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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
* DRAFT R1-2102247 LS\_RAN2\_L12XCM BI (revised 1): first revision
* ..

## 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.  [Mod: Done, added ‘if supported’ since we haven’t agreed to support unified TCI for non-serving cell.]  **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.  [Mod: Done.] |
| 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.  [Mod: The use of source RS is already captured in the 2nd sentence of the definition (not needed). Added clarification on PCI (although this is perhaps obvious).]  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.  [Mod: From the inputs, unfortunately almost all companies do not see it this way. They prefer to ask questions an await answers from RAN2 (and some also suggested RAN3 and RAN4) for progressing in RAN1.]  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 reconfiguration  The 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 split  RAN1 has agreed to support intra-DU scenarios.  [Mod: This issue is still FFS. In RAN1#104-e, one FL proposal was to agree on intra-DU assumption. It was rejected by a few companies.]  Issue 3: Aspects related to inter-band CA  One 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 operation  So 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.  [Mod: Added clarification on the agreement for intra-frequency. Re inter-band and inter-frequency, Apple’s clarification may help.]  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 sentences  Add “can be” and “if supported”, since RS configured for the non-serving cell is not agreed yet  Add “s” after source RS, since the TCI state can have two RSs  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~~ 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?   [Mod: Done] |
| 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?   [Mod: Done] |
| 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? |   [Mod: Agreed, done]  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? |   [Mod: Done]  We think RAN4 may also need to be involved at least for Question 5 and Question 6.  [Mod: Added a note in ACTION] |
| 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 |   [Mod: Technically I tend to agree with this since questions 3/5/6 would benefit from RAN3/4 attention. But Ericsson pointed out that the agreement only includes RAN2 and RAN3/4 CC should be removed. As a compromise I keep the CC RAN3/4 and add RAN + a note in ACTION on RAN3/4].  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? |   [Mod: Added, also a note on RAN1 agreement]  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? |   [Mod: I assume the intention is L3 handover, not intra-cell handover].   |  | | --- | | **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? |   [Mod: The proposed rewording is good. Added one sub-question to better clarify the intention of the question]   |  | | --- | | **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. |   [Mod: Incorporated] |
| 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?  [Mod: Based on the inputs, most companies seek answers to the questions in order to progress on RAN1 work further. From FL perspective, in addition to this goal, the answers from RAN2 (possibly with RAN3/4) can offer a holistic view of the feature, i.e. the work needed in other WGs and how they can impact decisions made in RAN1/]  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?   [Mod: Done} |
| 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:  [Mod: Thanks for pointing this out]  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).  [Mod: Agreed, done] |
| Sony | First of all, it seems reasonable to switch Q1 and Q2 as mentioned by vivo and others, since serving cell change may result in RRC reconfiguration. vivo’s version looks good to us.  For Question 1 (Item 2), in our understanding, RRC parameters follows the ASN.1 rule which is surely in different format from MAC CE or DCI. Our question would be that is such dynamic signaling based on RRC pre-configuration on a few of cells including serving cell(s) and non-serving cell(s)? If yes, we would like to try the following modification.   1. Can some RRC parameters related to the non-serving cell(s) be updated via dynamic signaling (e.g. MAC CE and/or DCI) based on RRC pre-configuration but without any additional RRC reconfiguration signaling?   [Mod: Done, cf. Qualcomm’s input]  For Qestion 3 (Item 2), since in current spec TS 38.321, C-RNTI can be updated per MAC entity by MAC CE. From latency and realiableiy perspective, it seems not necessary to apply RRC reconfiguration to update C-RNTI, so we would like to try following change too   1. In such condition(s), if any, is MAC CE or some other (dynamic) signaling needed for the C-RNTI update?   [Mod: Done, cf, MediaTek’s input]  Finally, considering the status of RAN2 TU budget, we would like to confirm that even without RAN2’s answers or responses, RAN1 may continue the study/discussion in RAN1’s region, e.g. L1 measurement, L1 reporting  [Mod: From the inputs, it seems that most companies would prefer some answers to proceed with the work. But as discussed in the previous RAN, only essential Rel-17 FeMIMO LSs (seeking answers, not merely informative) are sent to RAN2 and this one can be categorized as such.] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1: We are not sure if the first part is really needed. In our reading, if a UE is not currently configured to receive from non-serving cell, RRC reconfiguration would naturally be needed; if a UE has been pre-configured for reception from several candidate non-serving cell(s), RRC reconfiguration seems not needed for picking up reception from one of the previously configured non-serving cell (and the WID explicitly says ‘as opposed to RRC’).  