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# Introduction

[R2-2201560](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116bis-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2201560.zip) Running RRC CR for FeMIMO Rel-17 Ericsson draftCR Rel-17 38.331 16.7.0 NR\_feMIMO-Core Late

- has implemented all L1 parameter, except the one under discussion and with FFSes from R1.

* Review offline
* [AT116bis-e][052][feMIMO] RRC progress (Ericsson)

 Scope: a) Review R2-2201560, to be endorsed if possible, b) Continue R2-2200015, take agreements into account, attempt to progress further, take also into account R2-221xxxx c) Collect Questions for R1 in an LS out. Identify Open Issues.

 Intended outcome: Report, with agreements, CB points

 Deadline: CB points CB Mon W1, Otherwise EOM

RAN2#116 and 116bis agreements are listed in the appendix.

Note that BFD/BFR related parameters are not discussed here due to overlap with other AI(Samsung summary)

# 2 Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Ericsson | Helka-Liina Määttänen | Helka-liina.maattanen@ericsson.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | David Lecompte | david.lecompte@huawei.com |
| Intel | Youn Heo | Youn.hyoung.heo@intel.com |
| Xiaomi | Yumin Wu | wuyumin@xiaomi.com |
| OPPO | ZhongdaDu | duzhongda@oppo.com |
| Samsung | Seungri Jin | seungri.jin@samsung.com |
| CATT | Erlin Zeng | Erlin.zeng@catt.cn |
| MediaTek | Li-Chuan TSENG | li-chuan.tseng@mediatek.com |
| Fujitsu  | Meiyi Jia | jiameiyi@fujitsu.com |
| Vivo | Chenli | Chenli5g@vivo.com |
| Apple | Fangli XU | fangli\_xu@apple.com |
| Qualcomm | Ozcan Ozturk | oozturk@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Beam management

## 3.1 Unified TCI state operation RRC&MAC

Related to configuring UL/DL/joint TCI state lists there are the following agreements:

* RAN2 to conclude ““Joint DL/UL TCI” means that there is one TCI state ID for each codepoint, while “separate DL/UL TCI” means that there is one or two TCI state IDs for each codepoint.”
* RAN2 assumes that unified TCI state related parameters for DL and Joint is implemented iin IE PDSCH-Config.
* RAN2 assumes UL TCI state is in UL BWP-Dedicated IE

What is not yet concluded is the TCIstateId handling and related MAC CE design. The options are

* one TCIstateId pool for joint/DL TCI state and separate TCIstateId
* common TCIstateId pool across join/DL and UL TCI states

The MAC CE operation for joint unified TCI state maps 8 joint unified TCI states to the 8 corresponding DCI codepoints. However, for separate unified TCI state operation, there are 1 or 2 UL/DL unified TCI states mapped to each DCI codepoint. This means there are 8-16 TCI state IDs present in the MAC CE independent of whether joint or common id pool is used.

If comparing the necessary content of the MAC CE for separate unified TCI state operation only from TCI state ID perspective and leave for now all assisting fields out we have two baseline starting points. For simplicity we assume here that all 8 DCI codepoints are mapped to both UL and DL TCI states.

**Unified TCI state MAC CE for separate Id pool**

Can be used with existing agreements for placing joint/DL and UL TCI state lists.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| BWP id UL (1st bit) | Serving cell ID | BWP id DL (2 bits) |
| C | Joint/DL TCI state ID (7 bits 128 states) |
| F | BWP id UL (2nd bit) | UL TCI state ID (6 bits 64 states) |
| C | Joint/DL TCI state ID (7 bits 128 states) |
| F | BWP id UL (2nd bit) | UL TCI state ID (6 bits 64 states) |
| C | Joint/DL TCI state ID (7 bits 128 states) |
| F | BWP id UL (2nd bit) | UL TCI state ID (6 bits 64 states) |
| C | Joint/DL TCI state ID (7 bits 128 states) |
| F | BWP id UL (2nd bit) | UL TCI state ID (6 bits 64 states) |
| C | Joint/DL TCI state ID (7 bits 128 states) |
| F | BWP id UL (2nd bit) | UL TCI state ID (6 bits 64 states) |
| C | DL TCI state ID (7 bits 128 states) |
| F | BWP id UL (2nd bit) | UL TCI state ID (6 bits 64 states) |
| C | Joint/DL TCI state ID (7 bits 128 states) |
| F | BWP id UL (2nd bit) | UL TCI state ID (6 bits 64 states) |
| C | Joint/DL TCI state ID (7 bits 128 states) |
| F | BWP id UL (2nd bit) | UL TCI state ID (6 bits 64 states) |

C field describes whether octet with UL TCI state ID is present

F field describes whether UE should consider the preceding octet as padding or as DL TCI state (only needed for “separate beam indication”).

BWP id UL points to the BWP where UL TCI state list is configured

This MAC CE works also as joint TCI state indication MAC CE as UE is RRC configured for either joint or separate operation. When used as joint TCI state MAC CE, all C fields would be set to 0 and no octets for UL TCI state would be present.

**Unified TCI state MAC CE for commonId pool:**

As there is (room) for only DL BWP ID the agreements for placing the TCI state lists would need to be reverted, or RRC would pair UL and DL BWPs such that it would be enough to point out DL BWP in the MAC CE.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| R | Serving cell ID | BWP id DL 2bits |
| T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 |
| T9 | T10 | T11 | T12 | T13 | T14 | T15 | T16 |
|  TCI state ID (8 bits =128+64 states) |
| TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
|  TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
|  TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
| TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
| TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
| TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
| TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
| TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
|  TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
|  TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
|  TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
|  TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
|  TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
|  TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |
|  TCI state ID(8 bits =128+64 states) |

Tn field describes whether the corresponding octet is present.

 For joint unified TCI state operation every other Tn would be set to 0.

**Q1. Which option companies prefer?**

* **Option 1 Separate TCI state lists for joint/DL and UL in PDSCHConfig and UL BWP, respectively, and separate Id pools**
* **Option 2 Separate TCI state lists for joint/DL and UL in PDSCHConfig and UL BWP, respectively, and common Id pools, and mapping of UL/DL BWPs in RRC**
* **Option 3 Revert agreements on TCI state lists and have one large list in RRC PDSCHConfig where also UL TCI states are included, and common pool**
* **Option 4 other**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | O1 | O2 | O3 | O4 | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |  |  | Do we really need a different UL BWP ID for different code points?As the legacy MAC CE indicates the TCI state for each code point when a given DL BWP is active, couldn't the new MAC CE indicate the TCI state for each code point when a give (DL BWP, UL BWP) is active?For option 2, not sure why there is no UL BWP ID at all. |
| Intel | Yes |  |  |  | When RAN2 agreement was made for separate list, we assume that it also means separate ID should be introduced. Regarding UL BWP ID, we think it is not necessary. Imagine that RAN2 define joint TCI state list. How do we indicate UL BWP associated to UL TCI state included in the joint TCI state list in PDSCH-Config which is per DL BWP? Somehow, semi-static relationship between DL and UL BWP should be configured in RRC signaling if we go with joint TCI state. Based on it, even in separate TCI state list, we could assume semi-static association between DL and UL BWP. We could introduce a new RRC signaling or assume the same BWP ID between DL and UL BWP. The latter approach is already used in candidateBeamRSList definition in the legacy system.  |
| Xiaomi |  | Yes |  |  | It would be simpler for the MAC CE design when we have a common TCI-state ID pool. |
| Ericsson | yes |  |  |  | UL BWP can be left out if the signaling is made other ways unambiguous. It was introduced in this example as there was comment during online that UL BWP missing is why separate lists and ID space cannot be introduced.  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |  |  | We think UL BWP ID is necessary, but it should be the same for all UL TCI states within MAC CE. Fixed relation between UL and DL BWP is possible, but it also means scheduling limitation for network. There is no problem for TDD, but we see it is problematic for FDD. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |  |  | The most important point to determine the unified TCI state pool configuration and MAC CE design is that flexible usage of mapping of UL/DL TCI state when separate TCI pool ID is configured.Option 1 is possible to support all combinations (64 x 128 = 8192) which are made by separate UL TCI state and DL/Joint TCI state but Option 2 has restriction to support only 256 (8 bits) combinations. We also think the RAN2 agreement was already agreed to use the separate list and it should be supported by separate ID.Fo UL BWP ID for different code points, it was not discussed and RAN2 just follow the legacy operation i.e. not apply this, but RAN1 confirmation is preferred if companies doubt about this. It would be better to ask RAN1 for confirmation(?) |
| CATT | Yes |  |  |  | We see a need to clarify what is the current assumption regarding whether all the TCI states that may be indicated by this MAC CE are associated to the same PCI, or they can associate to different PCIs? RAN1 had ***agreement*** ***On Rel-17 beam indication enhancements for inter-cell beam management, for separate DL/UL TCI, there is no consensus in restricting the indicated DL TCI and UL TCI to be associated with SSBs of a same physical cell ID.******Whether a corresponding UE feature can be introduced can be discussed in UE feature agenda***This is relevant, as it impacts the ID pool(s) that a TCI state ID in the MAC CE is pointing to. Also as we do not mention any info regarding PCI in the MAC CE, the assumption has to be that such associations are defined in RRC spec. But currently it is unclear at least to us, e.g., what are the maximum number of the TCI state can be pre-configured to UE, including the pTRP and aTRP(s), is it still 127 (maxNrofTCI-States)? |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |  |  | A separate list with separate ID is reasonable. But the example MAC CE seems not agreeable:1. The “padding” for Joint/DL TCI states wastes a lot of bits
2. When a UL TCI follows a Joint/DL TCI, the format cannot indicate if they belong to the same codepoint or not
3. There is no need to have different BWP for different UL TCI states

We believe that the MAC CE format will be discussed later, but here is our proposed format.* D/U: DL or UL
* SC: indicate if a UL TCI belongs to the same codepoint as the DL TCI is preceding octet
* If DL BWP ID and UL BWP ID can be paired, we may not need UL BWP ID (Oct 2)

