configuration to inform that the UE shall apply the first one, the second one, or both of the indicated joint/UL TCI states to a PUCCH resource/group* Note: Detail of the RRC configuration is left to RAN2 design
 |

Opt 2 can reuse the same RRC parameter as in the sDCI case so that only one RRC parameter is configured in PUCCH resource/group for TCI selection. In turn, in Opt 1, the second RRC parameter *coresetPoolIndex* has to be introduced in PUCCH resource/group for the mDCI case. Since sDCI case and mDCI case will not occur simultaneously, including *coresetPoolIndex* in PUCCH resource/group is redundant.We support both Opt3 and Opt4 besides Opt2. In particular, regarding Opt4, for mTRP BFR case where only one PUCCH-SR is configured, the PUCCH-SR should be transmitted to the non-failed TRP. This cannot be realized by either Opt 1 or Opt 2 since gNB cannot know in advance that which TRP will fail, and thus cannot configure the PUCCH-SR to adopt the first or second joint/UL TCI state. While, such issue can be solved with Opt 4.**Proposal 3.7:** Not support in this form. The proposal needs modification. First, technically speaking, CSI-RS resource set is not “configured” to follow unified TCI state. Instead, the CSI-RS resources within the set may be configured with *qcl-info*. If *qcl-info* is not provided for the CSI-RS resources, then UE uses the unified TCI for the CSI-RS resources.Second, for Rel-17 group-based beam reporting, *CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo* is associated with two resource sets *resourceSet* and *resourceSet2-r17* where the two resource sets are transmitted from two TRPs.The way that Proposal 3.7 is currently written, one RRC parameter is provided in *CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo*. This means that, based on the current text of the proposal, for Rel-17 group-based beam reporting, both CSI-RS resource sets would follow the same indicated TCI state signaled by the RRC parameter. This would not be acceptable since the two resource sets are transmitted from two different TRPs.Third, even if the RRC parameter is configured per each CSI-RS resource set, still it would not be useful for the NCJT CSI measurement. For sDCI based NCJT CSI measurement, one or two resource pairs can be configured by *cmrGroupingAndPairing-r17* in a resource set where each resource pair includes two CSI-RS resources. Since the two CSI-RS resources are used for channel measurement of different TRPs, they should adopt different indicated joint/DL TCI states. In particular, if *qcl-info* is not provided for the CSI-RS resources of the resource set, the first and the second indicated joint/DL TCI state should be applied to the first and the second CSI-RS resources in the resource pair within the CSI-RS resource set, respectively.Based on the above explanation, we suggest the following: **Proposal 3.7 (modified):** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, if an aperiodic CSI-RS resource set for CSI/BM is not configured with *qcl-info* ~~configured to follow unified TCI state~~, an RRC configuration can be provided in *CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo* of *CSI-AperiodicTrigger State* for the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set to inform that the UE shall apply the first or the second indicated joint/DL TCI state to the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set* For an aperiodic CSI-RS resource set configured with two Resource Groups for NCJT CSI and not configured with *qcl-info* ~~configured to follow unified TCI state, if above RRC configuration is not provided to the aperiodic CSI-RS resource set~~, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/DL TCI state to the CSI-RS resource(s) in Group 1 and the second indicated joint/DL TCI state to the CSI-RS resource(s) in Group 2.
* When two aperiodic CSI-RS resource sets are associated with a *CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo*, the CSI-RS resources in the first resource set adopts the first indicated joint/DL TCI state, and the CSI-RS resources in the second resource set adopts the second indicated joint/DL TCI state.

**Issue 3.8:** We prefer Opt2.When two CB/NCB SRS resource sets are configured for TDM/SDM/SFN PUSCH and *followUnifiedTCI-StateSRS* is configured for the sets, UE should use the same indicated TCI state for the SRS resource set and the corresponding PUSCH. It means that one SRS resource set should apply first indicated TCI state and the other SRS resource set should apply the second indicated TCI state. So, even if we go with Opt1 for CB/NCB SRS, there should be an additional rule to ensure that the RRC parameter does not configure the same indicated TCI state for both CB/NCB SRS resource sets. Therefore, we think it is simpler to go with Opt2 altogether. Further, note that the RRC parameter that is introduced in Rel-18 would be optional and if we go with Opt2, RAN1 may need to specify a “default rule” for CB/NCB SRS when the RRC parameter is not configured. **Issue 3.9:****Question 1:** No. We have not identified an important application for “11” so far and prefer to keep it reserved for now. **Question 2:** We prefer to configure it per BWP.**Issue 3.10:** It seems that 38.214 has already precluded such a misalignment due to the following text:

|  |
| --- |
| **6.1.1.1 Codebook based UL transmission**[...]The UE shall transmit PUSCH using the same antenna port(s) as the SRS port(s) in the SRS resource indicated by the DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 or by configuredGrantConfig according to clause 6.1.2.3.[…]**6.1.1.2 Non-Codebook based UL transmission**[…]The UE shall transmit PUSCH using the same antenna ports as the SRS port(s) in the SRS resource(s) indicated by SRI(s) given by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 or by configuredGrantConfig according to clause 6.1.2.3, where the SRS port in (i+1)-th SRS resource in the SRS resource set is indexed as .[…] |

