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## Introduction

In this summary, the term “item 1” refers to the first item in the Rel.17 NR FeMIMO WID, i.e. multi-beam enhancement:

|  |
| --- |
| * Enhancement on multi-beam operation, mainly targeting FR2 while also applicable to FR1:
	+ 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 and/or a larger number of configured TCI states:
		1. Common beam for data and control transmission/reception for DL and UL, especially for intra-band CA
		2. Unified TCI framework for DL and UL beam indication
		3. Enhancement on signaling mechanisms for the above features to improve latency and efficiency with more usage of dynamic control signaling (as opposed to RRC)
	+ Identify and specify features to facilitate UL beam selection for UEs equipped with multiple panels, considering UL coverage loss mitigation due to MPE, based on UL beam indication with the unified TCI framework for UL fast panel selection
 |

This summary includes the following:

* Observation and proposal
* Summary of current companies’ positions on each of the aspects within the category

## Summary of companies’ inputs

The listed issues are structured primarily to facilitate some progress on pending issues identified in the agreements (see Appendix A).

### Issue 1 (Rel.17 unified TCI framework – note: for intra-cell beam management)

Table 1 Summary: issue 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 1.1 | For QCL-Type D configuration in TCI state(s) shared across a set of CCs (that is associated with the same gNB beam):* **Alt1**: Separate QCL-Type D RS for each of the CCs can be determined from the TCI state(s). The determined QCL-Type D RSs for the set of CCs are further associated with a same QCL-Type D RS.
* **Alt2**: A single QCL-Type D RS for the set of the CCs is determined from the TCI state(s), and support enhanced QCL chain:
	+ **Alt.2-1**: Support Opt. A only.
	+ **Alt.2-2**: Support Opt. B only.
	+ **Alt.2-3**: Support both Opt. A and Opt. B.

Options of the enhanced QCL chain:* Opt. A: The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS, with different CSI-RS resources.
* Opt. B: The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D SSB.
 | **Alt 1**: Nokia/NSB, CATT, Apple, NTT Docomo, Intel, LG, APT/FGI, Ericsson**Alt 2-1**: OPPO, MTK (2nd), Sony**Alt 2-2**:**Alt 2-3**: vivo, Samsung, ZTE, Qualcomm, MTK (1st)  |
| 1.2 | Setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index): * AltA. The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is also associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* AltB. The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is also included with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* AltC. The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is neither associated with nor included in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state

Note: It has been agreed that the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is associated with UL channel or UL RS (therefore the setting is channel- and signal-specific). | **AltA**: Lenovo/MoM, Spreadtrum, CMCC (PUSCH/PUCCH), Nokia/NSB, Futurewei, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, ZTE, CATT (MAC CE update), OPPO (PUSCH, PUCCH), Apple, NTT Docomo, MTK, Intel (2nd preference)**AltB**: Nokia/NSB, Samsung, IDC, Apple, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo (2nd pref), LG, Intel**AltC**: vivo, Ericsson (P0 and alpha), Huawei, HiSi, OPPO (SRS, per resource set), Sony  |
| 1.3 | Path-loss measurement (PL RS):* AltA. PL-RS can be included in UL TCI state (or, if applicable, joint TCI state).
* AltB. PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state (or, if applicable, joint TCI state)
	+ FFS: Exact association mechanism
* AltC. UE calculates path-loss based on periodic DL RS configured as the source RS for determining spatial TX filter in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ FFS: If a PL RS is not included in or associated with the UL TCI state (or, if applicable, joint TCI state), whether the UE can estimate path-loss based on the PL-RS of an UL RS provided in an UL TCI state (or, if applicable, joint TCI state) as a source RS for determining the spatial TX filter.
 | **AltA**: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, IDC, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Samsung (2nd preference), OPPO, Qualcomm, AT&T, NTT Docomo, LG, Intel**AltB**: Lenovo/MoM, Spreadtrum, CMCC, Futurewei, ZTE, CATT (MAC CE update), Huawei, HiSi, Sony, MTK**AltC**: vivo, Nokia/NSB (if not configured in TCI state), Samsung, ZTE (if not configured in TCI state), Apple, Ericsson**One solution only** (no mixture optional/default): NTT Docomo, Samsung, Qualcomm |
| 1.4 | See table below (cf. offline discussion [1])Do the following ‘other signal(s)/channel(s)’ admit Interpretation 1 when operating with Rel-17 unified TCI? | CSI-RS resource for CSI:* **Yes**: Lenovo/MoM, Spreadtrum, Nokia, Ericsson, Samsung, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, ZTE (only AP), OPPO, Apple (at least AP), Convida, APT/FGI, Xiaomi, CATT, Sony
* **No**: vivo, Huawei, HiSi, Futurewei

Some CSI-RS resource(s) for BM (if so, which one(s), e.g. aperiodic, repetition ‘ON’)* **Yes**: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Samsung, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (rep ON), OPPO (one resource with rep ON), Apple (at least AP), APT/FGI (rep ON), ZTE (only AP), Xiaomi, CATT, Sony
* **No**: vivo, Spreadtrum, Huawei, HiSi, Futurewei

CSI-RS for tracking:* **Yes**: Lenovo/MoM, Ericsson
* **No**: vivo, Spreadtrum, Samsung, Huawei, HiSi, MTK, ZTE, Futurewei

 Some SRS resources or resource sets for BM:* **Yes**: Ericsson, OPPO, ZTE, APT/FGI
* **No**: Huawei, HiSi, Futurewei

Non-UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs:* **Yes**: vivo
* **No**: Huawei, HiSi, Futurewei
 |
| 1.5 | See table below (cf. offline discussion [1])For ‘other signal(s)/channel(s)’ which do not admit Interpretation 1 when operating with Rel-17 unified TCI (i.e. only Interpretation 2 is applicable), what TCI state update/configuration mechanism is used? | **Rel-15/16 update/configuration mechanism**: Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Samsung, OPPO, ZTE, MTK, Sony**Rel-17 update/configuration mechanism (using M>1 or N>1)**: vivo, Futurewei |
| 1.6 | For separate TCI, UL TCI state poolAlt1: Shared pool with joint/DL TCI stateAlt2: Separate pool  | **Alt1**: vivo, Spreadtrum, Samsung, Xiaomi, ZTE, Qualcomm, MTK, Convida, NTT Docomo, Intel**Alt2**: CMCC, Ericsson, Futurewei, Huawei, HiSi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, OPPO, Sony |
| 1.7 | TCI state pool for CAAlt1: Separate, per CCAlt2: Shared among all CCsNote: This is related to 1.1.  | **Alt1:** Nokia/NSB, Huawei, HiSi, OPPO, LG, Ericsson, CATT, Futurewei**Alt2:** vivo, Spreadtrum, Apple, Samsung, Xiaomi, Sony, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo, MTK, Intel, ZTE  |
| 1.8 | Maximum value of M (DL) and N (UL) along with the use case(s) | Max M:* **1 for sTRP**: Spreadtrum, ZTE, Samsung, Convida, NTT Docomo, MTK, OPPO, Ericsson
* **>1 only for mTRP**: Samsung (M=2), Apple (M=2), LG, OPPO (M = 2), Sony (M=2)
* **>1 for uses other than mTRP (specify)**: Futurewei, CATT, Qualcomm, LG

Max N:* **1 for sTRP**: Spreadtrum, ZTE, Samsung, Convida, NTT Docomo, MTK, OPPO, Ericsson
* **>1 only for mTRP/panel**: Samsung (N=2), Apple (N=2), LG, OPPO (N = 2), Sony (N=2)
* **>1 for uses other than mTRP (specify)**: Futurewei, CATT, Qualcomm, LG
 |
| 1.9 | If M>1 and/or N>1 are supported, whether this implies simultaneous reception with different DL QCL(s) or transmission with different UL spatial filter(s)  | **Yes**: Apple, Futurewei **No**:  |
| 1.10 | Additional source RS type for DL QCL Type-D reference for DL common UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETsNote: CSI-RS for tracking (TRS) and CSI-RS for BM have been agreedNote: There are currently two interpretations on the agreement regarding CSI-RS for CSI: 1) Agreeing on reusing Rel-15/16 QCL rules implies CSI-RS for CSI is also agreed, 2) Only CSI-RS for tracking and BM were listed in the agreement, so CSI-RS for CSI is not yet agreed | SSB, with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS* **Yes:** vivo, Samsung, ZTE, MTK, NTT Docomo, Xiaomi
* **No:** Spreadtrum, OPPO, Apple, Intel, APT/FGI, Sony, Futurewei

SRS for BM, optionally with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS* **Yes:** vivo, Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, IDC, ZTE, Convida, Xiaomi
* **No:** Ericsson, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, OPPO, LG, APT/FGI, Sony, Futurewei

CSI-RS for CSI* **Yes:** CMCC, ZTE, Sony
* **No:** vivo, Spreadtrum, Samsung, OPPO, APT/FGI
 |
|  |  |  |

**From offline discussion on how Rel-17 unified TCI applies to ‘other signals/channels’ (1-4 and 1-5):**

|  |
| --- |
| For discussion purposes, the term ‘other signal(s)/channel(s)’ refers to channel(s), CORESET(s), or a signal(s) *other than* (DL) UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs), as well as (UL) dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources. That is:* For DL: CSI-RS resource for CSI, some CSI-RS resource(s) for BM, CSI-RS for tracking, non-UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs
* For UL: Some SRS resources or resource sets for BM

Two possible interpretations on how Rel-17 unified TCI applies to ‘other signal(s)/channel(s)’. We use CSI-RS resource for CSI as an example to illustrate the point. * Interpretation 1: The CSI-RS resource for CSI shares the same (Rel-17 DL or, if applicable, joint) TCI state machine (hence ‘DL RX beam tracking loop’) as that for UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs. This works regardless of the values of M and/or N.
	+ In this case, the Rel-17 DL or, if applicable, joint TCI state used for the CSI-RS resource for CSI needs to be associated with some UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs.
* Interpretation 2: The CSI-RS resource for CSI uses a different (Rel-17 DL or, if applicable, joint) TCI state machine (hence ‘DL RX beam tracking loop’) as that for UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs. This [may] require M>1 and/or N>1 [if Rel-17 TCI state update/configuration mechanism is used].
	+ In this case, a separate Rel-17 DL or, if applicable, joint TCI state dedicated to the CSI-RS resource for CSI can be used without any association with any UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs.
 |

The following observation can be made:

* (1.2, 1.3) These two issues have bene discussed since RAN1#103-e (11/2021) and need to be concluded. Preferences from companies do not change significantly although they are better understood. In general, a number of companies prefer not to support two-scheme (default/optional) solutions as those would impose complication on both NW and UE implementation.
	+ On PL-RS, detailed aspects of the PL-RS can be further discussed after proposal 1.2 is agreed.
* (1.1/1.7) From offline discussion [1], proposals 1.3 (on CA QCL) is a good compromise between Alt1 and Alt2 proponents (Alt1 represents slight majority view).
* (1.4, 1.5) From offline discussion [1], proposals 1.4 (on applicability and use of Rel-17 TCI states) may be agreed after some discussion. Proposal 1.5 and 1.6 are good starting points for finalizing the issue in this meeting.
* (1.10) The situation has not changed since RAN1#103-e. It is time to conclude.

Based on the above observation, the following moderator proposals can be made:

**Proposal 1.1A**: On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, at least for PUSCH and PUCCH, the setting is included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.

* FFS: Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed and the signaling), and whether it is up to RAN2
* FFS: The setting for SRS

**V.S.**

**Proposal 1.1B: (still formulated, compromise between AltB and AltC from Ericsson)**

**Proposal 1.2**: On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, a PL-RS (configured for path-loss calculation) is included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.

* If the DL source RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state to provide spatial relation indication is different from PL-RS, the choice of RS for path-loss measurement (either the DL source RS in the TCI state or the PL-RS) is up to the UE
* FFS: Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed and the signaling), and whether it is up to RAN2
* The UE maintains the PL-RS of the activated UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The maximum number of activated UL TCI states or (if applicable) joint TCI states per band is a UE capability
* Note: As agreed in RAN1#104-e, the total number of maintained PL-RSs per CC is no more than 4
* FFS: detailed aspects of PL-RS, e.g. CSI-RS type(s), time-domain behavior(s), restriction on configuration

**Proposal 1.3A**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, [a single RRC pool of TCI states is used] for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide common QCL information and/or common UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs

* A CC~~-~~specific source RS can be determined from the indicated common TCI state ID to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter. The determined CC-specific source RSs for the set of configured CCs/BWPs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS.
	+ The CC-specific source RS is applied to all BWPs within the CC but measured only within the active BWP
	+ [FFS: how to provide the CC/BWP-specific RSs in a TCI state of the single RRC TCI state pool shared among the set of configured CCs/BWPs, e.g., the BWP/CC ID for the source RS for QCL Type-D reference and/or UL TX spatial reference can be absent in a TCI state]
* “A set of configured CCs/BWPs” includes all the BWPs in the set of configured CCs in one band

**V.S.**

**Proposal 1.3B:** On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, [a single RRC pool of TCI states is used] for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide common QCL information and/or common UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs

* A single QCL-Type D RS for the set of configured CCs/BWPs is determined from the TCI state(s)
* The following rules can be used:
	+ (From Rel-15/16 QCL rule) The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘repetition’ configured, with different CSI-RS resources
	+ The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘trs-Info’ configured, with [same/]different CSI-RS resources
* “A set of configured CCs/BWPs” includes all the BWPs in the set of configured CCs in one band

**Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,

* Any DL RS or DL physical channel that is a valid target signal/channel of a Rel-15/16 TCI state based on the Rel-15/16 QCL rules can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool)
	+ Note: This does not imply that all such DL RSs and DL physical channels necessarily share a same TCI
* FFS: Whether some SRS resources or resource sets for BM can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 UL TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL TCI state pool)
* Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is still TBD)

**Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, discuss and decide by RAN1#106-e (August 2021)

* Whether each of the following DL RSs and channels 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
	+ 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

**Proposal 1.6**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for any DL RS or DL physical channel that does not 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, but can be configured as a target signal/channel 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: For some channels/signals, only one of the above two alternatives may apply (to be discussed).

Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is still TBD)

[FFS: Whether/how the selected alternative can be used to align the Rel-17 DL TCI state between two target channels/signals which do not share the same Rel-17 DL TCI state

* E.g. TCI state #1 can be activated for PDCCH+PDSCH as in Rel-17 and can also be simultaneously configured for a CSI-RS resource for BM as in Rel-15/16.]

**Conclusion 1.7**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#105-e, there is no consensus on supporting the following source RS types for DL QCL Type-D reference for UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs:

* [SSB]
* [SRS for BM]
* [CSI-RS for CSI]

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **1) Check and update Table 1****2) Share your inputs on the above FL proposals** |
| MediaTek | P1.1 and P1.2: Support. We would like to further check whether the signaling (RRC or MAC-CE) to provide the association is also decided by RAN2 if ‘associated with’ is adopted by RAN2. If so, we prefer to further clarify it in the proposal. For example, * Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed and the signaling) is up to RAN2

P1.3: We can support the proposal if the brackets of [a single RRC pool of TCI states is used] are removed. Regarding how to provide the “CC-specific” RSs in a TCI state for multiple CCs, the BWP/CC ID for the source RS can be absent in a TCI state, and RS will be located in the active BWP in each CC by default.[Mod: Based on the current situation, we may need to consider two versions of the proposals based on Alt1 vs Alt2.1 – to be discussed in later rounds]P1.4: We prefer not to introduce any new signaling mechanism for “other” signals/channels not applying Rel-17 TCI state machine. However, it may not be possible to reuse Rel-15/16 UL spatial relation update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state for “other” UL signals/channels not applying Rel-17 TCI state machine. Since RS index is directly provided as spatial relation, it is quite different from TCI state. Thus, for UL part in P1.4, we prefer to leave it for further study.[Mod: Done, same comment as OPPO – it seems the only UL signal of interest is “some SRS for BM”]P1.5: SupportP1.6: For Alt1, as mentioned above, we see it may not be possible to reuse Rel-15/16 UL spatial relation update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state for “other” UL signals/channels not applying Rel-17 TCI state machine.[Mod: Agree. Let’s discuss this to refine the proposal in later rounds. I added a note which should resolve your concern.]P1.7: Support |
|  Nokia/NSB | Proposal 1.1Open for further discussionProposal 1.2 Not support subbullets. We don’t think PL measurement can depend on UE implementation. It should be clarified in the spec. We can only accept the main bullet only. And for the clarification, in our understanding, when we say association to TCI state, we may consider association to the TCI index not to the TCI state itself. Can we confirm the general understanding? **Proposal 1.2**: On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, a PL-RS (configured for path-loss calculation) is either included in TCI state or associated with index/codepoint of UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.* ~~If the DL RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state to provide spatial relation indication is different from PL-RS, path-loss measurement is up to UE implementation~~
* ~~Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed) is up to RAN2~~
* ~~FFS: detailed aspects of PL-RS, e.g. CSI-RS type(s), time-domain behavior(s), restriction on configuration~~

[Mod: Please see revised version which should address your concern]Proposal 1.3: We slightly prefer separated TCI pool per CC, but can be open for further discussion.Proposal 1.4: SupportProposal 1.5: SupportProposal 1.6: Support |
| Intel | Proposal 1.1: OK. Also OK with Mediatek’s clarificationProposal 1.2: OK with the main bullet and 2nd sub-bullet. Share Nokia’s concern on UE implementation based PL measurement. Would be good have further discussion on this case. We can keep it as FFS for now.[Mod: Please see revised version which should address your concern]Proposal 1.3: OK in principle. Proposal 1.4 – 1.6: Our general preference is to implement a clean design of Rel-17 unified TCI framework which replaces the spatial relation information signaling from Rel-15/16. To this end, leaving some configurations to re-use old framework while some use the new framework is not preferable. The two frameworks should not co-exist down the road making the whole design more complicated. As a result, in Proposal 1.6, we are not sure how Alt.1 works, especially since the Rel-17 UL TCI state definition and contents are not finalized yet. [Mod: That is indeed the goal. Re proposal 1.6, this will be discussed further. For now, we need to shape the discussion with proposal 1.6. Also added a note per your concern (similar to MTK)] |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 1.1, Suggest the following wording for potential RRC+MAC-CE based PL RS update, similar to R16**Proposal 1.1**: On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, the setting is ~~either~~ included in and/or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.* Whether it is ‘included in’, ~~or~~ ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed), or both (e.g. MAC-CE updates the one configured in TCI state) is up to RAN2

[Mod: The current wording should be ok. We do not touch the RRC vs MAC CE issue here. It is left to RAN2 (an LS will be sent). But to accommodate your input, I have removed “either” and that should be enough]For Proposal 1.2, same wording suggestion**Proposal 1.2**: On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, a PL-RS (configured for path-loss calculation) is ~~either~~ included in and/or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.* If theDL RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state to provide spatial relation indication is different from PL-RS, path-loss measurement is up to UE implementation
* Whether it is ‘included in’, ~~or~~ ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed), or both (e.g. MAC-CE updates the one configured in TCI state) is up to RAN2
* FFS: detailed aspects of PL-RS, e.g. CSI-RS type(s), time-domain behavior(s), restriction on configuration

[Mod: Please see above]For Proposal 1.3, suggest the following wording for the following reasons: * I guess the bracket in the main bullet is because one or multiple pools is still FFS. So suggest to reword the main bullet and add the FFS as a sub-bullet;
* Common TCI state ID may or may not provide common beam in R16. So suggest to remove it from main bullet;
* Modified the original 1st sub-bullet to emphasize at least a single common beam indication RS can be indicated for all BWPs/CCs; I guess that is the intention.
* Removed the bracket for FFS and clarify that it is for the case each BWP/CC has its own source RS, especially for TypeA RS, which must be different for different BWP/CC

**Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, ~~[a single RRC pool of TCI states is used]~~ each configured RRC pool of TCI states is used for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide ~~common~~ QCL information and/or ~~common~~ UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs* FFS: whether a single or multiple RRC pools can be configured across a set of configured CCs/BWPs
* At least a common ~~A CC-specific~~ source RS can be determined from the indicated common TCI state ID to provide common QCL Type-D indication and/or to determine common UL TX spatial filter across the set of configured CCs/BWPs. ~~The determined CC-specific source RSs for the set of configured CCs/BWPs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS.~~
	+ […]
	+ ~~[~~FFS: how to provide the CC/BWP-specific source RSs from ~~in~~ a TCI state of one ~~the single~~ RRC TCI state pool shared among the set of configured CCs/BWPs, e.g., the BWP/CC ID for the source RS for QCL Type-A/D reference and/or UL TX spatial reference can be absent in a TCI state~~]~~
* […]

[Mod: See latest version]For Proposal 1.4, suggest the following wording to include joint TCI**Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, * Any DL RS or DL physical channel that is a valid target signal/channel within the Rel-15/16 QCL rules can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL or joint TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL and joint TCI state pool(s))
* Any UL RS or UL physical channel that is a valid target signal/channel within the Rel-15/16 UL spatial relation rules can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 UL or joint TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL and joint TCI state pool(s))

[Mod: Please check offline discussion comments from Huawei in R1-2105296. This has been discussed. “Joint” is not needed.]For Proposal 1.5, fine to discuss. Our preference is allow sharing same configured TCI for any RS/channelFor Proposal 1.6, suggest to discuss after Proposal 1.5. Because it would be more efficient to reuse/share same R17 TCI for any DL/UL RS/channel. [Mod: Intended to set direction for discussion.] |
| Apple | Proposal 1.1: SupportProposal 1.2: We can compromise to consider PL-RS with one of the additional bullets* Option 1: Introduce a UE capability to report whether it beam alignment between PL-RS and DL-RS for beam indication
* Option 2: Enhance FG 2-4 and 2-62 that PL-RS is counted for active TCI
* Option 3: Pathloss measurement is up to UE implementation if beam mismatch happens
* Beam alignment/mismatch can be defined based on whether the DL-RS for beam indication and PL-RS is the same or whether there is direct/indirect QCL relationship between DL-RS for beam indication and PL-RS.