Q2: Whether the UE should change the primary serving cell depends on the design in RAN1 and RAN2. In our view, it would make more sense to ask RAN2 about the feasibility of not-changing the primary serving cell if all or part of UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH are switched to a non-serving cell (as changing the primary serving cell completely is already possible with L3 handover), or the feasibility of changing the primary serving cell via dynamic signaling such as MAC-CE and/or DCI.  Q3: The question is formulated obviously biased towards C-RNTI update. We suggest rephrasing it in a question form such as ‘whether C-RNTI update is needed for DL reception from and UL transmission to a non-serving cell’.  [Mod: please check the revised wording for Q1, Q2, Q3 which should address your concern, at least partially (if I manage to comprehendall your points, that is).]  Q4: After checking with our RAN2/RAN3 colleagues, our understanding is allowing for inter-DU case would have RAN3 impact, and we suggesting copying RAN3 for them to check.  [Mod: Already done, also added RAN3/4 in ACTION]  Q5: To us, it would make more sense to ask what the addtiaionl higher-layer impact is when inter-band CA is supported in addition to intra-band CA (agreed). In our understanding, if similar design as traditional L3 handover is considered, the SCell(s) would be released upon changing primary serving cell. In this case, a relevant question that we may need to ask RAN2 would be whether it is feasible and how to keep the SCell(s) alive if the primary serving cell is to be changed.  Q6: Again, to us, it would make more sense to ask what the addtiaionl higher-layer impact is when inter-frequency scenario is supported in addition to intra-frequency scenario (agreed).  [Mod: Check revised wording] |
| OPPO | In general, the list of questions in the LS draft look ok. It is necessary to get answers from RAN2/RAN3 on those question for our design in RAN1.  One comment is that those questions seem to be relevant to the inter-cell mTRP too. In inter-cell mTRP, the UE also receives PDSCH and PDCCH from one neighbor non-serving cell. Thus, suggest the update following paragragh by including the inter-cell mTRP:  For ~~this purpose~~ the L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP, RAN1 seeks a few answers from RAN2 on the following questions in order to proceed further.  [Mod: Done]  Particularly for Question 2: We shall also figure out what shall the UE do to the previous serving cell and those TCI states associated with previous serving cell if the UE changes the serving cell when being indicated with non-serving cell TCI states. All those ‘normal’ TCI states seems to become TCI state asscoaited with a non-serving cell now after the UE changing the serving cell.  Furthermore, what is the impact on receiveing system information. For instance, does the UE need to receive system information from the non-serving cell? And does the UE stop receiving system information from previous serving cell?  **Question 2**: 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? And if so, how to deal with the previous serving cell and the TCI states associated with previous serving cell? Any impact on UE receiving system information.  [Mod: Done] |
| LG | We sympathize Ericsson’s comment that it would be better to clarify the meaning of ‘L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility’ and ‘non-serving cell’ from RAN1/MIMO perspective as these terminologies have quite different meaning for RAN2.  [Mod: Please check revised wording]  In addition, we think that explanation of background of these questions is needed before asking RAN2’s opinion. For example, the text provided by Ericsson ‘The 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.  [Mod: Based on the discussion so far, companies may have different understanding. From FL perspective, I see what you mentioned above as a perfectly feasible alternative for a particular flavor of NW implementation.]  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.’ can be added for Q1~Q3. Some explanation of RAN1 discussion for Q4~Q6 seem to be needed as well.  [Mod: Please check the revised wording – I believe your points have been addressed after I incorporated the suggestions from previously commenting companies] |
| ZTE | Firstly, we share the same views with Nokia that this LS should be sent to RAN3 and RAN4 as well, considering that inter/intra-DU at Q3 is relevant to RAN3 and inter/intra-frequency at Q5 is relevant to RAN4. Some update in Section 2 Action to RAN3/4 is needed accordingly.  [Done: Partially addressed. CC to RAN3/4 is kept as a compromise between Ericsson and vivo/Nokia/Huawei/ZTE/APT]  Q1: In our views, this question in first sub-bullet is to identify which RRC parameters should be updated/reconfigured due to switching to non-serving cell, rather than reusing the common parts for current serving cell. Then, we would like check RAN2 views on whether the idenfied RRC parameter can be updated by dynamic signaling. If so we suggest to slightly change the first sub-bullet as follows, in order to avoid some ambiguities:   |  | | --- | | **Question 1**: In regard of RRC configuration:   1. Are RRC parameters needed to be reconfigured 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 of the above 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? |     [Mod: Done]  Q2: We slightly prefer to go with Nokia’s updated version, considering that RAN2 clarification on procedure of switching a serving cell to a non-serving cell is necessary for RAN1 following discussion.  [Mod: Done]  Q5: In our views, the clarification for intra-band updated from some companies seems not to be needed.  [Mod: Please check the revised version and let me know if the revised version is fine]  Q6: This question is also relevant to RAN4. Also we would like to split the case of inter-frequency into inter-ferquency within an active BWP and inter-frequency outside active BWP, considering that the UE behavior of inter-frequency within an active BWP is similar to intra-frequency.   |  | | --- | | **Question 6**: In regard of inter-frequency issues, what kind of the higher-layer impacts does RAN2 and RAN4 foresee assuming inter-frequency scenarios (within an active BWP or outside an active BWP) as opposed to intra-frequency scenarios? |   [Mod: Done] |