Above text simply says that PUSCH beam follows the corresponding SRS beam which is aligned with Alt2. We are also supportive of making a conclusion without spec impact and agree on Alt3.  |
| Sharp | Proposal 3.1: SupportProposal 3.2: SupportIssue 3.3: In our view, Alt 1 is simplest and reasonable, or we are fine with Alt 3 if Proposal 3.2 is agreed. Proposal 3.4: SupportProposal 3.5: SupportProposal 3.6: Support and prefer Opt 3 with Opt 1 to save PUCCH resources.Proposal 3.7: We are OK with the proposal.Issue 3.9 – Question 1: No, currently.Issue 3.10: We prefer Alt 3. Aperiodic SRS can be triggered, if needed. |
| NEC | **Proposal 3.2**: OK**Issue 3.3**, slightly prefer Alt 4 and added our position in the table**Proposal 3.5:** Support.**Issue 3.6**: Support Opt2 and added our position in the table**Issue 3.8**: Opt1 only can work.**Issue 3.9**: Q1: open to have it used; Q2: per CORESET**Issue 3.10:** slightly prefer Alt 2 and added our position in the table |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 3.1: Support.Proposal 3.2: In our view, Alt4 is more in line with current specs. Issue 3.3: Support Alt2 to keep the rule simple for fallback DCI.Proposal 3.4: Support.Proposal 3.5: Support.Proposal 3.6: Support.Issue 3.8: Opt1 is preferred. Both Opt1 and Opt2 could work, but Opt1 provides more flexibilities compared to Opt2 when two SRS resource set for CB/NCB are configured.Issue 3.9: Regrading Q1, no. We think the codepoint "11" should be reserved. |
| CATT | Proposal 3.1: supportProposal 3.2: we prefer Alt 2 since RRC configuration is not necessary.Issue 3.3: support Alt 2 as a unified solution for default beams is preferred. Proposal 3.4: support Proposal 3.5: supportProposal 3.6: support.Proposal 3.7: Fine for progress.Proposal 3.8: support Opt1 only, which is applicable to Opt2.Proposal 3.9: we prefer ‘per CORESET’ for Q2 as legacy TCI present in DCIProposal 3.10: support Alt 3 |
| Docomo | **Proposal 3.1:** After reading HW’s comments, we are fine to reuse R17 parameter. We assume additional R18 RRC parameter (Rel-18 TCI selection parameter) is introduced to indicate {1st, 2nd, both} per CORESET.**Proposal 3.2:** Support.**Proposal 3.3:** In Rel.17, if both SFN-CORSET/PDSCH are configured, DCI format 0\_1 can schedule SFN-PDSCH. We’d like to enable this Rel.17 behavior. We suggest to discuss the case both SFN-CORSET/PDSCH are configured and other cases separately.**Proposal 3.4:** Support.**Proposal 3.5:** Support.**Proposal 3.6:** Support.**Proposal 3.7:** Generally fine, but there is an issue of buffering for the reception of of A-CSI-RS triggering offset <threshold in FR2.Similar to PDSCH, UE may receive A-CSI-RS before finishing the DCI decoding of the triggering DCI. Hence, default QCL was defined for PDSCH/A-CSI-RS in Rel.17. In Rel.18, if all UEs buffer received signal with both indicated TCIs, it is fine that the triggering DCI selects 1st or 2nd indicated TCI. However, it was agreed that buffering of two indicated TCI states for PDSCH is optional UE capability, and if UE does not support the capability, it is not possible to select {1st, 2nd} indicated TCI by the triggering DCI. Hence, the proposal can be applied when the triggering offset > threshold or when UE supports the capability of buffering two indicated TCI states. If not, we need to discuss separately.**Issue3.8:** Support Opt1+Opt2.**Issue 3.9:** Q1:no need for SDM/SFN, but maybe benefitial for TDM, Q2: Per BWP**Issue 3.10:** support Alt.3, and we think there is no need to discuss. We think typical gNB implementation configures 1st indicated TCI to 1st SRS resource set and 2nd indicated TCI to 2nd SRS resource set. |
|  |  |
| Ericsson | Proposal 3.1: Do not support, not needed: the RRC parameter {first,second,both} must be there, and that replaces the functionality of *followUnifiedTCIstate*Proposal 3.2. SupportIssue 3.3: We prefer Alt3. It’s the same RRC parameter that we anyway use.Proposal 3.4: SupportProposal 3.5: SupportProposal 3.6: Do not support. We propose to exclude opt3 and opt4. We note that we have already selected opt2 for most of the sDCI cases, and it would be beneficial to build on these agreements.Proposal 3.7: Do not support. We would be fine to have the subbullet as FFS.Issue 3.8: Let’s agree on Opt1 first, we can further discuss optimizations.Issue 3.9: Q1: Somewhat strange question: if there is no use for ‘11’, then it will be reserved Issue 3.10: In our understanding, we already agreed on Alt1 – i.e., no additional handling. |

# Issue 4 – UL power control for UL MTRP operation

Table 4-1 Summary for Issue 4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ view and Recommended Proposal** |
| 4.1 | UL PC for S-DCI based STxMP (including SDM/SFN based PUSCH Tx and SFN based PUCCH Tx) | **FL note: In the last meeting, per-indicated-TCI PC parameter setting and PL-RS were agreed to be used for determining UL Tx power for MTRP operation. However, how to assume the UE-configured maximum output power for STxMP was left as FFS. According to the RAN4 LS reply on UE power limitation for STxMP [2], both per-UE and per-panel power limitation are feasible and should be applied to a same UE for STxMP. To meet/enable the per-panel power limitation, one question is raised as follows:** Question 1: At least for S-DCI based STxMP, whether to introduce per-panel/indicated-TCI UE-configured maximum output power, i.e., the UE shall determine UL Tx power per panel or per indicated joint/UL TCI state based on per-pane/indicated-TCI UE-configured maximum output power?* Yes: CATT, Docomo, Lenovo, LG, Panasonic, MediaTek, vivo, OPPO, QC, ZTE, LG, Xiaomi, Nokia (M-DCI also), Sharp
* No:

**FL note: For M-DCI based STxMP, per-panel power limitation can be enabled by the per-Tx-occasion UE-configured maximum output power in current spec.****TS 38.213**If a UE transmits a PUSCH on active UL BWP $b$ of carrier $f$ of serving cell $c$ using parameter set configuration with index $j$ and PUSCH power control adjustment state with index $l$, the UE determines the PUSCH transmission power $P\_{PUSCH,b,f,c}(i,j,q\_{d},l)$ in PUSCH transmission occasion $i$ as  |
| 4.2 | Power allocation for STxMP (including both S-DCI and M-DCI based STxMP) | **FL note: According to the RAN4 LS reply on UE power limitation for STxMP [2], both per-UE and per-panel power limitation are feasible and should be applied to a same UE for STxMP. To meet/enable the per-UE power limitation, one question is raised as follows:** Question 1: Whether prioritization for Tx power allocation/reduction is needed for STxMP so that the total UE Tx power for transmissions on serving cells in the frequency range wouldn’t exceed a total power limitation, e.g., $\hat{P}\_{CMAX}(i)$ used in TS 38.213 (clause 7.5) and defined in TS 38.101?* Yes: Nokia, MediaTek, Panasonic, ZTE, OPPO, QC, LG, Xiaomi, Apple, Sharp
* No: vivo (concern on the target condition)
 |

