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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.  |
| Ericsson | We do not see why this needs to go to RAN3 or RAN4.A relevant piece of information to include early is that RAN1 has agreed to support intra-DU scenarios.We suggest clarifying RAN1’s interpretation of “non-serving cell”:RAN1 is currently investigating TCI state update (beam indication) for DL reception from and UL transmission using non-serving reference signals – at least for UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH. A non-serving reference signal is a reference signal that is transmitted from a TRP broadcasting a PCI that is different than the serving PCI, i.e., the PCI in the servingCellConfigCommon. From RAN1’s point of view, such a TRP would correspond to a non-serving cell.We do not see that RAN1 needs any confirmation to proceed further. The LS is to inform RAN2 of the RAN1 work so that RAN2 can act accordingly:Overall, we do not see that RAN1 needs any information from RAN2 to progress the work. The LS is to explain and inform RAN2 about the work that we are doing. RAN2 can then act accordingly, as long as the correct explanation is provided. We suggest reformulating the questions into issues that may or may not require RAN2’s attention:During the discussions RAN1 has identified the following issues that may or may not require RAN2 attention:Issue 1: Aspects related to RRC reconfigurationThe procedures addressed by RAN1 (i.e., TCI state update) will not lead to any automatic updates of the RRC configurations, and RAN1 has discussed if such updates would be beneficial or needed. Two issues that have been discussed in particular are if the serving cell needs to be updated, and if it is viable to reuse the same C-RNTI over an area covered by multiple cells.Issue 2: Aspects related to the CU-DU splitRAN1 has agreed to support intra-DU scenarios. Issue 3: Aspects related to inter-band CAOne topic that is of particular interest in the FeMIMO WI is inter-band CA, and RAN1 is discussing if there are any particular aspects that should be considered in relation to beam indication.Issue 4: Aspects related to inter-frequency operationSo far, RAN1 has agreed to support intra-frequency scenarios, whereas inter-frequency scenarios have not been agreed. RAN1 is discussing if there are any particular aspects that should be considered in relation to beam indication.For the actions, we suggest:**ACTION:** RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to take the above information into account in their future work.  |
| Qualcomm | Some wording suggestions for the following sentencesAdd “can be” and “if supported”, since RS configured for the non-serving cell is not agreed yetAdd “s” after source RS, since the TCI state can have two RSsRAN1 is currently investigating TCI state update (beam indication) for DL reception from and UL transmission to non-serving cell(s) – at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH. In this case, the TCI ~~is~~ can be associated with ~~a~~ source RS(s) configured for the non-serving cell(s) if supported. To our understanding, selecing pre-configured values is one way to avoid RRC reconfig, so suggest to add it in the example.**Question 1**: In regard of RRC configuration:1. Is RRC reconfiguration signaling needed for DL reception from or UL transmission to a non-serving cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? If so, which parameter(s)?
2. Can some RRC parameters related to the non-serving cell(s) be updated via dynamic signaling (e.g. MAC CE and/or DCI, potentially selecting pre-configured values) without any additional RRC reconfiguration signaling?
 |
| MediaTek | Regarding the question 1, we think the point is whether any RRC paranmeter update is needed for DL reception from and UL transmission to non-serving cell(s). Then, if the answer is yes, it is clear for us that the RRC paranmeter(s) can be updated by RRC reconfiguration signaling. However, what we want to know is whether the RRC paranmeter(s) can be updated without RRC reconfigurtion signaling, and the 2nd sub-bullet can be used for clarify it. In summary, we suggest the following changes: **Question 1**: In regard of RRC configuration:1. Is RRC paramter(s) needed to be updaed for DL reception from or UL transmission to a non-serving cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? If so, which parameter(s)?
2. If RRC paramter(s) updae is needed for DL reception from or UL transmission to a non-serving cell, can the RRC parameter(s) be updated via dynamic signaling (e.g. MAC CE and/or DCI) without any additional RRC reconfiguration signaling?
 |
| vivo | For Question1, our understanding is that Question1 is dependent on the answer for Question2. If there is no motivation to change serving cell, we don’t think it is necessary to further discuss Question1. For the case when the serving cell is not changed, wethere some other RRC parameters need to be updated is independent of which TCI state is indicated. Thus we would like to switch the order of Question1 and Question2. And change the corresponding questions as following:

|  |
| --- |
| Question 1: In regard of serving cell, is a UE expected to change its serving cell for DL reception from or UL transmission to another (i.e. a non-serving) cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? If so, what would be the higher-layer impact?Question 2: If the answer to Question 1 is yes, in regard of RRC configuration:1. Is RRC reconfiguration signaling needed for DL reception from or UL transmission to a non-serving cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? If so, which parameter(s)?
2. Can some RRC parameters related to the non-serving cell(s) be updated via dynamic signaling (e.g. MAC CE and/or DCI) without any additional RRC reconfiguration signaling?
 |