| Ericsson2 | We share the views of Intel that we need to understand the intention of the LS better. Overall, it would seem appropriate to discuss RAN2 issues in RAN2, and at least some of the questions are in RAN2’s domain. Avoiding discussions in RAN1 on these topics is a good idea, and with a RAN2 LS, we would hand over these discussions to RAN2. This is an important motivation of the LS. In addition, the LS gives RAN2 a heads-up to find other issues, not identified by RAN1. We would be surprised if there are no such issues.  What we fail to see is how any RAN2 feedback would impact the work in RAN1. For example, the first question is if RRC configuration is needed. The answer could be ‘no’ – in which case there is no impact on RAN1 work. The answer could be ‘yes’ – in which case there is also no impact on RAN1 work, but it could impact the work in RAN2. So why would RAN1 need a response to progress our work?  There are several examples in the questions on the higher layer impact. It would make sense to inform RAN2 that RAN1 has identified a potential higher layer impact, but why would RAN1 need to know? If there is (significant) higher-layer impact, RAN2 would have to specify the required functionality.  [Mod: The above outcome would be ideal from FL perspective since we can progress with the work without any interruption. Yet this doesn’t seem to be the understanding from most companies. Therefore, I have no choice but to keep the current ‘inquiry-based’ format. Companies can still bring up issues in RAN1#104bis-e and we can try to progress while waiting for RAN2/3/4 response]  Thanks Emad for spotting the intra-DU issue – our interpretation was that the FFS was if we should support intra-DU or intra+inter-DU, but that is not the only interpretation.  We reiterate that the most important part of the LS is to explain how RAN1 has interpreted the statements in the WID on L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility. Without that interpretation, it is very difficult for RAN2 to provide any answers. This should be made clear: from a RAN1 point of view, a non-serving cell is a TRP that broadcasts another PCI.  [Mod: Already clarified that PCI is what we use to differentiate NSC from SC]  In the agreement it is stated that the LS should go to RAN2. We suggest sticking to the agreement.  [Mod: Evidently vivo, Nokia, Huawei, ZTE, and APT seem to have a different view. But your point is acknowledged. As a compromise, the CC list is kept as is without moving RAN3/4 to the direct addresse list (added RAN per Nokia’s request)] |
| NTT DOCOMO | First, we agree with E/// that we should clarify RAN1’s interpretation of “non-serving cell” in the LS since RAN2 has a clear meaning for ‘non-serving cell’, which is different from RAN1’s intension.  [Mod: Done]  Second, we agree with OPPO that those questions are also relevant to the inter-cell mTRP. Hence, in the LS, we suggest including inter-cell mTRP in addition to L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility.  [Mod: Done]  Third, we think we should clearly ask for feedback from RAN2, otherwise the purpose of the LS is not clear. On the other hand, we would like to clarify that before we get feedback from RAN2, how to proceed the discussions in RAN1? Considering no TU in RAN2 on MIMO, and potential complicated discussions in RAN2, it may take a long time to receive LS reply from RAN2.  [Mod: Per the input from RAN2 chairperson in the last RAN, RAN2 will promptly respond to any inquiry LS from RAN1 despite the TU allocation.] |
| APT | We are generally supportive of the LS from content wise. Meanwhile, we share similar views with Nokia and other companies that the LS should inform RAN 3 and RAN 4 as well since we need expertized feedback from RAN3 for CU-DU impact and pontential implementation issue from RAN4 for support of inter-frequency. Otherwise, RAN1 may be circling around similar arguments in future meetings.  [Mod: Done.RAN3 and RAN4 are on the CC list]  We would also like to clarify what is RAN1’s action in subsequent meetings if RAN2 has not been able to provide their feedback.  [Mod: RAN1 will continue on the work on RAN1#104bis-e and see what we can progress on while waiting on the response. From FL perspective, we have an FFS related to source RS and measurement/reporting that we can discuss and hopefully progress. At least the measurement/reporting part is the least affected by this LS, if any].  Lastly, we support vivo’s sugestion to switch order of current Q1 and Q2, and share OPPO’s concerns that this is also related to inter-cell multi-TRP.  [Mod: Done] |
| Moderator | Version: revised 1   * Revised based on the inputs from companies * The CC list with RAN3 and RAN4 is kept (compromise between RAN2 only and RAN2/3/4 on addressee list), added RAN per Nokia’s comment * Added inter-cell MTRP (per Samsung, OPPO, NTT DOCOMO, APT) |