 |
| ZTE | Yes with second priority. |  | Yes with first priority |  | As we commented in online meeting, assuming that the separate TCI state list in UL BWP and DL BWP is supported, how to present UL BWP and DL BWP within one MAC CE for separate TCI state activation/deactivation is an issue. For example:**Option 1:Separate TCI state lists and Separate ID pools**In this option, we assume that the first present MAC CE should be used.In the case that separate TCI state case, the UL BWP is present specifically in MAC CE for each UL TCI state, so the activated UL TCI state can be easily associated with a certain BWP.However, in the case that the joint TCI state case, given the joint TCI states are present in DL BWP, how to associate the UL part of the joint TCI state with one or more UL BWP, it is literally for sure we need to define a different implementations of associating the activated UL/Joint TCI state to a UL BWP. **Option 2: Separate TCI state list and common ID pools**In this option , we do not think it can work unless there is no any mapping relationship between DL BWP/UL BWP.**Option 3: Common TCI state list and common ID pool**In this option, the TCI state list for both UL/DL/Joint TCI state are configured in PDSCH-Config in one BWP, how to associate the UL BWP to the UL/Joint TCI state can be through one common method which can be decided by RAN1, which seems more simpler.In addition, if we are sure to support the separate TCI state list in PDSCH-Config and PUSCH-Config respectively, we need to send an LS to RAN1 for notifying the agreements in RAN2 since we think they seems only assuming the TCI state pool is only configured in PDSCH-Config no matter it is separate or common.  |
| Fujitsu  | Yes  |  |  |  | We also think that the association between DL BWP and UL BWP is semi-static and configured via RRC signalling. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Partly | Partly | No | Yes | **General comments:** Since several companies have something against common TCI state ID with a joint list, let's go with 1) separate IDs for UL and DL/joint TCI states AND 2) separate MAC CEs for separate and joint TCI state activation (since those are never used together). That makes the MAC CE definition easier. Also, we shouldn't just assume the case where all 8 codepoints use both UL and DL for the MAC CE design - that just ensure we never consider the (more common) cases when some are UL-only or DL-only.**Proposal 1:** Define one MAC CE for joint TCI state activation and one MAC CE for separate TCI state activation.**Inclusion of BWP ID:** The BWP ID is not mentioned in the RAN1 MAC CE excel, so like Huawei we are not sure if the UL BWP ID is needed - isn't this always for the active BWP?But assuming it is needed, something like the MTK approach is far easier to understand than dividing the UL bits to two fields. NR tried to get rid of that habit (which was used in LTE) as it's cumbersome to define in specifications. **Proposal 2:** Do not split the bits between MAC CE octets - if needed, defined separate octet with R-bits.**For separate TCI state MAC CE:**The main thing is how to model the UL+DL TCI state. Since we have maximum of 8 UL+DL TCI states, it seems easier to separate the presence of second (=UL octet) into the header at the start. Then whether the first TCI state is UL or DL can be defined by the first bit in the octet. We have provided example MAC CE structure of this below (which also shows the UL BWP ID, if needed - if that is not needed, R-bits are added instead). So assuming there are M (<=8) octets with UL+DL codepoints and N (<=8) octets with UL or DL codepoints, the MAC CE size is **2 + 2M + N octets** (with M+N >=1), giving minimum size of 3 octets and maximum size of 18 octets. Finally, in case BWP ID is needed, it can be introduce to the UL TCI state octet R-bits.**Proposal 3:** For the separate TCI state MAC CE, define "header octet" (=octet 2 above) that indicates for which DCI codepoints UL+DL TCI is used.**For joint TCI state MAC CE:** This MAC CE seems easier as the TCI state ID = 7 bits, and presumably the UL BWP ID is not needed. We can then just let the MAC sub-header determine the length in octets, which determines the number of code-points. We have provided example MAC CE structure of this below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | MAC CE for joint TCI states |
| Bit position | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Octet 1 | R | Serving cell ID | BWP ID |
| Octet 2 | R | Joint TCI state ID, 1 |
| Octet 3 | R | Joint TCI state ID, 2 |
| Octet 4 | R | Joint TCI state ID, 3 |
| Octet 5 | R | Joint TCI state ID, 4 |
| Octet 6 | R | Joint TCI state ID, 5 |
| Octet 7 | R | Joint TCI state ID, 6 |
| Octet 8 | R | Joint TCI state ID, 7 |
| Octet 9 | R | Joint TCI state ID, 8 |

With M joint TCI states, the size of this MAC CE is **1+M octets**, with minimum size of 2 octets and maximum size of 9 octets.**Proposal 4:** Define one MAC CE for joint TCI state activation and one MAC CE for separate TCI state activation. |
| vivo | Yes with comments |  |  |  | As we agreed separate TCI state lists for joint&DL and UL BWP, option 1 is preferred.For option 1, for separate TCI mode, both DL and UL TCI could be by default. For some codepoint corresponding to UL-only, is seems that there is no indication where DL TCI state ID is present?Regarding option 2, there is no UL BWP ID. In this way, it cann’t indicate the UL TCI ID is configured to which UL BWP. Besides, each TCI state ID already includes DL and UL TCI, why 16 TCI state ID is still needed. |
| Apple | Yes |  |  |  | It’s straightforward that the separate lists mean the separate ID pools. But for the MAC CE format, following are our comments:1. UL BWP ID is not needed, and we can assume the same BWP ID for both UL BWP ID and DL BWP ID.
2. The max active TCI ID number is 8, but the example gives upto 16 TCI state in one MAC CE format. It seems incorrect.

Maybe we can consider some part of the following format example. The BWP ID is to indicate the UL BWP ID and DL BWP ID, and the T bit octet is to indicate how many active TCI IDs are included in this MAC CE. It would be simple.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Maybe |  |  | We can discuss the MAC CE details later. Maybe the first agreement should be that a single MAC CE format will be used (not separate for DL/joint and UL). Option 2 is also acceptable since it will make the MAC CE design simpler. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Clear majority supports the 1 option. It is also pointed out that the dependence on UL and DL BWP should be discussed. In separate UL/DL TCI state case, it is possible to have UL BWP id in the MAC CE. However, in joint TCI state case this is not needed. It can be defined that UE applies the joint TCI state in it’s active UL BWP. However, more discussion is needed and as it depends on the MAC CE exact design, it is proposed to have FFS on those as outcome of this discussion.

**Proposal 1 RAN2 agrees on Separate TCI state lists for joint/DL and UL in PDSCHConfig and UL BWP, respectively, and separate Id pools.**

**Proposal 2 RAN2 continues discussing MAC CE design for common and separate TCI state operation as well as the UL/DL BWP association**

## 3.2 BAT

The latest RAN2 agreements about it reads:

* IT shall be possible to configure the parameter BeamAppTime differnet for different SCS
* FFS if parameter BeamAppTime is under the cell group config.

The SCS is configured in IE BWP which is given in BWP-DownlinkCommon and network ensures same SCS for UL and DL. Thus it seem highest place where BAT can be placed is IE BWP-DownlinkCommon.

– *BWP-DownlinkCommon*

The IE *BWP-DownlinkCommon* is used to configure the common parameters of a downlink BWP. They are "cell specific" and the network ensures the necessary alignment with corresponding parameters of other UEs. The common parameters of the initial bandwidth part of the PCell are also provided via system information. For all other serving cells, the network provides the common parameters via dedicated signalling.

***BWP-DownlinkCommon* information element**

-- ASN1START

-- TAG-BWP-DOWNLINKCOMMON-START

BWP-DownlinkCommon ::= SEQUENCE {

 genericParameters BWP,

 pdcch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDCCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M

 pdsch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDSCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M

 ...

}

-- TAG-BWP-DOWNLINKCOMMON-STOP

-- ASN1STOP

|  |
| --- |
| ***BWP-DownlinkCommon* field descriptions** |
| ***pdcch-ConfigCommon***Cell specific parameters for the PDCCH of this BWP. This field is absent for a dormant BWP. |
| ***pdsch-ConfigCommon***Cell specific parameters for the PDSCH of this BWP. |

**Q2. Which option companies prefer?**

* **Option 1 keep the parameter *BeamAppTime\_r17* in PDSCH-Config?**
* **Option 2 move the parameter *BeamAppTime\_r17* to** **BWP-DownlinkCommon?**
* **Option 3 move the parameter *BeamAppTime\_r17* to** *ServingCellConfig*
* **Option 4 move the parameter *BeamAppTime\_r17* to *PhysicalCellGroupConfig***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option1 | Option 2 | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  |  | We see no difference, let's keep it where it is now. |
| Intel | Yes |  | Same as Huawei. If we want to make sure that BAT is the same for DL and UL BWP, we could describe in the field description.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  | Both work from SCS perspective. We prefer to keep it in PDSCHConfig where other unified DL/joint TCI state information is configured. |
| OPPO |  |  | In our understanding even this parameter is configured in BWP level the value corresponding to same SCS should be the same across BWPs within same cell. So we think this parameter is cell level parameter. So the best place should be in *ServingCellConfig*. |
| Samsung | Yes |  | According to RAN1 agreements, we think this BAT is only applied to the “CCs configured with the common TCI state ID update” so it should be configured per CC rather than per-CG (regarding FFS if parameter BeamAppTime is under the cell group config)On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the UE can assume that one beam application time (BAT) for a given SCS is configured for all the CCs configured with the common TCI state ID update,* Note: It was agreed that the BAT associated with the carrier(s) (hence BWP(s)/CC(s)) on which the beam indication applies is determined based on the carrier with the smallest SCS among the carrier(s) (hence BWP(s)/CC(s)) applying the beam indication
* TBD (maintenance): whether a second configured BAT is also supported, e.g. for MPUE or inter-cell BM
* The detailed signaling of the BAT is up to RAN2
* FFS: For CC(s) not configured with a common TCI state ID update

Option 1 is fine to us and we share the view from Ericsson. |
| CATT | Yes |  |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |  |
| ZTE |  |  | According to the RAN1 agreements:**Agreement**On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the UE can assume that one beam application time (BAT) for a given SCS is configured for **all the CCs** configured with the common TCI state ID update,So we suggest to make a configuration for each SCS type under the cell group config instead of configuring the *BeamAppTimer\_r17* per BWP |
| Fujitsu  | Yes  |  | Both options can work. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  |  | Agree with ZTE: We would be fine with option 3 as it's a waste to configure it per-BWP. However, we are fine to keep it in PDSCH-Config for now as also Huawei and Intel indicated. We can ask from RAN1 if they have some reason not to agree to this. |
| Vivo | Yes |  | We support option 1. We could reuse the current SCS configuration, and NW could guarantee the same SCS for UL and DL. In this way, BAT could be configured per-SCS, which is corresponding to the DL and UL BWP with the same SCS. |
| Apple |  |  | According to RAN1 agreements, the BAT should be configured per SCS and for a CC list. We prefer Option 4, since it’s clear reflect the meaning of this parameter, and can avoid the duplicated configuration per serving cell per BWP. But if companies would like to keep this parameter in PDSCH-Config per BWP, we should make the meaning clearly in the field description part.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  | Even though Option 3 or 4 is more efficient for signaling overhead, keeping it current location and clarifying in field description that they will be same across cells is fine. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

As the parameter is to be configured only for serving cells that are configured with unified TCI state the placing per cell group does not seem that clean. The remaining options are per serving cell, or per BWP either in BWP-DownlinkCommon or in PDSCH-Config. There seems to be consensus in keeping the BAT in PDSCHConfig and clarifying in the field description that it should have same value for all servingcells with given SCS. In this way, it is also natural that it is configured only with serving cells configurted with unified TCI state.

**Proposal 3 The BAT parameter is configured in PDSCHConfig and the field description clarifies that it has the same value for all servingcells with given SCS**

## 3.3 CORESET to follow Unified TCI state

The below agreement states how different coresets may assume different TCI state assumption.

**Agreement**

For Rel-17 unified TCI framework, on applying the indicated Rel-17 TCI state to PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception:

* For discussion purposes, define as follows:
	+ ‘CORESET A’: A CORESET other than CORESET#0 associated with only UE-dedicated reception on PDCCH in a CC, comprising CORESETs in association with:
		- [USS and/or CSS Type 3]
	+ ‘CORESET B’: A CORESET other than CORESET#0 associated with only non-UE-dedicated reception on PDCCH in a CC, comprising CORESETs in association with:
		- [CSS or CSS other than Type 3]
	+ ‘CORESET C’: A CORESET other than CORESET#0 associated with both UE-dedicated and non-UE-dedicated reception on PDCCH in a CC
	+ CORESET#0
* For Rel-17 TCI state indication, support per CORESET determination as follows:
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a ‘CORESET A’ and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a ‘CORESET B’ and the respective PDSCH reception, whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state associated with the serving cell is determined per CORESET by RRC
		- FFS: For intra-cell BM, whether CORESET C is supported or not
	+ If CORESET C is supported, the TCI state of CORESET C
		- FFS: For inter-cell BM, whether CORESET C is supported or not
	+ If CORESET C is supported, the TCI state of CORESET C
		- FFS: The TCI state of CORESET 0

In RRC there is currently no concept of CORESET A or CORESET B, and there for CORESET C. Thus, a way to configure above behaviour for a CORESET in RRC is to enable Unified TCI state per CORESET. Any restrictions can be specified separately. ASN1 example is given as below:

####  – *ControlResourceSet*

The IE *ControlResourceSet* is used to configure a time/frequency control resource set (CORESET) in which to search for downlink control information (see TS 38.213 [13], clause 10.1).