We are also fine without any consensus for PL-RS, which means the SSB for MIB decoding would be used.[Mod: Please check latest version which should address your concern]Proposal 1.3: OK. We support single TCI state pool, which can save overhead. R15 design unnecessarily requires large UE memory.Proposal 1.4: As downlink QCL indication is a 2-stage approach, does this mean we need at least 2 types of unified TCI – one for CSI-RS, the other for PDSCH/PDCCH? Similarly uplink spatial relation indication for PUSCH is based on a 2-stage approach, does it mean SRS for CB/NCB can be included in UL TCI, and there would be two types of UL TCI – one for SRS/PUCCH, the other for PUSCH?[Mod: If CSI-RS can use Rel-17 TCI and if it does not share the same TCI state as PDSCH/PDCCH, it means we have two Rel-17 TCI states which share the SAME.COMMON DL TCI pool: one for PDSCH/PDCCH, the other for CSI-RS. Then the next question is signaling mechanism (proposal 1.6).But if CSI-RS shares the same TCI state as PDSCH/PDCCH (currently majority view), there is only one Rel-17 TCI state.]Proposal 1.5: Support in principle.Proposal 1.6: We suggest we first identify what “other signal/channel” is, and decide the solution later. Proposal 1.7: Support |
| Samsung | Proposal 1.1: SupportProposal 1.2: We share Apple’s view that the PL RS and the beam RS should be aligned to the same QCL source. However, the current wording of the first sub-bullet seems to imply that the PL RS and beam RS should be the same. We suggest the following update:“A UE expects that the DL RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state providing spatial relation indication and the PL-RS are aligned to the same QCL source”.[Mod: Please check latest version which should address your concern]Proposal 1.3: We agree with the direction of the proposal as a compromise, but we would like to remove the square brackets around “a single RRC pool of TCI states is used”Proposal 1.4: Support with a small wording update* Any DL RS or DL physical channel that is a valid target signal/channel ~~within the~~ of a Rel-15/16 TCI state QCL rules can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool)

[Mod: Done]Proposal 1.5: SupportProposal 1.6: Support slight preference for Alt1, as we have limited TCI state indication capability in release 17 (with no repurposing) |
| OPPO | Proposal 1.1: Only support it for PUSCH and PUCCH. But not support it for SRS. For SRS, the (P0, alpha, closed loop index) shall be configured to the set and they shall not change along with the TCI state switch[Mod: Noted. Since the majority supports this proposal, it is kept as is for now.] Proposal 1.2: SupportProposal 1.3: The proposal contradict with the previous agreement. In previous agreement, the QCL-TypeRS is a “same/single RS”. But this proposal proposes to use CC-specific RS, which are definitely not same/single RS. The reason for agreed “same/single RS” is to ensure same beam on those CC. The new description of “CC-specific source RS… with a same QCL-TypeD RS” can not ensure the same beam on multiple CCs because from the perspective of PDCCH and PDSCH, only the indirect QCL is same and that does not mean same beam.[Mod: It doesn’t contradict since it uses indirect QCL. But I added 1.3B to see which one can be agreed – to be discussed in the next rounds]Proposal 1.4: The proposal is confusing. For example, regarding the SRS of BM, does the proposal mean that we are going to just replace the “spatial relation info” with ‘TCI state’ but still use the beam indication control signaling specified in rel15/16? If so, why we bother to repeat the same function here? If not so, does the proposal mean the indicated “common TCI” in rel17 unfied TCI framework will be applied to all the channel and reference signals?[Mod: Please check revised version which should address your concern.]Proposal 1.5: OkProposal 1.6: For ‘other signal/channels’: we suggest to reuse whatever is specified in rel15 and rel16 and do not repeat the same function by replacing “spatial relation info” with “UL TCI”. [Mod: Next step discussion☺]Conclusion 1.7: Ok |
| ZTE | Proposal 1.1: Support. We are also fine with MTK’s or QC’s clarification.Proposal 1.2: SupportProposal 1.3: As we mentioned before as in offline discussion, it is a compromise solution that the Alt1 + a single RRC pool, and the bracket for a single RRC pool should be removed. Otherwise, we need to go Alt2, and to be honest, we do believe that Alt1 is to revert the previous agreement.* **Alt1**: Separate QCL-Type D RS for each of the CCs can be determined from the TCI state(s). The determined QCL-Type D RSs for the set of CCs are further associated with a same QCL-Type D RS.
* **Alt2**: A single QCL-Type D RS for the set of the CCs is determined from the TCI state(s), and support enhanced QCL chain:

[Mod: Done. Actually for Alt2.1, the QCL rule is already supported in Rel-15/16 in my understanding]Proposal 1.4: A little bit confusing. If our understanding is correct, we only need to clarify which types RSs/channels can be assumed as target ones of unified TCI framework in the spec, and if unified TCI framework is enabled, then the UE need to follow the specified UE behavior corresponding unified TCI framework rather than Rel-15/16. If so, it seems that this proposal is not needed unless we would like to clarify some ambiguities among companies.[Mod: Please check the latest version, also offline discussion in R1-2105296. This proposal was made per comment from Huawei.] Proposal 1.5: Support. Our preference can be found in the above tables.Proposal 1.6: Support.Proposal 1.7: Considering that we already supported that CSI-RS for CSI can be configured as source RS in Rel-15/16 QCL chain, we slightly prefer to keep CSI-RS for CSI as source RS in Rel-17 unified TCI framework also. [Mod: Understood but there is no consensus on this.] |
| LG | Proposal 1.1: SupportProposal 1.2: Support the main bullet but we share a similar view with Nokia on the first sub-bullet that it needs further discussion for how to handle the case.[Mod: please check revised version]Proposal 1.3: It is preferred to remove ‘a single RRC pool of TCI state is used’ in main bullet and discuss further on that as FFS. As Huawei and CATT mentioned in offline discussion, it would lead the same UL PC across CCs by taking PC setting included in/associated with UL TCI into account.[Mod: Now it is back to two alternatives. We will discuss next rounds since there seems no hope to converge on this early.]Proposal 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and Conclusion 1.7: Support |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1.1, support.Proposal 1.2, for the first sub-bullet, we think it need to be specified when the DL RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state to provide spatial relation indication is different from PL-RS. [Mod: This would restrict NW implementation, and could potentially need a new test case in RAN4, and most likely not agreeable. Note that this is the way it is handled in Rel-15/16 (left to UE)]Proposal 1.3, support.Proposal 1.4, support. And fine with the revision from Qualcomm.Proposal 1.5, support.Proposal 1.6, it is not clear how to reuse UL spatial relation update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state. It is better to discuss it after the definition of UL TCI state or joint TCI state is completed.[Mod: Next step discussion. Signaling mechanism and TCI state/pool are two separate issues] |
| NTT Docomo | Support proposal 1.1~1.6.On proposal 1.6, we prefer Alt.1. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Proposal 1.1: Agree in principle.Proposal 1.2: Support the main bullet in principle. We’d prefer that in certain scenarios that the indication of the PL RS along with the TCI state is optional to lower the control information overhead (PL RS is a periodic DL RS indicated as a spatial source or PL RS is the one used for the UL RS indicated as spatial source in the TCI state) as lowering the overhead and improving latency is also a target for this work item. [Mod: A number of companies have concern on two-scheme solution resulting from optionality]Proposal 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6: Proposal 1.5 and 1.6 seem to address the relevant issues concerned with target channels and signals for unified TCI and the signaling mechanisms to be used for the ones left out. Proposal 1.4 seems somewhat contradictory to proposal 1.5. Proposal 1.5 says that “decide whether each of the following DL/UL RSs and channels can share the same Rel-17 TCI state” and proposal 1.4 says “Any DL RS or DL physical channel (or UL RS or UL channel) that is a valid target signal/channel within the Rel-15/16 QCL rules can be configured as a target signal/channel.” This conflicting message can be avoided if we keep only one of them. In our opinion, proposal 1.5 is good enough and 1.4 is not required. [Mod: If you closely follow offline discussion in R1-2105296, there should not be any confusion. A signal can be a target for Rel-17 TCI state but doesn’t have to share the SAME Rel-17 TCI state as PDSCH/PDCCH – or PUSCH/PUCCH. This implies there are >1 Rel-17 TCI states even if those different Rel-17 TCI states share the same TCI state pool.]Conclusion 1.7: Support |
| CATT | Proposal 1.1: One minor wording suggestion below On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, the setting is either included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with index/codepoint of UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.[Mod: Done]Proposal 1.2: On the main bullet, sharing same view as Nokia on the following wording changes:On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, a PL-RS (configured for path-loss calculation) is either included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with index/codepoint of UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.[Mod: Done] Proposal 1.3: OK with the proposalProposal 1.4: SupportProposal 1.5: SupportProposal 1.6: Support |
| Mod V16 | Revised proposals to address the above inputs. Added proposal 1.3B as an alternative to 1.3A (original) for further discussion.**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| vivo | Regarding proposal 1.1, we still believe Alt C is the best solution. We don’t understand the motivation to associate the PC parameters with TCI. We don’t even need any agreement on this.[Mod: The proposal reflects the majority view of having beam-dependent setting in addition to channel/signal-dependent setting. It was agreed in RAN1#104b-e to finalize this issue in this meeting. So we need a conclusion. But if you mean that if no consensus on this issue is needed for a functional design, it is true. If no consensus, AltC is the automatic outcome.] Regarding proposal 1.2, it is obvious that current formulation would create spec wholes. We would like to start from the AltC formulation. As also commented by other companies, without any agreement, the specification is still working well since the default mode can still be used.[Mod: The proposal reflects the majority view of explicitly configuring a PL-RS (vs. using periodic DL-RS in the UL TCI). There is no default mode agreed for PL-RS as of now and a number of companies voiced concern on the two-scheme solution. Without any agreement, there is no PL-RS support for Rel-17 unified TCI – the natural outcome would be to use SSB of MBI or leave path-loss measurement up to the UE.]Regarding CC-specific RS proposal 1.3A, is it correct understanding that UE TCI state ID is still interpreted per BWP (i.e., the QCL-A RS is BWP specific), but the QCL-D RS in the TCI state is CC-specific? Or the QCL-A RS and QCL-D are both CC-specific? If the RS is CC specific, does UE only monitor the part within the active BWP?**Proposal 1.3A**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, [a single RRC pool of TCI states is used] for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide common QCL information and/or common UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs* A CC~~-~~specific source RS can be determined from the indicated common TCI state ID to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter. The determined CC-specific source RSs for the set of configured CCs/BWPs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS.
	+ Note: From a previous agreement, the common TCI state ID implies that the same/single RS determined according to the TCI state(s) indicated by a common TCI state ID is used to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter across the set of configured CCs/BWPs
	+ [FFS: how to provide the CC/BWP-specific RSs in a TCI state of the single RRC TCI state pool shared among the set of configured CCs/BWPs, e.g., the BWP/CC ID for the source RS for QCL Type-D reference and/or UL TX spatial reference can be absent in a TCI state]
* “A set of configured CCs/BWPs” includes all the BWPs in the set of configured CCs in one band

[Mod: It is CC-specific and applies to all BWPs in the configured CC. For Type-D RS, however, although it’s is CC-specific, it uses indirect QCL to refer to a same/single RS. The proponents can clarify more]Regarding proposal 1.4, we are fine with this direction. But the following is restricted to DL. **Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, * Any DL RS or DL physical channel that is a valid target signal/channel of a Rel-15/16 TCI state and spatial relation based on the Rel-15/16 QCL rules can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool)
* FFS: Whether some SRS resources or resource sets for BM can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 UL TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL TCI state pool)

[Mod: Done]Regarding proposal 1.5, there is also discussion regarding whether subset of PUCCH needs to share the common beam. Moreover, our understanding is that UE may not be able to differentiate UE dedicated or non-UE dedicated reception for subset of CORESETs.**Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#105-e, discuss and decide * Whether each of the following DL RSs and channels can share the same 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
	+ Non-UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH
	+ Subset of CORESETs
	+ Subset of PUCCH.
* Whether some SRS resources or resource sets for BM can share the same Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all or subset of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC

[Mod: Done, note that the above only hold for M>1 and N>1 per the definition concluded in RAN1#104-e]For proposal 1.6, we would like to understand how Alt.1 legacy spatial relation update signaling is used to reconfigured Rel-17 TCI state. BTW, Alt.2 does not need to be bundled with M>1, N>1.**Proposal 1.6**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for the following (‘other’) signal/physical channel:* Any DL RS or DL physical channel that does not share the same Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC
* Any UL RS or UL physical channel that does not share the same Rel-17 TCI state dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all or subset of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC,

Discuss and down-select in RAN1#105-e between the following two alternatives:* Alt1. Rel-15/16 TCI state and, if applicable, UL spatial relation update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are reused to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state
* Alt2. New TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are used, e.g. using M>1 and/or N>1, with Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication for Rel-17 joint/separate TCI

Note: For some channels/signals, only one of the above two alternatives may apply (to be discussed).[Mod: Per my previous comments, this is for next step discussion. Agree we can remove M/N]Regarding conclusion 1.7, we don’t think the conclusion is necessary to be made before we have clear understanding on how the cross carrier beam indication is designed. Moreover, we are open to CSI-RS for CSI that they can be used as the source RS as in Rel-15.**Conclusion 1.7**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#105-e, there is no consensus on supporting the following source RS types for DL QCL Type-D reference for DL common UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs:* SSB
* SRS for BM
* CSI-RS for CSI

[Mod: Not sure how this is related to cross-carrier beam indication. For SSB, since Alt2-2 is now removed, SSB is irrelevant. SRS is irrelevant for cross-carrier. vivo is open to using CSI-RS for CSI, but more companies view it is not needed. So there is no consensus. The situation has not changed at all from the previous meetings.] |
| APT/FGI | We are generally fine with FL’s proposals/conclusion. Regarding Proposal 1.1, we may need similar change as Proposal 1.2 as below. * Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed and the signaling) is up to RAN2

[Mod: Thanks for the good catch! Done!] |
| Samsung2 | For proposal 1.3A/1.3B, we prefer proposal 1.3B.We would also like to clarify the following, “The following Rel-15/Rel-16 QCL rule is used: The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS, with different CSI-RS resources”. According to 38.214, the TRS resources and the QCL Type-D resource should be the same, except for the case of ‘repetition’ for the QCL-TypeD CSI-RS. Is the intention here to restrict this to a CSI-RS with repetition?[Mod: Yes, configured with the parameter ‘repetition’ which means it is CSI-RS for BM. Added in the proposal to avoid confusion] *For the DM-RS of PDSCH, the UE shall expect that a TCI-State indicates one of the following quasi co-location type(s):**- 'QCL-TypeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet configured with higher layer parameter trs-Info and, when applicable, 'QCL-TypeD' with the same CSI-RS resource, or**- 'QCL-TypeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet configured with higher layer parameter trs-Info and, when applicable, 'QCL-TypeD' with a CSI-RS resource in an NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet configured with higher layer parameter repetition,or**- QCL-TypeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet configured without higher layer parameter trs-Info and without higher layer parameter repetition and, when applicable, 'QCL-TypeD' with the same CSI-RS resource.* |
| Mod V20 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| NTT Docomo | For proposal 1.3A/1.3B, we support proposal 1.3A.We have concern on proposal 1.3B, due to the following reasons:* It makes mandatory for gNB to transmit CSI-RS with repetition. For the gNB who configures QCL-Type A TRS + QCL-Type D TRS, it causes additional RS overhead.
* A single QCL-Type D RS has an issue for FR1-FR2 CA. Usually, we don’t configure QCL-Type D RS in FR1. Thus, the single QCL-type D RS cannot be shared in FR1-FR2 CA.

Proposal 1.3A says “*The determined QCL-Type D RSs for the set of CCs are further associated with a same QCL-Type D RS.*” So, it does not contradict with the previous agreement. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Proposal 1.1: supportProposal 1.2: support the main bullet, we cannot support the first bullet. If the DL source RS in the UL TCI is different from the PL-RS, it should not be up to UE to choose the RS for path-loss measurement. The UE shall use the RS specified for PL-RS for path-loss measurement.[Mod: This is to address Apple’s concern to avoid additional RAN4 test]Proposal 1.3: between 1.3A and 1.3B we slightly prefer 1.3B.Proposal 1.4: Support. We want to clarify that this does not imply all DL RS and DL physical channels necessarily share the same TCI. [Mod: Added]Proposal 1.5: Support.Proposal 1.6: Between Alt1 and Alt2, we need to decide separately for different channels and signals. Proposal 1.7: It is premature to draw this conclusion. We need to decide separately for different RSs during RAN1#105-e meeting.[Mod: SRS and CSI-RS for CSI are put in brackets] |
| MediaTek | **P1.3:** We still more prefer single TypeD RS in proposal 1.3B. But we can support 1.3A as a compromise only if a single TCI pool is used. Otherwise, we don't see any clear gain from 1.3A compared with Rel-16. Regarding 1.3B, we share the same view with Docomo is would be restrictive for NW to use only CSI-RS for BM as TypeD source. We prefer to add one more QCL rule TRS for A + other TRS for D. Even thorough this would be a new QCL rule, we don't see much implementation issue on this from UE perspective.* + The following Rel-15/16 QCL rule ~~is~~ can be used: The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘repetition’ configured, with different CSI-RS resources
	+ Support an additional QCL rule: The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘trs-Info’ configured, with different CSI-RS resources

[Mod: Done] **P1.4:** Regarding the revised proposal with “and spatial relation”, the bullet is only about DL RS or DL physical channel, why spatial relation is added here? We fail to see any DL RS or DL physical channel is a valid target of a spatial relation. [Mod: Correct] Regarding the TCI pool, since whether separate TCI pools for joint/DL and UL is not decided yet. Thus, we prefer to avoid use the wording. We think “Rel-17 TCI state pool” is clear.[Mod: This wording would bias the meaning toward joint/shared pool. So I added a note instead – also in P1.6]**Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, * Any DL RS or DL physical channel that is a valid target signal/channel of a Rel-15/16 TCI state ~~and spatial relation~~ based on the Rel-15/16 QCL rules can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 ~~DL~~ TCI state pool)
* FFS: Whether some SRS resources or resource sets for BM can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 UL TCI (hence the Rel-17 ~~UL~~ TCI state pool)

**P1.5:** Regarding the newly adding sub-bullets for M, N > 1, we suggest to add “if supported” to avoid misunderstanding:* + For M>1, if supported, subset of UE-dedicated CORESETs
	+ For N>1, if supported, subset of UE-dedicated PUCCH resources

[Mod: Done] **P1.6:** If our understanding is correct, P1.6 is discussed based on the conclusions of P1.4 and P1.5. Thus, we prefer adding the following tom make it more clear:**Proposal 1.6**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for the following (‘other’) signal/physical channel:* Any DL RS or DL physical channel that does not share the same Rel-17 TCI state 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 signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 TCI state pool)
* Any UL RS or UL physical channel that does not share the same Rel-17 TCI state dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all or subset of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC, but can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 UL TCI (hence the Rel-17 TCI state pool)

[Mod: Done]  |
| Ericsson | P1.1: Do not support. There is no motivation, except that it was like that in R15/16. Why should P0 be different for different TCI states. This configuration possibility will never be utilized, so it must be possible to avoid it.[Mod: P0 is put in brackets for now]P1.2: SupportP1.3A: OK without “a single RRC pool of TCI states is used”. TCI stats pool is a different issue, and should be treated as suchP1.3B: We have concerns, if this would mandate the NW to configure CSI-RS with repetition ON [Mod: This doesn’t imply repetition is always ON. It simply implies repetition parameter is configured, i.e CSI-RS for BM. It can be OFF]P1.4: OK with the original formulation. Like MTek, we do not see what DL RS or channel that can be a *target* of a R15/16 spatial relationP1.5: OK to discuss. Just as in R16, we think that it is relevant that the UE performs measurement on any type of CSI-RS using the QCL properties of PDCCH/PDSCH. With such a rule, we also reduce the need for aperiodic triggering states, which is bottleneck in practical implementation.P1.6: OK to discuss. We prefer no mix of R15/16 and R17 TCI states, i.e., Alt2.Conclusion 1.7: OK |
| CMCC | Proposal 1.1~1.2: SupportProposal 1.3: We prefer Alt1, but open to discuss further.Proposal 1.4~1.6: Support.Conclusion 1.7: CSI-RS for CSI is already supported as the source RS to determine the QCL of DM-RS of PDCCH and DM-RS of PDSCH in Rel-15/Rel-16. We should respect the previous agreement, which implies CSI-RS for CSI is also agreed.[Mod: SRS and CSI-RS for CSI are put in brackets – note that there is conflicting interpretation on the agreement pertaining to CSI-RS for CSI] |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 1.1: Support in principleProposal 1.2: Support in principle Proposal 1.3A vs 1.3B: support 3AProposal 1.4: OK.Proposal 1.5: OK.Proposal 1.6: OK.Conclusion 1.7: not needed! [Mod: SRS and CSI-RS for CSI are put in brackets] |
| CATT | Proposal 1.3A vs. 1.3B: support 3A.  |
| Mod V28 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 1.1: Prefer no bracket on P0Proposal 1.2: OKProposal 1.3A vs 1.3B: Support 1.3B whose meaning is at least clear, except for the newly added part below. Does this part want to have 1 TRS for A and another TRS for D? The current spec seems not allow such combination. Suggest to put it in FFS or bracket. * + The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘trs-Info’ configured, with different CSI-RS resources

[Mod: Done. However, note that without this bullet t least 1 operator has some concern since CSI-RS for BM is not yet implemented in the field.] We don’t understand 1.3A, which says in 1st sub-bullet that a CC-specific RS is determined to provide QCL-D, and the CC-specific source RSs for the set of CCs are further associated with a same QCL-D RS. What does this mean? Why needs to further associate with same QCL-D? Also, in the note, it says a single RS is used to provide QCL-D across the CCs. But this conflicts with the 1st sub-bullet, which says that QCL-D is CC-specific. So we could not understand 1.3A and tried to clarify the meaning in our previous response.[Mod: It is essentially per-CC QCL A/D source RS but indirect QCL D is used to ensure those source RSs are associated with a same RS]Proposal 1.4: Suggest to change “DL TCI” to “DL and joint TCI” in 1st bullet.[Mod: This has been discussed offline cf. x5296, please see comments from Huawei. I don’t think adding joint TCI is necessary since it is true only by implication.]Proposal 1.5: Fine to discuss. Proposal 1.6: Do not support. Because we don’t think there should be any RS/channel that cannot share the R17 TCI. For example, TCI state #1 can be activated for PDCCH+PDSCH, but can also be configured for CSI-RS resource #1. This is what we meant for sharing. The current Proposal 1.6 only describes the option for any RS that cannot share, but we need to add the option that any RS can share, and down select between these two first. [Mod: I believe this is clarified offline, thanks] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1.1/1.2: We understand it appears difficult to make decision in RAN1, but we are not really sure whether it is a good idea to pass the ball to RAN2, as they may come back to us with even more questions. For example, if RAN2 decides to include PC parameters in UL TCI, and common TCI state ID update is supported by RAN1, does that imply simultaneous multi-CC power control will be supported? With those details, somehow we feel it would be safer to discuss more in RAN1. [Mod: now FFS]Proposal 1.1: We are not sure why there is need to mention “codepoint of UL TCI state” here. Is the intention to introduce/imply an UL TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 or to imply the support of indicating association between UL TCI state and PC parameter by TCI activation MAC-CE? If it is the former, we prefer to not to introduce such implication, and if it is the latter, we prefer to make it clear. [Mod: Removed. Agree this could cause confusion. The intention is the 2nd since the 1st is impossible (no repurposing in Rel-17 ☺)]We also suggest adding “either” before “included in” in the main bullet, as we don’t see the need for duplicated signaling mechanisms. [Mod: Please check Qualcomm’s earlier comment. Removing “either” was a compromise ☺ I tend to agree with you however. No tech reason to duplicate and make the design complicated]Proposal 1.2: Similar comment as Proposal 1.1 that we prefer not to mention “codepoint of UL TCI state” if not clarified. In the 1st sub-bullet, by saying “up to the UE”, it implies NW should not configure it this way, with which we are now more leaning towards Alt-C in previous agreement, which can avoid mismatch between TCI source RS and PL reference RS and save some signaling overhead. As Alt-C is actually similar to default PL-RS in R16, which has been recognized by at least one operator, it seems worth a try.[Mod: This has been tried last 2 meetings if you remember. I’d suggest we focus on proposal 1.2 and see how this can be agreed.]Proposal 1.3A: We suggest removing “[a single RRC pool of TCI states is used]” from the proposal, as per-CC versus shared TCI state pool across CCs is a separate issue. If it is difficult to reach consensus in RAN1, given the direction Proposal 1.1/1.2, we suggest considering leaving the issue of per-CC vs shared TCI state pool across CCs to RAN2. Also, the note seems not needed, as it has created some confusion to QC. [Mod: For now I’ll keep the text and in later round check the temperature who has concern vs who doesn’t. The proposal to leave pool design for RAN2 could be another venue to explore in the next rounds.]Proposal 1.3B: We have concerns on this proposal as it would either mandate NW to configure CSI-RS for BM or to transmit TRS(s) on different CC(s) with similar Tx beam but to give them different indices (which is counter-intuitive for NW planning).[Mod: Noted for further down selection in the next rounds]Proposal 1.4: Failed to understand the comment from QC. Given that joint TCI is to be jointly applied to PDCCH, PDSCH, PUCCH, and PUSCH, why it should be applied to CSI-RS or SRS? So far, we don’t see the need to add “and joint TCI”. Proposal 1.5: Suggest adding “active” before “Rel-17 TCI” in both bullets, i.e., “the same active Rel-17 TCI”. We failed to understand the intention of the newly added sub-bullets (i.e., M>1 or N>1) under the first bullet. In our understanding, “subset of UE-dedicated CORESETs” (if supported) will naturally share the active TCI state of “all CORESETs”. Any clarification? [Mod: Done]Proposal 1.6: We failed to understand the comment from QC. Note that here it is about “the same Rel-17 TCI state”, i.e., the one TCI state that is being used for PDCCH/PDSCH reception, instead of “Rel-17 TCI state pool”. To reduce confusion, similar as Proposal 1.5, we suggest adding “active” before “Rel-17 TCI” in the first two bullets.Conclusion 1.7: In our understanding, CSI-RS for CSI has been supported in R15/R16, and has been agreed in R17. Similar as CMCC, we prefer not to revert the agreement and suggest removing the 3rd sub-bullet. And we suggest removing “common” from the main bullet. [Mod: Re CSI-RS for CSI, I tend to agree with your interpretation but it is not shared by some other companies. But anyway conclusion 1.7 now focuses on SSB. “Common” removed.] |
| OPPO | On the revised Proposal 1.1: as we commented previously, the PC parameters for SRS shall not change along with the beam applied on SRS resource. [Mod: done, SRS is FFS now]On Proposal 1.3: we support 1.3B. We would to remind the group that we only agreed the multi-CC TCI state for intra-band CA, not inter-band CA. Therefore, @ DCM’s comment on FR1+FR2 CA: that is not part of our agreement. Furthermore, the purpose of multi-CC TCI state is to provide same/single beam on multiple CCs. Thus, the case FR1+FR2 CA is not valid since we definitely apply different beams on CC of FR2 and CC of FR1(where there is no beam). Re QC’s comment: we do support using TRS as TypeA and CSI-RS for BM as TypeD for PDCCH/PDSCH in rel16, here the specification in 214:Proposal 1.4: Suggest to delete “spatial relation” in the first bullet. The DL RS or DL channel can not be target signal of ‘spatial relation’.[Mod: already deleted in the last version]Proposal 1.6: As we commented previously, for the DL RS/channels and UL RS/channel that do not share the ‘common’ TCI for PDSCH/PDCCH and PUSCH/PUCCH, the rel15/rel16 beam indication rule shall be applied. From our perspective:* For DL RS/channels: the rel15/16 beam indication method shall be re-used and the TCI state pool of rel17 can be reused here.
* For UL RS/channels: the rel15/16 spatial relation info indication method shall be re-used. For example for AP SRS, MAC CE is used to update the SRS spatial relation info of each SRS resource. In rel15/16, there is pool of spatial relation info, thus sharing the rel17 TCI is not a valid statement.