### Inputs on revised version 1

Table 2 Companies’ inputs: revised 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Samsung | For **question 0**, there could be more than one serving cell (CA case). There could be more than one non-serving cell, multiple neighbor cells as well as CA. Hence, we suggest the following update:  **Question 0.** In regards of TCI state measurements, is it feasible, from RAN2 perspective, that network could request a UE to provide measurements used for TCI state updates for both serving cell(s) and non-serving cell(s)?   * Note: RAN1 has agreed to support L1-RSRP-based measurement and reporting ~~to~~ of non-serving cell(s) derived from measuring at least SSB from the non-serving cell(s)   [Mod: To avoid confusion with (s) for serving cells, I will add ‘for a configured DL CC’. Adding (s) behind non-serving cell should be fine]  For **question 1**, what is the expected answer from RAN2 for 1-2 and 1-3? For 1-2, we think that RAN1 likes to do the L1/L2-centric cell switch before L3 handover for lower latency. Maybe we can re-phrase the question differently:  If so, how can the addition, release or change of a non-serving cell for DL reception and/or UL transmission be done~~? For example, would any of these actions require~~ before L3 handover from RAN2 perspective?  [Mod: OK]  [Mod: Sorry, reverted back in ‘revised 1.3’ per Huawei’s comment which I think is valid]  For 1-3 not clear if this is a RAN2 issue. TCI states are used in the PHY. It would be up to RAN1 to decide if it keeps the TCI states if the UE returns back to the original serving cell or discards them. I suggest deleting this question.  [Mod: OK]  I think that **question 2** is applicable if the answer to question 1-1 is either yes or no   1. If “yes” there would be invetibale change to some RRC parameters, the non-serving cell becomes the serving cell. 2. If “no” the UE might still be expected to change some RRC parameters to be able to receive from the non-serving cell.   We propose to update question 2 as follows:  **Question 2**: ~~If the answer to question 1 is yes~~, in regard ~~of~~ to RRC configuration:   1. RAN1 is discussing whether to allow a UE to be configured for DL reception from or UL transmission to a non-serving cell (depending on the answer to question 1-1) on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH. What impact does RAN2 see for allowing the UE to transmit and/or receive on some or all of those channels and which RRC parameter(s) would need to be reconfigured for the UE? 2. From RAN2 perspective, is it feasible to update some of the above RRC parameter(s) via dynamic signaling (e.g. MAC CE and/or DCI, potentially selecting pre-configured values) without any additional RRC reconfiguration signaling?   [Mod: Agreed that it could apply to both cases, I will reword accordingly] |
| Qualcomm | For Q0, suggest to add “in a single reporting instance”, which is one FFS in RAN1 agreement. It seems no concern to provide measurements for serving and non-serving cells in separate report instances.  **Question 0.** In regards of TCI state measurements, is it feasible, from RAN2 perspective, that network could request a UE in a single reporting instance to provide measurements used for TCI state updates for both serving cell and non-serving cell?   * Note: RAN1 has agreed to support L1-RSRP-based measurement and reporting to non-serving cell(s) derived from measuring at least SSB from the non-serving cell(s)   [Mod: OK]  [Mod: Q0 is removed]  For Q1, suggest to add “selection among pre-configured cells” in the example in 2nd bullet, also suggest to add impact on RACH and PUCCH in a new bullet in addition to system info.  **Question 1**: In regard of serving cell,   1. […] 2. If so, how can the addition, release or change of a non-serving cell for DL reception and/or UL transmission be done? For example, would any of these actions require L3 handover and/or selection among pre-configured candidate cells from RAN2 perspective? 3. […] 4. […] 5. If so, what is the impact on the RACH and PUCCH procedure?   [Mod: OK] |
| Moderator | To expedite process, I added some response to the above comments and uploaded version ‘revised 1.2’.  I moved ‘RAN2 perspective’ to the main sentence in Q2 for cleaner wording. |
| Xiaomi | For Q0, suggest to add “and reports”  **Question 0.** In regards of TCI state measurements, is it feasible, from RAN2 perspective, that the network could request a UE in a single reporting instance to provide measurements and reports used for TCI state updates for both the serving and non-serving cell(s) for a configured DL CC?   * Note: RAN1 has agreed to support L1-RSRP-based measurement and reporting to non-serving cell(s) derived from measuring at least SSB from the non-serving cell(s)   [Mod: Q0 is removed]  In my understanding, the answer to Q0 is yes by the existed measurement/report mechianism for L3 mobility. But i want to know the motivation of Q0, even the answer is yes, the existed mechanism is not suitable for L1/L2 centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell multi-TRP operations, since there is a long latency by the existed measurement/report mechianism for L3 mobility.  [Mod: Understood] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Commennts based on DRAFT R1-2102247 LS\_RAN2\_L12XCM BI (revised 1.2).docx  Question 0:  Similar as Xiaomi, we are not sure why we need to ask RAN2 about whether it is feasible to put beam reporting for serving and non-serving cells into a single report. In our view, this is something to be discussed/decided in RAN1. It is also strange to say ‘TCI state measurements’ (which does not exist) and ‘measurements used for TCI state updates’ (in speficiation, there is no hardcoded linkage between measurement and update), we suggest updating them as ‘TCI state ~~measurement~~ update’ and ‘measurements and reporting ~~used for TCI state updates~~’.  [Mod: Q0 is now removed. Your point is acknowledged. Perhaps this is a RAN4 issue which involves measurement/reporting latency and accuracy. If the issue comes clearer in later meetings, we can still send an LS to RAN4]  Question 1:  The formulation of ‘another (i.e. a non-serving) cell’ looks strange and we suggest changing it as ‘another ~~(i.e. a~~ non-serving~~)~~ cell’. We suggest changing ‘received’ in the 4th bullet as ‘reception’ to make it more general. And we failed to understand SS’s comment that ‘RAN1 likes to do the L1/L2-centric cell switch before L3 handover for lower latency’ (there is no such agreement/conclusion, we are not sure why cell switching needs to be performed twiced), and suggest falling back to preivous version.  [Mod: OK on the editorial. Agreed, there was no such conclusion/understanding on such RAN1 preference. From the discussion, it seems clear some companies wouldn’t agree. I undid the change and reverted back to the previous version.]  Question 3:  In the 1st bullet, it is strange to say ‘Is a UE required to be assigned a separate C-RNTI’. We suggest reformulating it as ‘Is there a need to assign the UE a separate C-RNTI or DL reception from and UL transmission to a non-serving cell’.  In the 3rd bullet, we suggest changing ‘are required’ as ‘are considered as necessary in some cases’ – to avoid the impliciation that RAN1 is leaning towards always using separate C-RNTI(s) for serving and non-serving cell(s).  [Mod: OK]  Question 4:  Suggest adding RAN3 in the 1st sub-bullet, as RAN3 is mentioned in the main bullet.  [Mod: Ericsson may have an issue with this ☺ but I think this is reasonable (also requested by Nokia, ZTE, and APT]  Question 5:  The description of intra-band CA is not immediately clear. We suggest rephrasing it as ‘UE is configured to operate with serving and non-serving cells that ~~correspond to intra-band CA band combination that UE supports~~ belongs to the same frequency band’.  In our understanding, the beavhior described in the note is just an optional configuration (not always the case) and is not aligned with current agreement (common TCI state ID stead of TCI state directly). So we suggest rephrasing it as ‘Note that ~~the unified~~ one common TCI state ID ~~introduced in Rel-17~~ associated with a non-serving cell, if supported, ~~would~~ may be optionally applied for CCs ~~at least~~ in a band’ or removing the note.  [Mod: OK]  Question 6:  We are not sure if it is a good idea to associate the concept of ‘active BWP’ with ‘intra/inter-freqneucy’ discussed under the context of mobility. We suggest removing ‘(within an active BWP or outside an active BWP)’ to avoid potential ambiguilty.  [Mod: OK] |
| MediaTek | For Q0, we think the answer of this question should be discussed/decided in RAN1 instead of RAN2. If RAN1 decides that the measurements for serving cell and non-serving cell at a time are allowed, from RAN2 perspective, NW can request UE to do so by reporting/measurement configurations. If not, simultaneous confguraitons shoud be avoided. Even adding “in a single reporting instance” in the question proposed by Qualcomm, it is still a RAN1 issue about how to design the reporintg format. We don't see this question is needed in this LS.  [Mod: Q0 is now removed. I tend to agree. Please also see comment to Huawei]  For Q1, we think the 3rd sub-bullet is needed. In general, the question is asking RAN2 whether it is possible to request UE to handle the confogurations associated with previous serving cell after the cell change.  [Mod: OK, added back] |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Commennts based on DRAFT R1-2102247 LS\_RAN2\_L12XCM BI (revised 1.2).docx  Question 0: we think it is a pure RAN1 issue. It can be discussed together with 8.1.2.2.  [Mod: Q0 is removed]  Question 1: OK.  Question 2: We think this depends on the answer to question 1. We should avoid having multiple RRC configurations in a cell at any time. If a UE changes its serving cell, all the RRC parameters need to be configured. If a UE adds a non-serving cell, a set of RRC parameters will be required too.  [Mod: Yes, already addressed]  Question 3: We are not sure if a UE shall have more than 1 C-RNTI in a cell at any time. It is best to tie this question with Question 1 regarding non-serving cell.  [Mod: The question doesn’t imply >1 C-RNTIs per cell per UE. It is about whether a separate C-RNTI is needed for a 2nd cell (non-serving) per UE. It is a separate issue from Q1 as discussed in the last meeting.]  For Question 4-6, we see them as pure RAN2 issue, although they originate in RAN1. No matter what is RAN2’s decision on these questions, these decisions do not impact RAN1’s work. So we think RAN1 does not need answer from RAN2. It is best to phrase Question 4-6 as notification instead of questions.  [Mod: Based on the inputs so far, there is consensus on this. Regardless, RAN1 can continue discussion on this issue and companies will comment accordingly.] |
| Moderator | To expedite process, I added some response to the above comments and uploaded version ‘revised 1.3’. More siginificant changes   * Q0: Removed, per comments from Huawei, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Lenovo * Q1: Reverted back to previous version in ‘revised’ per MediaTek’s and Huawei’s comments * Moved RAN3 from CC to addressee per Huawei’s comment (note: previously requested by Nokia, ZTE, and APT) |
| Moderator | Uploaded version ‘revised 1.4’: corrected the ACTION section since RAN3 is now on addressee list. |