***ControlResourceSet* information element**

-- ASN1START

-- TAG-CONTROLRESOURCESET-START

ControlResourceSet ::= SEQUENCE {

 controlResourceSetId ControlResourceSetId,

 frequencyDomainResources BIT STRING (SIZE (45)),

 duration INTEGER (1..maxCoReSetDuration),

 cce-REG-MappingType CHOICE {

 interleaved SEQUENCE {

 reg-BundleSize ENUMERATED {n2, n3, n6},

 interleaverSize ENUMERATED {n2, n3, n6},

 shiftIndex INTEGER(0..maxNrofPhysicalResourceBlocks-1) OPTIONAL -- Need S

 },

 nonInterleaved NULL

 },

 precoderGranularity ENUMERATED {sameAsREG-bundle, allContiguousRBs},

 tci-StatesPDCCH-ToAddList SEQUENCE(SIZE (1..maxNrofTCI-StatesPDCCH)) OF TCI-StateId OPTIONAL, -- Cond NotSIB1-initialBWP

 tci-StatesPDCCH-ToReleaseList SEQUENCE(SIZE (1..maxNrofTCI-StatesPDCCH)) OF TCI-StateId OPTIONAL, -- Cond NotSIB1-initialBWP

 tci-PresentInDCI ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL, -- Need S

 pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID INTEGER (0..65535) OPTIONAL, -- Need S

 ...,

 [[

 rb-Offset-r16 INTEGER (0..5) OPTIONAL, -- Need S

 tci-PresentDCI-1-2-r16 INTEGER (1..3) OPTIONAL, -- Need S

 coresetPoolIndex-r16 INTEGER (0..1) OPTIONAL, -- Need S

 controlResourceSetId-v1610 ControlResourceSetId-v1610 OPTIONAL -- Need S

 ]],

 [[

 followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL -- Need R

 --Editor’s note: Rel-17 DL TCI/joint state is enabled for this CORESET and tci-StatesPDCCH-ToAddList is not configured

 ]]

}

-- TAG-CONTROLRESOURCESET-STOP

-- ASN1STOP

Last round there was a discussion on why the added parameter, or marking would be on CORESET level while it seems to also depend on search space configuration.

CORESET is a frequency resource and search space gives the time and DCI assumption. For this not to be so straightforward it seems these configurations can be overlapping in freq/time. Thus it might not after all be so straightforward to know which level the followUnifiedTCIstae parameter should be configured.

For now, it has been agreed to implement the COREST level marking with editor’s note and discuss a question to RAN1 related to this configuration.

* Implement acc to RAN1 decisions wrt TCI state for PDCCH, applyunifiedtcistate applied to CORESET, introduce editor’s note about the potential issue (maybe something need to be captured in RRC, or in L1 TS, or need to move the IE).

RAN2 may decide to include question on this in the LS or wait for further input from RAN1

**Q3: Do you support asking about this from RAN1? If yes, please give suggested question**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Question to ask |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | RAN2 considers including a parameter, per CORESET, that indicates whether or not the UE shall apply Rel-17 TCI state indications when this CORESET is used with a common search space, or with any search space.Would this satisfy RAN1 requirements/agreements?If no, please explain what RAN1 requirement/agreement is not covered by such signalling. |
| Intel | Yes | We understand that the above RAN1’s agreement requires RRC signalling on CORESET B. We can ask what is relationship of CORESET B and “DM-RS for non-UE dedicated PDCCH” in ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLList parameter. In addition, we can ask how to define CORESET B to apply unified TCI state.   |
| Ericsson | Yes | We should note them this parameter was not in their final excel but it was in the intermediate excel and RAN2 had noted the respective RAN1 agreements, based on which initial RAN2 discussions were conducted. As a question, we could simply state the currently concluded RRC signaling and ask whether this is enough and whether any restrictions are needed in addition, or if another signaling is suggested(if so to explain the functionality). |
| OPPO | Yes | To us it is clear that CORESET B need such marking. But for CORESET C which involving both UE dedicated reception and non-UE-dedicated reception is puzzling  |
| Samsung | Yes | We also have same understanding with Intel which may following:1. CORESET #N (associated with USS and/or CSS Type3) – No RRC signaling is required, only require the description either RAN1 (and)/or RAN2 specification. UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
2. CORESET #M (CSS or CSS other than Type 3) – RRC signaling indicates whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state e.g. 1 bit indicator.

RAN2 just ask whether this is enough or further support (e.g. FFS point for CORESET C) is required. |
| CATT | Yes, if majority wants to do so | We also understand that the configuration of R17 TCI state applicability is on CORESET level. From the cited RAN1 agreement it can be seen that only CORESET B can be configured by RRC, CORESET A always follows the unified TCI framework, while CORESET C is still FFS now.It seems RAN2 can just specify based on these understanding. But we are OK to check with RAN1 with such understanding, if majority see a need to check. Regarding the questions for checking, it seems HW/Ericsson’s suggestions are generally OK. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Agree with Huawei |
| ZTE | Yes | The same view with intel, in addition ,we would like to ask if one CORESET is associated with a CSS type 3, it is CORESET B or CORESET A?**Agreement**For Rel-17 unified TCI framework, on applying the indicated Rel-17 TCI state to PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception:* For discussion purposes, define as follows:
	+ ‘CORESET A’: A CORESET other than CORESET#0 associated with only UE-dedicated reception on PDCCH in a CC, comprising CORESETs in association with:
		- [USS and/or CSS Type 3]
	+ ‘CORESET B’: A CORESET other than CORESET#0 associated with only non-UE-dedicated reception on PDCCH in a CC, comprising CORESETs in association with:
		- [CSS or CSS other than Type 3]
	+ ‘CORESET C’: A CORESET other than CORESET#0 associated with both UE-dedicated and non-UE-dedicated reception on PDCCH in a CC
	+ CORESET#0
 |
| Fujitsu  | Yes  | According to RAN1 agreements, RAN2 adds a new field *followUnifiedTCIstate-r17* for a CORESET in RRC to enable Unified TCI state per CORESET.RAN2 asks RAN1 whether such design to enable Unified TCI state per CORESET is enough, especially for CORESET B case. If not, which level is required? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes | It's best to ask RAN1 to explain 1) what the CORESET "marking" intends to achieve, 2) what were the reasons why RAN1 thought it needs to be in CORESET, and 3) are there some implications due to these CORESET types to RAN2 configuration (e.g. the does this mean that RRC needs to ensure there are no overlaps in the monitored slots of SearchSpaces using CORESETs that do and do not use the "marking", since UE can't receive beams from both TRPs at the same time)? It's also fine to ask if what RAN2 does is fine to RAN1, but we really should ask why RAN1 came to their conclusion: RAN1 indicated that CORESET (which is pooled and can be associated to multiple SearchSpaces) needs to tell how it behaves with respect to the SearchSpaces. So child IE needs to behave differently based on parent IE configuration - why would then the same behaviour NOT be configured under the parent IE instead?Note that none of the questions necessarily mean the configuration changes, but at least RAN1 needs to explain why they did what they did, and RAN2 can capture the right implications to RRC configuration. |
| vivo | Yes, if majority want | Our understanding is the configuration followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 is applicable for both CORESET A and CORESET B.Regarding CORESET C and CoRESET#0, we could wait for further RAN1 progress.  |
| Apple | Yes | Agree with Huawei. We can inform RAN1 about RAN2 initial decision on the per CORESET configuration, ask their feedback. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | It would be good to clarify the intended functionality as well as get feedback on RAN2 plan for signaling. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Majority of companies would like to confirm from RAN1 if the per CORESET indications of followunifiedTCIstate of PDSCH is according to RAN1 intention. Further ask if any limitation/condition needs to be added in a field description. Some companies would like RAN1 to clarify the functionality.

**Proposal 4 RAN2 will ask in the LS that whether the per CORESET indications of followunifiedTCIstate of PDSCH is according to RAN1 intention and whether any limitation or condition needs to specified. FFS on exact question formulation as well as if broader question on functionality is added. Work on the FFS when formulating the questions in a draftLS.**

## 3.4 AP CSI-RS to follow Unified TCI state

Another aspect is how to configure possible aperiodic NZP CSI-RS resource or DMRS to follow the DL(or joint) unified TCI state.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ran2 parent IE | Param name | Description | Comment |
|  | ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLList | a list of the resource and/or resource set ID of the RS(s) which share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC | Candidates include: AP-CSI-RS for BM, AP-CSI-RS for CSI, DL DMRS for non-UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH from the serving cell.Exact design including whether an explicit RRC parameter is needed or not is up to RAN2.Applies only to Rel-17 unified TCI Framework |

The DMRS does not have an ID but DMRS is configured in PDSCH-config for PDSCH DMRS and PDCCH-Config for PDCCH DMRS. It is unclear why DMRS of PDSCH or DMRS PDCCH would not follow the TCI state configured for respective PDxCH. The related latest RAN1 agreements are:

**Agreement**

On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, discuss and decide by RAN1#106-e (August 2021)

* Whether each of the following DL RSs can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC
	+ CSI-RS resources for CSI
	+ Some CSI-RS resources for BM, if so, which ones (e.g. aperiodic, repetition ‘ON’)
	+ CSI-RS for tracking
	+ DMRS(s) associated with non-UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs
* Whether some SRS resources or resource sets for BM can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all or subset of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC

**Agreement**

On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for any DL RS that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC, but can be configured as a target DL RS of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool), discuss and down-select by RAN1#106-e (August 2021) between the following two alternatives:

* Alt1. Rel-15/16 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are reused to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state
* Alt2. Rel-17 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are used, e.g. with Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication for Rel-17 joint/separate TCI

Note: The DL RS includes CSI-RS and DMRS for PDSCH or PDCCH

Note: For some channels/signals, only one of the above two alternatives may apply (to be discussed).

It remains unclear how DMRSs could be pointed to in a list of different TCI state from PDxCH is expected to be enabled. It is assumed this aspect will be clarified by RAN1.

Also the aperiodic NZP-CSI RS does not have an ID as such. Instead, the UE is configured with a list of aperiodic CSI-RS states where each consists of a set of CSI hypothesis. One CSI hypothesis consist of assumption on channel measurement and assumption on interference measurement where the latter may be CSI-IM(a window to inspect interference) or NZP CSI RS(an actual dedicated RS for interference measurement). Thus, there are two levels/options to easily indicate whether the aperiodic trigger state should assume Unified TCI state, or the TCI state configured specifically for the aperiodic trigger state.

The two levels are

* Option 1: at trigger state level, which means all CSI hypothesis follow unified TCI state.
* Option 2: per CSI hypothesis within a trigger state.

ASN1 code for both options is presented below

– *CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList*

The *CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList* IE is used to configure the UE with a list of aperiodic trigger states. Each codepoint of the DCI field "CSI request" is associated with one trigger state (see TS 38.321 [3], clause 6.1.3.13). Upon reception of the value associated with a trigger state, the UE will perform measurement of CSI-RS, CSI-IM and/or SSB (reference signals) and aperiodic reporting on L1 according to all entries in the *associatedReportConfigInfoList* for that trigger state.

***CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList* information element**

-- ASN1START

-- TAG-CSI-APERIODICTRIGGERSTATELIST-START

CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrOfCSI-AperiodicTriggers)) OF CSI-AperiodicTriggerState

CSI-AperiodicTriggerState ::= SEQUENCE {

 associatedReportConfigInfoList SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofReportConfigPerAperiodicTrigger)) OF CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo,

 ... ,

 [[

 followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL -- Need R

 -- Editor’s note: OPTION 1: at trigger state level, which means all CSI hypothesis follow unified

-- TCI state is this is enabled

-- Editor’s note: this applies only to CMR

 ]]

}

CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo ::= SEQUENCE {

 reportConfigId CSI-ReportConfigId,

 resourcesForChannel CHOICE {

 nzp-CSI-RS SEQUENCE {

 resourceSet INTEGER (1..maxNrofNZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetsPerConfig),

 qcl-info SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofAP-CSI-RS-ResourcesPerSet)) OF TCI-StateId

 OPTIONAL -- Cond Aperiodic

 },

 csi-SSB-ResourceSet INTEGER (1..maxNrofCSI-SSB-ResourceSetsPerConfig)

 },

 csi-IM-ResourcesForInterference INTEGER(1..maxNrofCSI-IM-ResourceSetsPerConfig) OPTIONAL, -- Cond CSI-IM-ForInterference

 nzp-CSI-RS-ResourcesForInterference INTEGER (1..maxNrofNZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetsPerConfig) OPTIONAL, -- Cond NZP-CSI-RS-ForInterference

 ... ,

 [[

 followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL -- Need R

 -- Editor’s note: OPTION 2: at CSI hypothesis level, which means each CSI hypothesis can separately be configuredd

-- Editor’s note: this applies only to CMR

 ]]

}

-- TAG-CSI-APERIODICTRIGGERSTATELIST-STOP

-- ASN1STOP

In last round of email discussion it was concluded that Option 2 is implemented and it is in the current running RRC CR.

**Proposal 6 Option 2 is implemented in running CR with editor’s note on FFS**

However, due to rapporteur’s hasty formulation of the proposal, we need another round..

* P6: Clarify which parameter is intended, resolve naming confusion, miáy be agreeable

**Proposal RAN2 to agree that “****followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 ENUMERATED {enabled}” can be implemented in IE CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo as an optional parameter with editor’s note on FFS on placement**

 **Q4: Do you agree with the reformulated proposal? In an Ls to RAN1, should RAN2 ask RAN1 whether they are ok with this outcome or inform RAN1 about the conclusion or neither is needed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No about proposal | Comments on possible LS text |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not sure, see comment | According the "description" column in RAN1 excel sheet, if there would be a parameter, it would be in CSI-ResourceConfig or in NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet, not anywhere else. However, it is true that the "comment" column somehow contradicts with the "description" column.If we send an LS to RAN1, we could point this contradiction in their excEricssonel sheet.With respect to CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo:- if the Rel-17 TCI framework is to be followed, the qcl-Info should be absent, while currently the qcl-Info must be present for aperiodic resources. Therefore, absence of qcl-Info could be sufficient to indicate that the Rel-17 TCI framework is to be followed for aperiodic resources.- if RAN1 wishes some indication to apply also to periodic resources, absence of qcl-Info in NZP-CSI-RS-Config could imply that Rel-17 TCI framework is to be followed.In any case, if a parameter is added that says that Rel-17 TCI indications are to be followed rather than qcl-Info, it should be specified that qcl-Info is absent. |
| Intel | See comment | To our understanding, followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 (a.k.a ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLList) needs to be defined for AP-CSI-RS for BM, AP-CSI-RS for CSI, DL DMRS for non-UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH separately and defined per PDSCH-Config as RAN1 indicates “Per UE per cell per BWP”. The example is: ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLList{              AP-CSI-RS for BM            ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL, AP-CSI-RS for CSI             ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL,DL DMRS for non-UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH   ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL}One may ask who to define AP-CSI-RS for BM and AP-CSI-RS for CSI. We understand that there is no separate configuration for CSI-RS for BM, CSI, TRS etc. It determined based on the following:• If trsInfo is configured, then the AP-CSI-RS is TRS• If trsInfo is not configured but “repetition” is configured, then AP-CSI-RS is for BM• If trsInfo and repetition are not configured, then AP-CSI-RS is for CSI Therefore, if we define a simple enabling parameter, PHY specification can take care of the mapping which AP-CSI-RS should be applied with TCI state. For example, if “AP-CSI-RS for BM” is enabled, TCI state of AP-CSI-RS not configured with trs-Info but “repetition” is configured follows unified TCI state.We are ok to send an LS to RAN1 to check our understanding.  |
| Ericsson | yes | In the excel there are three rows(16,17,26) that may be seen related as all are about unified TCI state and NZP-CSI-RS resource. The row 16 and 17 suggest to add Rel-17 TCI state ID in both NZP CSI-RS resource for periodic reporting as well as CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo. This is intended to be able to configure Rel-17 unified TCI state for the resources OTHER than what PDSCH/(PDCCH) uses. Additionally, row 26 is about indicating when AP CSI-RS should instead follow the beam of PDSCH/(PDCCH). The question here is only about row 26.However, the in row 26 RAN1 suggest to have what is according to example provided by Intel. Issue is, RRC does not have “AP-CSI-RS for BM” or “AP-CSI-RS for CSI”. RRC has trigger states and there can be 128 of those. Depending on specific parameters within the trigger state, the AP CSI-RS can be either BM, CSI or TRS. Thus, instead of starting to maintain toadmodlist in PDSCHConfig where two out of three kinds of trigger states could be added/removed, it is suggested to have “followunifiedTCIstate” parameter in the CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo. Certainly, if there is simpler working way as suggested by HW that absence of QCL “marks” the trigger state to have the followunifiedTCIstate then that can be adopted/discussed once the principle is agreed. Also, any naming fine tuning can be done. Perhaps followPDSCHTCIstate is more descriptive. |
| OPPO | See comments | We agree with Intel’s understanding in terms of the usage of CSI RS resource set. So it should be fine for current place holder since the new parameter is associated with a NZP-CSI-RS resource set, which can indicate whether it is for BM or CSI or TRS.In addition the detail of TCI state per resource within resource set should be configured by RRC signaling i.e. the qcl-info should not be absent. In case unified TCI state is extended based on current TCI state, current qcl-info can be reused, whose TCI state id actually refers to one joint/DL TCI state.In case aperiodic CSI RS need follow beam indication in DCI, then these TCI state ids can be absent. So we think current wording of the IE should be fine. |
| Samsung | Not sure | We share the view from Huawei that there are some uncertainties between the “description” column and “comment” column from RAN1 excel sheet.First we need to know which description is correct in order that RAN2 know how this functionality is implemented in the ASN.1.Based on RAN1 response, RAN2 will further determine how to signal this parameter(s):* Under the CSI-ResourceConfig or in NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet; or
* Under the CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo; or

New RRC IE |
| CATT | See comments | In RAN1 excel line #26 they mentioned the required ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLList is fo**r ‘a list of the resource and/or resource set ID of the RS(s) which share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC’**So it looks like we should define such as list, in which the corresponding resource or resource set IDs are included.Unless we found an issue we prefer to follow the R1 request to define an explicit ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLLis.  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Intel’s comments show a “direct interpretation” of RAN1’s table. But the detailed signaling is up to RAN2, so we are fine to have a placeholder as rapporteur suggests. |
| Fujitsu  | Yes  | Possible LS text:RAN2 adds followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 in IE CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo as an optional parameter to enable Unified TCI state per CSI hypothesis.RAN2 asks RAN1 whether this is aligned with RAN1 design. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Not sure | As Huawei noted, we can ask RAN1 to clarify if the proposed intent is correct. Same as with the CORESET "marking", it's best to ask why this is needed, what it intends to achieve and what does it mean for RAN2 configuration (e.g. does it affect which AP-CSI-RS can be triggered at the same time?).  |
| vivo | See comments | In general, we share the similar view as Huawei. We need to confirm with RAN1 that it is not applied to resource level or resource set level, as option 2 is different from RRC excel from RAN1. |
| Apple | Yes | As RAN1 indicates “Exact design including whether an explicit RRC parameter is needed or not is up to RAN2.”, we are fine with the current proposal, and we can double check whether it’s aligned with RAN1 intention.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | It is fine to confirm with RAN1 on the discrepancy mentioned by others if we end up sending an LS to RAN1. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Here, company views are varying from supporting the list of resource to asking RAN1 about the lists and current ASN1 implementation suggestion. As no company was directly against the suggested ASN1 implementation it is proposed to take that as baseline and ask confirmation from RAN1.

Rapporteur would like to also clarify the following: In the excel there are three rows(16,17,26) that may be seen related as all are about unified TCI state and NZP-CSI-RS resource. The row 16 and 17 suggest to add Rel-17 TCI state ID in both NZP CSI-RS resource for periodic reporting as well as CSI-AssociatedReportConfigInfo. This is intended to be able to configure Rel-17 unified TCI state for the resources OTHER than what PDSCH/(PDCCH) uses. Additionally, row 26 is about indicating when AP CSI-RS should instead follow the beam of PDSCH/(PDCCH). The question here is only about row 26, that is, about AP CSI following PDSCH/(UE specific PDCCH) and not unified TCI state in general. It should also be noted that it is the AssociatedReportConfigInfo where AP CSI resource currently is configured with its QCLInfo. This is because the UE could be triggered to measure same NZP-CSI-RS occasion with different QCL assumptions by the aperiodic triggering. Thus that placing is natural for the followUnifiedTCIstate-r17. Listing NZP CSI-RS resources or placing the marking for a resource seems to not work so well with current functionality for AP CSI-RS.

**Proposal 5 RAN2 will ask in the LS that about implementation suggestion for ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLList. Starting point:**

**“RAN2 notes there is discrepancy with the description and comment related to ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLList. RAN2 has baseline implementation for this functionality where 1 bit “followunifiedTCIstateof PDSCH” is added in “AssociatedReportConfigInfo” where QCL for an aperiodic resource is currently configured. RAN2 would like to ask whether this implementation is according to intended functionality or whether this indication should be placed per NZP-CSI-RS resource. Note that it will be RAN2 signaling design whether supporting this functionality is 1 bit indication per field X, or by maintaining lists of field X.”**

**FFS work on exact question formulation in draftLS. FFS if the parameter can be later replaced by other ASN1 ways to indicate the same.**

## 3.5 SRS follow unified TCI state

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RAN2 Parant IE** | **Description** | **Value Range** | **Comment** |
| ApplyTCI-State-r17forSRS | Whether all SRS resources in resource set(s) configured for antenna switching/codebook-based/non-codebook-based UL transmissions share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC. This applies to the following: 1) Aperiodic SRS for BM, 2) SRS (of any time-domain behavior) for codebook, non-codebook, and antenna switching  | {0,1}See col P (comment from LG) | Exact design including whether an explicit RRC parameter is needed or not is up to RAN2.Applies only to Rel-17 unified TCI FrameworkComment from LG: For the value range, it should be considered further for applying the indicated beam with configurability on SRS resource or resource set level instead of ON-OFF decision for all SRSs. Also, similar configuration parameters are required for other DL/UL target channels, e.g. for some CSI-RS resources, for some CORESETs, for some PUCCH resources, etc. |

Based on the input, it looks like a “followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 ENUMERATED {enabled} “ can be placed under SRSresourceSet as the following example:

SRS-ResourceSet ::= SEQUENCE {

 srs-ResourceSetId SRS-ResourceSetId,

 srs-ResourceIdList SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofSRS-ResourcesPerSet)) OF SRS-ResourceId OPTIONAL, -- Cond Setup

 resourceType CHOICE {

 aperiodic SEQUENCE {

 aperiodicSRS-ResourceTrigger INTEGER (1..maxNrofSRS-TriggerStates-1),

 csi-RS NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId OPTIONAL, -- Cond NonCodebook

 slotOffset INTEGER (1..32) OPTIONAL, -- Need S

 ...,

 [[

 aperiodicSRS-ResourceTriggerList SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNrofSRS-TriggerStates-2))

 OF INTEGER (1..maxNrofSRS-TriggerStates-1) OPTIONAL -- Need M

 ]]

 },

 semi-persistent SEQUENCE {

 associatedCSI-RS NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId OPTIONAL, -- Cond NonCodebook

 ...