Table 4-2 Company input for Issue 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | Please update your preference on the two questions in Issue 4.1 and Issue 4.2, respectively. |
| OPPO | **Q1 of Issue 4.1**: Yes. **Q1 of Issue 4.2**: Yes.  |
| vivo | Issue 4.1: Yes.Issue 4.2: No. We don’t think total UE Tx power across multiple panels for simultaneous transmission on serving cells in the frequency range has a fixed relation with the total power limitation Pc,max. RAN4 focuses on per-UE measured peak EIRP Pumax rather than Pc,max, where Pumax is relevant to beam direction. We can’t assign Tx power, which doesn’t reflect any beam direction information, in per-panel level. If Tx power is allocated by restricting the total UE Tx power for transmissions less than the total power limitation, the actual measured peak EIRP may not reach Pumax. |
| QC | For 4.1 Q1: Yes. To FL, could you provide the spec section # on the per-Tx-occasion UE configured max power?For 4.2 Q1: Yes |
| Xiaomi | Issue 4.1: YesWe want to clarify that RAN4 only agreed that at least the current per UE power limitation which is defined based on regulation compliance should be considered for STxMP. In addition, a total power limitation over all panels, which is difference from the current per UE power limitation and power limitation per panel are feasible. But whether a total power limitation over all panels and per panel power limitation should be introduced is up to RAN1. Hence, both whether to introduce per-panel maximum output power and whether to introduce a total power limitation over all panels should be discussed in RAN1.Issue 4.2: YesBut for SDCI based STxMP, the data transmitted from these panels simultaneously belongs to the same PUSCH, then how to define the prioritization might be difficult. |
| Nokia/NSB | On 4.1: Yes. Also, we think that similar discussion would be also needed for the M-DCI case.On 4.2: Yes. |
| ZTE | For issue 4.1, we agree to have panel-specific maximum output power Pc,max. Sine the UE determines the UL Tx power based on the indicated joint/UL TCI state, calculating the transmission power for each panel separately based on the corresponding PC parameters and panel-specific Pc,max is a straightforward solution.For issue 4.2, we support to study prioritization for Tx power allocation/reduction for STxMP transmission. Regarding the relationship between the per-panel power limitation and per-UE power limitation, we prefer that the sum over all panels of the per-panel power limitation can be greater than the per-UE power limitation, which is beneficial for maximizing UL Tx transmission power. In this case, we have to handle the issue of exceeding the power limitation and study associated priority rules or power allocation/reduction mechanisms. For example, the calculated transmission power for each panel does not exceed the panel-specific power limitation, but the total calculated transmission power exceeds the power limitation for a power class, as shown in the i+2 occasion in the figure below. 绘图8 |
| LG | Issue 4.1: YesAs RAN4 mentioned, the concept of ‘panel’ has not been defined and then it needs to be clarified on the panel and the panel association for handling each assumption of UE power limitation. To this end, extending the usage of UE capability value index reporting introduced in Rel-17 can be the one of promising approaches.Issue 4.2: Yes |
| Apple  | **Issue 4.1:** Our understanding on RAN4 LS response is a bit different:

|  |
| --- |
| However, whether and how to introduce per-panel power limitation or similar concept and/or requirements in RAN4 is still under discussion. |

As highlighted above, the per-panel limitation is still FFS. There were similar discussions in the earlier releases on this regard and per-Panel limitation was not introduced by RAN4 so far. In brief, we are not sure whether RAN1 can decide to introduce per-panel maximum out power or not as it is being discussed in RAN4 as business as usual. **Issue 4.2**: We also think prioritization rule is needed in general.  |
| Google2 | **Issue 4.1** Question 1: Yes**Issue 4.2** Question 1: Yes |
| Spreadtrum | **Issue 4.1**:Support to have panel-specific maximum output power. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Issue 4.1:** We are OK to introduce per-panel UE-configured max output power.**Issue 4.2:** Yes. This is an important issue since RAN4 confirmed that “per-UE power limitation would be applicable at all the time”.  |
| NEC | **Issue 4.1:** Yes, and per-panel UE-configured max output power could be enough, not see the need of per-TCI max power.**Issue 4.2:** Yes. |
| CATT | Issue 4.1 Q1: YesIssue 4.2 Q1: Basically Yes. The detailed total power limitation value Pcmax need to be further studied to determine whether the original value in TS38.213(clause 7.5) can be reused.  |
| vivo2 | Issue 4.2: We are fine to study but the target condition is not correct in our mind, i.e., “the total UE Tx power for transmissions on serving cells in the frequency range wouldn’t exceed a total power limitation, e.g., P ̂\_CMAX (i) used in TS 38.213”. We have similar understanding as ZTE, i.e., the total UE Tx power for transmissions on serving cells in the frequency range can exceed the Pc,max. |
| Docomo | **Issue 4.1** Question 1: Yes. Even for M-DCI STxMP, we are not sure whether per panel UE power limitation can be enabled by per Tx occasion UE configured maximum output power. In current spec., transmission occasion is defined as: “*A PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS/PRACH transmission occasion* $i$ *is defined by a slot index* $n\_{s,f}^{μ}$ *within a frame with system frame number* $SFN$*, a first symbol* $S$ *within the slot, and a number of consecutive symbols* $L$.”. When two PUSCHs overlap in time, per panel UE power limitation may also need to be defined for M-DCI STxMP.**Issue 4.2** Question 1: Yes. We are fine to study this issue. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Ericsson | Issue 4.1: This is not our interpretation of the LS response. RAN4 may define per panel Pcmax, but before that, RAN1 should not go ahead and define anything.Issue 4.2: Leave to RAN4. RAN4 will – if there is a need – define per-panel Pcmax that will ensure that regulatory limits are fulfilled – that’s what RAN4 does. Before RAN4 comes back, specifying anything in RAN1 is premature. |

# Issue 5 – PDSCH-CJT Tx scheme

Table 5-1 Summary for Issue 5

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ view and Recommended Proposal** |
| 5.1 | Switching between PDSCH-CJT Tx scheme and other S-DCI based PDSCH Tx scheme(s) | **FL note: Based on pre-RAN1#112b offline discussion [1] and Tdoc contributions to RAN1#112b [3]-[34], Proposal 5.1 is recommended. Note that since this is not an essential issue in this AI, it is unlikely to treat it in the GTW discussion. I hope we can converge through the offline discussion.****Proposal 5.1:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, PDSCH-CJT Tx scheme is RRC-configured, and dynamic switching between PDSCH-CJT and other S-DCI based PDSCH Tx schemes is not supported* Support: Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSilicon, QC, Docomo, CMCC, Apple, Sharp, LG, IDC, FGI, Intel, Futurewei, OPPO, ZTE (okay if this is majority)
* Not support: ~~ZTE~~
 |
| 5.2 | QCL type(s)/assumption(s) if two indicated joint TCI states are applied to PDSCH-CJT | Alt1: PDSCH DMRS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of both indicated joint TCI states with respect to QCL-TypeA* Support: Huawei, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Ericsson, Xiaomi, CATT, Qualcomm, Nokia, Docomo, CMCC, Lenovo, NEC, LG, Intel, Samsung, Sharp
* Concern: ZTE

Alt2: PDSCH DMRS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of both indicated joint TCI states with respect to QCL-TypeA except for QCL parameters {Doppler shift, Doppler spread} of the second indicated joint TCI state* Support: Huawei, ZTE, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Qualcomm, Docomo, CMCC, Samsung
* Concern:

Alt3: PDSCH DMRS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RS of the first indicated joint TCI state with respect to QCL-TypeA and QCLed with the DL RS of the second indicated joint TCI state with respect to QCL-TypeB* Support: ZTE, Ericsson
* Concern: Huawei, QC, Samsung

**FL note: Based on feedback from companies, all the alternatives have their use cases. Thus, Proposal 5.2 is recommended. Note that since this is not an essential issue in this AI, it is unlikely to treat it in the GTW discussion. I hope we can converge through the offline discussion.****Proposal 5.2:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, the following three alternatives are supported for PDSCH-CJT applying both indicated joint TCI states (if the UE supports two indicated joint/DL states for PDSCH-CJT):* Alt1: PDSCH DMRS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of both indicated joint TCI states with respect to QCL-TypeA
* Alt2: PDSCH DMRS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of both indicated joint TCI states with respect to QCL-TypeA except for QCL parameters {Doppler shift, Doppler spread} of the second indicated joint TCI state
* Alt3: PDSCH DMRS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RS of the first indicated joint TCI state with respect to QCL-TypeA and QCLed with the DL RS of the second indicated joint TCI state with respect to QCL-TypeB

Introduce a UE capability on support each of above alternatives, and either one of above alternatives can be configured by RRC according to the UE capability |

Table 5-2 Company input for Issue 5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | * Please input your comment to Proposal 5.1 and Proposal 5.2, if any.
* Please also update your preference on those alternatives in Issue 5.2, if needed.
 |
| OPPO | **Proposal 5.1**: Fine. **Proposal 5.2**: Not supportive. For PDSCH-CJT at FR1, we think the TRP-specific time/freq. domain compensation lacks of validity, thus UE behavior on dropping certain QCL parameter is not necessary. QCL-TypeA would be enough to serve. We don’t need to specify different UE capability on this issue.  |
| QC | Proposal 5.1, supportProposal 5.2, not support. Alt3 has no evaluation.  |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 5.1: support |
| Google | **Proposal 5.1:** Support  |
| Nokia | **Proposal 5.1:** SupportIssue 5.2: Support Alt1. |
| ZTE | Proposal 5.1: Not our first preference. But we can live with that if having majority companies support.Proposal 5.2: As a compromise, we can live with that. In our contribution, we have the following evaluation results which proves that there may be significant performance benefits if having Alt2/3, compared with Alt1. Figure 1 UPT comparison in second TCI state: (a) Alt 2, i.e., with Doppler compensation vs Alt 1 w.r.t. QCL-TypeA, i.e., without any compensation (in a case of 0.025ppm per TRP); (b) Alt 2, i.e., only w.r.t. QCL-TypeB with delay compensation vs Alt 1 w.r.t. QCL-TypeA, i.e., without any compensation (for inter-site scenario) |
| LG | **Proposal 5.1**: Fine.  |
| CMCC | Proposal 5.1: SupportProposal 5.2: Support Alt1+Alt2. |
| Apple  | **Proposal 5.1**: Support.  |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 5.1:** Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 5.1:** Support**Proposal 5.2:** Support. We can accept all three alternatives to make progress. |
| Sharp | Proposal 5.1: Support |
| CATT | Proposal 5.1: SupportProposal 5.2: Support Alt1 |
| vivo | Proposal 5.1: Support. |
| Docomo | Proposal 5.1: OK.Proposal 5.2: OK. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 5.1: SupportProposal 5.2: Support. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Issue 6 – Beam failure recovery and beam reporting

Table 6-1 Summary for Issue 6

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ view and Recommended Proposal** |
| 6.1 | Implicit BFD-RS determination for S-DCI based MTRP | **Proposal 6.1:** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, if the UE is provided the first candidate beam RS list ($\overbar{q}\_{1,0}$) and the second candidate beam RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{1,1}$) but not explicitly provided the first BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,0}$) and the second BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,1}$) for TRP-specific BFR and if both first and second indicated joint/DL TCI states are configured by RRC to be applied to CORESETs for PDCCH reception, the UE determines the BFD-RS for the first and second BFD-RS sets from the first and second indicated joint/DL TCI states, respectively.* FFS: The case if any CORESET is configured to apply both first and second indicated joint/DL TCI states for PDCCH-SFN
* FFS: Whether and how to handle the case if one or both of the first and second indicated joint/DL TCI states is/are NOT configured by RRC to be applied to CORESET(s) for PDCCH reception

**Current TS 38.213 for link recovery procedures**If the UE is not provided $\overbar{q}\_{0,0}$ and $ \overbar{q}\_{0,1}$ for a BWP of the serving cell, the UE determines the set $\overbar{q}\_{0,0}$ and $ \overbar{q}\_{0,1}$ to include periodic CSI-RS resource configuration indexes with same values as the RS indexes in the RS sets indicated by TCI-State for first and second CORESETs that the UE uses for monitoring PDCCH, respectively, where the UE is provided twocoresetPoolIndex values 0 and 1 for the first and second CORESETs, or is not provided coresetPoolIndex value for the first CORESETs and is provided coresetPoolIndex value of 1 for the second CORESETs, respectively*.***FL note: This proposal was provided in the last meeting but no chance to discuss it online/offline, please input your comment to this proposal, if any. Note that since this is not an essential issue in this AI, it is unlikely to treat it in the GTW discussion. I hope we can converge through the offline discussion.** |
| 6.2 | Enhancement to beam update after NW response to TRP-specific BFR request | For M-DCI based MTPR, after NW response to TRP-specific BFR request to a BFD-RS set associated with a *coresetPoolIndex* value, QCL assumption/spatial Tx filter/PL-RS for channel(s)/signal(s) that applies the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state specific to the *coresetPoolIndex* value is updated according to the new beam (qnew) corresponding to the BFD-RS set.* Support: Docomo, CATT, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, OPPO
* Concern: Ericsson

**FL note: S-DCI based MTRP case can be discussed after there is a conclusion on Issue 6.1. Note that since this is not an essential issue in this AI, it is unlikely to treat it in the GTW discussion. I hope we can converge through the offline discussion.** |