Suggest to update the Alt1 of 1.6 as follows:[Mod: Done]Discuss and down-select in RAN1#105-e between the following two alternatives:* Alt1. Rel-15/16 TCI state ~~and, if applicable, UL spatial relation~~ update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are reused to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state
* Alt2. New 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
 |
| Mod V33 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| ZTE | Proposal 1.1: Suggest to remove bracket of P0 as QC mentioned. Beam-specific P0 configuration has been widely used in Rel-15/16, and meanwhile, it is essential for mTRP operation. [Mod: Done, but Ericsson seems to have concern]Proposal 1.2: We have concerns about the second last bullet as follows and let’s FFS it firstly. In our views, it is a separate issue over PL-RS configuration, and meanwhile how to identify/count active UL/joint TCI state per band is also unclear to us, if considering CA case.* FFS: The maximum number of active UL TCI states or (if applicable) joint TCI states per band is a UE capability

[Mod: This is to address some previous concern.]Proposal 1.3: We support proposal 1.3B. If companies has concerns about mandatorily configuring the CSI-RS for BM, and we think that the following bullet should be fine as a compromise solution:* + ~~[~~The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘trs-Info’ configured, with different CSI-RS resources~~]~~

[Mod: Done, I hope Qualcomm is fine since they were the ones suggesting the brackets]Regarding HW’s comments of ‘leaving the issue of per-CC vs shared TCI state pool across CCs to RAN2’, we think that this is a RAN1 issue, e.g., how to guarantee the QCL-TypeA RS from serving CC, and it is a pure signaling design issue. Instead, we think that ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ as a pure signaling issue can be left to RAN2.Regarding 1.4, the last note is weird since we have already agreed the using a common pool for joint DL/UL TCI state update in RAN1#103. So, we suggest removing the last note, or clarifying that only for separate DL and UL TCI state indication. [Mod: Done]Regarding 1.5, if our understanding is correct, this proposal is relevant to the indicated TCI state rather than active TCI state. For progress, we need to add ‘indicated/’ before ‘active Rel-17 TCI state’.[Mod: Done, I agree “indicated” is more accurate]Regarding 1.6: for other UL RS/channels, we need to consider use Rel-15/16 UL spatial relation update, and based on the comments from OPPO, it seems we need to clarify ‘Rel-17 TCI state’ rather than removing ‘UL spatial relation’. Please check the following update:* Alt1. Rel-15/16 TCI state and~~, if applicable,~~ UL spatial relation update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are reused to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state and UL spatial relation, respectively.

[Mod: Done]   |
| NEC | Proposal 1.1/1.2: OK.Proposal 1.3A vs 1.3B: prefer 1.3A.Proposal 1.4: Support.Proposal 1.5: Support in general. And we share similar view as ZTE that “indicated” should be added.Proposal 1.6: Support in general and we support Alt 2. And regarding the first two bullets, do we also need “indicated” before “Rel-17 TCI state” (similar as proposal 1.5)?[Mod: Yes, thanks. Done]Conclusion 1.7: Support. |
| MediaTek | P1.3B: Share same view with ZTE. Some companies show concern on only CSI-RS for BM can be supported as TypeD RS. The additional QCL rule can be a solution to address the concern. [Mod: Done]Re HW’s comment, it seems TRSs on different CCs with the same Tx beam still can be assigned with the same index. For example, TRS#0 in CC#0 is configured as source RS for TypeA and TypeD. In CC#1, TRS#0 in CC#1 is configured as source RS for TypeA and TRS#0 in CC#0 is configured as source RS for TypeD.P1.5: Share same view with ZTE. The intension of this proposal is discussing whether additional signal/channel can share the same “TCI state machine” used by UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC. If we put “active” in this proposal, it may imply NW can use separate signaling to indicate one of the active TCI states for the additional signal/channel. Thus, we suggest to change “active” to “indicated” to avoid confusion.[Mod: Done] P1.6: Support the change suggested by ZTE.[Mod: Done] |
| Mod V37 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 1.1: Support. In our views, this is only a signaling issue, and whether the PC parameters among different TCI states are the same or different depends on gNB implementation. We are OK to leave it to RAN2.Proposal 1.2: Support the main bullet. For the 1st subbullet, we think UE should always perform pathloss estimation based on the configured PL-RS. Otherwise, the PL-RS configuration may not be useful. Besides, the 1st subbullet may confict the 3rd subbullet saying ‘UE maintains the PL-RS’.[Mod: This was discussed in the last meeting. It is added to resolve some concern from some companies that RAN4 may introduce a new test/requirement for beam misalignment between UL TCI and PLRS. Note that in Rel-15/16, misalignment can happen and it is left to UE implementation. No RAN4 test, no RAN1 spec support. So this bullet is simply to repeat what’s assumed in Rel-15/16]Proposal 1.3: Our first preference is Proposal 1.3B. We can also support Proposal 1.3A as compromise as long as the square bracket is removed.Proposal 1.4: We are not clear on the meaning/point of this proposal, since the target channel/RS issue is being discussed under Pro-posal 1.5 and Proposal 1.6.[Mod: This was discussed during offline (also check x5296) and I have commented above as well (please check). P1.4: all the DL signals/channels should be able to use Rel-17 TCI states and pools. But this doesn’t imply that all those will share the SAME Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH. P1.5: which ‘other’ DL signals/channels (configured with Rel-17 TCI) can share the SAME Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH? P1.6: For those not sharing the SAME Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH, what signaling mechanism is used?I hope this helps.]Proposal 1.5: Support making a decision in this meeting.Proposal 1.6: Support. We are open to discuss this proposal, and prefer Alt1.Conclusion 1.7: We can support this conclusion. |
| vivo | Still negative in Proposal 1.1 and Proposal 1.2 with current formulation.Regarding proposal 1.3A, with the understanding that the CC-specific source RS is applied to all BWPs, we would like to clarify the following.**Proposal 1.3A**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, [a single RRC pool of TCI states is used] for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide common QCL information and/or common UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs* A CC~~-~~specific source RS can be determined from the indicated common TCI state ID to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter. The determined CC-specific source RSs for the set of configured CCs/BWPs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS.
	+ The CC-specific source RS is applied to all BWPs within the CC. UE only needs to maintain the part of the RS within the active BWP.
	+ [FFS: how to provide the CC/BWP-specific RSs in a TCI state of the single RRC TCI state pool shared among the set of configured CCs/BWPs, e.g., the BWP/CC ID for the source RS for QCL Type-D reference and/or UL TX spatial reference can be absent in a TCI state]
* “A set of configured CCs/BWPs” includes all the BWPs in the set of configured CCs in one band

[Mod: Done]Regarding proposal 1.6, in Alt1, does Rel-17 UL spatial relation means the joint/separate TCI state?**Proposal 1.6**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for the following (‘other’) signal/physical channel:* Any DL RS or DL physical channel that does not 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, but can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool)
* Any UL RS or UL physical channel that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all or subset of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC, but can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 UL TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL TCI state pool)

Discuss and down-select in RAN1#105-e between the following two alternatives:* Alt1. Rel-15/16 TCI state and UL spatial relation update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are reused to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state and UL spatial relation, respectively
* Alt2. New 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: For some channels/signals, only one of the above two alternatives may apply (to be discussed).Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is still TBD)[Mod: Spatial relation is removed now (see comment to ZTE)] |
| ZTE | Regarding Proposal 1.3, we review the some companies’ concerns about ‘a single RRC pool of TCI states is used’, and after offline discussion we think that this issue can be clarified as follows.* In a set of configured CCs, the single RRC pool of TCI state is configured in a reference CC (e.g., reusing the legacy pool of PDSCH), and then the pool can be copied to other CCs in the set from the perspective of UE implementation, rather than CC-individual TCI pool configuration.

Then, as a fall-back mode, if the serving CC is configured with TCI state pool, of course the pool should be used. So we have the following proposal to be added for clarifying ‘a single RRC pool of TCI states’ including the determination mechanism for QCL Type-A in the proposal 1.3, and hopefully the bracket can be removed. **Proposal 1.3:** **...**On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, ‘a single RRC pool of TCI states’ implies that the single RRC TCI state pool can be configured in a CC and can be shared among the set of configured CCs.* For QCL Type-A, the BWP/CC ID for QCL-Type A source RS can be absent in a TCI state.
* When the BWP/CC ID for QCL-Type A source RS is absent in the TCI state, the BWP/CC ID for QCL-Type A source RS is determined according to a target CC of the TCI state and the corresponding active BWP
	+ For each applied active BWP per CC, UE uses the corresponding BWP ID + CC ID + QCL TypeA RS source ID to locate the corresponding QCL Type-A source RS
* Note that cross-CC UL power control indication is FFS as a separate issue.

Regarding vivo’s comment for Proposal 1.6, in our views, ‘Rel-17 UL spatial relation means legacy UL spatial relation as in Rel-15/16.[Mod: After further review, we have defined UL spatial relation in terms Rel-17 UL TCI (and if applicable joint TCI). In some sense Rel-17 UL spatial relation is a new term. In addition, in proposal 1.4, the only applicable UL signal is still FFS. So the mention of UL is too early. I removed the reference to UL in proposal 1.6 for now.] |
| Sony | **Proposal 1.3,** we prefer Proposal 1.3B. By recalling the offline discussion, single TCI state pool for multiple CCs can be viewed as part of compromise. If possible, we hope it can be confirmed in Proposal 1.3B. For the following sub-bullet under Proposal 1.3B, we think it’s fine to allow TRS as both TypeA and TypeD. But it might be possible to be the same TRS on one particular CC, e.g. PCell which provides TypeD reference. Perhaps we missed some import discussion on it. * The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘trs-Info’ configured, with different CSI-RS resources

**Proposal 1.4 to Proposal 1.6,** given previous offline discussion, we think P1.4 to P1.6 are well organized and shaped. Our general thinking would be that if no additional benefits identified, we should strive for unified solution, that is (take DL as exmaple) DL RS and DL channel can share the same Rel.17 TCI state pool. We failed to see good reasons to artificially introduce such constraint, either for DL or for UL.**Conclusion 1.7,** we share same view with CMCC and HW that CSI-RS for CSI was supported as source RS for QCL-TypeD from Rel.15. Perhaps different companies have different view, but in our view, it’s time for RAN1 to fix confliction/error in previous agreement. So we are fine to keep “[CSI-RS for CSI]” and hopefully this item could be further discussed.  |
| Mod V43 | Revised proposal 1.3A and 1.6 per vivo’s comment* **Please check the revised versions**
* **Please check the proposed description for common TCI state pool for CA from ZTE**
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 1.5: We understand the motivation for removing the two sub bullets (For M>1, For N>1). When different CORESETs have different TCIs, how to indicate which RS share the TCI of which CORESETs need to be discussed. [Mod: Yes, when we get to M,N>1 we will] Proposal 1.6: Support in general. Our preference is Alt 2.  |
| Samsung3 | Proposal 1.3A: Don’t understand the new intention of the new sub-bullet, especially the part highlighted yellow. Can you clarify the meaning of the “UE only needs to maintain the part inside the active BWP”? Our understanding is that a UE should not be receiving or transmitting outside the active BWP. I think we can just say that “the CC-specific source RS is within the active BWP of a CC.”. A UE can only have one active BWP in a CC.* A CC-specific source RS can be determined from the indicated common TCI state ID to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter. The determined CC-specific source RSs for the set of configured CCs/BWPs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS.
	+ The CC-specific source RS is applied to all BWPs within the CC. UE only needs to maintain the part of the RS within the active BWP

[Mod: Done]Conclusion 1.7: We would like SSB to be within square brackets. As commented in our Tdoc, at least one benefit of having the SSB as a source RS is that, “the SSB is already supported as a source RS for UL TCI state, in case of joint UL-DL TCI state indication, the same RS is indicated as the UL spatial source RS and DL QCL Type-D source RS, so it would seem natural to support the SSB as a QCL Type-D source RS.”[Mod: Done] |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 1.1, OKFor Proposal 1.2: OKFor Proposal 1.3: Support 1.3B. Because the 2-level QCL-D indication in 1.3A cannot guarantee common beam across CCs. Although per-CC CSI-RS for type A+D has common QCL-D source, the Rx beams indicated by those per-CC CSI-RS can still be different, since they can be different P2 narrow beams within a common SSB beam. Proposal 1.3B has no such issue. For 1.3B, still prefer to put the following in bracket. I don’t think we have agreement for a separate TRS as QCL-D.* + The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘trs-Info’ configured, with different CSI-RS resources

For Proposal 1.4, for a configured DL TCI state, it would be most efficient to reuse it also for legacy single-target beam indication, e.g. TCI #1 can be activated for PDCCH+PDSCH as in R17 and can also be simultaneously configured for a CSI-RS resource for BM as in R15/16. So we prefer to add the following Note to make sure this proposal does achieve this goal. **Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, * Any DL RS or DL physical channel that is a valid target signal/channel of a Rel-15/16 TCI state based on the Rel-15/16 QCL rules can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool)
	+ Note: This does not imply that all such DL RSs and DL physical channels necessarily share a same TCI
	+ Note: This implies the same DL TCI state can be simultaneously used for multi-target beam indication as in R17 and single-target beam indication as in R15/16
		- E.g. TCI state #1 can be activated for PDCCH+PDSCH as in R17 and can also be simultaneously configured for a CSI-RS resource for BM as in R15/16.
* […]

For Proposal 1.5, we are fine if the intention is to decide whether those RS can be one of the multiple targets in the multi-target beam indication and, regardless the decision, those RS can still be individually configured with a TCI in the single-target beam indication as in Proposal 1.4. If so, we suggest the following clarification: **Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#105-e, discuss and decide * Whether each of the following DL RSs and channels can be one of the multiple targets sharing ~~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
	+ Non-UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs
* Whether some SRS resources or resource sets for BM can be one of the multiple targets sharing ~~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

For Proposal 1.6, we are fine if the intention is to decide the single-target beam indication signaling for a RS/channel not one of the multiple targets for the multi-target beam indication and, more importantly, the same TCI can be used for both single-target and multi-target beam indications. If the understanding is correct, suggest the following rewording for better clarification. **Proposal 1.6**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for any DL RS or DL physical channel that is not one of the multiple targets sharing ~~does not 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, but can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool) Discuss and down-select in RAN1#105-e 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. New 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: For some channels/signals, only one of the above two alternatives may apply (to be discussed).Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is still TBD)Note: The configured Rel-17 DL TCI for the above any DL RS or DL physical channel can be same as or different from the 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[Mod: Based on our offline chat, the proposed Note in 1.4 is moved as an FFS to 1.6, thanks for your understanding] |
| Mod V48 | Minor revisions to address inputs * **Please check the revised versions**
* **Please check the proposed description for common TCI state pool for CA from ZTE**
 |
| MediaTek | On P1.6, we don't see why the new FFS is needed. To our understanding, if Proposal 1.4 can be agreed, the new FFS can be natural supported by NW implementation. Original Proposal 1.6 or other proposal doesn't prohibit NW from such configuration.[Mod: Re the FFS, my understanding is that Qualcomm wants to investigate possible spec support for this. I keep this in bracket now so we can work on the wording. If we decide it’s not needed it can be removed.] |
| NTT Docomo | Support proposal 1.3A.For proposal 1.3B, if the proposal include QCL-Type A TRS + QCL-Type D TRS, without [ ], we can accept it. But, with [ ], we cannot accept the proposal. We believe it is essential and important for gNB to allow QCL-Type A TRS + QCL-Type D TRS configuration. Minor comment on proposal 1.3, for a CC where QCL type D RS is configured (i.e. CC#0 in the below figure), QCL-Type A TRS and QCL-Type D TRS should be the same. So, we suggest to add following, as also commented by Sony.* + The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘trs-Info’ configured, with same/different CSI-RS resources

 |
| Spreadtrum | P1.4: Thanks for the clarification, we support it.P1.6: Similar view as MTK. There is no such restriction on NW configuration, the new FFS is not needed. We prefer to keep the proposal short and simple, clarification is only needed when the proposal may cause wrong impression.[Mod: Re the FFS, my understanding is that Qualcomm wants to investigate possible spec support for this. I keep this in bracket now so we can work on the wording. If we decide it’s not needed it can be removed.] |
| LG | Proposal 1.3: We support 1.3A and still have a concern on ‘a single RRC pool of TCI state is used’ in main bullet. We have a similar view with Huawei that the issue of TCI state pool across CCs needs to be set aside to move forward or to leave depending on RAN2 decision. Conclusion 1.7: For the brackets on SRS and CSI-RS, it is not sure that they are discussed further in next round or next meeting?[Mod: Now all three are in brackets. We can try if we can conclude in this meeting.] |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1.1: We have a compromise proposal that combines AltB and AltC:PC parameters are associated with TCI states in a variable length list. Each element in the list has the following content: * TCI state\_Id (optional)
* P0
* Alpha
* CLI

The list may be as long as the number of TCI states. If the TCI state Id is missing, the PC parameters are applied to all TCI states. Since we PC parameters are channel specific, we need three such lists: one for PUSCH, one for PUCCH and one for SRS.[Mod: From FL perspective this is quite reasonable]P1.2: SupportP1.3A/B: * The pool issue should be discussed separately. What is the motivation to have them in the same agreement?
* Then we noticed ZTEs proposal with a reference CC. This could be a starting point for future discussions since it includes a per-CC pool as a special case.
* When this is captured in the specification, it will be formulated from the UE’s viewpoint. Would it be possible to think about formulations that the UE may assume that the QCL TypeD properties of PDCCH/PDSCH are the same across all intra-band CCs?
* We prefer Proposal 1.3A, since it would reuse the commonly deployed RS transmission schemes. We have concern on any proposal that cannot reuse the periodic TRSs that are anyway transmitted – this would pretty much guarantee that unified TCI is never deployed in field.
* Comment to Qualcomm: there is no guarantee that Proposal 1.3B will lead to periodic CSI-RS transmission in narrow beams: it is an unlikely event in any case.

Proposal 1.4: SupportProposal 1.5: Support to discuss. But this issue is critical, and may need until the next meeting to ensure that we do not cripple the solution. A functional solution will require that CSI-RS for CSI and CSI-RS for BM can use the [Mod: Agree. Deadline is changed to 106-e for both 1.5 and 1.6]Proposal 1.6: Support, but we don’t understand the FFS. We prefer Alt1.[Mod: Re the FFS, my understanding is that Qualcomm wants to investigate possible spec support for this. I keep this in bracket now so we can work on the wording] |
| Mod V58 | Small revision on 1.3B (added “same”), and changed deadlines of 1.5/1.6 to RAN1#106-e (August) no other revision. However:* **1.1: Please check the compromise proposal from Ericsson (highlighted in cyan). From FL perspective, this is quite reasonable and I hope other companies can accept.**
* **1.3: Please check the proposed description for common TCI state pool for CA from ZTE (so far only Ericsson provided comments)**
 |
| Samsung | Question to Ericsson: Before we comment, we would like to understand the proposal better. Since the “list” may be a RAN2 issue (ASN.1/IE), does the following formulation reflect the intention of the proposal?Proposal: 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, PUCCH, and SRS, * The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) can be associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.
* If not associated, for each of the PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) will neither be associated with nor included in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.

Note: It has been agreed that the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is associated with UL channel or UL RS (therefore the setting is channel- and signal-specific).[Mod: This can be a starting point for round 1 – using the format from previous meeting] |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 1.1, we prefer the FL’s proposal, which will lead to one option, i.e. either in or associated with TCI. We may not prefer to add another option on top. One should be enough For Proposal 1.3, fine with ZTE’s proposal, which is much better than 1.3A and 1.3B formats to our understanding. Because whether configure same QCL-D across CCs in 1.3A or CC-specific QCL-A+D in 1.3B should be NW’s choice. Not sure why we need to down select and discuss them, which are not the key part of the common TCI pool concept to our understanding. For Proposal 1.6, the FFS is essentially asking the following question, which may not be answered by 1.4 or 1.5, and needs to be answered to our understanding. There seems no common understanding on this issue as offline discussed with FL. So we prefer to at least add FFS on this issue. Otherwise, our understanding on 1.4-1.6 may be incorrect. Also, one more question, if the answer to the following issue is YES, does it mean this CSI-RS resource for BM is shared with the TCI for PDCCH/PDSCH or not? Our understanding is NOT. The word of “shared” is only for the pre-determined set of channels/RSs mapped to that TCI. It would be good for FL to clarify. Can TCI state #1 be activated for PDCCH+PDSCH as in Rel-17 and also be simultaneously configured for a CSI-RS resource for BM as in Rel-15/16?[Mod: If the answer to 1.5 on CSI-RS for BM is “yes”, the answer to this question is “yes”. Else, it is only possible if an additional signaling mechanism is used to “align” this TCI state by NW implementation. In this case, some signaling/configuration mechanism is needed, which is the topic for 1.6. So the FFS added by Qualcomm is still relevant IMO after some slight rewording]In above question, the scenario is that PDCCH+PDSCH is in the pre-configured set of channels/RSs mapped to TCI state #1, while the CSI-RS resource for BM is not in that pre-configured set.[Mod: Correct. I reworded the FFS a bit] |
| MediaTek | Regarding ZTE’s proposal, we would like to clarify whether it means “TCI pool sharing” feature is not tied to “common TCI ID activation/indication” feature., thus they can be configured by NW (and supported by UE) separately. Is it possible that NW can configure a set of CCs for “common TCI ID activation/indication”, but only a subset of the configured CCs share the same TCI pool? If so, we tend to agree that they can be discussed separately. Furthermore, we see “a single QCL-Type D RS”, as already agreed in previous meeting can be considered as a part of “TCI pool sharing” feature since the intension is the same. **We may not need any further agreement for “common TCI ID activation/indication” feature.** [Mod: Thanks. Will take this to round 1]**Proposal 1.3:** **...**On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, ‘a single RRC pool of TCI states’ implies that the single RRC TCI state pool can be configured in a CC and can be shared among a set of configured CCs.* A single QCL-Type D RS for the set of configured CCs/BWPs is determined from the TCI state(s)
* The following rules can be used:
	+ (From Rel-15/16 QCL rule) The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘repetition’ configured, with different CSI-RS resources
	+ The QCL-Type A TRS and, if any, QCL-Type D CSI-RS with higher-layer parameter ‘trs-Info’ configured, with same/different CSI-RS resources
* For QCL Type-A, the BWP/CC ID for QCL-Type A source RS can be absent in a TCI state. When the BWP/CC ID for QCL-Type A source RS is absent in the TCI state, the BWP/CC ID for QCL-Type A source RS is determined according to a target CC of the TCI state and the corresponding active BWP
	+ For each applied active BWP per CC, UE uses the corresponding BWP ID + CC ID + QCL TypeA RS source ID to locate the corresponding QCL Type-A source RS

Note that cross-CC UL power control indication is FFS as a separate issue  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 1.1: Ericsson’s proposed text is ok with us, but it contradicts the FFS in the sub bullet. We need to decide whether to keep the first FFS (“whether it is up to RAN2”)Proposal 1.3B: Want to clarify that the newly added ”same” implies the type A RS and type D RS may be the same CSI-RS resource or different. Is this understanding correct?[Mod: “same” implies the same resource. The text is bracketed for now.] |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 1.1: OK.Proposal 1.2: OK. Proposal 1.3A vs 1.3B: prefer 1.3A Proposal 1.4: OK.Proposal 1.5: OK.Proposal 1.6: OK.Conclusion 1.7: not needed |
| Apple | Proposal 1.1: We support the compromised solution in principle, but there may be one problem in the compromised solution. If there are two elements without TCI state\_Id, which parameters should be used for the remaining TCI states without association?PC parameters are associated with TCI states in a variable length list. Each element in the list has the following content: * TCI state\_Id (optional)
* P0
* Alpha
* CLI

The list may be as long as the number of TCI states. If the TCI state Id is missing, the PC parameters are applied to all TCI states. Since we PC parameters are channel specific, we need three such lists: one for PUSCH, one for PUCCH and one for SRS.How about the following way? * **For uplink signal indicated with a TCI without PC parameters associated or included, a default power control parameters can be used**
	+ **The first P0/alpha from the P0/alpha list for corresponding uplink channel configured by RRC is used**
	+ **CLI is 0**

[Mod: This is another good starting point which doesn’t look like an ASN.1 skeleton from Claes ☺ I will use this as a starting point component for round 1]Proposal 1.2 – 1.7 OK. But it seems 1.6 depends on the outcome of 1.5. Is it possible to decide 1.5 in this meeting?[Mod: We should try. The deadline is next meeting, but let’s see ☺] |
| OPPO | Proposal 1.1: Ericsson’s proposed solution seems to be about RRC parameter design. In our view, that shall not be discussed by RAN1. We only need to agree the functionality and the RRC parameter design is up to RAN2.[Mod: One possible starting point is given in Samsung’s comment – using the format from previous meeting]Proposal 1.3: we are ok with 1.3B but not ok with adding the “same” in the 2nd sub-bullet. The “same CSI-RS resource” does not work in this case because that would result in different QCLtypeD RS for different CCs. So suggest to remove the added “same”.[Mod: bracketed now]Re proposal 1.6: One question on Alt2: what does it mean by “e.g. with Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication for Rel-17 joint/separate TCI”? Is the ‘common’ TCI state indicated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 applied here?[Mod: My understanding is that some Rel-17 signaling mechanism is used to update or configure the Rel-17 TCI state for this. For example, using M>1 for DCI based, or Rel-17 MAC CE. Or even RRC. This is a good point for the next level discussion – proponents should clarify by 106-e.] |
| NTT Docomo | For proposal 1.3: ZTE’s suggestion to clarify the “single RRC pool”: * We are fine to add the note for both proposal 1.3A and 1.3B. But, for proposal 1.3A, the note only mentions QCL type A RS, so QCL type D RS should be also included in the note, if the note is added.