 },

 periodic SEQUENCE {

 associatedCSI-RS NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId OPTIONAL, -- Cond NonCodebook

 ...

 }

 },

 usage ENUMERATED {beamManagement, codebook, nonCodebook, antennaSwitching},

 alpha Alpha OPTIONAL, -- Need S

 p0 INTEGER (-202..24) OPTIONAL, -- Cond Setup

 pathlossReferenceRS PathlossReferenceRS-Config OPTIONAL, -- Need M

 srs-PowerControlAdjustmentStates ENUMERATED { sameAsFci2, separateClosedLoop} OPTIONAL, -- Need S

 ...,

 [[

 pathlossReferenceRSList-r16 SetupRelease { PathlossReferenceRSList-r16} OPTIONAL -- Need M

 ]] ,

 [[

 followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL -- Need R

 ]]

}

**Q5: Do companies agree with placing a “followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 ENUMERATED {enabled} “ under IE SRSresourceSet?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes if | that parameter is needed at all.If it is possible to set this parameter when the SRS resource set refers to SRS resources that include the spatialRelationInfo field, then the parameter is needed. Otherwise, absence of spatialRelationInfo in all SRS resources of a resource set might be sufficient to indicate that the Rel-17 TCI indications are to be followed to determine the spatial relation information. |
| Intel | Yes  | This seems ok although in our contribution, we propose to define followUnifiedTCIstate-r17 per type of SRS (i.e. 1) Aperiodic SRS for BM, 2) SRS (of any time-domain behavior) for codebook, non-codebook, and antenna switching ). We preferred to use the original RAN1 parameter name but can accept if rapporteur prefer the current name. But, could we add SRS (ie. followUnifiedTCIstateSRS-r17) to be aligned with RAN1 parameter list?  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes but | For periodic SRS and aperiodic SRS, per SRS resource set configuration is enough.But for SP SRS can’t be addressed by RRC i.e. it could be done via MAC CE. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu  | Yes |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes but | As with other "marking" parameters: The RAN1 intent seems to be to indicate that some SRS resource sets follow unified TCI state and some do not. So why is that needed, what does it accomplish and does it create some restrictions for the RAN2 configuration? |
| vivo | Yes | We are fine to add this parameter in SRS resource level.  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Companies seems to support having this parameter per SRSResourseSet level. One company would like to ask RAN1 “So why is that needed, what does it accomplish and does it create some restrictions for the RAN2 configuration?”. Rapporteur thinks that only the last part of the question may be needed. Although the description says: “This applies to the following: 1) Aperiodic SRS for BM, 2) SRS (of any time-domain behavior) for codebook, non-codebook, and antenna switching “. RAN2 could ask whether this restriction will be specified by RAN1 or it is needed in the field description.

**Proposal 6 A parameter “followUnifiedTCIstate-r17” is added to SRSResourceSet IE and RAN2 asks RAN1 whether the stated restrictions are enough and whether those should be placed in TS 38.331 or these will be specified by RAN1. FFS if the parameter can be later replaced by other ASN1 ways to indicate the same or exact parameter name.**

**Q6: Do companies think similar parameter is needed for PUCCH? If so, should RAN2 ask about this from RAN1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | At least, not based on this parameter. Of course, RAN1 can ask if they want. |
| Intel | No | Agree with Huawei |
| Ericsson | No |  We can assume RAN1 brings it up if it is needed |
| OPPO | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| CATT | No | If RAN1 decided, they would indicate to RAN2 later. |
| MediaTek | No | If needed, RAN1 should inform us. |
| ZTE | No | Agree with above companies |
| Fujitsu | No |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Not sure | If we send LS to RAN1, we can also ask this if companies think it's unclear. |
| vivo | No | No at least by now, as there is no conclusion in RAN1. |
| Apple | No | RAN1 will inform us if they decide to support it. |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Proposal 7 RAN2 does not ask about whether a parameter “followUnifiedTCIstate-r17” should be applied for PUCCH or not.**

## 3.6 UL power control framework for BM

For other UL power control parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index), a setting of P0, alpha, closed loop index can be associated per signal/channel. The excel seems to also give the option that one set is given that is common to all PUSCH, PUCCH and SRS. In addition, the excel suggest that an UL TCI state may be associate to a set (P0, alpha, closed loop index).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RAN2 Parant IE** | **Parameter name in the spec** | **Description** | **Per (UE, cell, TRP, …)** | **Comment** |
| PUSCH-PowerControl | p0\_Alpha\_CLIdPUSCHSet | UL PC parameters other than PLRS (Set of P0, alpha and closed loop index): PUSCH | Per UE per cell per BWP | It can be discussed in RAN2 whether a new parameter is needed or the associated legacy parameter can be reused. Or if one parameter that includes all UL PC setting (other than PLRS) pars can be used.It was agreed that one setting can (optionally) be associated with an UL or if applicable joint TCI state via RRC. The details are up to RAN2Applies only to Rel-17 unified TCI FrameworkUp to RAN2 whether the ones for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS are combined into one structure (RAN1 thinks this can be done) |
| PUCCH-PowerControl | p0\_~~Alpha\_~~CLIdPUCCHSet | UL PC parameters other than PLRS (Set of P0, alpha and closed loop index): PUCCH  | Per UE per cell per BWP | It can be discussed in RAN2 whether a new parameter is needed or the associated legacy parameter can be reused. Or if one parameter that includes all UL PC setting (other than PLRS) pars can be usedIt was agreed that one setting can (optionally) be associated with an UL or if applicable joint TCI state via RRC. The details are up to RAN2Applies only to Rel-17 unified TCI FrameworkUp to RAN2 whether the ones for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS are combined into one structure (RAN1 thinks this can be done) |
| SRS-Config | p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSRSSet | UL PC parameters other than PLRS (Set of P0, alpha and closed loop index): SRS  | Per UE per cell per BWP | It can be discussed in RAN2 whether a new parameter is needed or the associated legacy parameter can be reused. Or if one parameter that includes all UL PC setting (other than PLRS) pars can be used.It was agreed that one setting can (optionally) be associated with an UL or if applicable joint TCI state via RRC. The details are up to RAN2Applies only to Rel-17 unified TCI FrameworkUp to RAN2 whether the ones for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS are combined into one structure (RAN1 thinks this can be done) |
| p0\_Alpha\_CLIdPUSCHSetp0\_Alpha\_CLIdPUCCHSetp0\_Alpha\_CLIdSRSSet | p0\_~~Alpha\_~~CLIdSetId | p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet ID (Set of P0, alpha and closed loop index) | Per UE per cell per BWP | It can be discussed in RAN2 whether a new parameter is needed or the associated legacy parameter can be reused. Or if one parameter that includes all UL PC setting (other than PLRS) pars can be used.It was agreed that one setting can (optionally) be associated with an UL or if applicable joint TCI state via RRC. The details are up to RAN2Applies only to Rel-17 unified TCI Framework |

A related parameter is the pathloss reference refence signal

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RAN2 Parant IE** | **Parameter name in the spec** | **Description** | **Per (UE, cell, TRP, …)** | **Comment** |
| [TCI-State\_r17 or new IE list for PLRS in PUSCH\_Config] | SourceRS-Info\_r17-PLRS | ~~Source RS and QCL Info definition for~~ Rel-17path-loss measurement RS (PL-RS) | Per UE per cell per BWP | Detailed design up to RAN2Can be included in UL or Joint TCI if included in TCI state, or can be a separate list in PUSCH Config if associated. Detailed design is up to RAN2.Applies only to Rel-17 unified TCI Framework |

**RAN1 agreed that:**

**Agreement**

On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework,

* For each of PUSCH and PUCCH, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) can be associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state per BWP.
	+ In this case, multiple settings are configured. Each setting can be associated with at least one TCI state, and, for a given TCI state, only one setting for PUSCH and only one setting for PUCCH can be associated at a time.
	+ (Working Assumption) In this case, for each of the PUSCH and PUCCH, each of the activated UL or (if applicable) joint TCI states is associated with one of the settings.
* If not associated, for each of the PUSCH and PUCCH, the setting(s) of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) per channel/signal per BWP is independent of the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI states
* FFS: If the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for SRS can also be associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.
* FFS: (to be decided in RAN1#106-e) whether to configure the same setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) per TCI state across channels and apply a channel dependent component, or configure a channel dependent setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) per TCI state

Excel guides RAN2 to discuss and decide on the power control parameters thus it is checked whether RAN2 can converge on some aspects related to the power control design.

Last round companies were converging to have a common set of power control parameters for PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS and to configure that under BWP-UplinkDedicated. However, there seemed to be diverging input on this to this meeting and also rapporteur suggested to verify this understanding.

Even if there would be common IE to configure these the remaining question is that is it assumed that the UL channels share the same PO set (P0, alpha, closed loop index)

**Q7: Do companies assume that common PO set (P0, alpha, closed loop index), i.e. the same PO values, are shared for PUSCH, PUCCH and SRS?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | as is visible from the Excel file from RAN1. |
| Intel | No | It should be different PO value but can be grouped as one IE group for unified TCI state. For example, p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet{p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSetIdp0-AlphaSets for PUSCHp0-AlphaSets for PUCCHp0-AlphaSets for SRS}p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet can be introduced in UL configuration level i.e. PUSCH ConfigOne remaining issue is how p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSetId is associated with actual uplink transmission because it is not associated with each UL TCI directly. If we follow Rel-16 operation, gNB configures the mapping between SRI and p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet. We suggest to ask RAN1 if SRI and p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet mapping information should be configured |
| Ericsson | No | Our understanding is that SRI is to switch pathlossRS assumption for PUSCH. Now pathlossRS is in UL(or joint) TCI state and thus gets indicated. But ok to ask.Current understanding for coding of the PO parameters is as such that * pathlossRS is configured in UL TCI state which are configured in BWP-UL-Dedicated.
* Then PO set(P0, alpha, closed loop index) is configured for each UL channel PUSCH, PUCCH, SRS in both UL TCI state as well as outside of UL TCI state(in BWP-UL-Dedicated).
	+ In both places bc RAN1 did not decide which way to go. Should then clarify that UE receives POset in UL TCI state or in BWP-UL-Dedicated
 |
| OPPO |  | The question is however bit misleading because it sounds like the power control parameters could be same for PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS. Our view is that network can configure a pool of PO(P0, alpha, closed loop index). Different index i.e. p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSetId can be referred by PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS to enable different configuration. These 3 index can be associated with one UL TCI state or joint TCI state. here is one example:UL-TCIState ::= SEQUENCE { ul-tciState-r17 TCI-State,  puschpPowerControlSetId-r17 p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet ID-r17  pucchPowerControlSetId-r17 p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet ID-r17  srsPowerControlSetId-r17 p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet ID-r17  plr-RS-Id-r17 PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id, } UL-PC-Set-r17 ::= SEQUENCE { p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet ID INTERGER(1..max-p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet ID), p0-r17 INTEGER (-16..15) OPTIONAL, -- Need S alpha-r17 Alpha OPTIONAL, -- Need S pusch-ClosedLoopIndex-r17 ENUMERATED { i0, i1 }} |
| Samsung | No | We share the understanding from Ericsson above. |
| CATT | No | As we know, RAN1 agreed (highlight as yellow )that these PO settings can be channel/signal dependent, which means that RRC need to support separate PO setting for PUSCH, PUCCH and SRS.Further, as RAN1 agreed, the PO configurations can be per TCI specific. RAN2 also need to discuss how to associate the PO settings and the UL/Joint TCI state with consideration of the following candidate solutions:* RRC to make such association;
* MAC CE to make such association upon activation

**RAN1#106e****Agreement**On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for SRS can also be associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.* If not associated, the setting(s) of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for SRS per BWP is independent of the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI states
* This is only applicable for SRS sets using Rel-17 TCI state to determine their spatial relation.