Table 6-2 Company input for Issue 6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V00 | * Please input your comment to Proposal 6.1, if any.
* Please also update your preference on Issue 6.2, if needed.
 |
| OPPO | **Proposal 6.1**: Supportive.**Issue 6.2**: Support. This is to reset/update the new beam in the similar way as that in Rel.17 for S-TRP using unified TCI state.  |
| QC | Proposal 6.1, support |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 6.1: support Issue 6.2: support for M-DCI based MTRP at least. |
| Google | **Issue 6.2:** Support  |
| Samsung | Issue 6.1 and Issue 6.2: support in principle |
| ZTE | We support proposal 6.1.For issue 6.2, we support to further consider the SDCI based MTRP case. In general, once a given TRP fails, QCL assumption/spatial filter corresponding to DL/UL channel/RS associated with the same configured ID/coresetPoolIndex as the failed BFD-RS set should be updated according to the new identified beam q\_new. |
| LG | Proposal 6.1: Fine |
| Apple  | Proposal 6.1: Support. Proposal 6.2: Support. This is a simple extension of Rel-17 TRP-specific BFR to apply unified TCI framework.  |
| Google2 | **Proposal 6.1:** Since we are three meetings away from completing Rel-18, we turn to not support it. As mentioned by FL, this proposal is not quite essential. Without this proposal, BFD for S-DCI M-TRP can still work. In addition, FFS parts are critical for supporting this feature. Without clear ways to resolve them, we suggest deferring the discussion.  |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 6.1:** Support in principle. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 6.1:** Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 6.1:** Support |
| CATT | Proposal 6.1: SupportProposal 6.2: Support |
| vivo | Proposal 6.1: Support.Proposal 6.2: Support. |
| Docomo | We believe BFR is very essential for FR2 operation. Especially, if we don’t update indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state after BFR completion, gNB cannot update indicated TCI state by MAC CE/DCI, because UE received the MAC CE/DCI in old/failed beam, and BFR happens again. It means system does not work to us.Proposal 6.1: Support. Proposal 6.2: Support. We agree with ZTE to discuss sDCI mTRP case as well. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 6.1: SupportIssue 6.2: Indicated TCI states are handled by the NW. A statement saying that the UE uses the qnew until it receives an update from the NW would serve the same purpose. So this could be OK with a slight reformulation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Other issue

If there is any important issue not captured in the discussion of previous meetings, company can input to Table 7-1.

Table 7-1 Company inputs for other issue

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| ZTE | As agreed in RAN1#112, the maximum Tx power when the UE determines UL Tx power for the PUSCH/PUCCH transmission occasion(s) or antenna port(s) is to be discussed after receiving RAN4 reply on UE power limitation. Since RAN4 has provided their answers in R4-2303494, we prefer to prioritize the discussion about the following UL PC related issues for STxMP.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement:**On unified TCI framework extension, if an indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) applies to a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission occasion(s) or antenna port(s), the UE shall determine UL Tx power for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission occasion(s) or antenna port(s) based on the UL PC parameter setting for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS, if any, and the PL-RS included in the indicated joint/UL TCI state* FFS: For STxMP, the maximum Tx power when the UE determines UL Tx power for the PUSCH/PUCCH transmission occasion(s) or antenna port(s) (discussed after receiving RAN4 reply on UE power limitation for STxMP in FR2)
* FFS: Default UL PC parameter setting(s) if one or both of indicated joint/UL TCI states applied to PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission occasion(s) or antenna port(s) does/do not include the UL PC parameter setting(s) for PUCCH/PUSCH/SRS
 |

Additionally, according to RAN4 reply, both the per-panel power limitation and per-UE power limitation are feasible and shall be applied to a same UE. With both assumptions being applied, we need to further consider the cases of exceeding the power limitation for STxMP UL transmission, such as the sum of calculated transmission power for both two panels exceeds the per-UE power limitation, or the calculated transmission power of at least one panel exceeds the per-panel power limitation. Therefore, we suggest to add the following sub-bullet for further study.* FFS: power scaling/allocating mechanism in case of exceeding the power limitation for STxMP UL transmission
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | CC group-based TCI indication is a key issue of unified TCI framework since R17. This has been discussed in previous meetings without much progress. No matter mixed or separate CC grouping is supported in Rel-18 or not, CC group-based TCI indication should be discussed and supported in mTRP-based uTCI framework in Rel-18. Since there are only three remaining meetings, we suggest to prioritize it in this meeting.  |
| Docomo | Although, it is captured in the following agreement to study, we’d like to emphasize BFR is important in FR2 operation. After NW response of TRP specific BFR request, joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and TPC assumptions should be updated for both Single-DCI based and Multi-DCI based M-TRP. If not, after BFR completion, UE cannot receive PDCCH with new beam, and it gNB cannot update indicated TCI state by MAC CE/DCI.**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, study the following enhancements for TRP-specific BFR:* Implicit BFD-RS determination based on the indicated joint/DL TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP
* Enhancement to beam update after NW response to TRP-specific BFR request
 |
| FGI | Agree with HW that the discussion for CC group-based TCI indication has been pending for few meetings, so we could prioritize the discussion this meeting. |
| Intel | We need to have some agreements in place for switching between sDCI mTRP schemes since now, we use the new DCI indicator field for TCI state update. The legacy method of using the #TCI states and the #DMRS CDM groups will not work depending on how sTRP switching is handled. Good to prioritize and conclude on this issue along with Proposal 2.1[Mod] To my understanding to current agreements, the new DCI indicator field is used for TCI selection instead of TCI state update, and the new DCI indicator field can enable the dynamic switching between sTRP and mTRP.We are also open to discuss BFR issue highlighted by Docomo. |
| Samsung | TCI signaling enhancements for SDCI MTRP are needed. As we may end up of having fullset and numerous subset TCI states combinations, we see the need of increasing the maximum number of MAC CE activated TCI codepoint. Otherwise, the beam indication flexibility would be highly restricted. Then, method to support indicating more TCI codepoints in DCI without increasing the TCI field size and DCI payload can be specified. |

# Appendix: Agreements/conclusions before/in RAN1#112b-e

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#112b-e** |
| Hope we will have 10+ agreements here |
| **RAN1#112** |
| **Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, a 2-bit [TCI selection field] can be configured by RRC to be present in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 that schedules/activates PDSCH reception (including dynamic PDSCH and SPS PDSCH) according to the followings:* If the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 indicates codepoint "00" for the [TCI selection field], the UE shall apply the first one of two indicated joint/DL TCI states to all PDSCH DMRS port(s) of corresponding PDSCH transmission occasions(s) scheduled/activated by the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2
* If the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 indicates codepoint "01" for the [TCI selection field], the UE shall apply the second one of two indicated joint/DL TCI states to all PDSCH DMRS port(s) of corresponding PDSCH transmission occasions(s) scheduled/activated by the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2
* If the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 indicates codepoint "10" for the [TCI selection field], the UE shall apply both indicated joint/DL TCI states to the PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2
* FFS: Whether and how to use the codepoint "11" of the [TCI selection field]

If the UE is in FR1, or the UE supports the capability of two default beams for S-DCI based MTRP in FR2 regardless of threshold, above apply to PDSCH reception(s) scheduled/activated by the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2. * Note: If the UE supports the capability of two default beams for S-DCI based MTRP in FR2, UE uses both indicated joint/DL TCI states to buffer the received signal before a threshold.