For the following question, is the intention to compare the difference between inter-DU and intra-DU case?

|  |
| --- |
| Question 4: In regard of CU-DU split, by restricting the above feature only for intra-DU scenarios (instead of allowing inter-DU scenarios as well), what would be the difference in terms of the following compared to allowing inter-DU scenarios as well? 1. The associated RAN2 specification impact
2. The implication in applicable use cases and inter-operability (e.g. across different gNB vendors)
 |

For Question 5, we would like to make the questions more general rather than directly asking the spec impact.

|  |
| --- |
| Question 5: In regard of inter-band CA issues, are there any specific issues that need to be considered assuming intra-band CA as opposed to inter-band CA? |

For Question 6 we would also like to highlight that only intra-frequency case is agreed. We are fine with E///’s wording.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6**: In regard of inter-frequency issues, RAN1 has agreed to support intra-frequency scenarios, whereas inter-frequency scenarios have not been agreed. Are there any specific issues that need to be considered assuming intra-frequency scenarios as opposed to inter-frequency scenarios?  |

We think RAN4 may also need to be involved at least for Question 5 and Question 6.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We first have the following update on the receipients of the LS, due to the reason that CU-DU-split is in RAN3 domain, so better ask for RAN3 to provide view on that and also RAN could be in CC for information since this may impact TU discussions.

|  |
| --- |
| **To:** RAN2, RAN3, RAN4**Cc:** RAN |

We respect to the text, we have the following suggestions. First, we see a need to add a question w.r.t the TCI, the point being that is it feasible from RAN2 POV that UE does measurements (e.g. L1-RSRP, L3-RSRP) for TCI state updates for the non-serving cell?

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 0**: With regards to TCI state measurements, is it feasible from RAN2 viewpoint that network could request UE to provide measurements used for TCI state updates for both serving cell and non-serving cell? |

On question1, in addition to some text edits, we think it might be good to ask if RAN2 sees difference if UE was configured for 1) PDSCH, 2) PDCCH+PDSCH, 3) PUSCH, 4) PUCCH+PUSCH, 5) PxSCH, 6) PxCCH+PxSCH?

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1**: In regard of RRC configuration:1. RAN1 is discussing whether to allow UE to be configured to receive DL from or transmit UL to a non-serving cell, on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH. What kind of impacts does RAN2 see for allowing UE to receive some or all of these channels and which parameter(s) would need to be configured for the UE to allow this?
2. Does RAN2 see it feasible that some RRC parameters related to the non-serving cell(s) could be updated via dynamic signaling (e.g. MAC CE and/or DCI) without any additional RRC reconfiguration signaling (i.e. changing the parameters would only require MAC CE and/or DCI indication)?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 2**: How can the addition, release or change of a non-serving cell for DL reception and/or UL transmissionbe done? E.g. if UE is configured to additionally receive DL from or transmit UL to the non-serving cell, what would be the higher-layer impacts? Would any of these actions require (intra-cell) handover from RAN2 perspective? |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3**: In regard of C-RNTI:1. Is UE required to have separate C-RNTI for DL reception from and UL transmission to the non-serving cell, or can the same C-RNTI as used for the serving cell be reused?
2. If separate C-RNTI is required for serving and non-serving cells, how would this be configured for UE, i.e. is RRC reconfiguration signaling or some other (dynamic) signaling needed for the C-RNTI update?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 4**: In regard of CU-DU split, ). From RAN2/3 perspective, are there any differences if only intra-DU or both intra-DU and inter-DU are supported in terms of the following? 1. The associated RAN2/3 specification impact
2. Applicable use cases (e.g. deployment scenarios) and
3. Network inter-operability (e.g. across different gNB vendors)
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 5**: RAN1 has discussed that the operation could be supported for intra-band CA scenario (i.e. UE is configured to operate with serving and non-serving cells that correspond to intra-band CA band combination that UE supports) or for both intra-band CA and inter-band CA scenarios. In regard to these scenarios, what kinds of higher-layer impacts does RAN2/4 foresee if the feature was supported in intra-band CA scenarios only or if it was supported in intra-band CA and inter-band CA scenarios? |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6**: RAN1 has discussed that the operation could be at least supported for intra-frequency scenario (i.e. both the serving and non-serving cell are operating under the same center frequency and SCS) and suppport of inter-frequency scenario is FFS. In regard to these scenarios, , what kind of higher-layer impacts does RAN2/4 foresee in intra-frequency scenarios only or if it was supported in both intra-frequency and to inter-frequency scenarios?  |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Actions:****To: RAN2****ACTION:** RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to provide answers for the above questions related to signalling or connection control procedures with additional details that RAN1 shall further consider.**To: RAN3****ACTION:** RAN1 respectfully asks RAN3 to provide answers for the above questions related to CU-DU split with additional details that RAN1 shall further consider. |