FFS: Whether more than one parameter sets can be configured, e.g. for different traffics**Conclusion**On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, there is no consensus in configuring the same setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) per TCI state across channels and apply a channel dependent component * Note: It has been agreed that “The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is at least associated with UL channel or UL RS” and hence the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is channel/signal dependent (separate settings for PUCCH, PUSCH, and SRS)
 |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| ZTE | No | Ericsson’s coding suggestion is fine to us |
| Fujitsu | No | According to excel from RAN1, different PO values can be configured while these parameters can be combined into one structure. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Unclear | The question is perhaps badly formulated: The L1 parameter excel indicates there can be different PC parameters for each channel. However, it is also entirely possible to use the same PC parameters for each. So perhaps the intent here is to consider how to 1) pool PC configurations and 2) indicate which of the PC "pooled" configurations each channel uses? In any case, we can ask from RAN1 if the proposed encoding matches their intention since we are anyway sending the LS. |
| vivo | No | As indicated by CATT. |
| Qualcomm | No | The agreement could be “The PO set parameters can take different values across PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS” |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Companies agree with the following implementation:

* pathlossRS is configured in UL TCI state which are configured in BWP-UL-Dedicated.
* Then PO set(P0, alpha, closed loop index) is configured for each UL channel PUSCH, PUCCH, SRS in both UL TCI state as well n BWP-UL-Dedicated(that is outside of UL TCI state).
	+ Should then clarify that UE receives POset in UL TCI state or in BWP-UL-Dedicated

**Proposal 8 The** **PO set(P0, alpha, closed loop index) is encoded in both UL TCI state as well n BWP-UL-Dedicated(that is outside of UL TCI state) and different values are enbaled for each UL channel PUSCH, PUCCH, SRS. UE receives the UL pc configuration in wither UL TCI states or in BWP UL-dedicated. FFS if confirming question is added in the LS and this can be worked when drafting the LS.**

**Proposal 9 pathlossRS is configured in UL TCI state which are configured in BWP-UL-Dedicated**

# 4 mTRP

## 4.1 UL power control framework for FR1 mTRP

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter name in the spec** | **New existing?** | **Description** | **Value range** |
| FFS: PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo (without referenceSignal) or PUCCH-PowerControlSetInfo (new IE) | RAN2 to decide reusing of PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo (without referenceSignal) | To support per-TRP power control in FR1, a new MAC-CE is used to link PUCCH resource with two power control parameter sets, and the MAC-CE shall indicate RRC IE that configures power control parameter sets (p0, pathloss RS ID, and a closed-loop index). RAN1 agreed that the exact design of RRC IE is up to RAN2 (from RAN1 point of view, one possible example is to reuse PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo except for the referenceSignal).Note: per-TRP’ refer to ‘per spatial relation (in FR2)’ or ‘per power control parameter set (in FR1)’ for PUCCH. | same as Rel-16 PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo without referenceSignal. |

What needs to be enhanced according to the above RAN1 agreement as well as the RAN1 input for MAC CEs, is to link a PUCCH resource with either one or two power control parameter sets for FR1.

There is no need to configure spatial relations to a UE in FR1. For this reason, it may not be a good idea to reuse the PUCCH-spatialRelationsInfo to configure the power control parameter sets. The power control and spatial relation are separate functionality, it is cleaner to have separate configuration for PUCCH power control. This is true even if FR1 would use spatial relations.

However, in either case, it is not clear from the input that how many power control parameter sets (p0, pathloss RS ID, and a closed-loop index) should be configured per TRP.

**Q8: Do companies agree to have separate configuration for PUCCH power control for FR1 mTRP?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | It would be cumbersome to use an ASN.1 structure with mandatory parameters that are always to be ignored by the UE.It is up to RAN2 to make choices for proper ASN.1 design. |
| Intel | Yes | Majority in RAN1 thinks that there is no issue to reuse PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo. However, referenceSignal is mandatory field in PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo. If we reuse PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo , either the UE should ignoree referenceSignal or new IE should be introduced. PUCCH-PowerControlSetInfo (new IE) should be introduced to configure power control parameter sets (p0, pathloss RS ID, and a closed-loop index). |
| Ericsson | yes | Agree with Intel about the new IE. |
| OPPO | comments | The same issue is discussed in email “[AT116bis-e][060][feMIMO] MAC general (Samsung)” and redundant discussion should be avoided. In short we support to reuse existing PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo |
| Samsung | Yes | Re-using the legacy RRC IE for FR1 makes more confusion in terms of functionality because FR1 don’t define spatial relations.In addition, handling of mandatory field in legacy RRC IE (i.e. ignore if UE receive this field) is not preferred for both NW and UE implementation. |
| CATT | Yes | In current PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo, the referenceSignal is mandatory present:PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo ::= SEQUENCE { pucch-SpatialRelationInfoId PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfoId, servingCellId ServCellIndex OPTIONAL, -- Need S referenceSignal CHOICE { ssb-Index SSB-Index, csi-RS-Index NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId, srs PUCCH-SRS }, pucch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id PUCCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id, p0-PUCCH-Id P0-PUCCH-Id, closedLoopIndex ENUMERATED { i0, i1 }}Thus, we prefer new PUCCH PC set IE to be introduced to configure per-TRP level PC in intra-cell mTRP scenario. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes but | Agree with Samsung: It's better to create new IE for the Rel-17 configuration. It's strange that we start using IEs for which we have to say "UE shall ignore this value" if we could just create a new IE instead. |
| vivo | See comments | We prefer to reuse spatial related info, and the reference RS could be change as optional. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Prefer a new IE so as we don’t signal parameters to be ignored by the UE. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q9: How many power control sets should be configured per TRP for PUCCH or should RAN2 ask this from RAN1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Nro | Comment/question to Ran1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ask RAN1 |  |
| Intel |  | We need to ask or wait for RAN1’s outcome. RAN1 is still under discussion how many TRPs can be configured/supported.  |
| Ericsson |  | Safer to ask as otherwise they may forget to inform about this |
| OPPO |  | Ask RAN1 |
| Samsung |  | Ask RAN1 |
| CATT | Maybe  | Further RAN2 need further confirm with RAN1 the applied scenario of per-TRP PUCCH PC enhancement, i.e., FFS only for R16 intra-cell mTRP? |
| MediaTek | - | Ask RAN1 |
| ZTE | - | Ask RAN1 |
| Fujitsu |  | RAN2 should ask this from RAN1 or wait for RAN1 progress. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Ask RAN1 | This is a minor configuration constant that we can fix once RAN1 tells us the number. |
| vivo |  | Ask RAN1 |
| Qualcomm |  | Wait for RAN1 or ask. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Companies agree to make clean configuration of adding new IE for power control for mTRP FR1 operation RAN1 should be consulted on the number of power control sets to be configured.

**Proposal 10 add a new IE for power control for mTRP FR1 operation and consult on the number of power control sets to be configured.**

## 4.2 SRI mapping for PUSCH for mTRP

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RAN2 Parant IE** | **Description** | **Value Range** |
| FFS: sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList2 or sri-resource-setId | AgreementWhen SRS resources from two SRS resource sets indicated in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, for linking SRI fields to two power control parameters, it is up to RAN2 to finalize the RRC details related to linking. RAN1 identified that the following options could be used. • Alt. 1: Add second sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList, and select two SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl from two sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList• Alt. 2: Add SRS resource set ID in SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl, and select SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl from sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList considering the SRS resource set ID | sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList2 : same as sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList |

For supporting PUSCH power control for the second TRP RAN1 is considering two configuration options:

* Alt. 1: Add second sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList, and select two SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl from two sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList
* Alt. 2: Add SRS resource set ID in SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl, and select SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl from sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList considering the SRS resource set ID

ASN1 perspective it is easier to add the second list as the IE SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl is not extendable. This is currently adopted in the running RRC CR. It should be further noted that handling of the ID space and designing of the corresponding MAC CE have dependency here.

**Q10: Which Alternative is supported by the company?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Alt 1 | Alt2 | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | No | It seems a little simpler |
| Intel  | Yes |  No | During RAN1 discussion, Alt-1 was the majority opinion in RAN1 but the agreement could not be made by strong concern and pushed this decision to RAN2. Alt-1 is straightforward in the sense that two SRIs are indicated in DCI format and each SRI is associated to sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList and sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList2. It is not so clear if we need to introduce addition “SRS resource set ID” and how it will be considered in one list to differentiate two different SRS resource sets. We prefer to add second sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList, and select two SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl from two sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList.  |
| Ericsson | yes | no | simpler |
| OPPO | Yes |  |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |  |
| CATT | Yes | No | Alt1 seems simpler |
| MediaTek | Yes |  | This looks simpler |
| ZTE | Yes |  |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  |  | No strong view, either option could work but it's usually best to select the simpler option. |
| vivo | Yes | No | Simpler |
| Qualcomm | Yes  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Companies agree with Alt1 thus.

**Proposal 11 Add second sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList, and select two SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl from two sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList**

# 5 CodebookConfig-r17

There is CodebookConfig related input from both CSI-FDD and CSI-mTRP subfeature groups.

The new CB from CSI-FDD is simple and translates into ASN1 like this(within new CodebookConfig-r17):

Type2 SEQUENCE {

 typeII-PortSelection-r17 SEQUENCE {

 paramCombination-r17 INTEGER (1..8),

 valueOfN-r17 ENUMERATED{n2, n4},

 typeII-PortSelectionRI-Restriction-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (4))

 }

 }

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter name in the text** | **Description** | **Value** | **Comment** |
| codebookType  | Support new codebook type, Rel-17 type II PS coodebook, as additional candidate value | new value:{typeII-PortSelection-r17} |  |
| paramCombination-r17 | Field describes supported parameter combination {M, alpha, beta} for Rel-17 Type II PS codebook | INTEGER (1..8), | With regarding to parameter combinations, 8 parameter combinations of {M,α,β} are supported in Rel-17 PS codebook with following restrictions: •Combinations with α=3/4 are not configurable with 4 and 12 Tx ports•Combinations {M,α,β} = {2,1,3/4} and {2,1,1/2} are not configurable with 32 Tx ports |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| valueOfN  | Field describes the size of the window of FD bases for Rel-17 Type II PS codebook. When M=2, N=2 or 4 | {2,4} | Proposal 12: In addition to N=2, N=4 is supported when M=2 for rank 1/2• For rank 3/4, when M=2, N = 2 or 4 is supported and same with the value of N configured for rank 1/2 |
| typeII-PortSelectionRI-Restriction-r17 | Field describes the applicable ranks that the UE can report for rank 1~4. | BIT STRING (SIZE (4)) |  |

Unfortunately, the input from CSI-mTRP is not very descriptive:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter name in the text** | **Description** | **Value** | **Comment** |
|  | Two RI restrictions can be configured per CodebookConfig, whereas one RI restriction is applied to all Single-TRP measurement hypotheses (up to the maximal rank of 8) and another one is applied to all NCJT measurement hypotheses (up to 4 rank combinations). | Up to RAN2 | Support the indication of following RI combinations by a joint RI field for a NCJT measurement hypothesis in CSI part 1, when the maximal transmission layers is less than or equal to 4: • {1, 1}, {1, 2}, {2,1}, {2,2} |
|  | Two CBSRs can be configured per CodebookConfig, whereas one CBSR is applied to one CMR group in a CMR resource set respectively. | Up to RAN2 | For a CSI report associated with a Multi-TRP/panel NCJT measurement hypothesis configured by single CSI reporting setting: |
|  |  |  | • Two CBSRs can be configured per CodebookConfig, whereas one CBSR is applied to one CMR group in a CMR resource set respectively, i.e. per TRP. |
|  |  |  |  |

Thus the instruction is to configure codebook subset restriction (CBSR) per TRP but it does not tell much on the details. Something can be deduced on the RI restrictions. Rapporteur’s understanding is that the particular CBSR is the Rel-15 type 1 single panel CB.