Proposal 1.3A**...**On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, ‘a single RRC pool of TCI states’ implies that the single RRC TCI state pool can be configured in a CC and can be shared among the set of configured CCs.* For QCL Type-A/D, the BWP/CC ID for QCL-Type A/D source RS can be absent in a TCI state.
* When the BWP/CC ID for QCL-Type A/D source RS is absent in the TCI state, the BWP/CC ID for QCL-Type A/D source RS is determined according to a target CC of the TCI state and the corresponding active BWP
	+ For each applied active BWP per CC, UE uses the corresponding BWP ID + CC ID + QCL TypeA/D RS source ID to locate the corresponding QCL Type-A/D source RS
* Note that cross-CC UL power control indication is FFS as a separate issue.

Qualcomm’s suggestion to support both proposal 1.3A and proposal 1.3B:* If spec. supports both 1.3A and 1.3B, we think UE should support both, or either as mandatory. We’d like to avoid the situation that one UE supports 1.3A and another UE supports 1.3B.

OPPO’s comment to remove the “same” in the 2nd sub-bullet.* For a CC where QCL type D RS is configured (i.e. CC#0 in the below figure), QCL-Type A TRS and QCL-Type D TRS should be the same. For other CCs, off course QCL-Type A TRS and QCL-Type D TRS are different (because, on different CCs).

 |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 1.1: we can support Ericsson’s suggestion in principle. The following special cases may cause ambiguity. * Case 1: Element 1 with TCI state 1, Element 2 with TCI state 1
* Case 2: Element 1 with TCI state 1, Element 2 without TCI state
* Case 3: Element 1 without TCI state, Element 2 without TCI state (same as the case raised by Apple)

In our views, the above cases should be avoided by gNB implementation without specifying default solutions. Besides, the configuration structure doesn’t support association between a single element and multiple TCI states.Therefore, we suggest the following modification.**Proposal 1.1**: On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, at least for each of the PUSCH and PUCCH, ~~the setting is included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.~~* If a single PC parameter set is configured, the PC parameter set are applied to all TCI states
* If more than one PC parameter sets are configured, each of the PC parameter sets is included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* FFS: Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed and the signaling), and whether it is up to RAN2
* FFS: The setting for SRS

[Mod: This is also another good suggestion, thanks. I will synthesize the inputs I received so far for 1.1B to be discussed in round 1] |
| Mod V71 | **No substantial revision in the current FL proposals** other than putting brackets around “same” in 1.3B and rewording for clarity of **the Qualcomm’s FFS in 1.6**.Added a placeholder for proposal 1.1B (compromise AltB+C from Ericsson which seems to gain some traction, but needs some discussion for formulation)Some good inputs on ZTE’s common CA pool text.**For 1st GTW, we will not discuss proposals 1.1 and 1.3 (common CA pool issue included) 🡪 will go to round 1. But please feel free to continue discussion.** |
| Futurewei | Proposal 1.1A: We are ok with the proposal.Proposal 1.2: We are ok with the main bullet. For the first sub-bullet, our view is that if the DL source RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state to provide spatial relation indication is different from the PL-RS, the PL-RS configured for path-loss calculation should be used. So we suggest removing the first sub-bullet. We would also like to keep the previous agreement from RAN1#104-e that the total number of maintained PL-RSs per CC is no more than 4. Also, both “activated UL TCI state” and “active UL TCI states” are used in the sub-bullets, we suggest changing “active UL TCI states” to “activated UL TCI states” to make it consistent. In summary, we would like to modify Proposal 1.2 as follows:**Proposal 1.2**: On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, a PL-RS (configured for path-loss calculation) is included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.* FFS: Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed and the signaling), and whether it is up to RAN2
* The UE maintains the PL-RS of the activated UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The maximum number of activated UL TCI states or (if applicable) joint TCI states per band is a UE capability
* Note: As agreed in RAN1#104-e, the total number of maintained PL-RSs per CC is no more than 4
* FFS: detailed aspects of PL-RS, e.g. CSI-RS type(s), time-domain behavior(s), restriction on configuration

[Mod: If you check the above comments (I understand there are numerous) the first bullet is introduced as a compromise for, e.g. Apple, to ensure no additional RAN4 test is introduced for beam misalignment (since Rel-15/16 this is handled via UE implementation) – without which this proposal cannot be agreed. We will keep this bullet (else we may end up with the outcome that PLRS is not supported in Rel-17 since the proposal will be objected). I hope Futurewei can understand for progress.Other edits are fine.] Proposal 1.3A/B: We support Proposal 1.3A.Proposal 1.4: We are ok with the proposal.Proposal 1.5: We are ok with the proposal.Proposal 1.6: We are ok with the direction of the proposal and we support Alt. 2. Our view is that a mixture of Rel-15/16 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) and Rel-17 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) should be avoided to reduce UE complexity. A few comments:* “indicated Rel-17 TCI state” should be “indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s)” as M/N may > 1 which is to be discussed and decided
* In Alt2, is the “New TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s)” referring to the ones we already agreed in R17 (and hence new comparing to R16) or actually meaning in addition to what’s agreed so far? We believe it intends to say “Rel-17 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s)”.

In summary, we would like to modify Proposal 1.6 as follows:**Proposal 1.6**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for any DL RS or DL physical channel 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 signal/channel 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: For some channels/signals, only one of the above two alternatives may apply (to be discussed).Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is still TBD)[FFS: Whether/how the selected alternative can be used to align the Rel-17 DL TCI state between two target channels/signals which do not share the same Rel-17 DL TCI state * E.g. TCI state #1 can be activated for PDCCH+PDSCH as in Rel-17 and can also be simultaneously configured for a CSI-RS resource for BM as in Rel-15/16.]

[Mod: Done]Conclusion 1.7: Support. |
| Intel | **Proposal 1.1:** We understand the intention from Ericsson however, the list design is up to RAN2. For 1.1B we are basically agreeing to the fact that ULPC is optionally associated with a TCI state through linkage with a ULPC parameter list. We are ok to discuss this further. Then assuming we take SS and Apple’s comments as starting point for discussion, we are not sure what the second sub-bullet from SS proposal means i.e., if not associated, it is obvious that there parameters are not included in the TCI. Then for this case, we should need to specify a default option. From our perspective, the case that multiple PC parameters without TCI state ID configured should be restricted from gNB configuration perspective. We can have at most one list of ULPC parameters without TCI state ID which can be used as default PC parameter.**Proposal 1.2:** For the first sub-bullet, we are still not sure that PL-RS determination should be left up to the UE. Can the proponents clarify what is the motivation or use case for PL-RS to be different from DL source RS in the UL or joint TCI state?[Mod: Please check my comment for Futurewei. It’s essentially Rel-15/16 behavior spelled out to accommodate, e.g. Apple’s concern that a new RAN4 test might be introduced for misalignment scenario]**Proposal 1.3:** Support 1.3A |
| Mod V74 | **Minor edits** for proposal 1.2 and 1.6 per Futurewei’s comment.  |
| LG | Proposal 1.2: For adding the note on the total number of maintained PL-RSs per CC, it seems more or less redundant since the corresponding Note and FFS have been already captured on the agreement in the last meeting as below (after ‘In addition’ part). For keeping the note, all the FFS would be contained in the proposal to discuss further.**Agreement**On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#105-e, further discuss to down select or combine from the following three alternatives for PL-RS (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):* AltA. PL-RS can be included in UL TCI state (or, if applicable, joint TCI state).
	+ FFS: Whether it is always included or not. If not included, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.
* AltB. PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state (or, if applicable, joint TCI state)
	+ FFS: Exact association mechanism
	+ FFS: Whether it is always associated or not. If not associated, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* AltC. UE calculates path-loss based on periodic DL RS configured as the source RS for determining spatial TX filter in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ FFS: If a PL RS is not included in or associated with the UL TCI state (or, if applicable, joint TCI state), whether the UE can estimate path-loss based on the PL-RS of an UL RS provided in an UL TCI state (or, if applicable, joint TCI state) as a source RS for determining the spatial TX filter.

In addition:* FFS (to be decided in RAN1#105-e) whether a fallback scheme is needed and, if so, the details
* FFS: Support additional UE capability to report whether above PLRS determination mechanism is supported
* Note: As agreed in RAN1#104-e, the total number of maintained PL-RSs per CC is no more than 4
* FFS: investigate the condition(s) agreed in Rel-17 and, if needed, study whether a UE can simultaneously maintain more than four path-loss estimates based on UE capability
* FFS: UE capability for maximum number of active PL-RS across CCs per band
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 1.2: Support. Proposal 1.3: Support 1-3A, Proposal 1.4: SupportProposal 1.5: Support. Proposal 1.6: Support Alt.1. A clarification question on Alt. 2. what Huawei’s modification means. In the previous sentence, it was obvious that new TCI indication scheme is needed when TCI for PDSCH/PDCCH/PUSCH/PUCCH and TCI for other CH/RS are different. Now it is unclear whether all the TCIs should be same or different TCI can be supported. Could it be clarifired? Conclusion 1.7: Still unclear why we need it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Proposal 1.1A: We are not sure whether the proposal is to support two signaling methods, i.e., “included in” AND “associated with”, even for one channel, and we failed to see why (especially for one channel). We suggest adding “either” before “included in” in the main bullet. If it is not possible to make decision in RAN1, we suggest removing “FFS” from the sub-bullet and leave the decision to RAN2. Proposal 1.2: Similar comment as Proposal 1.1A. Proposal 1.3A: We are not sure about the intention of bracketed FFS point (to study or not), and suggest removing. Also, in our understanding, the “QCL Type-D” in the bracketed FFS sub-bullet should be changed to “QCL Type-A”, as listed in previous agreement. Proposal 1.3B: The meaning of “different” is unclear to us. Does it mean a resource with different index (compared with QCL Type-A RS), or a resource on a different CC (but can still be with same index)?Proposal 1.6: We are not sure about the intention of bracketed FFS point (to study or not), and suggest removing.Conclusion 1.7: Seems not needed.  |
| InterDigital | Proposal 1.1A: OKProposal 1.2: OKProposal 1.3: Prefer Proposal 1.3BProposal 1.4: OKProposal 1.5: OKProposal 1.6: Support Alt 1. Proposal 1.7: We do not support the proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 1.3: Prefer DCM’s change on top of ZTE’s proposal, which can support both 1 common type-D RS across CCs and CC-specific type-A+D RS. If we must select 1.3A vs 1.3B, we prefer 1.3BFor Proposal 1.6, should we remove the bracket for the FFS? Otherwise, people may not even comment on the wording. We are fine with the FL’s new FFS wording. |

### Issue 2 (L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility)

Table 3 Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2.1 | Support CSI-RS associated with/configured for non-serving cell(s) as a measurement RSNote: Supporting this implies the support of Rel-15 CSI-RSRP as beam metric/reporting | CSI-RS for mobility/RRM associated with NSC:* **Yes**: Lenovo/MoM, Huawei, HiSi, Sony, LG, ZTE, CATT
* **No**: Nokia/NSB, Samsung, OPPO, MTK, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo

CSI-RS for BM configured for NSC:* **Yes**: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, AT&T, ZTE, APT/FGI
* **No**: Samsung, OPPO, MTK, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo

CSI-RS for tracking (TRS) configured for NSC:* **Yes**: --
* **No**: Samsung, OPPO, MTK, NTT Docomo
 |
| 2.2 | Maximum value of K (beams associated at least with non-serving cell(s) reported in a single CSI reporting instance), i.e. KMAXNote: UE capability of supporting < KMAX is neither ruled out nor within the scope of 2.2 | **4**: vivo, Spreadtrum, MTK (if cell = 1),OPPO**8**: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, AT&T, CATT (at least), MTK (if cells > 1), APT/FGI **16**: Huawei, HiSi, Samsung, ZTE , NTT Docomo |
| 2.3 | How to set the value of K≤ KMAXAlt1: RRC configured (based on UE capability)Alt2: Dynamically selected by UE (indicated in CSI reporting, two-part UCI) | **Alt1**: OPPO, MTK, CATT, Intel, ZTE, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, APT/FGI, Spreadtrum**Alt2**: Samsung, Sony  |
| 2.4 | The maximum value of NMAX (number of non-serving cell(s) RRC configured for measurement/reporting) Note: UE capability of supporting <Nmax is neither ruled out nor within the scope of 2.4 | **1**: Spreadtrum, OPPO**>1 (specify)**: Ericsson (FFS the maximum value), CATT, Samsung (4), Xiaomi (3) , ZTE, NTT Docomo, Sony, AT&T |
| 2.5 | Whether to support the following reporting behavior | Periodic**:*** **Yes**: Nokia/NSB, MTK, Samsung (with restriction), Spreadtrum, ZTE, NTT Docomo, CATT, Ericsson, AT&T
* **No**:

Semi-persistent**:*** **Yes**: Nokia/NSB, MTK, Samsung, ZTE, Spreadtrum, NTT Docomo, CATT, Ericsson, AT&T
* **No**:

Aperiodic**:*** **Yes**: Nokia/NSB, MTK, Samsung, ZTE, Spreadtrum, NTT Docomo, CATT, Ericsson, AT&T
* **No**:

Event-driven**:*** **Yes (specify event)**: Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi (L1 event), ZTE (event triggered by L3 mobility measurement), Apple (L1-RSRP of NSC is beyond L1-RSRP of SC plus an offset), AT&T, Sony (L1 metric of NSC is beyond L1 metric of SC plus an offset), Qualcomm, Samsung, LG, CATT
* **No**: MTK, Ericsson, Spreadtrum
 |
| 2.6 | Supported DL QCL Type-D and/or UL TX spatial reference source RS type(s) for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility by extending Rel-17 unified TCI framework to inter-cell indication  | DL QCL Type-D: * *SSB associated with NSC as direct QCL source:*
	+ **Yes**: Nokia/NSB, Samsung, MTK, NTT Docomo, ZTE, Xiaomi, CATT
	+ **No**: Ericsson
* *SSB associated with NSC as indirect QCL source (therefore any CSI-RS resource using NSC SSB can be used as a source RS):*
	+ **Yes**: CMCC, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Sony, Ericsson, MTK, NTT Docomo, ZTE, LG, Xiaomi, CATT
	+ **No**:
* *CSI-RS for RRM:*
	+ **Yes:** Sony, LG
	+ **No:** Samsung, MTK, Ericsson

UL TX spatial reference:* *SSB associated with NSC as direct QCL source:*
	+ **Yes**: CMCC, Samsung, Sony, Ericsson, MTK, ZTE, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, CATT
	+ **No**:
* *SSB associated with NSC as indirect QCL source (therefore any CSI-RS resource using NSC SSB can be used as a source RS):*
	+ **Yes**: CMCC, Samsung, Sony, Ericsson, MTK, ZTE, LG, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, CATT
	+ **No**:
* *CSI-RS for RRM:*
	+ **Yes**: Sony, LG
	+ **No**: Samsung, MTK, Ericsson
 |
| 2.7 | Whether to support the following Rel-17 unified TCI types for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility | Joint TCI:* **Yes**: Samsung, vivo, Nokia/NSB, MTK, ZTE, LG, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, CATT, Ericsson, Sony, AT&T
* **No**:

Separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only, UL-only, and [DL+UL]):* **Yes**: vivo, Nokia/NSB, MTK, NTT Docomo, CATT
* **No**: Samsung (FFS), ZTE (FFS is needed), Ericsson (FFS)
 |
|  |  |  |

The following observation can be made:

* (2.6, 2.7) For beam indication, at the minimum, indirect QCL with SSB from NSC seems agreeable as a method for spatial reference. In addition, joint TCI can be agreed.
* (2.1) This issue has been discussed for several meetings and there is no consensus (the situation hasn’t changed)
* (2.2) Kmax=8 represents the majority view
* (2.5) No objection to support P/SP/AP, and the majority supports L1-based event-driven reporting

Based on the above observation, the following moderator proposals can be made:

**Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, support the following:

* At least for UE reception (on PDSCH and PDCCH) and transmission (on PUSCH and PUCCH) associated with UE-dedicated CORESETs, Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) for joint TCI
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Beam indication support for separate DL/UL TCI in case of L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility
	+ FFS: Whether to support activation of TCI states for more than one cells simultaneously
* The DL QCL and UL spatial relation rules already agreed for intra-cell scenario
* The use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as a direct/indirect QCL reference, except for a direct QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH
	+ Note: When RS X is an indirect QCL reference of a target channel, RS X serves as a QCL source RS of the source RS configured for the target channel.
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL reference (source RS) for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH
* Note: This proposal neither assumes nor implies that a change in serving cell or RNTI is required or not requited
	+ If so, whether and how beam indication would lead to change of serving cell or RNTI is to be discussed, e.g. if beam indication to non-serving cell would lead to change of serving cell or RNTI, more relaxed beam application timing may be required

**Conclusion 2.2**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP, there is no consensus on supporting CSI-RS for mobility/RRM associated with non-serving cell as measurement RS in RAN1#105-e

**Proposal 2.3**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,

* Support at least K=4, where K is defined as the number of beams associated at least with non-serving cell(s) reported in a single CSI reporting instance
	+ The maximum value of supported K is a UE capability
	+ K is configured by NW based on the UE capability
	+ FFS: The support of K=8 and 16
		- For K>4, the maximum number of beams associated with one cell is 4
* FFS: Support L1-based event-driven reporting, including the definition of L1-based event, if needed

Table 4 Additional inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **1) Check and update Table 3** **2) Share your inputs on the above FL proposals** |
| MediaTek | P2.1: SupportP2.2: SupportP2.3: Support in principle. Regarding K=8, we prefer to support it only when a reporting is associated with more than cells (NSCs and/or SC). Otherwise, we don't see the need to support more than four if a reporting is associated with only one NSC. [Mod: Agree, added] |
| Intel | Proposal 2.1: Not ok with the first sub-bullet. MAC-CE activation and TCI state mapping to codepoints for intra-cell is not finalized. For example, if dynamic indication is agreed where both joint and separate DL/UL TCI can be mapped to codepoints, only joint TCI state update is an added constraint and it is not clear why we should agree to this at this point. We can put the entire MAC-CE based codepoint activation part in the FFS. * Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication (using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment~~, including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) with the TCI field used to update joint TCI state~~
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): MAC-CE-based TCI state activation and the use of the TCI field to update joint or separate DL/UL TCI states

[Mod: The intention of this bullet is to agree on supporting joint TCI only, for now. While separate TCI is FFS. It has nothing to do with switching between joint and separate. Reworded accordingly] |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 2.1* Suggest to add “at least”
	+ Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication (using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment, including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) with the TCI field used to update at least joint TCI state
* Suggest to add “for PDCCH/PDSCH”, because SSB should be allowed to be as direct QCL source at least for CSI-RS. Otherwise, it is unclear how this indirect QCL for any channel/RS works.
	+ The DL QCL and UL spatial relation rules already agreed for intra-cell scenario, also allowing the use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as an indirect/direct QCL source, except for a direct QCL source for PDCCH/PDSCH
		- FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL source for PDCCH/PDSCH (source RS)

[Mod: Please check latest version. Done. ]For Conclusion 2.2: SupportFor Proposal 2.3: Support |
| Apple | Proposal 2.1: one minor suggestion as follows, since we also support MAC CE based beam indication in R17**Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, support the following:* Rel-17 MAC CE and DCI-based beam indication (using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment, including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) with the TCI field used to update joint TCI state
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): The use of the TCI field to update separate DL/UL TCI states
* The DL QCL and UL spatial relation rules already agreed for intra-cell scenario, also allowing the use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as an indirect QCL source
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL source (source RS)

Proposal 2.2: SupportProposal 2.3: We have concerns for aperiodic report. UE has to measure corresponding SSB to get ready for potential beam report triggering, but UE does not know when this report would be triggered. This waste UE power quite a lot. So, we suggest the following change.**Proposal 2.3**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,* Support at least K=4 and 8, where K is defined as the number of beams associated at least with non-serving cell(s) reported in a single CSI reporting instance
	+ The maximum value of supported K is a UE capability
	+ FFS: The support of K=16
* Support NW-controlled periodic, and semi-persistent reporting
	+ FFS: Restriction for periodic reporting, e.g. smaller value(s) of K, number of non-serving cells
* Support L1-based event-driven reporting
	+ FFS: Definition of L1-based event

[Mod: Since majority would like to support aperiodic as well (even as a primary mode), I will keep the proposal as is, and we can further discuss, e.g. perhaps the concern can be addressed with activation/deactivation] |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.1: In general, the direction of the proposal is fine. We have not, based on my knowledge, define indirect SSB. I think we should define if we include in proposal to be clear. Alternatively we can avoid this wording as follows:* The DL QCL and UL spatial relation rules already agreed for intra-cell scenario, also allowing the use of ~~SSB~~ at least a reference signal associated with an antenna port of a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as ~~an indirect~~ QCL source
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL source (source RS)

At least is added to cover the FFS which would be an additional RS[Mod: Since the use of SSB as an indirect QCL is the main point of this bullet, removing SSB and replacing with antenna port as proposed could cause further confusion and ambiguity.]Conclusion 2.2: SupportProposal 2.3: Support direction of proposal. We think that the last bullet should be FFS in its entirety as we have not define what the event is:* FFS: Support L1-based event-driven reporting
	+ ~~FFS:~~ Definition of L1-based event

[Mod: Ideally the group can agree on everything at once, but there is a strong majority for supporting L1-based event driven (including Samsung). Leaving the whole thing FFS doesn’t provide much progress from the last meeting.]  |
| OPPO | 2.1：The main purpose of this proposal is to reuse the agreed DCI-based beam indication for inter-cell mobility. Then we only need to say this and the details for joint TCI or separate TCI can be removed for current moment. And as in Conclusion 1.7, there is no consensus to support SSB as direct QCL, we do not see why we need the second FFS. **Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, support the following:* Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication (using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment, including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) with the TCI field is used ~~to update joint TCI state~~
	+ ~~FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): The use of the TCI field to update separate DL/UL TCI states~~
* The DL QCL and UL spatial relation rules already agreed for intra-cell scenario, also allowing the use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as an indirect QCL source
	+ ~~FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL source (source RS)~~

[Mod: Please check latest version. The purpose is to agree only on joint TCI and have separate FFS]Conclusion 2.2: suggest to remove “in RAN1#105-e”. Let us make a conclusion and stop discussing it.[Mod: From FL perspective, this is the best I can do. The chairman will have to change this per your suggestion (similar to last meeting on source RS issue). We will leave it to the chairman]2.3: we have concern on K =8. There is no justification to support so many. Suggest to only support K = 4.[Mod: Now in brackets] |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.1: Support. Also we are fine with Apple’s update for MAC-CE based beam indicationProposal 2.2: Definitely not our preference, but we can live with this proposal for progress.[Mod: Thanks for your understanding]Proposal 2.3: We suggest to support K=16 in this proposal from spec perspective, and UE vendor can report capability signaling of the maximum number of K to be supported. Meanwhile, we can NOT live with K=4 only as OPPO suggested, and it significantly weakens the benefits of NSC-measurement (also relevant to spec forward compatibility) from gNB vendor perspective.[Mod: I understand, but it seems even K=8 is being contested] |
| LG | For Proposal 2.1: Support in principle. However, the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 for Rel-17 beam indication also can be considered, which is up to the result of Issue#3.For Proposal 2.3, it seems too early to support K>4 until details of reporting method is fixed. If we simply reuse existing beam reporting, K=4 may be sufficient.  |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.1, share same view as apple to add “MAC CE”Conclusion 2.2, supportProposal 2.3, as for K=8, we think it is better to discuss it after the maximum number of non-serving cell is decided.  |
| NTT Docomo | Proposal 2.1: Support. We are fine with adding “MAC CE” by Apple, because DCI indication of unified TCI is agreed as optional feature in RAN1#104bis-e. If possible, we’d like to clarify the "indirect QCL source" to avoid ambiguity.[Mod: Done] Proposal 2.2 - 2.3: Support. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.1: SupportConclusion 2.2: SupportProposal 2.3: On the second subbullet, we think the “FFS” issue can be achieved by implementation, but we are fine to leave it there. [Mod: Agree, added ‘if needed’] |
| Mod V16 | Revised proposals to address the above inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| vivo | It seems that we still do not have RAN2 LS feedback on how UE interprets such beam update, i.e., whether there is serving cell change or not. For the current formulation, we would like to focus on UE dedicated reception part.**Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, support the following:* For UE reception and transmission associated with UE dedicatedly configured CORESETs, Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and DCI-based beam indication (using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) for joint TCI state
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Beam indication support for separate DL/UL TCI in case of L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility
* The DL QCL and UL spatial relation rules already agreed for intra-cell scenario, also allowing the use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as a direct/indirect QCL reference, except for a direct QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH
	+ Note: When RS X is an indirect QCL reference of a target channel, RS X serves as a QCL source RS of the source RS configured for the target channel.
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL reference (source RS) for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH

[Mod: Sure.]Regarding conclusion 2.2, we would like to understand what it means by “CSI-RS for BM configured for non-serving cell” and “CSI-RS for tracking configured for non-serving cell”. The conclusion should be captured in a way that the CSI-RS for BM and CS-RS for tracking associated with an SSB from non-serving cell should not be precluded.**Conclusion 2.2**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP, there is no consensus on supporting the following measurement RS types in RAN1#105-e:* CSI-RS for mobility/RRM associated with non-serving cell
* CSI-RS for BM configured for non-serving cell
* CSI-RS for tracking configured for non-serving cell

[Mod: Good point. I think we can remove the 2nd and 3rd bullets for now]Regarding 2.3, we would also like to put aperiodic reporting in brackets at this stage before we have clear understanding on how the non-serving cell RS are measured.**Proposal 2.3**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,* Support at least K=4, where K is defined as the number of beams associated at least with non-serving cell(s) reported in a single CSI reporting instance
	+ The maximum value of supported K is a UE capability
	+ FFS: The support of K=8 and 16
		- For K>4, the maximum number of beams associated with one cell is 4
* Support NW-controlled periodic, semi-persistent[, and aperiodic reporting]
	+ FFS: Restriction for periodic reporting, e.g. smaller value(s) of K, number of non-serving cells
* Support L1-based event-driven reporting

FFS: Definition of L1-based event, if needed[Mod: Perhaps the technical concern on NSC measurement should be articulated first so some discussion can happen. Is it related to the activation issue? Note that aperiodic reporting is typically the main operational mode in CSI/beam reporting.] |
| Mod V20 | Revised proposals to address the above inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.1: Support.Conclusion 2.2: We still think it is helpful to use support CSI-RS for mobility for L1/2 inter-cell mobility, but we can go with the majority view for the sake of progress.Proposal 2.3: Support in principle. Regarding the third bullet “L1-based event-driven reporting”, we think it is necessary to define L1-based event first.  |
| MediaTek | P2.1: Regarding the added sentence “At least for UE reception and transmission associated with UE-dedicated CORESETs”, we think UE-dedicated data reception should be supported as well. We would like to add one FFS to study whether UE can support the activated TCI states are associated with RSs configured for more than one cells simultaneously. It could be difficult for UE to be dynamically switched between different cells based on DCI indication if the timing difference cannot be guaranteed.* At least for UE reception and transmission associated with UE-dedicated CORESETs and PDSCH receptions, Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and DCI-based beam indication (using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) for joint DL/UL TCI ~~state~~
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Beam indication support for separate DL/UL TCI in case of L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility
	+ FFS: Whether to support activation of TCI states for more than one cells simultaneously

[Mod: On the first point, I think there is some misunderstanding on your part ☺ Vivo’s comment is intended not to restrict reception only for UE-dedicated CORESET (since we still have “reception and transmission”). It is only on the assignment/grant. But I agree the current wording is prone to such. Added clarification to avoid this confusion]P2.2: OkayP2.3: We would like to clarify how K is provided is this proposal. In our view, it should be configured by NW based on the UE capability.* Support at least K=4, where K is defined as the number of beams associated at least with non-serving cell(s) reported in a single CSI reporting instance
	+ The maximum value of supported K is a UE capability
	+ K is configured by NW based on the UE capability

[Mod: Done] |
| Ericsson | P2.1: Support.P2.2: OKP2.3: Why is this one proposal? We are not OK to agree to event-driven reporting. At best, this is essentially BFR-light, which will require heavy involvement from RAN2, since RAN1 specifications are stateless. Both the triggering condition, and the reporting procedure would have to be in RAN2 specifications. The benefit is also unclear.[Mod: FFS now.]  |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.1~2.2: Support.Proposal 2.3: Suggest to discuss the supported number of non-serving cells first. |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 2.1: Similar views as Intel and OPPO, we are not OK with the mention of joint TCI in the first sub-bullet as long as the framework is being discussed in a different discussion item. In fact we also prefer to discuss such issues more in the mTRP agenda, we have simulation results in this meeting showing that there are unclear (if no benefits) of the L1/2 mobility as such, w.r.t L3 operation. The only purpose we see for the continuation of this discussion is if the operation framework is under mTRP.[Mod: The intention is to agree on what we can agree now. But if companies who have concern on agreeing on separate TCI now are fine, this is also fine.]Conclusion 2.2: OK.Proposal 2.3: we are not OK with the last bullet, a similar proposal was in the last meeting and as long as the “ o FFS: Definition of L1-based event, if needed” is not clarified, for us this proposal is a hard to take![Mod: FFS now] |
| Mod V28 | Revised proposals to address the above inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2.1: OKConclusion 2.2: OK. Should we also list CSI-RS for BM and TRS as FFS to conclude them in this meeting?[Mod: We can leave it for the next rounds or next meeting – please see vivo’s comment]Proposal 2.3: OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 2.1: We checked with our RAN2 colleagues, and are informed that they are considering different options (whether to change serving cell or not for L1/L2 mobility or inter-cell mTRP) and may send LS back sharing opinions and asking questions. With this, we feel it would be better to be more cautious at RAN1 side. We understand the intention here is to make some progress in RAN1, assuming no change of serving cell (which is to be decided in RAN2). With this in mind, we suggest capturing this assumption in the proposal, i.e., UE assumes no change of serving cell including RNTI(s), etc. [Mod: Done – based on the discussion on RAN2, it seems this is reasonable] If changing serving cell is to be considered/implied by this proposal, we are thinking supporting DCI-based cell switching is a bit overwhelming for UE complexity, and prefer to put DCI part in brackets (can live with MAC-CE part, if that is the majority view). We also suggest marking this proposal as a possible working assumption. Later on, if RAN2 informs RAN1 that the serving cell is to be changed for L1/L2 mobility, e.g., not by TCI indication but by some dedicated RAN2 signaling, we may need to revisit this proposal. [Mod: I don’t see any need for this after I added “Assuming no change in serving cell and RNTI(s)”]The current formulation of the 2nd bullet is a bit difficult to follow (as it mixed up direct and indirect QCL rules, and added an exception rule). With this formulation, we have a question on whether the 2nd bullet implies that CSI-RS for BM or tracking configured for non-serving cell (if supported) can be used as direct QCL source for PDCCH/PDSCH, and prefer to clarify this. Similar to R15, we feel it would be better to explicitly list the supported QCL rules, instead of having a generic statement with exception rule. [Mod: Rearranged for better readability without reworking the text – since it has been stable, please check]Proposal 2.3: Support |
| Mod V33 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.1: We have concerns about the further addition of ‘assuming no change of serving cell including RNTI(s)’. From gNB perspective, we may experience serious issues of sharing the C-RNTI across neighboring cell. Otherwise, after double thinking about the concerns from Huawei, we are fine to postpone this discussion. [Mod: Put in brackets for now]Proposal 2.2: We have concerns about how to handle NW-initialized semi-persistent and aperiodic, and meanwhile introducing L1-based event-driven reporting is for saving UE complexity and reducing latency. If FFS the last bullet, we suggest to also FFS the second last bullet. **Proposal 2.3**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,* Support at least K=4, where K is defined as the number of beams associated at least with non-serving cell(s) reported in a single CSI reporting instance
	+ The maximum value of supported K is a UE capability
	+ K is configured by NW based on the UE capability
	+ FFS: The support of K=8 and 16
		- For K>4, the maximum number of beams associated with one cell is 4
* FFS: Support NW-controlled periodic, semi-persistent, and aperiodic reporting
	+ FFS: Restriction for periodic reporting, e.g. smaller value(s) of K, number of non-serving cells
* FFS: Support L1-based event-driven reporting, including the definition of L1-based event, if needed

[Mod: I checked the agreements and actually the support for P/S/AP has been agreed. So I removed the 2nd bullet since it is unnecessary (sorry about that)*On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,* * *On the value of K (defined in RAN1#104-e as the number of beam qualities associated at least with non-serving cell(s) can be reported in a single CSI reporting instance),*
	+ *For the supported maximum value(s) of K, down-select at least one from the following candidates {4, 8, 16}*
	+ *FFS: whether the maximum value of K is a UE capability*
* *Periodic, semi-persistent, and aperiodic reporting (and the respective measurements) are supported.*
	+ *Note: Semi-persistent and aperiodic reporting (and their respective measurements) are NW-initiated*

] |
| NEC | Proposal 2.1: Support.Conclusion 2.2: Support.Proposal 2.3: Support. |
| Mod V37 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.1: support to agree on joint TCI first. One clarification question on the last bullet, does this mean non-serving cell SSB can be configured as source RS for another cell which maybe a serving/non-serving cell?[Mod: Only indirectly]Conclusion 2.2: Support.Proposal 2.3: Support. Regarding FFS on the event-driven reporting, we think it should be deprioritized before BM-like reporting is finished. |
| Sony | **Proposal 2.1**, support in general. One tiny change we would like to suggest is as below. The reason is that other DCI format for beam indication, e.g. DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, may still hold a chance, even though not very likely* At least for UE reception (on PDSCH and PDCCH) and transmission (on PUSCH and PUCCH) associated with UE-dedicated CORESETs, Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) for joint TCI

[Mod: OK]**Conclusion 2.2,** with respect to the fact, we support this conclusion. **Proposal 2.3,** support in principle.We think the event-driven reporting might be the quickest reporting approach when compared with P/SP/AP, since UE carries out the DL measurement. In addition, since K is the number of beams associated with NSC, should we extend this kind of reporting to inter-cell mTRP which in our view are composed of serving cells from up to 2 TRPs? We are not quite sure. [Mod: Thanks for bringing this up. This can be discussed in later rounds time permitting] |
| Mod V43 | Minor revision of proposal per Sony’s input **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.3:** we think support of L1-based event-driven reporting is needed. RAN1 needs to study the triggering condition. The details of the reporting format is up to RAN2.  |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 2.1, OKFor Conclusion 2.2: OKFor Proposal 2.3: OK |
| Mod V48 |  **No revision of FL proposals** |
| Spreadtrum | P2.1: Thanks for the clarification. For better understanding, we would like to suggest the following change,* The use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as a direct/indirect QCL reference of a target channel configured for the serving cell, except for a direct QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH
	+ Note: When RS X is an indirect QCL reference of a target channel, RS X serves as a QCL source RS of the source RS configured for the target channel.

FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL reference (source RS) for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH[Mod: Thanks, this is a good clarification if we keep “assuming no change in serving cell” which is removed per Ericsson’s comment. This doesn’t mean that serving cell is changed. We just don’t tie the proposal with a pending issue discussed in RAN2. But I will keep this comment in mind once more clarity on serving cell issue comes from RAN2.] |
| AT&T | Support the current version of FL proposals |
| LG | Proposal 2.1: For the third sub-bullet, the clarification is needed why the SSB associated with a PCID different from that of serving cell as a “direct/indirect” QCL reference?[Mod: This is a comment from Qualcomm (please see above) “Suggest to add “for PDCCH/PDSCH”, because SSB should be allowed to be as direct QCL source at least for CSI-RS” ] |
| Ericsson | P2.1: Support. We prefer not to condition the whole agreement on “no serving cell change”. However, we acknowledge HWs concern on the complexity involved in the beam application towards non-serving cell. Could we add the following note:**Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, support the following:* At least for UE reception (on PDSCH and PDCCH) and transmission (on PUSCH and PUCCH) associated with UE-dedicated CORESETs, Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) for joint TCI
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Beam indication support for separate DL/UL TCI in case of L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility
	+ FFS: Whether to support activation of TCI states for more than one cells simultaneously
* The DL QCL and UL spatial relation rules already agreed for intra-cell scenario
* The use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as a direct/indirect QCL reference, except for a direct QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH
	+ Note: When RS X is an indirect QCL reference of a target channel, RS X serves as a QCL source RS of the source RS configured for the target channel.
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL reference (source RS) for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH
* If beam indication to non-serving cell would lead to change of serving cell or RNTI, more relaced beam application timing may be required.

[Mod: I tend to agree. I believe the added bullet should resolve the concern.]Conclusion 2.2: OKProposal 2.3: Support. As we repeatedly stated, adding event-driven reporting is not a small thing, so we encourage companies to think about not only the event itself, but also on the reporting, and how the UE gets resources for UL transmission of a report. |
| Mod V58 | Revised proposal 2.1 (removed the text in square brackets on “assuming no change ...”, added one bullet per Ericsson’s comment**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.1: Regarding the last sub bullet, it really depends on the definition of beam application time and the sequence of events. Change of serving cell or RNTI requires RRC configuration, which is much longer than L1 procedure. If the RRC reconfiguration of serving cell or RNTI needs to complete before new beam from non-serving cell can be indicated by a DCI, the time from the DCI to the time the indicated beam becomes active is no different than intra-cell beam indication. It is too early to have this last sub-bullet in the agreement. We need to at least add an FFS to it. [Mod: Agree, please see revision based on vivo’s comment] |
| vivo | Please check whether the following update clarifies the intention or not.**Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, support the following:* At least for UE reception (on PDSCH and PDCCH) and transmission (on PUSCH and PUCCH) associated with UE-dedicated CORESETs, Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) for joint TCI
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Beam indication support for separate DL/UL TCI in case of L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility
	+ FFS: Whether to support activation of TCI states for more than one cells simultaneously
* The DL QCL and UL spatial relation rules already agreed for intra-cell scenario
* The use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as a direct/indirect QCL reference, except for a direct QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH
	+ Note: When RS X is an indirect QCL reference of a target channel, RS X serves as a QCL source RS of the source RS configured for the target channel.
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL reference (source RS) for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH
* Whether and how beam indication would lead to change of serving cell or RNTI is a separate discussion. If beam indication to non-serving cell would lead to change of serving cell or RNTI, more relaxed beam application timing may be required.

[Mod: Agree, thanks. Ventilated ☺] |
| OPPO | Re proposal 2.1: we prefer to add “at least for the case with no change of serving cell” because the proposals in all the sub-bullets only works if we assume serving cell is not changed. The last bullet added by Ericsson might not be sufficient for the case of changing serving cell. If the serving cell is changed, much more would be involved including both data plane and control plane. So it is not just how to relax the BAT. So we prefer to make the proposal for the case of no serving cell change first.[Mod: Perhaps a middle ground is to add a note that this doesn’t imply a change in serving cell? (please see revision)] |
| Mod V71 | Revised proposal 2.1 based on inputs from vivo, Lenovo, and OPPO on the last bullet**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Futurewei | Proposal 2.1: We suggest discussing this proposal after RAN1 receives RAN2’s LS response on L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility.Conclusion 2.2: Ok.Proposal 2.3: Support. |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.1:** On the last bullet, the sub-bullet is not necessary at this stage. If we get to a point where serving cell change is on the table, beam application time can be additionally discussed. At this current stage, keeping the last main bullet is enough. [Mod: We can discuss in round 1. It was added to accommodate Huawei] |
| Mod V74 | **No revision on FL proposals** |
| Nokia | Proposal 2.1: we need to reiterate our previous comment, we see no merit of the joint TCI indication in face of separate TCI indication, so that the joint solution is recommended for approval at this stage while separate is down prioritized. In addition, the framework for such signaling is discussed also in a separate agenda (Proposal 3.3 in this document), better progress can be achieved here once the framework is clarified. Taking into consideration also the note, it them means that what we agree here is a signaling solution for a form of DPS? If so, that should be discussed under the mTRP agenda.An acceptable proposal is highlighted below: **Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, support the following:* At least for UE reception (on PDSCH and PDCCH) and transmission (on PUSCH and PUCCH) associated with UE-dedicated CORESETs, Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) for [joint and/or separate] TCI
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Beam indication support for separate DL/UL TCI in case of L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility
	+ FFS: Whether to support activation of TCI states for more than one cells simultaneously
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Proposal 2.1: We failed to understand the logic of the note. If the proposal does not assume or imply anything, then it should work in both cases (change or not change serving cell). If the serving cell is to be changed, what is the point of supporting SSB associated a PCI that is different from the serving cell as indirect QCL source? If the serving cell is not to be changed, rather than saying nothing is not implied, such assumption should be captured in the proposal (and then the proposal becomes more relevant to inter-cell mTRP, which is not to be discussed in this meeting, instead of L1/L1 mobility).Conclusion 2.2: Given that CSI-RS for BM and tracking from non-serving cells are removed from the possible conclusion, we prefer not to agree on the conclusion to single out CSI-RS for mobility/RRM.  |
| InterDigital | Proposal 2.1: OKProposal 2.3: OK |

### Issue 3 (beam indication signaling medium)

Table 5 Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 3.1 | Whether both DL TCI and UL TCI states can be signaled in one instance of beam indication DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (with and without DL assignment) | **Yes (one TCI field codepoint represents both DL and UL TCI states)**: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Samsung, Xiaomi, OPPO, Fujitsu, Intel, NTT Docomo, CATT, Spreadtrum, Sony, Futurewei**No**:  |
| 3.2 | Beam application time (BAT): * Alt1: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the DCI with the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication
* Alt2A: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication
* Alt 2B: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication, except that the (new) TCI state update can be applied to the PDSCH, if it exists, (scheduled by the beam indication DCI) and corresponding ACK transmission (provided that the time offset between the DCI and the scheduled PDSCH exceed the threshold, analogous to Rel.15/16)
* Alt2C: Support both Alt1 and Alt2A, and introduce a UE capability that indicates the support of Alt1 or Alt2A
* Alt3: the first slot that is at least X1 ms or Y1 symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the DCI with beam indication and X2 ms or Y2 symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the acknowledgment of the beam indication
 | **Alt1**: vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Convida**Alt2A**: Lenovo/MoM, CMCC, Fujitsu, Samsung (2nd preference), IDC, Spreadtrum, ZTE, CATT, Huawei, HiSi, Apple, Sony, Qualcomm, NEC, NTT Docomo (2nd preference), APT/FGI, MTK, Intel, OPPO (2nd preference: Alt2B+ meet the UE capability), ZTE, Ericsson (2nd preference)**Alt2B**: Nokia/NSB, Samsung (1st preference), Xiaomi, NTT Docomo (1st preference), LG**Alt2C:****Alt3**: OPPO |
| 3.3 | For a UE configured with (supporting/capable of) both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, [or DL+UL TCI]), how to signal the switching between joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI: * AltA. Either joint TCI, DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, [or DL+UL TCI] can be dynamically indicated via beam indication DCI (i.e. the 8 available TCI codepoints are partitioned for all the TCI “types”)
* AltB. Either joint DL/UL TCI or separate DL/UL TCI can be activated via MAC CE signaling (included in the TCI state activation)
	+ When separate DL/UL TCI is activated, either DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, [or DL+UL TCI] can be indicated via beam indication DCI

Note: The UE capability/optionality/FG issue is beyond the scope of 3.2 | **AltA**: Lenovo/MoM, Nokia/NSB, ZTE, OPPO (only for the UE with UE capability supporting both joint and separate TCI state), Sony, Convida, APT/FGI, Intel (TCI state usage indication via MAC-CE and dynamic switching using DCI), CATT**AltB**: Spreadtrum, CATT, Ericsson, Huawei, HiSi, Samsung, Xiaomi, Apple, Qualcomm, MTK, NTT Docomo, LG |
| 3.4 | Additional support for DCI ACK/NAK for DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment when used for beam indication  | **Yes:** Lenovo/MoM (dedicated ACK/NACK bit in codebook), Xiaomi (separate HARQ-ACK bit), Samsung, CATT (only ACK), OPPO (only ACK), Apple, NEC (only ACK)**No:** ZTE (FFS is needed), Ericsson, Sony |
| 3.5 | Support for additional DCI formats for Rel-17 unified TCI framework beam indication (TCI state update) beyond the agreed DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with + without DL assignment | **No additional DCI format is supported for beam indication:** Convida, OPPO, NTT Docomo, CATT, Ericsson, Spreadtrum**DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 with UL grant (for UL-only TCI of separate DL/UL TCI)**: IDC, Sony, NEC, MTK, LG, Intel, ZTE, Xiaomi |
| 3.6 | When more than one TCI codepoints are activated by MAC CE, the activated TCI state(s) for the lowest codepoint is/are applied. | **Yes:** Huawei, HiSi, Ericsson, vivo**No:** Intel, OPPO, ZTE |
| 3.7 | When UE is configured with two HARQ priorities, the HARQ ACK/NACK feedback for beam indication DCI is always mapped to high priority codebook with PUCCH resource associated to priority index 1 | **Yes:** Intel**No:**  |

The following observation can be made:

* (3.1) Majority support for signaling both DL and UL TCI in one beam indication instance for separate TCI
* (3.2) Alt2A seems to be the alternative acceptable to (almost) all companies
	+ One company (LG) voiced “strong concern” on the proposal (based on Alt2A) since this could result in larger beam application latency on PDSCH (compared to Rel-15/16 – allowing updated TCI state to be used directly if threshold is met). Note that this potential drawback is only for PDSCH associated with the beam indication DCI and only when DCI 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment is used. LG proposes to adopt Alt2B instead to optimize this single case.
		- Alt2B is also supported by Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo, Samsung, and Xiaomi. But these companies are willing to accept Alt2A (proposal 3.2 from FL)
	+ However, at least the following companies voiced strong concern on Alt2B since it leads to different timing for this particular case of PDSCH and the other channels (including other cases of PDSCH): Apple, Ericsson, MTK, OPPO, ZTE, Qualcomm, Intel
* (3.3) AltB (MAC-CE-activation based) represents the majority viee and the middle ground between RRC-based (too slow) and codepoint-based (over-partitioning the max 8 available codepoints into joint and separate TCIs – 4 “types” of TCI) switching between joint and separate TCI. It also accommodates (partially) the view of those preferring fully dynamic switching (since the switching among DL, UL, and DL+UL is done via TCI field codepoints)

Based on the above observation, the following moderator proposals can be made:

**Proposal 3.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for separate DL/UL TCI, at least for M=N=1, one instance of beam indication using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (with and without DL assignment) can be used as follows:

* One TCI field codepoint represents a pair of DL TCI state and UL TCI state. If the DCI indicates such a TCI field codepoint, the UE applies the corresponding DL TCI state and UL TCI state.
* One TCI field codepoint represents only a DL TCI state. If the DCI indicates such a TCI field codepoint, the UE applies the corresponding DL TCI state, and keeps the current UL TCI state.
* One TCI field codepoint represents only an UL TCI state. If the DCI indicates such a TCI field codepoint, the UE applies the corresponding UL TCI state, and keeps the current DL TCI state.

FFS: the cases of M/N > 1, if supported

**Proposal 3.2**: On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the last symbol of the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication.