| Futurewei | Commennts based on DRAFT R1-2102247 LS\_RAN2\_L12XCM BI (revised 1.4).docx  Regarding the issue of RAN3 and RAN4, we agreed that RAN3 should be moved from “CC” list to “To” list. Also, since some questions (e.g., Questions 5 and 6) are for RAN4 to provide answers, RAN4 should also be moved from “CC” list to “To” list and the ACTION section should be updated accordingly.  [Mod: OK, I guess that is reasonable].  In the ACTION section, there are two duplicated “related to”. One of them should be removed.  [Mod: OK]  On Question 1-1, it is not clear what “UE expected” means here and we suggest changing “expected” to “required”. Also, it seems the follow-up questions are all for cases where the answer is “Yes”. We suggest adding some questions in case the answer is “No”. In summary, we suggest the following updates:  **Question 1**: In regard of serving cell,   1. Is a UE required to change its serving cell for DL reception from or UL transmission to another (non-serving) cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? 2. If so, how can the addition, release or change of a non-serving cell for DL reception and/or UL transmission be done? For example, would any of such actions require L3 handover and/or selection among pre-configured candidate cells from RAN2 perspective? 3. If so, how can the TCI states associated with the previous serving cell be handled? 4. If so, what is the impact on the system information reception by the UE? 5. If so, what is the impact on the RACH and PUCCH-related procedures? 6. If no, what is the impact on the applicable use cases (e.g., both the serving cell and the non-serving cell need to be within the same DU)?   [Mod: re 1-1, rewordd .to “is there a need ...”. Added 1-6 without the e.g. (I am not sure if this is strongly correlated with the CU-DU split - already addressed in Q4.2.)] |
| Moderator | Uploaded version ‘revised 1.5’ to address Futurewei’s inputs |
| Nokia2 | W.r.t the ACTION, Questions 5/6 are still also relevant to RAN2 (because of e.g. capability signalling aspects and CA/DC modelling), so we made a small correction as below.   |  | | --- | | **ACTION:** RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to provide answers for the above questions related to signalling or connection control procedures (questions 1 to ~~4~~6) with additional details that RAN1 shall further consider. RAN1 also respectfully asks RAN3 to provide answers for the above questions related to CU-DU split (question 4) with additional details that RAN1 shall further consider. RAN1 also respectfully asks RAN4 to provide answers for the above questions related to frequency band and CA (questions 5 and 6) with additional details that RAN1 shall further consider. |   [Mod: Done] |
| ZTE | Regarding Q6, it is may be confusing if we ask RAN4 higher-layer impacts based on the latest version, and it is the reason why we previously prefered to clarify cases within or outside active BWP as RAN4 issues. Alternatively, we can consider to clarify this question about RRM impacts that is related to RAN4, as follows:  **Question 6**: In regard of inter-frequency issues, from RAN2/4 perspective, what would be the higher-layer impact as well as the RRM impact (e.g., measurement gap) assuming inter-frequency scenarios as opposed to intra-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.   * Note: RAN1 has agreed to support intra-frequency scenarios, whereas the support for inter-frequency scenarios is still for further study.   Then, regarding action, it seems that this Q6 is also relevant to RAN2 (... from RAN2/4 prespective as copied above).  [Mod: Done, RRM is added without example, cf. OPPO’s comment below] |
| vivo | For Question 1-3, we don’t understand the motivation to ask RAN2 whether and how to handle TCI state of previous serving cell. It is up to RAN1 discussion rather than RAN2 expertise. Moreover, we would also like to add another example case for not changing the serving cell.  **Question 1**: In regard of serving cell,   1. Is there a need for a UE to change its serving cell for DL reception from or UL transmission to another (non-serving) cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? 2. If so, how can the addition, release or change of a non-serving cell for DL reception and/or UL transmission be done? For example, would any of such actions require L3 handover and/or selection/activation among pre-configured candidate cells from RAN2 perspective? 3. If so, what is the impact on the system information reception by the UE? 4. If so, what is the impact on the RACH and PUCCH-related configurations?   If not, what is the impact on the applicable use cases? For example, is it a valid case for the UE to receive the UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH and non-UE dedicated channels/RS from different cells?[Mod: Q1-2 done, Q1-3 is kept per OPPO’s and MediaTek’s input, Q1-5 I am not sure if this is a use case, so I rephrased your suggestion] |
| OPPO | Regarding the Question 1-3: we think it shall be included. The reason is when the UE change the serving cell, then a TCI state “associated with serving cell” before changing the serving cell will become a TCI state “assocated with non-serving cell” after the UE chaning the serving cell. How to handle that definitely has impact on TCI configurations, which is in higher layer. Please note that the TCI states are configured in RRC and activated in MAC CE.  Regarding question 1-4: for RACH, it is more about the RACH procedures. So suggest to include the word “procedures” too  Regarding the qesution 6:in our views the wording suggested by Moderator is good enough. The target use cases are L1L2 inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP. It seems no need to include more detailed examples there.  So, we suggest to keep the question 1-3 and revise 1-5, no change to question 1-6 as follows:  **Question 1**: In regard of serving cell,   1. Is there a need for a UE to change its serving cell for DL reception from or UL transmission to another (non-serving) cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? 2. If so, how can the addition, release or change of a non-serving cell for DL reception and/or UL transmission be done? For example, would any of such actions require L3 handover and/or selection/activation among pre-configured candidate cells from RAN2 perspective? 3. If so, how can the TCI states associated with the previous serving cell be handled? 4. If so, what is the impact on the system information reception by the UE? 5. If so, what is the impact on the RACH and PUCCH-related procedures and configurations? 6. If not, what is the impact on the applicable use cases   [Mod: Done. Q6 RRM is kept without the example] |