The total ASN1 for CodebookConfig-r17 could look something like when following the structure and style of the existing CodebookConfigs:

CodebookConfig-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

 codebookType CHOICE {

 type1 SEQUENCE {

 typeI-SinglePanel1-r17 SEQUENCE {

 nrOfAntennaPorts CHOICE {

 two SEQUENCE {

 twoTX-CodebookSubsetRestriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (6))

 },

 moreThanTwo SEQUENCE {

 n1-n2 CHOICE {

 two-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (8)),

 two-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (64)),

 four-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (16)),

 three-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (96)),

 six-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (24)),

 four-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (128)),

 eight-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (32)),

 four-three-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (192)),

 six-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (192)),

 twelve-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (48)),

 four-four-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (256)),

 eight-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (256)),

 sixteen-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction1-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (64))

 },

 typeI-SinglePanel-codebookSubsetRestriction1-i2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (16)) OPTIONAL -- Need R

 }

 },

 typeI-SinglePanel-ri-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (8))

 },

 typeI-SinglePanel2-r17 SEQUENCE {

 nrOfAntennaPorts CHOICE {

 two SEQUENCE {

 twoTX-CodebookSubsetRestriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (6))

 },

 moreThanTwo SEQUENCE {

 n1-n2 CHOICE {

 two-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (8)),

 two-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (64)),

 four-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (16)),

 three-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (96)),

 six-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (24)),

 four-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (128)),

 eight-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (32)),

 four-three-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (192)),

 six-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (192)),

 twelve-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (48)),

 four-four-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (256)),

 eight-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (256)),

 sixteen-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (64))

 },

 typeI-SinglePanel-codebookSubsetRestriction2-i2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (16)) OPTIONAL -- Need R

 }

 },

 typeI-SinglePanel-ri-Restriction2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (4))

 }

 Type2 SEQUENCE {

 typeII-PortSelection-r17 SEQUENCE {

 paramCombination-r17 INTEGER (1..8),

 valueOfN-r17 ENUMERATED{n2, n4},

 typeII-PortSelectionRI-Restriction-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (4))

 }

 }

 }

}

Open questions are at least:

* are both 2Tx and more than 2Tx supported for both CBSR?
* Is RI restriction configured per CBSR or are two RI restrictions, one 4 and one 8 bit configured for the pair?

**Q11: Do companies agree with the presented example and the open questions? Please state further questions if any**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Ericsson | See comment | Our current understanding is that the code is ok with the yellow updates and we could ask whether Ran1 is ok with this with below added field descriptions:Change name of *typeI-SinglePanelSDMP, typeI-SinglePanelSDMP2* to *typeI-SinglePanel1, typeI-SinglePanel2* and have field description for *typeI-SinglePanel1, typeI-SinglePanel2* would say that network selects same restriction bitmap for both fields.Change the name of *typeI-SinglePanel-ri-RestrictionSDMP-r17* to *typeI-SinglePanel-ri-Restriction1-r17* as it works same way as in Rel-15 and could have the following field description: Restriction for RI for TypeI-SinglePanel-RI-Restriction1 (see TS 38.214 [19], clause 5.2.2.2.1), when the reported CSI parameters correspond to one NZP CSI-RS resource from one Resource Group as defined in TS 38.214 [X], clause 5.2.1.4.2.Change name of *typeI-SinglePanel-ri-RestrictionSDMP2-r17* to *typeI-SinglePanel-ri-Restriction2-r17*And describe: "A pair of RI restrictions for *SinglePanel-RI-Restriction2* when the reported CSI parameters correspond to two NZP CSI-RS resources respectively from the first and second Resource Groups as defined in TS 38.214 [X], clause 5.2.1.4.2"Then we should have field descriptions for the bitmaps similar to: *n1-n2-codebookSubsetRestrition within typeI-SinglePanel1-r17*:“Number of antenna ports in first (n1) and second (n2) dimension and codebook subset restriction associated with a NZP CSI-RS resource from a first Resource Group as defined in TS 38.214 [X], clause 5.2.1.4.2*n1-n2-codebookSubsetRestrition within typeI-SinglePanel2-r17*:“Number of antenna ports in first (n1) and second (n2) dimension and codebook subset restriction associated with a NZP CSI-RS resource from a second Resource Group as defined in TS 38.214 [X], clause 5.2.1.4.2 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Ask RAN1 | Since we are anyway sending LS to RAN1, why not ask if this interpretation is correct? |
| vivo | No, see comments | For the 1st question, the answer is yes, both 2Tx and more than 2Tx are supported.For the 2nd question, in RAN1’s agreement, two CBSRs can be configured per CodebookConfig whereas one CBSR is applied to one CMR group in a CMR resource set respectively, and two RI restrictions can be configured per CodebookConfig whereas one RI restriction is applied to all Single-TRP measurement hypotheses (up to the maximal rank of 8) and another one is applied to all NCJT measurement hypotheses (up to 4 rank combinations). Our comments are as follows:* It is fine to have different CBSRs configured in typeI-SinglePanelSDMP-r17 and typeI-SinglePanelSDMP2-r17 respectively. The CodebookConfig-r17 should apply to both STRP and NCJT measurement hypotheses, that is, for STRP measurement hypotheses on CMR group 1, typeI-SinglePanelSDMP-r17 is used; for STRP measurement hypotheses on CMR group 2, typeI-SinglePanelSDMP2-r17 is used; for NCJT, both typeI-SinglePanelSDMP-r17 and typeI-SinglePanelSDMP2-r17 are used.
* The parameter name is not very proper, we recommend to use typeI-SinglePanel-r17 and typeI-SinglePanel2-r17 instead.
* The two RI restrictions are not applied for individual typeI-SinglePanel[SDMP]-r17 or typeI-SinglePanel[SDMP]2-r17, but for STRP and NCJT. One possible way is to configure the two RI restrictions in the level of type1 as follows:

 type1 SEQUENCE { typeI-SinglePanel~~SDMP~~-r17 SEQUENCE { nrOfAntennaPorts CHOICE { two SEQUENCE { twoTX-CodebookSubsetRestriction BIT STRING (SIZE (6)) }, moreThanTwo SEQUENCE { n1-n2 CHOICE { two-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (8)), two-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (64)), four-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (16)), three-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (96)), six-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (24)), four-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (128)), eight-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (32)), four-three-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (192)), six-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (192)), twelve-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (48)), four-four-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (256)), eight-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (256)), sixteen-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (64)) }, typeI-SinglePanel-codebookSubsetRestriction-i2 BIT STRING (SIZE (16)) OPTIONAL -- Need R } }, ~~typeI-SinglePanel-ri-RestrictionSDMP-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (8))~~ }, typeI-SinglePanel~~SDMP~~2-r17 SEQUENCE { nrOfAntennaPorts CHOICE { two SEQUENCE { twoTX-CodebookSubsetRestriction BIT STRING (SIZE (6)) }, moreThanTwo SEQUENCE { n1-n2 CHOICE { two-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (8)), two-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (64)), four-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (16)), three-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (96)), six-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (24)), four-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (128)), eight-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (32)), four-three-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (192)), six-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (192)), twelve-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (48)), four-four-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (256)), eight-two-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (256)), sixteen-one-TypeI-SinglePanel-Restriction BIT STRING (SIZE (64)) }, typeI-SinglePanel-codebookSubsetRestriction-i2 BIT STRING (SIZE (16)) OPTIONAL -- Need R } }, ~~typeI-SinglePanel-ri-RestrictionSDMP2-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (4))~~ } typeI-SinglePanel-ri-RestrictionSTRP-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (8)) typeI-SinglePanel-ri-RestrictionSDMP-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (4)) } |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Not much input for this. However, we propose to ask further clarification from RAN1.

**Proposal 12 Ask RAN1 about further input on how the 2 CBSR and RI restrictions are suppose to be configured. FFS on exact question formulation that can be worked with the draftLS**

# 6 Other

In SRSConfig, it was noticed that there is potentially one parameter missing as there was no r17 counterpart for *startPosition-r16*:

 [[

 resourceMapping-r16 SEQUENCE {

 startPosition-r16 INTEGER (0..13),

 nrofSymbols-r16 ENUMERATED {n1, n2, n4},

 repetitionFactor-r16 ENUMERATED {n1, n2, n4}

 } OPTIONAL -- Need R

 ]]

,

 [[

 resourceMapping-r17 SEQUENCE {

 nrofSymbols-r17 ENUMERATED {n8, n10, n12, n14},

 repetitionFactor-r17 ENUMERATED {n1, n2, n4, n5, n6, n7, n8, n10, n12, n14}

 }

**Q12: Do companies agree to ask from RAN1 whether this parameter should be there also in Rel-17?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| Ericsson | yes | Based on our understanding it would be needed also in Rel-17 thus we suggest to ask RAN1 |
| Samsung | Yes | Ask to RAN1 for this parameter, it is strange to remove the configuration of this parameter in R17. |
| Fujitsu  | Yes  |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes | Since we are anyway sending LS to RAN1, it's best to ask if this was omitted intentionally or not. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Proposal 13 Ask RAN1 whether the parameter startPosition should be there in resourceMapping also Rel-17 as it is there in Rel15 and Rel 16.**

# 7 Conclusion

**Proposal 1 RAN2 agrees on Separate TCI state lists for joint/DL and UL in PDSCHConfig and UL BWP, respectively, and separate Id pools.**

**Proposal 2 RAN2 continues discussing MAC CE design for common and separate TCI state operation as well as the UL/DL BWP association**

**Proposal 3 The BAT parameter is configured in PDSCHConfig and the field description clarifies that it has the same value for all servingcells with given SCS**

**Proposal 4 RAN2 will ask in the LS that whether the per CORESET indications of followunifiedTCIstate of PDSCH is according to RAN1 intention and whether any limitation or condition needs to specified. FFS on exact question formulation as well as if broader question on functionality is added. Work on the FFS when formulating the questions in a draftLS.**

**Proposal 5 RAN2 will ask in the LS that about implementation suggestion for ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLList. Starting point:**

**“RAN2 notes there is discrepancy with the description and comment related to ApplyTCI-State-r17-DLList. RAN2 has baseline implementation for this functionality where 1 bit “followunifiedTCIstateof PDSCH” is added in “AssociatedReportConfigInfo” where QCL for an aperiodic resource is currently configured. RAN2 would like to ask whether this implementation is according to intended functionality or whether this indication should be placed per NZP-CSI-RS resource. Note that it will be RAN2 signaling design whether supporting this functionality is 1 bit indication per field X, or by maintaining lists of field X.”**

**FFS work on exact question formulation in draftLS. FFS if the parameter can be later replaced by other ASN1 ways to indicate the same.**

**Proposal 6 A parameter “followUnifiedTCIstate-r17” is added to SRSResourceSet IE and RAN2 asks RAN1 whether the stated restrictions are enough and whether those should be placed in TS 38.331 or these will be specified by RAN1. FFS if the parameter can be later replaced by other ASN1 ways to indicate the same or exact parameter name.**

**Proposal 7 RAN2 does not ask about whether a parameter “followUnifiedTCIstate-r17” should be applied for PUCCH or not.**

**Proposal 8 The** **PO set(P0, alpha, closed loop index) is encoded in both UL TCI state as well n BWP-UL-Dedicated(that is outside of UL TCI state) and different values are enbaled for each UL channel PUSCH, PUCCH, SRS. UE receives the UL pc configuration in wither UL TCI states or in BWP UL-dedicated. FFS if confirming question is added in the LS and this can be worked when drafting the LS.**

**Proposal 9 pathlossRS is configured in UL TCI state which are configured in BWP-UL-Dedicated**

**Proposal 10 add a new IE for power control for mTRP FR1 operation and consult on the number of power control sets to be configured.**

**Proposal 11 Add second sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList, and select two SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl from two sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList**

**Proposal 12 Ask RAN1 about further input on how the 2 CBSR and RI restrictions are suppose to be configured. FFS on exact question formulation that can be worked with the draftLS**

**Proposal 13 Ask RAN1 whether the parameter startPosition should be there in resourceMapping also Rel-17 as it is there in Rel15 and Rel 16.**

RAN1 LS

RAN1 is informed of **RAN2 agrees on Separate TCI state lists for joint/DL and UL in PDSCHConfig and UL BWP, respectively, and separate Id pools.**

# 8 Appendix

RAN2 agreements 116bis

[R2-2201560](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116bis-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2201560.zip) Running RRC CR for FeMIMO Rel-17 Ericsson draftCR Rel-17 38.331 16.7.0 NR\_feMIMO-Core Late

- has implemented all L1 parameter, except the one under discussion and with FFSes from R1.