 |
| Intel | We want to better understand the intention of this LS from RAN1 perspective since some of the questions require actual solution based on further discussion in RAN2. Since RAN2 is not working on this topic currently, what would be the expectation from RAN1 i.e., do we wait for concrete feedback till RAN2 starts work and not discuss the related topics in RAN1 any further?Additionally, if we go with Ericsson’s suggestion of simply informing RAN2, do we still continue discussing support of RRC reconfiguration, C-RNTI update, inter-DU and inter-frequency use cases in RAN1? Generally, we feel that this should be a RAN2 led topic rather than RAN1 making decisions with major RAN2 specification impact. |
| Futurewei | We are in general ok with the questions in this LS. Since the answers to Questions 1 (RRC reconfiguration) and 3 (C-RNTI update) may be dependent on the answers to Question 2 (serving cell change), we agree with Vivo that the order of the questions should be re-arranged. Therefore we would like to suggest the following changes: **Question 1**: In regard of serving cell, is a UE expected to change its serving cell for DL reception from or UL transmission to another (i.e. a non-serving) cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? If so, what would be the higher-layer impact?**Question 2**: In regard of RRC configuration:1. Is RRC reconfiguration signaling needed for DL reception from or UL transmission to a non-serving cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? If so, which parameter(s)?
2. Can some RRC parameters related to the non-serving cell(s) be updated via dynamic signaling (e.g. MAC CE and/or DCI) without any additional RRC reconfiguration signaling?

**Question 3**: In regard of C-RNTI:1. In what condition(s) does a UE require C-RNTI update for DL reception from and UL transmission to a non-serving cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH?
2. In such condition(s), if any, is RRC reconfiguration signaling or some other (dynamic) signaling needed for the C-RNTI update?
 |
| Samsung | In RAN1#104-e, issues were raised and discussed relating to the need for RRC configuration, the need for C-RNTI change, inter-band CA issues, intra-band CA issues, etc …. The purpose of this LS is to solicit feedback from RAN2 on these open questions otherwise we continue discussing in RAN1 without much progress. Therefore, in the action section, we should clearly state that “we respectfully request RAN2 to provide feedback”. This LS is not just for RAN2’s information, but for benefit of RAN1 to get the information we need to progress.We are fine with the contents and questions in the LS. It is fine to switch the order of questions 1 and 2 as proposed by vivo and Futurewei. We agree with Qualcomm that RAN1 has not agreed on support of TCI states configured with non-serving cell RS. Therefore, we agree to change “is” to “can be”. Regarding Ericsson’s comment, it is true that RAN1 has agreed on intra-frequency in RAN1#103-e. But RAN1 has not agreed on support of intra-DU or inter-DU L1/L2-centric mobility. The agreement includes it as an FFS.**Agreement**On Rel-17 enhancements to enable L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility: * The following use cases are assumed:
	+ Network architecture:
		- NSA, i.e. LTE PCell and NR-PSCell
		- SA
	+ Intra-band CA
		- FFS: If inter-band CA is also included
	+ Intra- RAT (excluding inter-RAT)
	+ Intra-frequency scenario:
		- The SSBs of non-serving cells have the same center frequency and SCS as the SSBs of the serving cell
		- An SSB of a non-serving cell is associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell
		- FFS: Support for inter-frequency scenario
	+ FFS: Whether to support intra-DU only operation, or whether inter-DU is also allowed

Finally, we see some overlap with item 2b “QCL/TCI-related enhancements to enable inter-cell multi-TRP operations”. Therefore, some of the issues raised in LS could be applicable to item 2b. We could update the LS to include 2b:As a part of the Rel-17 NR\_FeMIMO WID wherein the group is tasked to “identify and specify features to facilitate more efficient (lower latency and overhead) DL/UL beam management to support higher intra- and L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility” as well as “QCL/TCI-related enhancements to enable inter-cell multi-TRP operations”, RAN1 is currently investigating TCI state update (beam indication) for DL reception from and UL transmission to non-serving cell(s) – at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH. In this case, the TCI is associated with a source RS configured for the non-serving cell(s). |

Observation/summary: ....

### Inputs on revised version