| Ericsson | The current version is not acceptable to us.  We have the following strong concerns:   * The RAN1 definition of non-serving cell is not clear – the proposed addition is not sufficient. RAN1 defines a non-serving cell from a strictly physical point of view (a TRP broadcasting another PCI than the one on servingCellConfigCommon), in contrast to how RAN2 defines a cell. * We don’t’ see that there is any impact on RAN1 procedures and the formulation that the information is needed to proceed further is inaccurate. The statement also hints to that RAN1 should wait for a response, for which several companies expressed concerns * The questions have now become far too detailed, and the extensions are unclear * Some questions are outside RAN2 competence area – such as those related to use cases, deployments and network inter-operability * The To: list should not include RAN3 and RAN4 – the questions posed to RAN3 and RAN4 are even less clear   The original version of the LS would be a better starting point for the discussion, in particular based on the original questions 1-3.  [Mod: Checking on the RAN1 reflector if other companies have some strong concern with this, i.e. informative LS to RAN2 only about the first 3 issues only. Regarding the proposed definition, I wonder why this issue didn’t appear before. We can try to discuss if your definition is shared by other companies (I suspect not necessarily).] |
| LG2 | For Question 1-1, it may be helpful to add the explanation for the clarity on serving cell as below and there is a small typo on Q1-2. Actually, while endeavoring to address the current LS version, it is concerned that the meaning of ‘L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility’ and ‘non-serving cell’ from RAN1/MIMO perspective seems still not concrete as Ericsson mentioned.  [Mod: Regarding the proposed definition, I wonder why this issue didn’t appear before. This should have been discussed before if it is indeed unclear. The proposed text below is an answer to the question which RAN1 should let RAN2 state themselves.]  **Question 1**: In regard of serving cell,   1. Is there a need for a UE to change its serving cell for DL reception from or UL transmission to another (non-serving) cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? If the parameters related to non-serving cell have been configured for MTRP, UE can perform DL reception from or UL transmission to another cell as above. In this case, it would be clarified on whether changing the serving cell or not. 2. If so, how can the addition, release or change of a non-serving cell for DL reception and/or UL transmission be done? For example, would any of such actions require L3 handover and/or selection among pre-configured candidate cells from RAN2 perspective? 3. If so, how can the TCI states associated with the previous serving cell be handled? 4. If so, what is the impact on the system information reception by the UE? 5. If so, what is the impact on the RACH and PUCCH-related procedures? 6. If not, what is the impact on the applicable use cases? |
| Moderator | Uploaded ‘revised 1.6’ addressing the above comments:   * ACTION: change 4 to 6 per Nokia’s suggestion * Revised Q1 based on the recent comments. Minor revision on Q6. Other questions are stable * Ericsson’s concern is now being discussed on the reflector |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We are fine with Q1 to Q3. However, we have some concerns regarding Q4-Q6  Question 4: This is a pure RAN2/3 issue. We shall not be seeking their replies but just inform them to be aware of the potential impact to RAN2/3 spec. The issues of use case, deployment and inter-operability are out of RAN2/3’s scope. The question can be repharsed as:  **Question 4**: In regard of CU-DU split, from RAN2/3 perspective, RAN1 respectively asks RAN2 to consider any potential difference between supporting intra-DU only and supporting inter- in addition to intra-DU, and the associated RAN2 specification impact.  [Mod: This is one possibility but there is a drawback. The proponents of asking a question for this argue that it is beneficial to understand the limitation on use cases and inter-operability of this feature. If I understand correctly, there might be some concern if the feature is only useful for a specialized NW implementation – this may not a concern for UE vendors ☺]  Question 5: We think this question is irrelevant to RAN2, but to RAN4. It shall be sent to RAN4 in a separate LS.  Question 6: We think this question is irrelevant to RAN2, but to RAN4. But because RAN1 has not decided to support inter-frequency, it is premature to ask this question. It shall be dropped at this stage.  [Mod: From FL perspective, RAN1 has agreed on this. Removing Q5 and Q6 would not conform with the agreement. I see less of a problem in including RAN4 to keep the agreement, rather than removing parts of the agreement strictly for ‘minimizing’ the number of WGs involved in the LS. But I understand your view.] |
| Moderator | The latest version 1.6 is converted into ‘revised 2’ (no change since ‘revised 1.6’).  The discussion on the concern from Ericsson (and other companies) can continue. |