If the UE doesn’t support the capability of two default beams for S-DCI based MTRP in FR2, above apply to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception when the offset between the reception of the scheduling DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 and the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception is equal to or larger than a threshold* FFS: How to apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception if the offset between the reception of the scheduling DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 and the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception is less than a threshold in FR2

FFS: Detail of the capability of two default beams for S-DCI based MTRP FFS: The threshold value**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, when two SRS resource sets for CB/NCB are configured, support the followings for PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 (including DG and Type2 CG):* If the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 indicates codepoint "00" for the existing SRS resource set indicator, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/UL TCI state to all PUSCH antenna port(s) of corresponding PUSCH transmission occasions(s)
* If the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 indicates codepoint "01" for the existing SRS resource set indicator, the UE shall apply the second indicated joint/UL TCI state to all PUSCH antenna port(s) of corresponding PUSCH transmission occasions(s)
* If the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 indicates codepoint "10" or “11” for the existing SRS resource set indicator:
	+ For TDM based PUSCH Tx scheme, the UE shall apply the first indicated joint/UL TCI state to the PUSCH transmission occasions(s) associated with the first SRS resource set for CB/NCB, and the second indicated joint/UL TCI state to the PUSCH transmission occasions(s) associated with the second SRS resource set for CB/NCB (note: the association between an SRS resource set for CB/NCB and PUSCH transmission occasions(s) is defined according to TS 38.214)
	+ FFS: SDM and SFN based PUSCH Tx schemes

FFS: The case that the spatial Tx filter(s) determined from the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) applied to a PUSCH transmission is different from the spatial Tx filter(s) used for the SRS transmission corresponding to the SRS resource(s) indicated to the PUSCH transmission**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, if an indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) applies to a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission occasion(s) or antenna port(s), the UE shall determine UL Tx power for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission occasion(s) or antenna port(s) based on the UL PC parameter setting for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS, if any, and the PL-RS included in the indicated joint/UL TCI state* FFS: For STxMP, the maximum Tx power when the UE determines UL Tx power for the PUSCH/PUCCH transmission occasion(s) or antenna port(s) (discussed after receiving RAN4 reply on UE power limitation for STxMP in FR2)
* FFS: Default UL PC parameter setting(s) if one or both of indicated joint/UL TCI states applied to PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission occasion(s) or antenna port(s) does/do not include the UL PC parameter setting(s) for PUCCH/PUSCH/SRS

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP, down-select from the following options for PUCCH transmission:* Opt1: A *coresetPoolIndex* value can be provided per PUCCH resource/resource group, and the UE shall apply the indicated joint/UL TCI state specific to the *coresetPoolIndex* value to the corresponding PUCCH transmission
* Opt2: An RRC configuration can be provided per PUCCH resource/resource group to inform that the UE shall apply the first or the second indicated joint/UL TCI state to the corresponding PUCCH transmission, where the first and the second indicated joint/DL TCI states correspond to the indicated joint/UL TCI states specific to *coresetPoolIndex* value 0 and value 1, respectively.
* Opt3: For a PUCCH transmission triggered by PDCCH on a CORESET when the UCI in the PUCCH transmission carries HARQ-ACK information only, the UE shall apply the indicated joint/UL TCI state specific to a *coresetPoolIndex* value to the PUCCH transmission, where the *coresetPoolIndex* value is determined from the one associated with the CORESET. Otherwise, either Opt1 or Opt2 is adopted.
	+ FFS: Whether Opt3 applies only when the UE is not provided with *ackNackFeedbackMode* = *joint*
* Opt4: For a PUCCH transmission with an LRR trigged for either the first BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,0}$) or the second BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,1}$) when the UE is provided only one or two *schedulingRequestID-BFR* configuration, the UE shall apply the indicated joint/UL TCI state specific to a *coresetPoolIndex* value to the PUCCH transmission, where the *coresetPoolIndex* value is 1 when the LRR is trigged for the first BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,0}$) and the *coresetPoolIndex* value is 0 when the LRR is trigged for the second BFD-RS set ($\overbar{q}\_{0,1}$). Otherwise, either Opt1 or Opt2 is adopted.

Note: Either Opt1 or Opt2 must be supported**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, down-select at least one of the followings for PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 configured w/o the [TCI selection field]:* Alt1: Using RRC configuration to inform that the UE shall apply the first one, the second one, or both of two indicated joint/DL TCI states to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception
* Alt2: The UE shall apply the first one of two indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception
* Alt3: The UE shall apply both of two indicated joint/DL TCI states to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception
* Alt3A: The UE shall apply the same joint/DL TCI state(s) that is applied to the PDCCH reception with the scheduling/activation DCI to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception
* Alt4: Which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is/are applied to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception is determined according to the existing TCI field of the most recently applied beam indication DCI

Above applies at least if the offset between the reception of the scheduling DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 and the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception is equal to or larger than a threshold (if the threshold is needed) |
| **RAN1#111** |
| **Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, in one beam indication instance, the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) can indicate joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) for one or both of the two TRPs in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list* FFS: Increase on the size of the TCI field
* Note: The term TRP is used only for discussion purpose in RAN1 and whether/how to capture this is FFS

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, a DCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 that schedules/activates PDSCH reception is used to determine which one or both of the indicated joint/DL TCI states shall be applied to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception* The presence of the DCI field is configurable by RRC; when the DCI field is not present in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2, the UE shall apply the default indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) to PDSCH reception
	+ FFS: Details on the default indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) to PDSCH reception
* FFS: The DCI field is a new indicator field or an existing field (e.g., the existing TCI field)
* FFS: Regardless the DCI field is present or not present, how to apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) to PDSCH reception if the offset between the reception of the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 and the corresponding PDSCH reception is less than a threshold

FFS: How to apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) to PDSCH reception scheduled/activated by DCI format 1\_0.Above applies for the case where PDSCHs scheduled by the same DCI.**Agreement** On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, use RRC configuration to inform that the UE shall apply the first one, the second one, or both of the indicated joint/UL TCI states to a PUCCH resource/group* Note: Detail of the RRC configuration is left to RAN2 design

