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## Introduction

In this summary, inputs from participating companies on the following DRAFT LS to RAN2:

[104-e-Post-R17-eMIMO-01] Email discussion for LS to RAN2 on TCI state update (beam indication) using non-serving source RS configured for non-serving cell(s) for DL reception and UL transmission – Eko (Samsung), Feb 22 ~ Feb 26

The following version of the companion DRAFT LS were provided:

* DRAFT R1-2102247 LS\_RAN2\_L12XCM BI (init): initial version
* ..

## Summary

### Inputs on the initial version

Table 1 Companies’ inputs: initial

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Apple | We suggest we clarify Q5 and Q6 a little bit. For Q5, RAN2 may not see the difference between inter-band CA and intra-band CA. For Q6, there may be different understanding on the definition of inter-frequency and intra-frequency.  **Question 5**: In regard of inter-band CA issues, what would be the higher-layer impact assuming intra-band CA as opposed to inter-band CA? The unified TCI state introduced in Rel-17 associated with a non-serving cell is applied for CCs at least in a band.  **Question 6**: In regard of inter-frequency issues, what would be the higher-layer impact assuming intra-frequency scenarios as opposed to inter-frequency scenarios? For intra-frequency scenario, it is assumed that SSBs of non-serving cells have the same center frequency and SCS as the SSBs of the serving cell. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Observation/summary: ....

### Inputs on revised version