### Inputs on revised version 2

Table 3 Companies’ inputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Alternatives for the LS** | **Company’s position** |
| Alt1. The overall content of version ‘revised 2’: all the 6 questions on the agreed list of 6 topics to RAN2, RAN3, and RAN4   * Some refinement on wording can be proposed in Table 4   Alt2. Ericsson’s proposal: informative-only (no questions), only to RAN2 describing only the first 3 from the agreed list of 6 topics | Alt1.  **Support**: Nokia/NSB, OPPO, Samsung, Qualcomm, Futurewei, Apple, ZTE, MediaTek (at least Q1-Q3), APT, Sony, Huawei/HiSilicon, DOCOMO  **Concern**: Ericsson, Lenovo/MoM (OK with Q1-Q3, and informative 4)  Alt2.  **Support**: Ericsson  **Concern**: Nokia/NSB, OPPO, Samsung, Qualcomm, Futurewei, Apple, ZTE, MediaTek (at least Q1-Q3), APT, Sony |

Table 4 Companies’ inputs: revised 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Moderator | Version ‘revised 2’ is used as a starting point since it has been quite stable and most companies are ok with this. |
| Futurewei | We support the current form of version “revised 2”. As a compromise for moving forward, we are also open to send at least the first 3 questions (Q1 to Q3) to RAN2 asking for their answer and leave the rest of the 3 questions for future LS to RAN 2/3/4. |
| Apple | Our view is provided. We are fine with latest version, and we think all the 6 questions should be listed and the action part is reasonable |
| ZTE | Our view is provided, and meanwhile only sending first 3 question (Q1 to Q3) to RAN2 is unacceptable for us. Clearly we have the following agreement for requesting some information from other WGs for moving forward issues about CU-DU, inter-band CA and inter-frequency (already highlighted as FFS in current agreements). Reverting this agreement is too bad and not contructive to move forward this mobility topic, and we will be stuck in the discussion about framework, usages and scenarios again. Consequently, we prefer to directly go with the version ‘revised 2’ including all questions.  **Agreement**  On Rel.17 enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility,   * … * Send an LS to RAN2 on TCI state update (beam indication) using source RS configured for non-serving cell(s) for DL reception and UL transmission. The following topics are considered for the LS:   + RRC configuration issues   + Serving cell issues   + C-RNTI issues   + Issues related to CU-DU split   + Inter-band CA issues   + Inter-frequency issues |
| MediaTek | RAN1 needs the answers from RAN2 to facilitate RAN1 discussions. At least for Q1-Q3, we see correct and common understanding on these issues is important. It is too bad if RAN1 spends time making these questions clear but without the anwasers from RAN2 in the end. |
| APT | Our views are updated in above table. We also share views with ZTE. We have agreed to consult other groups about listed issues. Hence, it appears wired to us to leave some of them untouched. Meanwhile, we recalled RAN has made a conclusion that only essential LS is sent to other groups, at least for FeMIMO. In that sense, we don’t see it is appropriate to only send informative messages to other groups. |
| Samsung | We are supportive of the revised version 2.  The intention of this LS is to get clarity on the feature and to help guide the RAN1 design (these issues have come up repeatedly in the RAN1 discussions). Therefore, we don’t see any issue with sending the LS, and asking the questions therein to the various RAN WGs. This will not stop RAN1 from progressing on this feature in the meantime. It is always up to the other RAN working groups to reply to the LS with information that is relevant to their areas of expertise, or inform RAN1 otherwise.  We would like to keep all 6 questions. The 6 areas have already been agreed in RAN1#104-e as pointed out by ZTE. |
| Sony | Our view on sending the LS is provided in Table 3. In our understanding, sending all questions (Q1~Q6) to other WGs (waiting for answers) doesn’t prevent RAN1 from continuing the work in RAN1’s region, e.g. measurement, reporting, or even L1/L2 indicaiton. So, we are okay with Alt.1.  One tiny wording change suggestion on Q1 is listed as below. The reason lies in the fact that there could be more than 1 serving cells involved or changed, e.g. by adding new serving cell, and releasing old serving cell. To be safe, we suggest to add an ‘(s)’.  **Question 1**: In regard of serving cell,  Is there a need for a UE to change its serving cell(s) for DL reception from or UL transmission to another (non-serving) cell, at least on UE-dedicated PDSCH, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH? |
| OPPO | We support Alt1 and have serious concern on Alt2. Also, as said before, we can not agree with the suggestion of suspending Q4/5/6 for now.  That would not obey the agreement. The agreement includes all 6 points. Technically, we do not see why Q4/5/6 is less urgent. The answers and replies to all 6 questions have impact on RAN1 further discussion and designs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Editorial comments on revised version 2 – hopfully not controversial.  Q1-2: Adding question mark after ‘be done’.  Q3-3: Removing comma after ‘considered necessary’.  We suggest adding Alt-3 that captures the previous compromise proposal from the moderator, i.e., asking for feedback from RAN2, but not directly from RAN3/RAN4 (instead, put them in CC list). And we support both Alt-1 and Alt-3 (if added).  We are also ok to suspend Question 4/5/6 for now (which can be further discussed in RAN1), and if needed, send input/question/request to RAN3/RAN4 at a later stage. |
| DOCOMO | Generally, we support Alt.1 to send questions to other WGs.  We’re fine to send either all the questions or just Q1/2/3 for now. |