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1. Background

This document summarizes company contribution on agenda 8.1.2.3, M-TRP simultaneous transmission with multiple Rx panels.

# Discussion

* 1. Beam measurement/reporting
     1. CMR configuration
     2. UE panel/antenna related feedback

On UE panel/antenna related feedback, two high level alternatives were discussed in the previous meeting. One company also supports gNB indication/configuration of UE hypothesis related to Alt-2 (e.g. whether reported beams associated to different Rx spatial filters, maximum number of supported layers, whether two beams can be used for sptial multiplexing or diversity).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.4 | UE reporting of information related to Rx panel/antenna-group   * Alt-1: UE reports panel ID / antenna-group ID or the reporting setting is associated with panel ID/antenna-group ID   + the reporting setting is associated with panel ID/ antenna-group ID * Alt-2: UE indicates if reported beams are associated to different RX spatial filters, or maximum number of supported layers corresponding to DL RS in a group, or whether two beams in a beam pair can be used for spatial multiplexing or diversity | Alt1 (4 companies): ZTE, DOCOMO (only for option 1), Huawei, HiSilicon  Alt-2 (12 companies); vivo (same/different spatial filters), CMCC, Qualcomm, Apple (UE capability in the max number of layers per Rx beam), Samsung, Ericsson, Intel, Xiaomi, CATT , MTK (same/different spatial filters), ZTE, AT&T |

Offline proposal 1.2.1:

On reporting of information related to UE Rx panel/antenna group for beam measurement/reporting option 2, further study and decide if any of the following alternatives for additional UE indication in the report is to be supported in Rel.17 in RAN1#106b-e