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, PDSCH-CJT is supported as a S-DCI based MTRP schemeNote: Above does not preclude discussions specific to PDSCH-CJT design in the unified TCI framework**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, use an indicator field (could be reusing an existing DCI field or introducing a new DCI field) in the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to inform which joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by MAC-CE/DCI the UE shall apply to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, down-select at least one of the following alternatives for PDSCH-CJT applying both indicated joint TCI states (if the UE supports two indicated joint/DL states for PDSCH-CJT):* Alt1: PDSCH DMRS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of both indicated joint TCI states with respect to QCL-TypeA
* Alt2: PDSCH DMRS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RSs of both indicated joint TCI states with respect to QCL-TypeA except for QCL parameters {Doppler shift, Doppler spread} of the second indicated joint TCI state
* Alt3: PDSCH DMRS port(s) is QCLed with the DL RS of the first indicated joint TCI state with respect to QCL-TypeA and QCLed with the DL RS of the second indicated joint TCI state with respect to QCL-TypeB

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP, the same configuration/rule used in Rel-17 unified TCI framework (for determining whether the UE shall apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH on a CORESET and respective PDSCH) is reused to determine whether the UE shall apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state specific to a *coresetPoolIndex* value to PDCCH on a CORESET associated with the same *coresetPoolIndex* value and PDSCH scheduled/activated by the PDCCH.**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP, the UE shall apply the indicated joint/UL TCI state specific to a *coresetPoolIndex* value to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by PDCCH (including DG-PUSCH and Type2 CG-PUSCH) on a CORESET that is associated with the same *coresetPoolIndex* value**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, a new indicator field is supported as the DCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 that schedules/activates PDSCH reception to determine which one or both of the indicated joint/DL TCI states shall be applied to the scheduled/activated PDSCH reception* FFS: Detail design of the new indicator field
 |
| **RAN1#110b-e** |
| **Conclusion** On unified TCI framework extension in Rel-18, there is no consensus to support simultaneous configuration of both joint and separate DL/UL TCI modes in a serving cell**Conclusion**On unified TCI framework extension in Rel-18, there is no consensus to support separate RRC-configured TCI state list(s) for each of TRPs**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP:* The existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one *coresetPoolIndex* value can indicate the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) specific to the same *coresetPoolIndex* value
	+ FFS: The UE shall apply the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) specific to a *coresetPoolIndex* value to channel(s)/signal(s) that have explicit or implicit association with the same *coresetPoolIndex* value
* A *coresetPoolIndex* value field is included in TCI state activation command (MAC-CE) to indicate that the mapping between the activated TCI state(s) and the TCI codepoint(s) is specific to which *coresetPoolIndex* value

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE for PDCCH repetition, PDCCH-SFN, and PDCCH w/o repetition/SFN, support the following:* Use RRC configuration to inform that the UE shall apply the first one, the second one, both, or none of the joint/DL TCI states indicated by DCI/MAC-CE to a CORESET or a group of CORESETs (if CORESET group configuration is supported)

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP:* For a serving cell configured with joint DL/UL TCI mode, one joint TCI state can be mapped to a TCI codepoint of the existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment)
* For a serving cell configured with separate DL/UL TCI mode, a DL TCI state, an UL TCI state, or a pair of DL and UL TCI states can be mapped to a TCI codepoint of the existing TCI field in a DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment)

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, down-select one alternative from the followings in RAN1#111 for PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2:* Alt1: Use an indicator field (could be reusing an existing DCI field or introducing a new DCI field) in the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to inform which joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by MAC-CE/DCI the UE shall apply to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2
* Alt2: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 follows the spatial domain transmission filter(s) used for the SRS resource(s) indicated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2
	+ - FFS: PL-RS(s), and UL PC parameter setting(s) (including P0, alpha, and closed loop index) for the PUSCH

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, down-select one alternative from the followings in RAN1#111 for PUCCH transmission:* Alt1: Use RRC configuration to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) and a PUCCH resource/ group
* Alt2: Use RRC configuration to inform the association between a CORESET group and a PUCCH resource/group, and the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group applies to the PUCCH resource/group associated with the same CORESET group
* Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) and a PUCCH resource/group
* Note: the association indicates whether the UE shall apply the first one, the second one, or both of the joint/UL TCI states indicated by DCI/MAC-CE to a PUCCH resource/group

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, up to 2 joint TCI states can be indicated by MAC-CE/DCI and applied to CJT-based PDSCH reception (PDSCH-CJT) in a BWP/CC configured with joint DL/UL TCI mode* Support of 1 or 2 indicated joint TCI states for PDSCH-CJT is up to UE capability
* FFS: QCL type(s)/assumption(s) of the indicated joint TCI state(s) applied to PDSCH-CJT
* Note: On how to inform UE to apply which indicated joint TCI state(s) to target channel(s)/signal(s) in the BWP/CC, it is discussed individually in AI 9.1.1.1

**Agreement** On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP:* The UE shall apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state specific to a *coresetPoolIndex* value to PDCCH on a CORESET that is associated with the same *coresetPoolIndex* value
* The UE shall apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state specific to a *coresetPoolIndex* value to PDSCH scheduled/activated by PDCCH on a CORESET that is associated with the same *coresetPoolIndex* value
* FFS: Other channel(s)/signal(s) that has explicit or implicit association with a *coresetPoolIndex* value
* FFS: Other channel(s)/signal(s) that doesn’t have association with a *coresetPoolIndex* value

Above are applicable to the CORESET(s) that is configured/allowed to follow the indicated joint/DL TCI stateFFS: The configuration/rule to configure/allow CORESET(s) to follow the indicated joint/DL TCI state, including the option to reuse the same configuration/rule as in Rel-17 unified TCI framework**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, study the following enhancements for TRP-specific BFR:* Implicit BFD-RS determination based on the indicated joint/DL TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP
* Enhancement to beam update after NW response to TRP-specific BFR request

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, down-select one alternative from the followings in RAN1#111:* Alt1: In one beam indication instance, the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) can indicate joint/DL /UL TCI state(s) for one of the two TRPs or both TRPs in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list
* Alt2: In one beam indication instance, the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) can indicate joint/DL /UL TCI state(s) only specific to one of the two TRPs in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list
	+ Note: According to the agreement in RAN1#109-e, support of one additional TCI field or a field associating the TCI field to the TRP(s) is not precluded

Note: It has been agreed to use the existing TCI field for TCI state indication for S-DCI based MTRP in RAN1#109eNote: The term TRP is used only for discussion purpose in RAN1 and whether/how to capture this is FFSFFS: The behavior if the UE receives a beam indication DCI that indicates joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) for one TRP |
| **RAN1#110** |
| **Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, for the target use cases agreed in RAN1#109-e in AI 9.1.1.1, up to 4 TCI states can be indicated in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list to DL receptions and/or UL transmissions, where these TCI states are indicated/updated by MAC-CE/DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation* FFS: The possible combination(s) of joint/DL/UL TCI states that can be indicated to DL receptions and/or UL transmissions in a BWP/CC/TRP
* Note: This agreement does not imply that there will be more than 2 DL or UL or joint TCI states indicated in a CC/BWP for the target use cases agreed in RAN1#109-e in AI 9.1.1.1
* Note: The maximum number of TCI states that can be indicated to each of the target use cases agreed in RAN1#109-e in AI 9.1.1.1 is remained the same as in Rel-16/17