* Note: The gap between the last symbol of the beam indication DCI and that first slot shall satisfy the UE capability
* FFS: Application time and whether additional offset is needed for the application time in case of cross carrier beam indication and common TCI state ID update across a set of configured CCs if CCs have different SCSs
* FFS: Whether inter-cell beam switching needs higher X/Y values than intra-cell
* FFS: Application time can be indicated dynamically, e.g., for the scenarios of cross CC, inter-cell or inter-panel

**Proposal 3.3**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for a UE configured with both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI), TCI states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation for either only joint DL/UL TCI or only separate DL/UL TCI

* When TCI states are activated for joint TCI, the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication can update only a TCI state associated with joint TCI
* When TCI states are activated for separate DL/UL TCI, the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication can update only a TCI state associated with either DL-only TCI or UL-only TCI, or update a pair of TCI states associated with DL TCI and UL TCI, respectively
* Detailed MAC-CE-based design is up to RAN2
* FFS: the cases of M/N > 1, if supported

Table 6 Additional inputs: issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **1) Check and update Table 5****2) Share your inputs on the above FL proposals** |
| MediaTek | P3.1: SupportP3.2: SupportP3.3: Support. Regarding how to activate joint TCI or separate TCI via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation can be left to RAN2 design. * *How to activate either only joint DL/UL TCI states or only separate DL/UL TCI states is up to RAN2*

[Mod: Agree, done] |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 3.1: SupportProposal 3.2: SupportProposal 3.3: We prefer no ‘mode like’ separation between indication of joint/separated TCI, since it can be up to gNB which TCI to be associated to each of TCI index. But as our 2nd preference, we can be open for MAC CE based switching. We do not support any slower changes, e.g., RRC.[Mod: Thanks for your understanding] |
| Intel | Proposal 3.1: SupportProposal 3.2: SupportProposal 3.3: Do not support this proposal. We don’t see the need to limit the configurable codepoints to one type of TCI states. As we outlined in our paper, MAC-CE configuring the TCI codepoints can also configure the usage i.e., what type of TCI state the codepoint maps to. In this case, the DCI indication can choose any of the 8 codepoints and they can map to either joint or separate TCI states. Requiring MAC-CE to reconfigure codepoints if gNB needs to indicate separate TCI states is not desirable. [Mod: The proponents of MAC CE based switching are concerned that using code-point-based switching between joint and separate will cause much more frequent use of MAC CE activation especially at high-speed. In addition, code-point-based switching has been used within 2-3 types of TCI in separate TCI. This is already a middle ground.]We also added Issue 3.7 to the Table 5. In our understanding, the ACK/NACK for beam indication is a very important UCI which is needed to ensure UE and gNB are aligned on which beam is used. In this case, this ACK/NACK feedback should not be dropped in favor of other UCI i.e., prioritization is needed. For the case when a UE is configured with two HARQ codebook priority indices, the beam indication ACK/NACK should always be mapped to the high priority HARQ/ACK codebook.  |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 3.1: Can more details be provided? How?[Mod: please check latest version. One codepoint mapped to both DL and UL, c.f Fraunhofer’s comment] For Proposal 3.2: SupportFor Propoal 3.3: Suggest the following clarification if that is the intention**Proposal 3.3**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for a UE configured with both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or a pair of DL+UL TCIs if supported), either only joint DL/UL TCI states or only separate DL/UL TCI states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation* When joint TCI states are activated, only joint TCI state can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
* When separate DL/UL TCI states are activated, either a single DL-only TCI state, a single UL-only TCI state, or a pair DL+UL TCI states if supported can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication

[Mod: Please check latest wording based on OPPO’s input – should address your input] |
| Apple | Proposal 3.1: SupportProposal 3.2: SupportProposal 3.3: For separate DL/UL, we suggest one code-point is always mapped to a pair of DL+UL TCI. So we suggest the following change:**Proposal 3.3**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for a UE configured with both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI), either only joint DL/UL TCI states or only separate DL/UL TCI states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation* When joint TCI states are activated, only joint TCI state can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
* When separate DL/UL TCI states are activated, DL+UL TCI state can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication

[Mod: Since we already agreed to signal DL-only and UL-only for separate (below), we cannot remove these options unless all companies agree ☹* *Use the existing TCI field (always present) to signal the following: 1) Joint DL/UL TCI state, 2) DL-only TCI state (for separate DL/UL TCI), 3) UL-only TCI state (for separate DL/UL TCI)*
	+ *FFS: Whether both DL TCI and UL TCI states can be signaled in one instance of beam indication DCI* ]
 |
| Samsung | Proposal 3.1: SupportProposal 3.2: SupportProposal 3.3: Support |
| OPPO | Proposal 3.1: The wording is confusing a little bit. Does the proposal intent to say that a single DCI can indicate one DL TCI state and one UL TCI state? Suggest to change as follows:**Proposal 3.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for separate DL/UL TCI, ~~both DL-only TCI and UL-only TCI states can be updated in~~ one instance of beam indication using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (with and without DL assignment) can indicate one DL TCI state and one UL TCI state.  Proposal 3.2: We prefer to add a note that the gap between the beam indication DCI and that first slot shall satisfy the UE capability.**Proposal 3.2**: On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the last symbol of the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication.* The gap between the last symbol of the beam indication DCI and that first slot shall satisfy the UE capability

Proposal 3.3: support in principle. But prefer to clarify that in one single MAC CE, all the activated TCI states shall be the same type: all are joint TCI states or all are separate TCI states. **Proposal 3.3**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for a UE configured with both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI), either only joint DL/UL TCI states or only separate DL/UL TCI states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation* When joint TCI states are activated, only joint TCI state can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication, here all the activated TCI states are joint TCI states.
* When separate DL/UL TCI states are activated, either DL-only TCI state, UL-only TCI state, or DL+UL TCI state can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication, here all the activated TCI states are separate DL/UL TCI states.

[Mod: Thanks for the good wording suggestions. Done.] |
| ZTE | Proposal 3.1: SupportProposal 3.2: Support. Xms is slightly preferred considering that different SCS may be configured for different CCs in CA case. Proposal 3.3: Support. We think that for separate beam indication mode (as a super mode compared with joint TCI indication), we also need to support a beam state that can be applied to both DL and UL as a joint TCI state by default. |
| LG | Proposal 3.1: Suggest to discuss whether to support DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 for UL TCI update before discussing this proposal. If it is supported, it seems not needed to use DL DCI format (i.e. 1\_1/1\_2) for UL TCI update in case of separate DL/UL TCI.[Mod: I don’t see any correlation with this, however]Proposal 3.2: We have strong concern on this proposal. The main difference between Alt2A and Alt2B is whether to apply the indicated TCI in DCI to the scheduled PDSCH. Could someone explain why the indicated TCI by DCI should NOT be applied to the scheduled PDSCH, which is an existing functionality? Alt2A will lead to worse performance than Rel-15/16, i.e. PDSCH beam application timing is delayed after sending HARQ-ACK for the scheduled PDSCH, which is very strange design. [Mod: Alt2B is largely based on Alt2A except with enhanced/different definition for PDSCH. Your argument is valid. But many companies have expressed strong concern on having different BAT definition only for PDSCH, and only for 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment.] Proposal 3.3: Support in principle. Need to remove ‘DL+UL TCI state’ by DCI 1\_1/1\_2 for now due to the reason commented on 3.1[Mod: we can put this in brackets for now until 3.1 is agreed.] |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 3.1, supportProposal 3.2, For the DCI format with DL assignment, we slightly prefer Alt 2B.Proposal 3.3, support. |
| NTT Docomo | Support proposal 3.1/3.2/3.3. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | In proposal 3.1, it is better to clarify if one instance means one DCI with 2 fields with one indicating a DL and a second indicating a UL TCI state, or one codepoint of a DCI field indicating both UL and DL TCI states. And, the part “with or without DL assignment” can be included without brackets in the main bullet or as a note in a sub-bullet.[Mod: It is the second. Pleae check the latest. Done.]Support 3.2 and 3.3. |
| CATT | Proposal 3.1: SupportProposal 3.2: SupportProposal 3.3: we are OK with the proposal. |
| Mod V16 | Revised proposals to address the above inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Vivo | Support proposal 3.1Regarding proposal 3.2, we would like to understand how this is applied for cross carrier beam indication case. In Rel-16 discussion, additional time-offset is applied for the beam indication timing when the scheduling cc numerology is different from scheduled cc numerology.**Proposal 3.2**: On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the last symbol of the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication.* The gap between the last symbol of the beam indication DCI and that first slot shall satisfy the UE capability
* FFS additional offset for the application time of cross carrier beam indication.

[Mod: Done] Support proposal 3.3. |
| APT/FGI | Proposal 3.1: OK with the main bullet. Proposal 3.2: support |
| Samsung2 | We are fine with proposal 3.1, it would be good to add a note that a “codepoint represents a pair of DL-only and UL-only TCI states” is in addition to DL only TCI codepoint and UL only one TCI codepoint.[Mod: Done] For proposal 3.3, as we have not defined “DL/UL TCI state” we should avoid this term. Suggest the following update:**Proposal 3.3**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for a UE configured with both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI), either only joint DL/UL TCI states or only separate DL/UL TCI states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation* When joint TCI states are activated, only joint TCI state can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
	+ Here, ~~all the activated~~ only TCI states ~~are~~ corresponding to joint TCI ~~states~~ are activated.
* When separate DL/UL TCI states are activated, either DL-only TCI state, UL-only TCI state, or DL+UL TCI state can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
	+ Here ~~all the activated~~ only TCI states ~~are~~ corresponding to separate DL/UL TCI ~~states~~ are activated.
* Detailed MAC-CE-based design on how to activate either only joint DL/UL TCI states or only separate DL/UL TCI states is up to RAN2

[Mod: Agree this wording is clearer since that term was never defined before, done] |
| Mod V20 | Revised proposals to address the above inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Proposal 3.1: OKProposal 3.2: SupportProposal 3.3: We think it is not necessary to have such limit. It is possible to assign separate TCI codepoint with MAC-CE to have a mixture of joint TCI and separate DL only, UL only, or UL+DL TCI, as long as all these TCI codepoints can fit into the 8 TCI states.  |
| MediaTek | P3.1: Support the proposal with Samsung’s suggestionP3.2: Support. Regarding the issue for further study, we think it is not only limited to additional offset, but also how to define the application time for CCs with different SCSs. Meanwhile, we think application time for common TCI state ID update across a set of configured CCs is also important. Thus, we suggest the change:* FFS: Application time and whether additional offset is needed for the application time ~~of~~ for cross carrier beam indication ~~is needed~~ and common TCI state ID update across a set of configured CCs if CCs have different SCSs

P3.3: Following the suggestion from Samsung, it would be better to revise the proposal as follows:**Proposal 3.3**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for a UE configured with both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI), TCI states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation for either only joint DL/UL TCI ~~states~~ or only separate DL/UL TCI ~~states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation~~* When ~~joint~~ TCI states are activated for joint DL/UL TCI, only joint TCI state can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
	+ Here, only TCI states corresponding to the joint TCI are activated.
* When ~~separate DL/UL~~ TCI states are activated for separate DL/UL TCI, either DL-only TCI ~~state~~, UL-only TCI ~~state~~, or DL+UL TCI ~~state~~ can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
	+ Here, only TCI states corresponding to the separate DL/UL TCI are activated
* Detailed MAC-CE-based design on how to activate either only joint DL/UL TCI ~~states~~ or only separate DL/UL TCI ~~states~~ is up to RAN2
 |
| Ericsson | P3.1: We think this is unnecessarily complex: it is highly unlikely that “UL-only” or “DL-only” is ever implemented. But we are ok for progress.P3.2: SupportP3.3: Same comment as for P3.1. |
| CMCC | Proposal 3.1~3.3: Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 3.3: looking at other companies’ comments, we do not agree with the direction of this agreement. In general we are not supportive to design separate operation within unified framework. If the unified TCI framework is going to fork in UE-feature-like support for joint and separate, we think this is a big drawback and not what was intended when this discussion started, that is a lean TCI framework. Indeed, the outcome of such “multi-mode” operation is worse than rel15/16, UE vendors will start “selecting” which mode they operation, that is joint OR separate, while on the network side we need to implement both! With such a potential outcome is not clear at all what are the benefits of the two ways of signaling? In addition, we should also discuss how many states are we going to use, are they going to be more than 8 states? Some of the signaling variants might make more sense than others when also knowing exactly how many states we are using. We think the starting point of this signaling should be that joint and separate are mapped in the same set of codepoints, are these not sufficient as a very first shot of Rel17? As an ultimate alternative, if companies insist of having joint or separate indication, we should take the temperature of what is the support of an independent operation for the two modes and decide which one to pick. We will be very much supportive of the option getting more support, but in any case, we should not continue with this dual track.[Mod: Thanks for the comments (some good points). As mentioned in the summary, the purpose is not related to UE capability or feature (many companies that support this proposal do not see the need for defining joint and separate as two different features or capabilities). This is not the topic to be discussed currently. The purpose is to ensure that activated TCI states are not spread too thin across 4 “types” of TCI.Re “are they going to be more than 8 states?”, since we have agreed to reuse the TCI field in the DCI and no repurposing of unused codepoints will be done in Rel-17, this is not an open issue, i.e. the maximum number of activated TCI states is 8.] |
| Mod V28 | Revised proposals to address the above inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 3.1: OKProposal 3.2: Suggest in the 1st sub-bullet to clarify that … UE capability, “which should be at least X ms or Y symbols”.Proposal 3.3: OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 3.1: We do not immediately see a use case that requires mapping a pair of DL TCI state and UL TCI state with one DCI codepoint. We can be ok if that is majority view. [Mod: Thanks for your understanding] It seems this proposal would rule out the possibly of supporting M>1 or N>1 or mTRP-based HST deployment using Rel-17 unified TCI framework?[Mod: Not in my understanding. This is a topic for the next round.]Proposal 3.2: The 1st sub-bullet seems not needed. It should be common understanding that UE is not expected to handle the case where gNB does not follow UE capability reporting on the required processing time. [Mod: I tend to agree that this is obvious. I added “Note” and we can check if the text can be removed (from OPPO)]Reading the comment from LG, we understand the concern on PDSCH and are now open to consider Alt-2B. Still, if going with Alt-2B, to avoid beam misalignment for PDCCH, we prefer to remove the ACK part from the proposal (i.e., the ACK is still transmitted with previous TCI/beam, not the newly indicated one by DCI). In addition, is it correct understanding that the proposal here is for intra-cell beam switching only? In our understanding, it is natural that inter-cell switching would require longer processing delay. If DCI-based cell switching is to be considered, we request to have separate UE capability reporting and also separate NW configuration. [Mod: added FFS for inter-cell beam switching]Proposal 3.3: Support. |
| Mod V33 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| ZTE | Proposal 3.1: Support.Proposal 3.2: Share the same concerns as Huawei. The following note should be removed and we do not need to clarify that that UE is not expected to handle the case where gNB does not follow UE capability reporting on the required processing time.Also, if we would like to considering the additional latency for beam switching for inter-cell or inter-panel, we need to need consider how to provide the additional latency, like DCI.**Proposal 3.2**: On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the last symbol of the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication.* ~~Note: The gap between the last symbol of the beam indication DCI and that first slot shall satisfy the UE capability~~
* FFS: Application time and whether additional offset is needed for the application time in case of cross carrier beam indication and common TCI state ID update across a set of configured CCs if CCs have different SCSs
* FFS: Whether inter-cell beam switching needs higher X/Y values than intra-cell
* FFS: Application time can be indicated dynamically, e.g., for the scenarios of cross CC, inter-cell or inter-panel.

[Mod: The note (from OPPO) is put in brackets (from my perspective the note is OK ☺). Added FFS.] |
| NEC | Proposal 3.1: We think the case of multi-TRP transmission should be further studied. For example, based on current proposal 3.1, it seems single-DCI based scheme 1a (two DL TCI states for PDSCH) can not be supported, so we propose the update as:**Proposal 3.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for separate DL/UL TCI, one instance of beam indication using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (with and without DL assignment) can be used at least as follows: * One TCI field codepoint represents a pair of DL TCI state and UL TCI state
* One TCI field codepoint represents only a DL TCI state
* One TCI field codepoint represents only an UL TCI state

FFS: The case of single-DCI/multi-DCI based multi-TRP transmission.[Mod: The details MTRP support will be discussed separately so this FFS can be discussed later] Proposal 3.2: Support.Proposal 3.3: Support the main bullet. Regarding the sub-bullet for joint TCI “Here, only TCI states corresponding to the joint TCI are activated”, we’d like to clarify that does this mean only joint TCI activated by MAC-CE? i.e. in this case, all the TCI states in the TCI codepoint are joint TCI. If so, it’s natural that only joint TCI can be updated via the TCI field. While it seems a little restrictive. For example, similar as comment in proposal 3.1, it seems multi-TRP transmission can not be supported, so we propose FFS on how to support multi-TRP based transmission. Regarding the sub-bullet for separate DL/UL TCI, similar comment. So we’d like to add one FFS point for multi-TRP transmission.**Proposal 3.3**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for a UE configured with both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI), TCI states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation for either ~~only~~ joint DL/UL TCI or ~~only~~ separate DL/UL TCI, and UE can be updated with either only joint TCI or only separate DL/UL TCI. * When TCI states are activated for joint TCI, only joint TCI can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
	+ ~~Here, only TCI states corresponding to the joint TCI are activated.~~
* When TCI states are activated for separate DL/UL TCI, either DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
	+ ~~Here, only TCI states corresponding to the separate DL/UL TCI are activated~~
* Detailed MAC-CE-based design on how to activate either only joint DL/UL TCI or only separate DL/UL TCI is up to RAN2

FFS: The case of single-DCI/multi-DCI based multi-TRP transmission.[Mod: Thanks for the careful review. Removing the sub-bullets is good since after a few iterations the wording of the bullets is clear. The main sentence is ok (“only” is needed to avoid ambiguity.)] In addition, regarding the applied beam after beam indication, we think following case should be discussed: in case of HARQ-ACK multiplexing, HARQ-ACKs for multiple DCI with/without DL assignment are multiplexed in one HARQ-ACK codebook, if the indicated beams are different in the multiple DCIs, which beam should be finally applied after application timing?Proposal 3.x: FFS the applied beam after application timing in case of HARQ-ACK multiplexing.[Mod: Thanks. I will take this proposal for the next round] |
| Mod V37 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal3.1: Support.Proposal 3.2: Support.Proposal 3.3: Support. We suggest to add a subbullet to explicitly state that ‘the switching between joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI is achieved by the same MAC CE as that for TCI state activation’ |
| Vivo | We would like to support the following operation mode in issue 3.6, which is beneficial for DCI overhead reduction:* When more than one TCI codepoints are activated by MAC CE, the activated TCI state(s) for the lowest codepoint is/are applied.

[Mod: Added vivo there] |
| Sony | **Proposal 3.1**, support. **Proposal 3.2,** support.**Proposal 3.3,** we think Nokia’s argument somehow makes sense and we also agree with FL that if 8 codepoints are divided by 4 types of TCI, each type of TCI would be too thin. So, we hope some meaningful combinations can be investigated. One example could be joint TCI + UL-only TCI activated by one MAC CE, and the intention is to allow UE to switch UL beam when MPE event identified on beam indicated by joint TCI.  |
| LG | **3.2:** We still have concern on introducing a new feature with worse performance than legacy system. Please keep in mind that **we are discussing latency reduction not latency increase**. We don’t understand any technical reason that BAT should be same for all DL/UL channels either. BAT is only about the minimum required time threshold which is exactly same as timedurationforQCL for the grant based PDSCH in Rel-15/16 and we don’t see any need to modify it and increase the latency. We can accept a compromised solution between 2A and 2B as Huawei mentioned above.**Proposal 3.2**: On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the last symbol of the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication except for the scheduled PDSCH by the DCI.* Beam application time for the scheduled PDSCH by the DCI is same as Rel-15/16.
* [Note: The gap between the last symbol of the beam indication DCI and that first slot shall satisfy the UE capability]
* FFS: Application time and whether additional offset is needed for the application time in case of cross carrier beam indication and common TCI state ID update across a set of configured CCs if CCs have different SCSs
* FFS: Whether inter-cell beam switching needs higher X/Y values than intra-cell
* FFS: Application time can be indicated dynamically, e.g., for the scenarios of cross CC, inter-cell or inter-panel

[Mod: Thanks for the proposal. I will ask companies with concern to comment] |
| Mod V43 | No change in proposals**Please check LG’s proposed refinement on proposal 3.2 if this is agreeable to companies having concern** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 3.3:** We share Nokia’s position. We shall try to limit the total number of TCI codepoints (both separate and joint TCI) to 8, then there will be no need to always have one of the two types of TCI activated at any time. [Mod: P3.3 is already a compromise between MAC-CE proponents and fully-dynamic proponents since the 3 TCI types of separate DL/UL TCI are dynamically switched. I hope both sides can meet in between.] |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 3.1: OKFor Proposal 3.2: OKFor LG’s Proposal 3.2: Not OK. We prefer all beams are changed at the same time to simplify implementation for the common beam update. Whether to support R15 PDSCH TCI indication, which can be different from scheduling PDCCH beam, can be separately decided or as UE capability. For Proposal 3.3: OK |
| OPPO | Re the revised proposal 3.2: we can not ok to put the Note in []. From our perspective, the BAT must meet the UE capability. The note is an essential part of the whole proposal. [Mod: Done]Re the LG’s proposed revision of proposal 3.2: we are not ok. Having different BAT for special PDSCH and PDCCH does not align the design of rel17 unfied TCI framework. That also complicate the system operation and UE behavior. The UE would have to alternate the operation of “one beams” and “two beam” all the time. Furthermore, applying separate BAT on PDSCH would actually enlarge the beam indication latency for rel17 unified TCI framework operation. For 2A: the beam switch latency could be as small as the UE capability. But in the revised proposal with separate BAT on PDSCH: the gNB would have to indicate a scheduling offset >= the UE capability for PDSCH and thus the beam switch latency for PDCCH would be even larger.  |
| Mod V48 | No change of content in proposals other than **minor editorial for proposal 3.2 (for clarity and conciseness)****Please check LG’s proposed refinement on proposal 3.2 if this is agreeable to companies having concern** |
| MediaTek | For LG’s P3.2: Share same view with QC and OPPO. This is NOT a compromise solution from UE implementation perspective due to the following aspects:* UE has to maintain two separate timelines for PDSCH and other signals/channels.
* UE has to maintain new beam and old beam simultaneously during the PDSCH reception

P3.3: For separate DL/UL TCI, as indicated in P3.1, a pair of TCI states for DL+UL TCI can be updated via the TCI field. Thus, we suggest the following:**Proposal 3.3**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for a UE configured with both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI), TCI states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation for either only joint DL/UL TCI or only separate DL/UL TCI * When TCI states are activated for joint TCI, the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication can update only a TCI state associated with joint TCI
* When TCI states are activated for separate DL/UL TCI, the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication can update only a TCI state associated with either DL-only TCI or UL-only TCI, or update a pair of TCI states associated with DLTCI and UL TCI, respectively
* Detailed MAC-CE-based design is up to RAN2

[Mod: Better wording, thanks, done] |
| Fujitsu | Support updated FL’s proposal on 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. We are also fine with LG’s refinement on proposal 3.2.  |
| Ericsson | P3.1: OK. Maybe we can add the following for clarification:**Proposal 3.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for separate DL/UL TCI, one instance of beam indication using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (with and without DL assignment) can be used as follows: * One TCI field codepoint represents a pair of DL TCI state and UL TCI state. If the DCI indicates such a TCI field codepoint, the UE applies the corresponding DL and UL TCI state.
* One TCI field codepoint represents only a DL TCI state. If the DCI indicates such a TCI field codepoint, the UE applies the corresponding DL TCI state, and keeps the current UL TCI state.
* One TCI field codepoint represents only an UL TCI state. If the DCI indicates such a TCI field codepoint, the UE applies the corresponding UL TCI state, and keeps the current DL TCI state.

[Mod: Thanks for adding UE behavior description to avoid ambiguity. Done]P3.2: OK, We have strong concerns on Alt2B, the effort of maintaining multiple beams during a transition period cannot be motivated. We would probably not implement it in any case.P3.3: OK. For clarification:**Proposal 3.3**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for a UE configured with both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI), TCI states can be activated via MAC-CE-based TCI state activation for either only joint DL/UL TCI or only separate DL/UL TCI * When TCI states are activated for joint TCI, only a TCI state associated with joint TCI can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
* When TCI states are activated for separate DL/UL TCI, only TCI state(s) associated with either DL-only TCI, UL-only TCI, or DL+UL TCI can be updated via the TCI field in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication
* Detailed MAC-CE-based design is up to RAN2

[Mod: Agree with the “TCI state(s)” since it can be DL+UL. This is also addressed in MTK’s comment by using “a pair” for DL+UL] |
| Mod V58 | Revised proposals 3.1 (added clarification on UE behavior from Ericsson) and 3.3 (wordsmithing, no content change, from Ericsson and MTK) per inputs **Re LG’s proposed refinement on proposal 3.2, the following companies have articulated the reasons of their strong concern: OPPO, Qualcomm, MTK, Ericsson** **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Samsung | Proposal 3.2: We support the FL proposal. Although we were initially supportive of Alt2B, we don’t support the refinement from LG for the following reasons. * It takes the PDSCH part from Alt2B while leaving out the corresponding PUCCH (especially for the ACK).
* The beam application time for PDSCH (if we go with Alt 2B) should be the same as that of the other channels, we see no reason for having a different beam application time for PDSCH.
* “Same as Rel-15/16” may imply different BAT framework from the other channels (even if the effect may be similar t Alt2B). From our perspective, this is not the intention (in the wording of Alt2B, “analogous” is used, not “same as”).