* Alt-1.0: UE reports UE panel ID per CMR within a group/pair
* Alt-1.1: if reported beams within a beam group/pair are associated to the same or different RX spatial filters
* Alt-1.2: maximum number of supported layers per CMR within a group/pair
* Alt-1.3: whether two beams within a group/pair can be used for spatial multiplexing or diversity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | views |
| Apple | Support Alt2. In our view, Alt1 is fit for option 1 if it is supported. If we go with Alt1, it becomes a mixed option 1 + option 2. |
| **Lenovo&MotM** |  |
| LGE | We are fine to study. |
| Qualcomm | Support Alt2 (same or different filters). We are also fine for Alt1 if the beams are measured only by the panel ID indicated in the reporting setting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Alt-1. |
| MediaTek | Support Alt2 (same or different filters). |
| **vivo** | Support Alt-2. But we think an indication of whether the reported beams are simultaneously received by the same spatial filter or multiple spatial filters in beam report is enough, and the maximum number of supported layers can be left to CSI. |
| DOCOMO | Ok to study Alt2. |
| Xiaomi | Support Alt 2 |
| ZTE | We can also support Alt-2 |
| Mod | It seems alt-2 have some converging support. Propose to study the three alternatives under atl-2 and make a decisioin in RAN1#106-e. |
| OPPO | We are open to study those Options listed in proposal 1.2.1. However, we do not think none of the Alt-1.1, Alt-1.2 and Alt-1.3 are needed or valid:  Re Alt-1.1: the UE just need to report two CRIs/SSBRIs can be received simulatesnaouly. But the UE does not to specify if they are received by different Rx beam or not.  Re Alt-1.2: the number of layers shall be part of CSI measurement, not part of beam measurement.  Re Alt-1.3: using the beams for spatial multiplexing or diversity is also part of CSI measurement, not part of beam measurement. |
| Apple | Suggest some changes for the proposals. I think it should be editorial.  Offline proposal 1.2.1:  On reporting of information related to UE Rx panel/antenna group for beam measurement/reporting option 2, further study and decide if any of the following alternatives for additional UE indication is to be supported in Rel.17 in RAN1#106b-e   * Alt-1.1: if reported beams are associated to different RX spatial filters * Alt-1.2: maximum number of supported layers corresponding to DL RS in a group * Alt-1.3: whether two beams in a beam pair can be used for spatial multiplexing or diversity   [mod]: done. Thanks for the suggestion. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Sony | We are fine to have above alternatives studied.  In our understanding for Option 2, different reported beams in a reporting instance can be received by UE simultaneously. Whether a single Rx beam or multiple Rx beams are used by UE is up to implementation. We are not sure about the benefits of reporting Rx beam(s) to NW.  In addition, for Alt-1.2 and Alt-1.3, we tend to agree with vivo that these two items may belong to the scope of CSI reporting for MTRP. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | OK to study, but we don’t think this is required for beam management.  This should be part of CSI acquisition.  Also, to support this, should we define UE capability for maximum number of ports per panel or RX spatial domain filter?  [mod]: I believe this can be a next-step discussion, in case alt-1.1 and alt-1.2 end up being adopted. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Ok to study further. Among the alternatives in Offline proposal 1.2.1, we can support Alt-1.1 (reporting of beams are associated with same or different Rx spatial filters).  According to current spec 38.214, the UE may use either a single spatial domain RX filter or multiple simultaneous spatial domain filters to receive the two beams in each group. If the UE uses a single spatial domain RX filter for both reported beams in each group, it will not be possible for the gNB to simultaneously scheduled PDSCH from two TRPs with rank higher than 2. So, we think it is important that the UE reports whether the same or different spatial Rx filters were used for the two beams in each group. |
| InterDigital | We support the original FL’s proposal.  However as a compromise, we could also support the following,  Offline proposal 1.2.1:  On reporting of information related to UE Rx panel/antenna group for beam measurement/reporting option 2, further study and decide if any of the following alternatives for additional UE indication is to be supported in Rel.17 in RAN1#106b-e   * Alt-1.0: UE reports panel ID / antenna-group ID or the reporting setting is associated with panel ID/antenna-group ID   + the reporting setting is associated with panel ID/ antenna-group ID * Alt-1.1: if reported beams are associated to different RX spatial filters * Alt-1.2: maximum number of supported layers corresponding to DL RS in a group * Alt-1.3: whether two beams in a beam pair can be used for spatial multiplexing or diversity |
| Intel | Support FL proposal in principle. we have similar clarifications as oppo - Alt-1.1 may not need UE indication, not clear how Alt-1.2 is different from rank indication, Alt-1.3 seem to solve the same issue as Alt-1.1 ? For example, if we agree on both Alt-1.1 and Alt-1.3, does it mean for every beam-pair that is reported, UE indicates whether it is from same/different spatial filter and also whether the pair is used for spatial multiplexing or diversity ? |
| MediaTek | Supprot FL proposal to study these alternitves |
| vivo | For Alt-1.2 and Alt-1.3, we think they are parts for CSI enhancement, not for beam management. |
| AT&T | Ok to study the proposed additional indications |
| LGE | Support the FL proposal in principle.  Regarding Alt-1.1, UE multi-panel related enhancement is actively discussed in 8.1.1, including introducing explicit UE panel ID and NW-initiated panel activation/selection. If the UE panel ID and reporting panel ID per CMR is supported, Alt-1.1 can be naturally supported. So, we suggest to add Alt-1.0 same as InterDigital, with below wording change.  Offline proposal 1.2.1:  On reporting of information related to UE Rx panel/antenna group for beam measurement/reporting option 2, further study and decide if any of the following alternatives for additional UE indication is to be supported in Rel.17 in RAN1#106b-e   * Alt-1.0: UE reports panel ID per CMR within a group/pair * Alt-1.1: if reported beams are associated to different RX spatial filters * Alt-1.2: maximum number of supported layers corresponding to DL RS in a group * Alt-1.3: whether two beams in a beam pair can be used for spatial multiplexing or diversity   Regarding the Alt-1.2, we also think this is more related with M-TRP CSI report. |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support the FL proposal and we prefer Alt-1.1. |
| Mod | Added alt-1.0 per InterDigital and LGE. |
| ZTE2 | Support the FL proposal. Please find the following update to make each alternative clear.  On reporting of information related to UE Rx panel/antenna group for beam measurement/reporting option 2, further study and decide if any of the following alternatives for additional UE indication in the report is to be supported in Rel.17 in RAN1#106b-e   * Alt-1.0: UE reports UE panel ID per CMR within a group/pair * Alt-1.1: if reported beams within a group/pair are associated to same or different RX spatial filters * Alt-1.2: maximum number of supported layers per CMR within a group/pair * Alt-1.3: whether two beams within a group/pair can be used for spatial multiplexing or diversity   [mod]: revised accordingly. Thanks |
| Mod | Slight wording change based on ZTE’s input. |
| Futurewei | Support FL’s proposal to study the alternatives. |
| Apple | In our understanding, the intention is to step a little bit further to preclude Alt-1.0. But current Alt-1.0 is similar to original Alt-1. The updated proposal seems to be a reformulation of previous Alt1 and Alt2. We found Alt-1.0 is under discussion in 8.1.1 as well. If possible, we would like to suggest we remove Alt-1.0.  [mod]: Given this is a study-list, I hope this is something that companies can compromise on. It captures the list of candidate options to formally move forward. Meanwhile it doesn’t endorse any particular alternative. |
| ZTE3 | Last meeting we had some discussion about above proposal but there was no agreement. So, this FL proposal is to identify the candidates and have a clear deadline for down-selection. We slightly prefer to keep the all four candidates herein, but open to further discussion.  BTW, it seems that ‘beam’ in Alt-1.1 is redundant considering consistent among candidates.   * Alt-1.1: if reported beams within a group/pair are associated to the same or different RX spatial filters |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal and prefer Alt 1.1. |
| LGE | We also prefer to keep the possible candidates to be studied, same as ZTE. |
| vivo | We share a similar view with Apple, that Alt1-0 should be precluded. And as for Alt-2 and Alt-3, we think they are parts for MTRP CSI enhancement.  [mod]: please see response to Apple. Thanks. |