* Review offline
* RAN2 to conclude ““Joint DL/UL TCI” means that there is one TCI state ID for each codepoint, while “separate DL/UL TCI” means that there is one or two TCI state IDs for each codepoint.”
* P3: Can consider the R1 proposal with TCI state references, not ask q acc to P3, progress this offline.
* IT shall be possible to configure the parameter BeamAppTime differnet for different SCS
* FFS if parameter BeamAppTime is under the cell group config.
* Implement acc to RAN1 decisions wrt TCI state for PDCCH, applyunifiedtcistate applied to CORESET, introduce editor’s note about the potential issue (maybe something need to be captured in RRC, or in L1 TS, or need to move the IE).
* P6: Clarify which parameter is intended, resolve naming confusion, miáy be agreeable
* RAN2 assumes that unified TCI state related parameters for DL and Joint is implemented iin IE PDSCH-Config.
* RAN2 assumes UL TCI state is in UL BWP-Dedicated IE

[Mon Not Finished]

RAN2 agreements 116

[R2-2110666](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2110666.zip) Running RRC CR for FeMIMO Rel-17 Ericsson draftCR Rel-16 38.331 16.6.0 NR\_feMIMO-Core

* Endorsed as baseline (last meeting agreements included). Comments to be incorporated in CR after the meeting.

[R2-2110960](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2110960.zip) MAC Running CR for Rel-17 feMIMO Samsung draftCR Rel-17 38.321 16.6.0 B NR\_feMIMO-Core Late

* Endorsed as baseline (last meeting agreements included). Comments to be incorporated in CR after the meeting.

RAN2 impacts of inter-cell beam mgmt

[R2-2110341](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2110341.zip) On Rel-17 FeMIMO Ericsson discussion NR\_feMIMO-Core

DISCUSSION

- Samsung think there are ongoing discussions in R1. UL could be common or separate.

- MTK support this proposal. Think that what could make it complex is if we have to mix both R16 and R17 new frameworks for one UE.

- Chair proposes a high level text. OPPO want to wait. CATT think we can agree on a high level.

* RAN2 to support separate DL and UL and joint TCI state configurations. Details FFS.
* [AT116-e][015][feMIMO] (Nokia [lead], Ericsson, vivo)

 Scope: On RAN1 LSes [R2-2111214](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2111214.zip), [R2-2111246](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2111246.zip), [R2-2109326](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2109326.zip) and their General and high level consequences. Review impacts to RRC (top down) and R2 work, e.g. general observations, structure, common impacts and impact specific to mTRP and MCBF - Find Easy/Potential Agreements, identify points for online discussion, can also identify and capture open issues, and whether LS out is needed. (Comment: please focus on points that need to be discussed/decided to pave the way for more detailed later discussions).

 Intended outcome: Report

 Deadline: For online W2 Wednesday

* 1a: RAN2 to use the terminology "primary TRP (pTRP)" and "additional TRP (aTRP)" for RAN2 discussion purposes. FFS whether these will really be needed in Stage-2/3 specifications.
* 1b: RAN2 does not consider RLM for aTRP in Rel-17 work
* 2a: No RRM enhancements are done in Rel-17 (unless later found critical to the functionality).
* 2b: Add SSB/PCI information for ICBM as cell-level information and link unified TCI state information to that. FFS on exact Stage-3 details.
* 2c: RAN2 starts the RRC CR work based on latest RAN1 input before sending general RRC LS to RAN1.
* 3: The RAN1 parameters for "MultiBeam" are only applicable to ICBM with unified TCI framework (i.e. not to mTRP). Discuss further in Stage-3 phase how the UL PC configuration parameters are defined.
* 4: Rel-17 MPE configuration can be included in PHR-Config. Will ask R1 whether MPE information can apply to both ICBM and mTRP
* 6: RAN2 assumes "mTRP" parameters are not for ICBM and starts Stage-3 work based on that assumption. If ambiguities are found, LS can be sent to RAN1 to ask for clarification from next meeting.
* 7: RAN2 will use one RRC CR for the FeMIMO WI and start the work in post-meeting email discussion. Can discuss RRC structure during the discussion before going for final Stage-3 details.
* [AT116-e][016][feMIMO] MAC CE impacts (Samsung)

 Scope: Based on [R2-2110962](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2110962.zip), [R2-2110035](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2110035.zip), RAN LS’s and RAN1 progress. Do an initial review of impacts to MAC (MAC CEs) and related R2 work, collect initial comments, assess maturity and if possible Find Potential Agreements, identify points for online discussion, can also identify open issues.

 Intended outcome: Report

 Deadline: For online W1 Thursday, CLOSED

* FFS if to Introduce the new PUCCH spatial relation activation/deactivation MAC CE for mTRP PUCCH repetition i.e. activating two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC.
* RAN2 to discuss how to support PHR reporting for mTRP PUSCH repetition, and may address e.g:

New MAC CE design including the function which TRP is applied for PHR reporting.

How to incorporate the additional MPE information coming in Rel-17 to the new PHR format

Whether use legacy parameters (timer, threshold, etc.) or adding TRP specific parameters

PHR triggering conditions

* R2 assumes to revise the legacy PUSCH Pathloss Reference RS Update MAC CE with additional field(s) to differentiate the TRP for mTRP PUSCH repetition. other aspects are FFS.
* [AT116-e][017][feMIMO] BFD BFR and Initial Running CRs (Samsung)

 Scope: 1) Review the submitted Running CRs in [R2-2110666](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2110666.zip) (RRC) and [R2-2110960](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_116-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2110960.zip) (MAC), collect comments with the goal of endorsement, save comments to be applied to the CRs after this meeting. 2) Treat the proposals in BFD BFR tdocs under AI 8.17.3, identify agreeable points, points for discussion, identify open issues, whether LS out is needed etc.

 Intended outcome: Report

 Deadline: W2 Wednesday.

 CLOSED

* All green-marked proposals are agreed, see below. For Running CR endorsement see R2-2110666 and R2-2110960.
* New BFR MAC CE including beam failure recovery information of both failed TRPs is transmitted when beam failure is detected for both TRPs of SCell. The Following pieces of information are included in enhanced BFR MAC CE for M-TRP BFR

Info 1: For the Identity of serving cell of failed TRP, Ci/SP fields are included.

Info 2: For indicating whether candidate beam is available or not for a failed TRP of serving cell, AC field is included.

Info 3: Candidate beam (if available) for a failed TRP is indicated by including the Candidate RS ID field.

* Both single octet bitmap (7 Ci bits and 1 SP bit) and 4 octet bitmap (31 Ci bits and 1 SP bit) formats are supported for enhanced BFR MAC CE.
* Both truncated and non-truncated enhanced BFR MAC CE are supported.
* Triggered BFRs for a BFD-RS set of a SCell shall be cancelled when a MAC PDU is transmitted and this PDU includes enhanced BFR MAC CE (or Truncated enhanced BFR MAC CE, if supported) which contains beam failure recovery information (i.e. candidate beam available or not, candidate beam if available) of that BFD-RS set of the SCell.
* if a PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI indicating uplink grant for a new transmission is received for the HARQ process used for the transmission of the enhanced BFR MAC CE which contains beam failure recovery information of a BFD-RS set of a serving cell: *BFI\_COUNTER* corresponding to the BFD-RS set of the serving cell is set to 0.
* if the SCell is deactivated, *BFI\_COUNTER* corresponding to each BFD-RS set of the serving cell is set to 0.
* if Random Access procedure initiated on SpCell due to beam failure detection on both TRPs (i.e. BFD-RS sets) of SpCell is successfully completed: *BFI\_COUNTER* corresponding to each BFD-RS set of the SpCell is set to 0.
* if the beamFailureDetectionTimer corresponding to a BFD-RS set of a serving cell expires; or if beamFailureDetectionTimer, beamFailureInstanceMaxCount, or any of the reference signals used for beam failure detection corresponding to a BFD-RS set of a serving cell is reconfigured by upper layers: BFI\_COUNTER for this BFD-RS set of the serving cell is set to 0.
* For SCell configured with multiple TRPs, SR can be triggered irrespective of whether beam failure is detected on one or both TRPs of SCell.
* For SpCell configured with multiple TRPs, SR can be triggered if beam failure is detected on only one TRP of SpCell.
* The cases for which SR is allowed (as per proposal 15, 16), SR is triggered if either of conditions a) and b) below are met:

- If UL-SCH resources are not available for a new transmission; or

- If UL-SCH resources are available for a new transmission but cannot accommodate the enhanced BFR MAC CE or enhanced truncated BFR MAC CE plus its sub header as a result of LCP.

* If a SR was triggered by BFR for a BFD-RS set of a serving cell and a MAC PDU is transmitted and this PDU includes an enhanced BFR MAC CE or a Truncated enhanced BFR MAC CE which contains beam failure recovery information for this BFD-RS set of the serving cell, pending SR is cancelled and the corresponding *sr-ProhibitTimer* is stopped, if running.
* If a SR was triggered by BFR for a BFD-RS set of an SCell and this SCell is deactivated, pending SR is cancelled and the corresponding *sr-ProhibitTimer* is stopped, if running.
* It is assumed that If beam failure is detected on both TRPs (i.e. BFD-RS sets) of an SpCell, UE initiate RACH procedure and transmits new BFR MAC CE including beam failure recovery information needed to recover both TRPs. (other options not excluded for now, it is FFS whether the UE can skip BFR information needed to recover one of the TRPs if there is not enough bits).
* The meaning of “beam failure is detected on both TRPs” is to be clarified, It is FFS which of the following options shall be applied:

Option 1 (12/17): “beam failure is detected on both TRPs” means that BFR is triggered for a TRP of the serving cell while the BFR for another TRP of same serving cell is still pending (i.e. not cancelled).

Option 2 (4/17): “beam failure is detected on both TRPs” means that BFR is triggered for a TRP of the serving cell while the BFR for another TRP of same serving cell is still pending (i.e. not successfully completed)

* Cell specific or TRP specific BFR / BFR cancellation when beam failure is detected on on both TRPs of SCell is to be determined. It is FFS which of the following options shall be applied:

Option 1(5/17): Cell specific BFR of SCell is triggered. Triggered Cell specific BFR of SCell is cancelled when BFR MAC CE containing beam failure information of both TRP of the SCell is transmitted.

Option 2 (12/17): TRP specific BFR for both the failed TRPs remains as pending. TRP specific BFR cancellation procedure (as discussed in Proposal 10) is applied for each TRP independently.

* It is FFS whether Triggered BFRs for a BFD-RS set of a SpCell shall be cancelled when a MAC PDU is transmitted and this PDU includes enhanced BFR MAC CE (or Truncated enhanced BFR MAC CE, if supported) which contains beam failure recovery information (i.e. candidate beam available or not, candidate beam if available) of that BFD-RS set of the SpCell.