In short it significantly lessens the benefit of Alt2B while still keeping its added implementation complication relative to Alt2A (mentioned by other companies).  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 3.1: SupportProposal 3.2: SupportProposal 3.3: Support |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 3.1: OK.Proposal 3.2: Our preference is Alt 1 for the lowest latency. However, if we need to go with Alt 2, we should go with Alt 2B for reasons described by LG.Proposal 3.3: Not support. We don’t see a motivation to prohibit the gNB to activate some TCI codepoints for joint TCI and other TCI codepoints for separate TCI. If the network wants to activate all TCI codepoints for either joint or separate TCI, this could be achieved by implementation.  |
| Apple | Proposal 3.1: OKProposal 3.2: We have strong concern for the bullet added by LG. We cannot accept different timeline for different channels. In addition, we also think the following note needs to be justified. What is the “UE capability” that needs to be satisfied? Is it a new one or legacy one? What is the meaning of “the first slot”?* Note: The gap between the last symbol of the beam indication DCI and that first slot shall satisfy the UE capability

In principle, BAT should be simple and clean. The only consequence for a complicated BAT is that UE would not support DCI based TCI update. We should note that the TCI in DCI to update PDSCH beam has never been used in the real network. There is nothing worse than R15.Proposal 3.3: I am afraid that I misunderstood previous proposal. The whole thing may be left to RAN2. From RAN1 point of view, we do not see any problem to support a mixed case – some TCI codepoint mapped to joint TCI and others mapped to separate TCI. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 3.2: we have concern on the suggestion added by LG, too. We prefer the same BAT for all applicable channels/RSs. |
| Mod V71 | **No revision in the FL proposals** Re LG’s proposed refinement on proposal 3.2, the following companies have articulated the reasons of their strong concern: OPPO, Qualcomm, MTK, Ericsson, Apple, Spreadtrum Fujitsu is ok with either FL proposal or LG version. Convida prefers Alt2B |
| Futurewei | Proposal 3.1: We are ok with the direction of the proposal. Since the case of M/N > 1 is still to be discussed, to avoid the mis-understanding that one instance of beam indication using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (with and without DL assignment) can only be used as described in the three sub-bullets in the proposal, we would like to make the following changes:**Proposal 3.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for separate DL/UL TCI, one instance of beam indication using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (with and without DL assignment) can be used as follows: * One TCI field codepoint represents m DL TCI state(s) and n UL TCI state(s).
* One TCI field codepoint represents only m DL TCI state(s).
* One TCI field codepoint represents only n UL TCI state(s).
* Note: m<=M and n<=N

[Mod: Thanks for bringing this up. The above revision can cause too much discussion (ambiguity, possibilities) since we have not decided on M and N, I will add the same FFS as you suggested for 3.3. The text you removed is also important to have a clear UE behaviour so it should be kept. It will be clarified that this is at least for M=N=1. If we make good progress on this and other, we will start discussing M and N issues in this meeting.]Proposal 3.2: Support.Proposal 3.3: Similar to our comments on Proposal 3.1, to avoid the misunderstanding that “M/N > 1” is excluded by this proposal, we would like to add “FFS the cases of M/N > 1, if supported.” at the end of the proposal.[Mod: Agreed, done] |
| Intel | **Proposal 3.1:** OK**Proposal 3.2:** We are not sure there is a need to apply the beam to the scheduled PDSCH, notwithstanding the complexity issues raised by several other companies. Unless the gNB and UE are aligned on the fact that the UE has received the DCI successfully, the new should not apply. In this case, gNB and UE are aligned after UE has transmitted the ACK. Since the proposal is to transmit this ACK on the old beam and not the newly indicated beam, we do not see why the PDSCH may not be received on this beam. In case there is beam failure, BFR mechanism can kick in.[Mod: Noted that Intel has the same concern on Alt2B and LG version]**Proposal 3.3:** We are not ok with the arguments presented in favor of MAC-CE based configuration of TCI codepoints to joint or separate TCI states. If configuring 8 codepoints with mixed TCI can lead to lots of MAC-CE reconfiguration, it can also be argued that when separate TCI is a valid use case, there will still be the requirement of frequent MAC-CE reconfiguration of the TCI codepoints. The arguments hold only when we consider that separate TCI is not a common use case which we do not agree with. We do not see any issues with mixed TCI state configuration by MAC-CE with usage indication. In case companies think joint TCI is a predominant use case, with the mixed TCI configuration enabled, the gNB is still free configure all 8 TCI states to joint TCI. Therefore, we see no point in restricting codepoints to one type of TCI. [Mod: Please understand the FL proposal is already a compromise between full MAC CE and full codepoint switching. Either scheme works honestly and this is just a “flavor” debate that doesn’t affect implementation or functionality.] |
| Mod V74 | **Minor revision** (Futurewei’s input) to clarify M/N issue.  |
| Nokia | Proposal 3.1: We are O.K. with adding FFS on M, N>1 since it is not agreed yet. But I don’t see a reason to restrict the main bullet to be applied for N=N=1. We propose to delete ‘at leat for M=N=1’ in the main bullet.**Proposal 3.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI, for separate DL/UL TCI~~, at least for M=N=1~~, one instance of beam indication using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (with and without DL assignment) can be used as follows: * One TCI field codepoint represents a pair of DL TCI state and UL TCI state. If the DCI indicates such a TCI field codepoint, the UE applies the corresponding DL TCI state and UL TCI state.
* One TCI field codepoint represents only a DL TCI state. If the DCI indicates such a TCI field codepoint, the UE applies the corresponding DL TCI state, and keeps the current UL TCI state.
* One TCI field codepoint represents only an UL TCI state. If the DCI indicates such a TCI field codepoint, the UE applies the corresponding UL TCI state, and keeps the current DL TCI state.

FFS: the cases of M/N > 1, if supportedProposal 3.2: Support Proposal 3.3: In principle we do not see necessary defining joint and separate “modes”. We also echo the comments from Intel above.  |
| InterDigital | Proposal 3.1: OKProposal 3.2: OK in principle. However, we have a question on the last FFS bullet “• FFS: Application time can be indicated dynamically, e.g., for the scenarios of cross CC, inter-cell or inter-panel”. Is this indication from gNB or UE? We prefer to have a better understanding before agreeing this FFS bullet.  |

### Issue 4 (MP-UE)

Table 7 Summary: issue 4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 4.1 | Whether to support the following measurement/reporting scheme for UE-initiated panel activation/selection:* Opt1-1: A panel entity corresponds to a reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index in a beam reporting instance
	+ The correspondence between a panel entity and a reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index is informed to NW
	+ Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a panel entity is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16)
* Opt1-2: A panel entity is referring to a new panel ID within CSI/beam reports
	+ FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID including the information conveyed by the new panel ID
	+ Note: The association between the new panel ID and the panel entity is determined by the UE
* Opt1-3: No additional specification support
 | **Opt1-1:** Huawei, HiSi, Apple (if capable), Sony (2nd pref), MTK, APT/FGI (2nd preference)**Opt1-2:** IDC, vivo, Lenovo/MoM, Spreadtrum, CMCC, Samsung (resource set ID), ZTE (global ID), Huawei, HiSi, Sony, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Xiaomi, AT&T, NTT Docomo, LGE **Opt1-3:** CATT, OPPO, Ericsson, Apple, APT/FGI (1st preference), Intel |
| 4.2 | Whether to support CB-based SRS resources with different numbers of ports | **Yes**: ZTE, Samsung, CATT, OPPO (different sets have different number of ports), Qualcomm, NTT Docomo, LGE, MTK **No**: vivo, APT/FGI, Intel |
| 4.3 | Whether to support NCB-based SRS resource sets with different numbers of resources | **Yes**: ZTE, Samsung, CATT**No**: |
| 4.4 | Support of NW-initiated panel activation/selection | **Yes**: IDC (TCI state group indication + gNB confirmation), vivo (TCI state update), Huawei, HiSi (handshake), Qualcomm (handshake), Fraunhofer IIS/HHI , Xiaomi( only NW-initiated panel selection), AT&T**No**: Spreadtrum, Sony, Xiaomi(not support NW-initiated panel activation), OPPO, CATT  |
|  |  |  |

The following observation can be made:

* (4.1) Opt1-2 represents the super-majority view
* (4.2) The additional support for having different # ports for SRS resources represents the majority view

Based on the above observation, the following moderator proposals can be made:

**Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, at least one panel entity is referring to a ‘panel ID’ within a CSI/beam reporting instance

* The ‘panel ID(s)’ within CSI/beam reporting instance is determined by the UE and reported to NW
	+ FFS: Details for reporting the ‘panel ID(s)’ within a CSI/beam reporting instance
* The panel ID(s) is used to convey at least the following information:
	+ A panel active state [either DL reception only or both DL reception and UL transmission]
	+ Other information is not precluded
* FFS: Detailed design of the ‘panel ID’
* Note: The term ‘panel ID’ is used only for discussion/descriptive purposes and may not be intended as a specification term
* Note: The association between the ‘panel ID’ and the panel entity is determined by the UE

**Proposal 4.2**: Support configuring a UE with two SRS resource sets having different numbers of ports for codebook-based UL transmission

* FFS: Whether SRS resource set is indicated by gNB or SRS resource set is selected by UE and reported to gNB
* FFS: Whether to support different SRS ports within a same SRS resource set if more than one SRS resources are configured in the set
* FFS: This can be applied to both single TRP and mTRP operations

Table 8 Additional inputs: issue 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **1) Check and update Table 7** **2) Share your input on the above FL proposals** |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 4.2: Support. Can we clarify that SRS resources within the same resource set can have different number of ports?**Proposal 4.2**: Support configuring a UE with SRS resources having different numbers of ports within the same resource set for codebook-based UL transmission[Mod: please check revised version which may address your comments] |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 4.1: Suggest to add the following FFSFFS: Details for reporting the new panel ID within CSI/beam reports.For Proposal 4.2: Support[Mod: done] |
| Apple | Do not support proposal 4.1 and 4.2.Proposal 4.1 and 4.2 prohibits flexibility for UE to change panel at any time.  |
| Samsung | Proposal 4.1: SupportProposal 4.2: Support |
| MediaTek | P4.1: We have concern on Opt1-2. For Opt1-2, if a new panel ID is associated with a beam reporting, which means UE can only initiate one UE panel for that beam reporting. If NW would like to check the link qualities from multiple UE panels, multiple beam reports with different IDs have to be configured. We fail to see why separate reports are needed for each UE panel. Furthermore, if multiple CSI/beam reports with different IDs are configured to UE, UE is required to initiate multiple UE panels, which is not aligned with the spirit of “UE-initiated” panel activation and election. In our opinion, for Opt1-1, only one beam report is needed since SSBRSs/CRIs can correspond to one or multiple UE panels, and UE can decide to activate how many UE panels.To address the comments from Apple, Qualcomm and MediaTek, suggest the following changes to the proposal:* Allow UE to determine new panel ID and inform to NW per reporting instance. UE can change the panel across different reporting instances. Details for reporting the new panel ID(s) within a CSI/beam reporting instance can be further discussed, as suggested by Qualcomm.
* Allow one or more activated panels per reporting instance, instead of only one.
* Clarify what information is conveyed by new panel ID in this proposal. If no information is conveyed by new panel ID, the need to introduce such ID in specification is unclear. At least we see a panel active state should be supported for the case if UL panel(s) are not the same set of DL panel(s), as agreed in previous RAN1 meeting. Other information is not precluded.

**Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, at least one panel entity is referring to a new panel ID within a CSI/beam reporting instance* The new panel ID(s) within CSI/beam reporting instance is determined by the UE and reported to NW
	+ FFS: Details for reporting the new panel ID(s) within a CSI/beam reporting instance
* The new panel ID(s) is used to convey at least the following information:
	+ A panel active state either DL reception only or both DL reception and UL transmission
	+ Other information is not precluded
* FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID
* Note: The association between the new panel ID and the panel entity is determined by the UE

[Mod: Done]P4.2: Support |
| OPPO | Proposal 4.1: do not support. We do not see the need for specification supportProposal 4.2: we support to configure two SRS resource set with different number of antenna ports for CB. Suggest to change the proposal as follows:**Proposal 4.2**: Support configuring a UE with two SRS resource sets having different numbers of ports for codebook-based UL transmission[Mod: agree, done] |
| ZTE | Proposal 4.1 Support. We think that we need to make final decision this meeting, otherwise to be honest, we do not think that we can have sufficient time budget/meetings for complete this issue 4 MPUE.Proposal 4.2: OPPO’s update is better in our views, and we also support to extend this issue to NCB case, e.g., two SRS resource sets that may have same or different numbers of SRS resources. |
| LG | Support Proposal 4.1 and 4.2On Proposal 4.1, prerequisite for this proposal would be a UE report regarding the number of DL/UL panel entities accompanied by their properties. Essential information for gNB would be whether reported CRI/SSBRI is measured from DL only panel or from DL/UL shared panel. If it is from DL only panel, gNB can use the CRI/SSBRI as DCI TCI but not for UL TCI, otherwise it can use it for both DL TCI and UL TCI. Thus, it would be good to add ‘UE capability report on panel-specific information is supported including at least supported number of DL/UL panel IDs’ as a subbullet. On Proposal 4.2, detailed signaling can be discussed later (e.g. different number of ports within a same resource set as Nokia or across different resource sets as OPPO).  |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 4.1, supportProposal 4.2, support |
| NTT Docomo | Support proposal 4.1 and proposal 4.2. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support proposal 4.1Proposal 4.2: Agree in principle. The proposal is still unclear if the difference in number of ports is between different SRS resources in a set or between resources in different SRS resource sets. |
| CATT | Proposal 4.1: Do not support. We don’t see a strong need for specification non transparent support of these identifiers. Proposal 4.2: Support.  |
| Mod V16 | Revised proposals 4.1 and 4.2 to address the above inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| vivo | Fine with the current formulation of proposal 4.1 and proposal 4.2. |
| Samsung2 | For proposal 4.1, we would like to replace “new panel ID” with “ID”. [Mod: Removing “new” is fine, but removing “panel” makes the proposal ambiguous. Since this proposal is about an ID for a panel entity, including “panel” gives a better functional description at this early stage. It is understood that “panel” is not a spec term, however.I removed “new” but not “panel”] |
| Mod V20 | Revised proposals 4.1 and 4.2 to address the above inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Proposal 4.1: SupportProposal 4.2: Support |
| MediaTek | Proposal 4.1: SupportWe see current specification cannot support UE-initiated UL panel activation and selection at least for the following agreed use cases:* Different configurations across UE panels
* UE power saving
* Multiple activated UE panels for e.g., MPE mitigation

In order to support above use cases, NW needs to know some panel-related information of the activated UE panel(s). For example:* To support different configurations across panels or UE power saving, the panel-specific configuration/ capability like the supported maximum number of ports/layers on each activated panel has to be known by NW. Then, NW can trigger SRS transmission and schedule PUSCH with a corresponding number of ports/layers on the UL panel selected by UE.
* To support multiple activated panels for MPE mitigation, the panel selection status of each activated panel (e.g. active state for both DL and UL or active state for DL only) has to be known by NW. Then, NW can schedule UL transmission on the UE-selected UL panel.

In our view, panel ID can be used as an implicit way to report panel-related information of the activated panel(s) to NW but without disclosing UE antenna (group) implementation, similar to TCI state used for beam indication without disclosing NW beamforming implementation. Proposal 4.2: Support |
| Ericsson | P4.1: Do not support. The panel ID would turn the UE into multiple UEs that can potentially be separately scheduled, and so far we have not seen any motivation why reference signals cannot be used instead of panel IDs.P4.2: Do not support. Use case is unclearP4.3: Do not support. Use case is unclearP4.4: Do not support. Up to the UE to activate panels. |
| CMCC | Proposal 4.1: Support. Proposal 4.2: Support. In our view, specification support is needed to facilitate gNB and UE have the same knowledge of the DL Rx panel(s) and UL Tx panel(s). |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 4.1: Do not support. The grouping concept can very much have the same functionality at the panel ID mentioned in this agreement.Proposal 4:2: OK. |
| Mod V28 | At this point I am not sure how to modify the proposals to address the recently voiced concerns**No revision in FL proposals** |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 4.1: OKProposal 4.2: OK, but need to clarify if the resources in the same set can have different port number or not?[Mod: Thanks for the good catch. Nokia pointed out before and I missed it]  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 4.1: Support.Proposal 4.2: Prefer to study more and decide in August meeting. [Mod: Noted. I’ll keep it there for now so we can discuss ☺ ] |
| Mod V33 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| ZTE | Support both FL proposals. |
| NEC | Proposal 4.1: Support.Proposal 4.2: Support. |
| MediaTek | P4.2: We support SRS in different sets can have different # of ports, but whether to support different # of ports within the same set can be further discussed. In our view, NW can trigger one of the sets with smaller number of ports to allow UE to use less number of TXRUs. If different # of ports are allow for different sets, different # of ports within the same set may not be necessary. Proposal 4.2: Support configuring a UE with two SRS resource sets having different numbers of ports ~~per resource~~ for codebook-based UL transmission* FFS: Whether to support different SRS ports within a same SRS resource set if more than SRS resources are configured in the set

[Mod: Please check the current modified wording - based on the last agreement I think the focus is on resource level rather than resource set. ] |
| Mod V37 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 4.1: Support. The reported panel ID informs that it’s currently active. We suggest to add a FFS on whether/how to inform the NW on which panel is currently de-active.Proposal 4.2: This proposal is not necessary. The mapping between ports and antennas from different panels can be UE implementation. |
| vivo | Regarding proposal 4.1, would like to keep how this active state is interpreted within brackets for further study.**Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, at least one panel entity is referring to a panel ID within a CSI/beam reporting instance* The panel ID(s) within CSI/beam reporting instance is determined by the UE and reported to NW
	+ FFS: Details for reporting the panel ID(s) within a CSI/beam reporting instance
* The panel ID(s) is used to convey at least the following information:
	+ A panel active state [either DL reception only or both DL reception and UL transmission]
	+ Other information is not precluded
* FFS: Detailed design of the panel ID
* Note: The association between the panel ID and the panel entity is determined by the UE

[Mod: Done]We do not support the following proposal with the two resource within the same set having different ports. We support different number of ports for SRS resources in different sets.**Proposal 4.2**: Support configuring a UE with two SRS resources in one SRS resource set having different numbers of ports for codebook-based UL transmission[Mod: Please check current version based on MTK] |
| Sony | **Proposal 4.1,** support.  |
| LG | **4.2:** Regarding the granularity of mapping panels into SRS resources,we slightly prefer each SRS resource set can be mapped to different panel and maintain a same number of ports within a same set, which is aligned with BM SRS design as OPPO and MediaTek commented before. If this is controversial, we can decide this signaling detail later based on these two alternatives, per resource-level vs. per-resource-set-level.[Mod: Please check current version based on MTK] |
| Mod V43 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 4.2:** The power control parameters and PL-RS are defined per SRS resource set, and different UE panels shall have different power control parameters and PL-RS. If SRS resources with different number of ports are targeting different panels, then these SRS resources shall belong to different SRS resource sets. Therefore it is necessary to have them as SRS resource sets, not SRS resources.  |
| Samsung3 | Proposal 4.2: Fine with change. A small update**Proposal 4.2**: Support configuring a UE with two SRS resource sets having different numbers of ports ~~per resource~~ for codebook-based UL transmission* FFS: Whether to support different SRS ports within a same SRS resource set if more than one SRS resource~~s~~ ~~are~~ is configured in the set

[Mod: Done] |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 4.1: OKFor Proposal 4.2: Suggest to add the following Note. We are not fine to have panel specific config only for mTRP. **Proposal 4.2**: Support configuring a UE with two SRS resource sets having different numbers of ports ~~per resource~~ for codebook-based UL transmission* FFS: Whether to support different SRS ports within a same SRS resource set if more than SRS resources are configured in the set
* Note: This can be applied to both single TRP and mTRP operations.

[Mod: OK] |
| OPPO | Re proposal 4.2: We think the selection of SRS resource set for PUSCH transmission shall be controlled by the UE. So suggest clarify that in the proposal:**Proposal 4.2**: Support configuring a UE with two SRS resource sets having different numbers of ports ~~per resource~~ for codebook-based UL transmission* The UE selects one of the SRS resource set for PUSCH transmission and report the selection to the gNB.
* FFS: Whether to support different SRS ports within a same SRS resource set if more than SRS resources are configured in the set

[Mod: OK] |
| Mod V48 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Ericsson | P4.1: We have strong concerns on the proposal. It is not unclear what the panel ID would be used for. It is relevant to say that the panel ID itself cannot be used: it would be some properties of the panel entity that might be useful.P4.2: Do not support – the use case is unclear. In TDocs, it is stated that SRS resources with different number of ports would map to different panels, but the whole sequence of events is unclear, and it is also unclear why a UE cannot map a 4-port SRS resource to a panel with 2 TXRUs. |
| Mod V58 | **No change FL proposals** |
| NTT Docomo | For current proposal 4.2, * For the first sub-bullet, we are not clear about the motivation of UE selecting one of the SRS resource set. We suggest to further discuss whether SRS resource set is indicated by NW or reported by UE.
* For the last sub-bullet, we think whether this can be applied to M-TRP PUSCH is related to the FFS whether to support different SRS ports within a same SRS resource set. Because in M-TRP PUSCH, we had agreement that two SRI fields are indicated and correspond to two SRS resource sets and the number of SRS ports between two TRPs should be the same. If two SRS resource sets do not have SRS resource with same number of ports, we fail to see how it can be applied to mTRP.

**Proposal 4.2**: Support configuring a UE with two SRS resource sets having different numbers of ports for codebook-based UL transmission* FFS: Whether SRS resource set is indicated by gNB or SRS resource set is selected by UE and reported to gNB
* FFS: Whether to support different SRS ports within a same SRS resource set if more than one SRS resources are configured in the set
* FFS: Whether this can be applied to mTRP operation

[Mod: I understand. Done] |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 4.1: SupportProposal 4.2: Support |
| Apple | We still have concern for proposal 4.1 and 4.2. For 4.1, if gNB does not trigger a beam report, does it mean UE cannot change panel? In addition, we do not support the terminology of “panel ID”.[Mod: I added a note that panel ID is just a term for discussion]For 4.2, the problem is that current the unified TCI can be applied for SRS and PUSCH, and we assume a panel can be associated with the unified TCI. Then all the SRS resources should share the same panel. Then why do we need to configure different number of ports for the SRS resources?  |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 4.2: Regarding the UE selection of SRS resource set added by OPPO, it seems to be a new signaling mechanism. In R15/16, SRS resource transmission is controlled by gNB, UE cannot decide which SRS resource will be transmitted.[Mod: Now FFS] |
| Mod V71 | Revised proposals 4.1 and 4.2 to address the above inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Intel  | **Proposal 4.1:** Still not clear how the gNB uses this panel ID. We tend to agree with Ericsson.  |
| Mod V74 | **No change in FL proposals** |
| CATT | Proposal 4.1: The use case of panel-ID, and its report, it unclear to us. For UE to report the panel ID along with the CSI/BM report, the panel has already been activated and used for the associated beam report. Then the association between CSI/beam and panel is known to UE and should be readily available for DL reception and UL transmission. Once NW schedule DL-reception or UL-transmission while using the CSI-RS resource as a reference, the associated panel will be used. This is the same procedure as in Rel.15/16. It is unclear how reporting the panel-ID makes any difference. As such we would like to suggest the following changes: **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, at least one panel entity is referring to a panel ID ~~within~~ associated with a CSI/beam reporting instance* The panel ID(s) ~~within~~ associated with CSI/beam reporting instance is determined by the UE [and reported to NW
	+ FFS: Details for reporting the panel ID(s) within a CSI/beam reporting instance
* The panel ID(s) is used to convey at least the following information:
	+ A panel active state [either DL reception only or both DL reception and UL transmission]
	+ Other information is not precluded
* FFS: Detailed design of the panel ID]
* Note: The association between the panel ID and the panel entity is determined by the UE
 |
| Nokia | Proposal 4.1 we have strong concern on the introduction of the panel ID, and the agreement is not acceptable to us especially given the FFS: Detailed design of the ‘panel ID’Proposal 4.2: We do not support, and sharing similar view with Ericsson. In addition, for M-TRP, RAN1 made agreements in RAN1 #103 that two SRS resouce sets can be configured for codebook, but those should have the same number of ports. We suggest to rely on the same design for single TRP. **Agreement**For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, support codebook based PUSCH transmission with following enhancements. Support the indication of two SRIs. oAlt1: Bit field of SRI shall be enhanced. oAlt2: No changes on SRI field Support the indication of two TPMIs. oThe same number of layers are applied for both TPMIs if two TPMIs are indicatedoThe number of SRS ports between two TRPs should be same.oFFS: Details on indicating two TPMIs (e.g, one TPMI field or two TPMI fields)Increase the maximum number of SRS resource sets to twoFFS: configuration details of each SRS resource set (e.g., number of SRS resources in a resource set) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Proposal 4.2: After checking the agreement pasted by Nokia, we prefer to allow for more time on this and decide in August meeting.  |
| InterDigital | Proposal 4.1: We don’t see the need to introduce panel ID within a CSI/beam reporting instance. In our view, by configuring panel ID in CSI-RS resources/resource set, association between panel and CSI-RS resources/resource sets can be achieved. In this case, we don’t need to include panel ID in a CSI reporting as gNB already identifies the association. Proposal 4.2: We don’t support the proposal.  |

### Issue 5 (MPE mitigation)

Table 9 Summary: issue 5

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 5.1 | Whether to support:* Opt 1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)} + Virtual PHR or a modified version
	+ The modified version may be associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI, or associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured) from candidate pool, if reported.
	+ The reporting reuses the event-driven mechanisms from the Rel-16 P-MPR reporting
* Opt 1D. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)}
	+ The reporting reuses the event-driven mechanisms from the Rel-16 P-MPR reporting
* Opt 2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication} + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured)
	+ FFS: Whether the reporting is UE-initiated (event-driven) and/or NW-initiated
	+ FFS: If Opt2A is selected and there is no consensus on a modified L1-RSRP definition, at least the Rel-15 L1-RSRP definition is reused and virtual PHR may be added
 | **Option 1A**: ZTE, Lenovo/MoM, Apple, OPPO (via MAC CE), Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, MTK, Convida, NTT Docomo **Option 1D**: vivo (add panel ID in PHR MAC CE), Spreadtrum, Huawei, HiSi, Sony, Xiaomi **Option 2A**: CATT, Apple, Sony, Lenovo/MoM, CMCC, Samsung, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, MTK, NTT Docomo, LGE, Ericsson |
| 5.2 | If Opt1A/D in 5.1 is supported:* Alt1. Beam-level reporting
* Alt2. Panel-level reporting
 | **Alt1**: Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, Convida, MTK, Intel, ZTE(1st preference) **Alt2**: vivo, Spreadtrum, Huawei, HiSi, Xiaomi, Sony, NTT Docomo, ZTE(2nd preference)  |
| 5.3 | If Opt2A in 5.1 is supported:* Alt1 (beam-level): Reporting of at least SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) to indicate gNB beam(s) that is feasible for UL transmission
* Alt2 (panel-level): Reporting of at least an indicator associated with a UE ‘panel’ that is feasible for UL transmission
 | **Alt1**: CATT, Nokia/NSB, Intel, ZTE, NTT Docomo, Sony**Alt2**: Lenovo/MoM, Samsung, LG |
|  |  |  |