Note: The maximum number of TCI states that can be indicated simultaneously to CJT-based PDSCH reception and the required type(s) of TCI states (i.e., DL /UL/joint) are independently discussed in this AI**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE for PDCCH repetition, PDCCH-SFN, and PDCCH w/o repetition/SFN, down-selection at least one alternative from the followings:* Alt1-1: Use RRC parameter(s) in a CORESET configuration to inform the UE whether and/or which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) shall be applied to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on the CORESET
	+ FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE
* Alt1-2: Use an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is associated with each CORESET group
	+ FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the CORESET group(s)
	+ FFS: How to associate the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) with each CORESET group
	+ FFS: The UE applies the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) to a CORESET according to the CORESET group(s) the CORESET belongs to, or the UE applies the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group(s) in which the beam indication DCI is received to all PDCCH receptions
* Alt2: The association between a CORESET and the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) is determined based on a fixed rule, and the UE shall apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on the CORESET
	+ FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE
* Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the UE whether and/or which indicated joint/DL TCI state(s) shall be applied to the corresponding PDCCH receptions on a CORESET
	+ FFS: Whether only the CORESET(s) that always/can share the unified TCI state as defined in Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be associated with the joint/DL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE

Switching between multi-TRP and single TRP operation is not precluded**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, for PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, down-selection one alternative from the followings:* Alt1: Use an indicator field (could be reusing an existing DCI field or introducing a new DCI field) in a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to inform which joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by MAC-CE/DCI the UE shall apply to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2
* Alt2: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 follows the spatial domain transmission filter(s) used for the SRS resource(s) indicated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2
* Alt3: Use an RRC parameter in a CORESET configuration to inform that the CORESET belongs to which CORESET group(s), and the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) is associated with each CORESET group. When a scheduling/activation DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 is received in a CORESET group, the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group is applied to PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2
	+ FFS: Details of CORESET group(s)

FFS: PUSCH transmission scheduled/activated by a DCI format 0\_0 and Type-1 CG-PUSCH**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, to inform the association with joint/UL TCI state(s) indicated by DCI/MAC-CE for PUCCH transmission, down-selection at least one alternative from the followings:* Alt1: Use RRC configuration to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) and a PUCCH resource/ group
* Alt2: Use RRC configuration to inform the association between a CORESET group and a PUCCH resource/group, and the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) associated with the CORESET group applies to the PUCCH resource/group
* Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) and a PUCCH resource/group
* Alt4: Use DCI to inform the association between the indicated joint/UL TCI state(s) and a PUCCH resource/group
 |
| **RAN1#109e** |
| **Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, consider all the intra and inter-cell MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17* Consider, if STxMP is supported, Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension at least for single-DCI based MTRP, the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) can indicate multiple joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list* FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI state ID(s) to a TCI codepoint, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI state IDs that can be mapped to a TCI codepoint
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits
* Note: This doesn't imply that support of one additional TCI field or a field associating the TCI field to the TRP(s) is precluded

Note: The term TRP is used only for the purposes of discussions in RAN1 and whether/how to capture this is FFS**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for M-DCI based MTRP, consider the following alternatives for TCI state update:* Alt1: Reuse the same TCI state update scheme for S-DCI based MTRP
* Atl2: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) corresponding to the same *CORESETPoolIndex* value
* Alt3: Use the existing TCI field in any DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to indicate all joint/DL/UL TCI states corresponding to both *CORESETPoolIndex* values
	+ Study the association between the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value
* Alt4: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) corresponding to the same or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value.
	+ Study whether the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) applies to the channels/signals associated with the same *CORESETPoolIndex* value or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value is indicated by DCI

**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension for S-DCI based MTRP, consider at least the following alternatives to map/associate a joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH reception(s)* Atl1: Use RRC configuration to inform the mapping/association between a configured or indicated joint/DL TCI state and a CORESET or a CORESET group
* Alt2: Use RRC configuration to inform the mapping/association between a configured or indicated joint/DL TCI state and a search space set
* Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the mapping/association between an activated or indicated joint/DL TCI state and a CORESET or a CORESET group
* Alt4: Use DCI to inform the mapping/association between an indicated joint/DL TCI state and a CORESET or a CORESET group
* Alt5: Based on a fixed mapping/association rule, e.g., the first indicated joint/DL TCI state always applies to PDCCH receptions

Consider above alternatives for PDCCH repetition, PDCCH-SFN, PDCCH w/o repetition/SFN, and potential support of dynamic switching between S-TRP and M-TRP for PDCCH. It is not precluded to adopt one single alternative or multiple alternatives to support these cases.**Agreement**On unified TCI framework extension, if an indicated joint or UL TCI state applies to a PUSCH/PUCCH transmission occasion at least for S-DCI based PUSCH/PUCCH repetition with TDM and the indicated joint or UL TCI state is associated with an UL PC parameter setting for PUSCH/PUCCH (including P0, alpha for PUSCH, and closed loop index) and a PL-RS, the UE should apply the UL PC parameter setting and the PL-RS for the PUSCH /PUCCH transmission occasion.* FFS: How to extend to other Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP, if supported
* FFS: UL PC enhancement for CB and non-CB SRS in above case

FFS: The applied UL PC parameter setting if one or both indicated joint or UL TCI state(s) is not associated with an UL PC parameter setting (including P0, alpha for PUSCH, and closed loop index) for PUCCH/PUSCH**Agreement**On UE power limitation for STxMP for FR2, send LS to RAN4 to check the followings:* Whether it is feasible to assume power limitation per panel for STxMP (Assumption 1)
* Whether it is feasible to assume a total power limitation per UE over all UE panels used for STxMP (Assumption 2)
* In either of Assumption1 or Assumption 2, whether the total power limitation per UE over all UE panels used for STxMP or the sum of per-panel power limitation for STxMP can be different from (greater than) the existing power limitation for a given power class?
* If both Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 are feasible, whether both assumptions can be applied to a same UE, and what is the relationship between the per-panel power limitation and total power limitation if both are applied (e.g., the sum of per-panel power limitation can be larger than the total power limitation per UE, or should be always the same)?

FFS: Detail of exact LS if agreedNote: Scenarios of above include at least single carrier scenario for FR2Note: Above power limitation includes both total radiated power and EIRPLS to RAN4 is endorsed in R1-2205639. |
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