The following observation can be made:

* (5.1) Opt2A represents the majority view, followed by Opt1A

Based on the above observation, the following proposal can be made:

**Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, support [one of] the following schemes [(to be down-selected in RAN1#106-e)]:

* Opt1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (TCI or SSBRI/CRI-specific)} + Virtual PHR or a modified version
	+ The modified version may be associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI, or associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured) from candidate pool, if reported.
	+ The reporting reuses the event-driven mechanisms from the Rel-16 P-MPR reporting
	+ FFS: Definition of virtual PHR and how it is used
* Opt2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)} (beam/panel level) + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] reporting (on PUSCH/PUCCH) or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)
	+ The reporting is NW-initiated.
	+ FFS: Whether to additionally support UE-initiated (event-driven) reporting
	+ FFS: If Opt2A is selected and there is no consensus on a modified L1-RSRP definition, at least the Rel-15 L1-RSRP definition is reused and virtual PHR may be added
	+ FFS: Depending on the outcome of issue 4 (MPUE), whether an indicator associated with ‘panel entity’ (term used for discussion) is also included
	+ FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs and their corresponding metrics are reported in the same reporting instance, whether and how to allow reporting of SSBRIs/CRIs to indicate gNB beams that are preferred for UL transmission only (e.g. intended for MPE mitigation), and preferred for both DL reception and UL transmission, in a single report

Table 10 Additional inputs: issue 5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **1) Check and update Table 10** **2) Share your inputs on the above FL proposals** |
| MediaTek | Support in principle. But prefer to support Opt2A as NW-initiated since event-driven mechanism is already supported by Opt1A, and Opt2A can be an enhanced beam reporting format. We don't see the need to introduce two schemes with the same reporting types.[Mod: Let’s take a baby step first for Opt2A ☺] |
| Nokia/NSB | Support in principle |
| Qualcomm | Support as a starting point |
| Apple | Support |
| Samsung | Support as a compromise |
| OPPO | Ok in principle. Suggest to remove the wording “beam” and “panel” because in the spec, we eventually use the RS ID or TCI state for those reports and there will be no beam or panel in the spec.**Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, support the following schemes:* Opt1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based ~~(beam/panel-level)~~} + Virtual PHR or a modified version
	+ The modified version may be associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI, or associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured) from candidate pool, if reported.
	+ The reporting reuses the event-driven mechanisms from the Rel-16 P-MPR reporting
* Opt2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) ~~and/or panel indication~~} + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) ~~and/or panel indication (if configured)~~
	+ FFS: Whether the reporting is UE-initiated (event-driven) and/or NW-initiated
	+ FFS: If Opt2A is selected and there is no consensus on a modified L1-RSRP definition, at least the Rel-15 L1-RSRP definition is reused and virtual PHR may be added

[Mod: Agree, done. Added an FFS just to prevent (many) panel ID proponents from feeling excluded ☺] |
| ZTE | Support as a compromise. Just to clarify our preference: if Alt-2 is supported, we think that it should be NW-initialized and be performed based on Rel-15 L1-RSRP + virtual PHR rather than a modified definition.[Mod: We keep this in mind for the next step] |
| LG | Support as a starting point |
| NTT Docomo | Support proposal 5.1. |
| CATT | Support proposal 5.1. |
| Mod V16 | Revised proposal per OPPO’s input**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| vivo | Regarding Option2A, would like to understand whether the L1-RSRP is reported in layer 1?[Mod: Done. Based on the Tdocs, yes it is reported just as the regular L1-RSRP (on PUCCH or PUSCH)]Regarding Option1A, would like to understand how the virtual PHR is defined? How they would be used?[Mod: FFS is added] |
| Samsung2 | Suggest to add the following FFS bullet in Opt2A (from last meeting agreement):o FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs and their corresponding metrics are reported in the same reporting instance, whether to allow mixture between the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)) intended for MPE mitigation and for DL beam reporting[Mod: Done] |
| Mod V20 | Revised proposal based on inputs**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Support in principle |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Ericsson | We would be OK with the following modification:**Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, support the following schemes:* Opt1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based} + Virtual PHR or a modified version
	+ The modified version may be associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI, or associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured) from candidate pool, if reported.
	+ The reporting reuses the event-driven mechanisms from the Rel-16 P-MPR reporting
	+ FFS: Definition of virtual PHR and how it is used
* Opt2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)} + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] reporting (on PUSCH/PUCCH) or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)
	+ The reporting is NW-initiated.
	+ FFS: Whether to additionally support UE-initiated (event-driven) reporting
	+ FFS: If Opt2A is selected and there is no consensus on a modified L1-RSRP definition, at least the Rel-15 L1-RSRP definition is reused and virtual PHR may be added
	+ FFS: Depending on the outcome of issue 4 (MPUE), whether an indicator associated with ‘panel entity’ (term used for discussion) is also included
	+ FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs and their corresponding metrics are reported in the same reporting instance, whether to allow mixture between the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)) intended for MPE mitigation and for DL beam reporting

Just as we remarked in the TDoc, it should be possible to operate under additional power backoff conditions for some time and having beam management solutions that are similar to the currently specified mechanisms would be crucial. Relying only on UE-initiated reporting is not an option. |
| CMCC | Support |
| vivo | Sorry if there is any misunderstanding and not make my original comments clear.We have strong concerns on current formulation.For Option2Awith the layer 1 report, this would create additional power consumption from UE perspective. MPR event typically happens at seconds level, but layer1 report is at millisecond level. It means UE would need to keep sensor on all the time. This is not acceptable from UE perspective. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| Mod V20 | At this point I am not sure how to modify the proposals to address the recently voiced concerns**No revision in FL proposals** |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 5.1, OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share similar concerns as vivo on Proposal 5.1. The proposal now says “Virtual PHR or a modified version” and “L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] or a modified version”. By ‘a modified version’, it is unclear what is being proposed here… In our view, whether/how virtual PHR and L1-RSRP/SINR can account for MPE event and whether to introduce them should be discussed in RAN4 first (On the contrary, P-MPR in Opt 1D has been used as MPE metric by RAN4 in Rel-16, so we know it can work).  |
| Mod V33 | Slight revision to address Ericsson’s comments (missed before, my apology)**Please check the latest version of FL proposals (not agreeable to some)** |
| ZTE | We are fine with Ericsson’s update, but for first main bullet, the ‘beam or panel-specific’ MPE should be added back as essential enhancement for MPE mitigation, rather than just using Rel-16 design. If not, we may have the same PHR value corresponding to different TCI or reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s).Based on comments from OPPO, we can the following update, and also we are fine with the original wording, like ‘(beam/panel-level)’.* Opt1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (TCI or SSBRI/CRI-specific)} + Virtual PHR or a modified version
	+ The modified version may be associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI, or associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured) from candidate pool, if reported.
	+ The reporting reuses the event-driven mechanisms from the Rel-16 P-MPR reporting
	+ FFS: Definition of virtual PHR and how it is used

[Mod: Done] |
| NEC | Support. |
| MediaTek | Regarding the last FFS of Opt2A, we would like to change the wording by reusing previous agreement as follows:* + FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs and their corresponding metrics are reported in the same reporting instance, whether and how to allow reporting of SSBRIs/CRIs to indicate gNB beams that are feasible for UL transmission and not feasible for UL transmission (i.e., used for DL reception only) simultaneously

[Mod: This wording is much better, thanks]**Agreement**On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, * On further enhancing the P-MPR report in Rel.16 (already agreed RAN4 framework, including triggering), down select between beam-level and panel-select reporting
* On SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or indication of panel selection, focus study on the following:
	+ Reporting of at least SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) to indicate gNB beam(s) that is feasible for UL transmission: additional reporting quantities are FFS
	+ Reporting of at least an indicator associated with a UE ‘panel’ that is feasible for UL transmission: additional reporting quantities are FFS
* Note: Just as agreed in RAN1#103-e, the purpose is to assess whether specification is needed or not

Re comment from vivo, we don't quite understand why Option2A consumes more power than Option1A due to keeping sensor on all the time. How to control the sensor is UE implementation issue, and it doesn't have to be aligned with the reporting occasion. Furthermore, if beam reporting for MPE mitigation can share the same reporting configuration with DL beam reporting, no additional resource overhead or UE power consumption is needed for Opt2A.  |
| Mod V37 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 5.1: In our views, Opt1D can work well on informing the gNB with panel level MPE event. gNB should indicate a new beam corresponding to another panel as response. The additional reporting parameters is not necessary. |
| Vivo | Do not support current proposal. |
| Sony | Support Proposal 5.1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 5.1: Support |
| Samsung3 | We prefer to clarify the FFS:FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs and their corresponding metrics are reported in the same reporting instance, whether and how to allow reporting of SSBRIs/CRIs to indicate gNB beams that are feasible for UL transmission only (e.g. intended for MPE mitigation) and ~~not~~ feasible for both DL reception and UL transmission ~~(i.e., used for DL reception only)~~ simultaneously in a single report[Mod: OK] |
| Qualcomm | Suggest the following wording. To our understanding, which beams to report is up to UE’s choice in R15/16. Beams feasible for UL transmissions may be too many including even those suffering from MPE and hence not preferred by UE. * + FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs and their corresponding metrics are reported in the same reporting instance, whether and how to allow reporting of SSBRIs/CRIs to indicate gNB beams that are preferred for UL transmission and that are preferred for DL reception ~~feasible for UL transmission and not feasible for UL transmission (i.e., used for DL reception only)~~ simultaneously

[Mod: OK] |
| Mod V48 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Xiaomi | We share same view as Spreadtrum that Option 1D can work well. |
| LG | We suggest the following modification for the last FFS of Opt2A. Regarding the use case for facilitating fast UL panel selection as agreed in RAN1#103-e, UE power saving is quite related to handle the MPE mitigation. Considering that only a single panel among multiple panels is activated for the purpose of power saving, it would be required to change another (preferred) panel for UL depending on the activation status of (preferred) panel when the current panel is now on MPE issue. * + FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs and their corresponding metrics are reported in the same reporting instance, whether and how to allow reporting of SSBRIs/CRIs to indicate gNB beams that are preferred for UL transmission only (e.g. intended for MPE mitigation), and preferred for both DL reception and UL transmission with considering panel activation status in a single report.
 |
| Ericsson | P5.1: Support. We do not understand vivo’s comment on power consumption due to that sensors need to be active all the time due to the reporting. The UE would have to estimate the MPE effect constantly, irrespective of what reporting is needed. The accuracy of P-MPR estimate would be up to UE implementation, i.e., the UE can choose to use an old estimate if it can. |
| OPPO | We just noticed the main bullet of 5.1 says “support the following schemes”. That cause confusion to us? Does it mean that we going to support both 1A and 2A? If so, we are not ok to support both.* 1. For the same issue, it does not make sense to support two schemes, which cause redundancy in specification
	2. The option 2A does not work because the MPE issue depends the uplink traffic load for each particular time duration The P-MPR value is determined based on the ratio of uplink symbols in each last one seconds as specified in RAN 4 specification. Asking the UE to report the MPE information in each beam reporting is not right, which we share the same understanding as vivo

[Mod: If I understand correctly, 2A (most likely NW-initiated) is intended to be used with the existing event-based P-MPR scheme (Rel-16). But your concern on supporting both schemes is understood. I added “one of”  |
| Mod V58 | Revised proposals per OPPO’s input**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Qualcomm | Not support to only selecting one scheme. Because both schemes have use cases to our understanding. Opt1A may have to be used if the UL reporting beam in Opt2A already fails due to MPE. [Mod: bracketed now]If only selecting one scheme, then the following FFS should be supported to also allow UE triggered report in Opt2A. In that way, UE can at least use RACH to report the MPE issue.* Opt2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)} (beam/panel level) + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] reporting (on PUSCH/PUCCH) or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)
	+ The reporting is NW-initiated.
	+ ~~FFS: Whether to~~ additionally support UE-initiated (event-driven) reporting

[Mod: This would trigger objection from some Opt2A proponents themselves ☹ ] |
| MediaTek | We prefer to support both options and start to finalize the detail in the later meetings. At least, we don't see Opt1A can be used in standalone since whether MPE issue can be mitigated depends on whether any BPL with a zero or smaller P-MPR value exists in the activated TCI states or the reported SSBRIs/CRIs. If no such BPL exists, how NW triggers UE to report some BPLs that are feasible for UL transmission? We still need Opt2A! [Mod: bracketed]Regarding concern of reporting period in Opt2A, we think it can be addressed by reusing normal beam reporting with additional information/indicator (maybe one bit is sufficient) to indicate whether the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) is feasible for UL transmission or not. For most of the time, all the reported SSBRIs/CRIs can be used for both DL and UL since UE only activates one panel for both DL and UL. Only for MPE mitigation, UE may activate one alternative panel for UL transmission, and a part of reported SSBRIs/CRIs are measured from this panel. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support Proposal 5.1. |
| vivo | Re E///, if UE only monitor at seconds level, what is the motivation to support layer1 report of UL-RSRP dynamically at millisecond level? Option2A should be removed from the list.[Mod: But Opt2A represents the majority view ☺ Opt2A proponents may argue otherwise re Opt1A] |
| Convida Wireless | Support |
| Apple | We support both options. Only with both options, gNB can calculate UL RSRP and select the proper beam. We provided simulation results to show that the performance gain can only be achieved with both options. It would be appreciated if objecting companies can provide some results that single option can provide performance gain.From the comments, it looks majority support both options.  |
| Spreadtrum | In our views, both Option 1A and Option 2A can achieve the purpose of MPE event reporting and new available beam/panel suggestion. Thus we don’t see the necessity to support both of them. The pros and cons between these two options can be further studied and down selection is reasonable. We also suggest to further study the necessity of reporting new available beam/panel since we haven’t decided whether gNB can align with UE on the same understanding of the association between TCI states and panels during the discussion for MP-UE issue. If the association information can be aligned between gNB and UE, reporting of new available beam/panel will be redundant. |
| Mod V71 | Slightly revised proposal per inputs: bracketing ‘one of’**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Intel | At this stage, we are also ok to support both options given our original preference of using the P-MPR report along with SSBRI/CRI based alternate beam information.  |
| Mod V74 | **No change in FL proposals** |
| LG | As commented above, we suggest the following modification (red-marked) for the last FFS of Opt2A. Regarding the use case for facilitating fast UL panel selection as agreed in RAN1#103-e, UE power saving is quite related to handle the MPE mitigation. Considering that only a single panel among multiple panels is activated for the purpose of power saving, it would be required to change another (preferred) panel for UL depending on the activation status of (preferred) panel when the current panel is now on MPE issue. FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs and their corresponding metrics are reported in the same reporting instance, whether and how to allow reporting of SSBRIs/CRIs to indicate gNB beams that are preferred for UL transmission only (e.g. intended for MPE mitigation), and preferred for both DL reception and UL transmission with considering panel activation status in a single report. |
| ZTE | We think that we need to make down-selection this meeting, and we are afraid that if doing next meeting, the time budget may be more limited and we do not see the possibility of companies views change. From ZTE perspective, we support Alt-1A, and can live with the support of both Alt-1A and Alt-2A for the progress with the condition that only gNB-initialized reporting is supported for Alt-2A, as Ericsson proposed.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Proposal 5.1: Cannot agree with the combo proposal without knowing whether virtual PHR and L1-RSRP/SINR can really account for MPE event and how to modify them (nothing is even provided in the proposal…). We can consider sending an LS to RAN4 asking feasibility of the three options agreed in previous meeting.  |
| InterDigital | We also prefer to support both options.  |

### Issue 6 (advanced beam refinement/tracking)

Table 11 Summary: issue 6

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views on specific candidate schemes** |
| 6.1 | Group 1: Beam management with reduced DL signaling to reduce latency* Opt 1-1A: Beam measurement/reporting/refinement/selection triggered by beam indication (without CSI request)
* Opt 1-1B: UE-initiated beam selection/activation based on beam measurement and/or reporting (without beam indication or activation from NW)
* Opt 1-2: Semi-static NW-configured beam selection (without beam indication and measurement/reporting)
* Opt 1-3: SSB grouping to reduce beam training
* Opt 1-4: Aperiodic beam measurement/reporting based on multiple resource sets for reducing beam measurement latency
 | **Opt 1-1A**: IDC, Nokia/NSB (refinement), OPPO, Samsung (refinement, M/R)**Opt 1-1B**: IDC (with beam group indication), Nokia/NSB, Futurewei, Ericsson, OPPO, MTK, LG, NTT Docomo**Opt 1-2**: NTT Docomo, Sony**Opt 1-3**: Apple, Ericsson**Opt 1-4**: Nokia/NSB (BFR), ZTE, Samsung |
| 6.2 | Group 2: Reducing activation delay of TCI states and PL-RSs (including other WGs, e.g. RAN4)* Opt 2-1A: Latency reduction for MAC CE based TCI state activation, or frequency/time/beam tracking
* Opt 2-1B: Latency reduction for MAC CE based PL-RS activation
* Opt 2-1C: Latency reduction for MAC CE based PUCCH resource/resource group activation
* Opt 2-2: Direct SCell TCI state activation
* Opt 2-3: Replacing RRC-based with MAC CE (or DCI) based for DL QCL or UL information update
* Opt 2-4: One-shot timing update for TCI state update

Note: A number of companies argued that most of the schemes in this category can be handled exclusively in RAN4 | **Opt 2-1A**: vivo (A-TRS), Ericsson, ZTE, Apple (AP CSI-RS triggering via MAC CE/DCI), NTT Docomo**Opt 2-1B**: vivo, ZTE **Opt 2-1C**: vivo* Other views: Ericsson (under issue 1)

**Opt 2-2**: Qualcomm * Other views: Ericsson (out of scope, CA AI)

**Opt 2-3**: IDC, Lenovo/MoM (associated CSI-RS for SRS resource for NCB)* Other views: Ericsson (unclear target)

**Opt 2-4**: Ericsson |

The following observation can be made:

* (6.1, 6.2) Opt1-1B and Opt 2-1A represent the majority views for Group 1 and 2, respectively. Note that the agreement says “strive for at most one per group”

Based on the above observation, the following proposal can be made:

**Proposal 6.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate advanced beam refinement/tracking, focus study (including down-selection) and, if needed, specification effort on the following options:

* Group 1: Aim for at most one solution for Group 1 in Rel-17 to address issue 6
	+ Opt 1-A. UE-initiated beam selection/activation based on beam measurement and/or reporting (without beam indication or activation from NW)
	+ Opt 1-B. Beam measurement/reporting/refinement/selection triggered by beam indication (without CSI request)
	+ Opt 1-C. Aperiodic beam measurement/reporting based on multiple resource sets for reducing beam measurement latency
* Group 2: Aim for at most one solution for Group 2 in Rel-17 to address issue 6
	+ Opt 2-A: Latency reduction for MAC CE based TCI state activation, or frequency/time/beam tracking
	+ Opt 2-B: Latency reduction for MAC CE based PL-RS activation
	+ Opt 2-C: One-shot timing update for TCI state update

Table 12 Additional inputs: issue 6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **1) Check and update Table 12** **2) Share your inputs on the above FL proposals** |
| MediaTek | Support the proposalFor G1, we see UE-initiated beam selection/activation could be one alternative to reduce the beam activation latency. Based on beam measurements, UE can select one (i.e., beam selection) or more (i.e., beam activation) TCI states as active and reports it/them to NW. Since the TCI state(s) is selected/activated by UE, UE is responsible to remember the QCL properties of DL RS(s) associated with the selected/activated TCI state(s). Thus, the one SSB measurement for beam activation is not needed anymore. Once NW response to the report is received by UE, the selected/activated TCI states can be immediately used for DL reception (or UL transmission in unified TCI framework). |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Apple | Support in principle. One quick question for clarification, for group 1, is it correct understanding that PRACH like beam report is not precluded? |
| Samsung | Not support* FL proposal for Group 1 is too premature since we haven’t even listed the pros and cons of each scheme. In fact, the benefit of opt 1-1B over beam indication based scheme is unclear. Without gNB confirmation we have misalignment, and with gNB confirmation there is no latency/overhead saving from beam indication based beam selection (at the expense of more spec impact).

[Mod: From FL perspective, unless we narrow things down at this stage, the chance of having any support for issue 6 in Rel-17 is zero. I added 1-1A (the second most popular scheme, it seems).]* For group 2, Samsung believes this is something to be discussed in RAN4, not in RAN1. So the second bullet from FL proposal is not needed and should be removed.

[Mod: Even if this is to start in RAN4, an LS to RAN4 seems to be necessary to start some discussion there. The purpose of this proposal is for that. Otherwise RAN4 wouldn’t know what to do] |
| ZTE | We support second bullet (Group-2), but not for first bullet (Group-1).In our views, the FL proposal for Group 1 should be well justified firstly due to that, from gNB perspective, we can NOT live with a solution of totally up to UE reporting without any gNB confirmation that seems to reverts the basic assumption for UE-initialized behavior, e.g., for BFR, in 3GPP 5G-NR. If with gNB confirmation, we are wondering the benefits compared with the normal procedure of beam indication/activation and reporting. [Mod: This is a valid point which can be further discussed when studying the candidates. Note that the proposal is not for support, but for focusing study to limit the scope ] |
| LG | Support |
| NTT Docomo | Support. |
| Mod V15 | Revised proposal to address concern from Samsung by adding one more candidate for Group 1. But I still believe the 2nd bullet for Group 2 is needed, e.g. for LS to RAN4.**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Samsung2 | For group A, we are fine to further analyze and study the pros and cons of OptA and OptB for down selection.[Mod: Done]For group B, if the purpose is to send LS to RAN4, shouldn’t we include all the options and let RAN4 comment on the options and do down selection[Mod: This is one possibility of course. But my concern is that RAN4 will be confused with the long list. From FL perspective, it is better to narrow down the list, or best to choose one. I am leaving it as is for now since only Samsung voices concern on this issue.] |
| Mod V20  | Slight revision. **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Ericsson | We agree with Samsung that we should strive to include more than one item from group 2 in a RAN4 LS. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| Mod V28 | Added alternatives to Group 2**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 6.1, OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As 11 candidate schemes were listed in April meeting, there was not enough time for comparing them. So we prefer to allow for more time to compare candidate schemes and not rush to down-selection in this meeting. If the majority wants to down-select right now, we suggest copying the note on “strive for at most one per group” from previous agreement. [Mod: Done] |
| Mod V33 | Slight revision. **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| ZTE | If adding more candidate, we think that the original 1-4 should be added back with the same or more supporter compared with Opt1-A and Opt2-C.[Mod: Good point. Done]**Proposal 6.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate advanced beam refinement/tracking, focus study (including down-selection) and, if needed, specification effort on the following options:* Group 1: Aim for at most one solution for Group 1 in Rel-17 to address issue 6
	+ Opt 1-A. UE-initiated beam selection/activation based on beam measurement and/or reporting (without beam indication or activation from NW)
	+ Opt 1-B. Beam measurement/reporting/refinement/selection triggered by beam indication (without CSI request)
	+ Opt 1-C: Aperiodic beam measurement/reporting based on multiple resource sets for reducing beam measurement latency
* Group 2: Aim for at most one solution for Group 2 in Rel-17 to address issue 6
	+ Opt 2-A: Latency reduction for MAC CE based TCI state activation, or frequency/time/beam tracking
	+ Opt 2-B: Latency reduction for MAC CE based PL-RS activation
	+ Opt 2-C: One-shot timing update for TCI state update
 |
| NEC  | Fine with the proposal. |
| Mod V37 | Revised proposals per inputs **Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 6.1: OK |
| Mod V48 | **No change in proposal** |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Mod V58 | Revised proposal by adding the “send LS to RAN4” action for Group 2**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Do not support to send LS to RAN4 for group 2. For Group 2, the two MAC-CE based approach (Opt2-A and Opt-2B) do not need study from RAN4. There is no point to only send Opt2-C to RAN4 either. The down selection shall be done in RAN1. [Mod: I understand. The LS sentence is removed and can be discussed later] |
| vivo | With the following LS, the intention is to study both at RAN1 and RAN4, right? If so Send an LS to RAN4 to inform of Group 2 candidates for RAN4 to study (including down-selection) and, if needed, specify. RAN1 may continue further study for the details of each scheme.[Mod: Now removed] |
| Apple | We think it is too early to send LS to RAN4. Only after RAN1 agrees some new mechanisms, RAN4 can update their parts. For example, if there is some new ways to support fast beam refinement and time/frequency offset tracking, RAN4 can update the TCI activation delay. Without any new RAN1 mechanisms, such kind of LS is like to blame RAN4 that they did not do a good job and defined a large TCI activation delay. ☺ [Mod: Who said RAN4 did a good job? ☺ (fully joking) But the LS sentence is now removed] |
| Mod V71 | Since the LS sentence is controversial, it is now removed.**Please check the latest version of FL proposals** |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal. |
| Mod V73 | **No change in FL proposals** |
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