* + 1. L1-SINR and interference measurement

L1-SINR measurement is supported by 19 companies, while 3 companies have concerns. Among the 19 supporting companies, one company only supports it for beam measurement option 1 (not agreed yet), and two companies only support if dedicated IMR is configured. 10 companies support to measure intra-group cross-beam interference in L1-SINR measurement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.7 | Q1: Support L1-SINR report  Q2: support interference measurement by taking into inter-beam interference within a group | Q1:   * Support (20): Huawei, HiSilicon, Lenovo/MotM, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Qualcomm, OPPO (option 1), Sony, Nokia/NSB (only with dedicated IMR), AT&T, LGE, ETRI, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CATT, Intel, Ericsson, Futurewei * No (3): vivo, OPPO, Apple,   Q2:   * Support (11): Huawei, HiSilicon, Lenovo/MotM, ZTE, LGE, CATT, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CATT, Futurewei |

Offline proposal 1.3.1:

For beam reporting option 2, evaluate the performance, specification, and implementation aspects of L1-SINR based beam measurement/feedback, including at least the following aspects

* Measurement resource for interference measurement, e.g.
* Dedicated IMR resource, and/or
* CMR of the other TRP
* UE behavior of interference measurement and corresponding L1-SINR derivation
* NOTE: L1-RSRP based reporting (option-2) is assumed as a baseline for simulation evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | views |
| Apple | As discussed in our contribution, Q2 is not feasible. No additional benefit for L1-SINR in addition to L1-RSRP and CSI. |
| **Lenovo&MotM** | For Q1, support.  For Q2, support. |
| LGE | We think the benefit for L1-SINR is clear since the cross-beam interference is not reflected for L1-RSRP, where the simultaneous DL transmission with reported beam pair/group is the objective of WID. L1-SINR based metric for beam pair/group reporting should be supported in order to consider the cross-beam interference within the pair/group especially for option 2. |
| Qualcomm | For Q1: support  For Q2: support  We believe one good use case of L1-SINR is for cross-beam interference measurement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For Q1, support the proposal.  For Q2, support the proposal. |
| **Vivo** | We don’t support interference measurement model in MTRP transmission scheme that directly regarding one CMR resource in one beam pair as the interference of another CMR resource to calculate L1-SINR, which has been verified to have performance loss compared with L1-RSRP in our companion contribution R1-2104345. Therefore, we think it’s better to determine the procedure of MTRP beam report based on L1-RSRP firstly, and then discuss how to measure the inter-beam interference within a group. |
| DOCOMO | For Q1: support  For Q2: support. And whether to consider inter-beam interference within a group for L1-SINR measurement can be RRC configured. |
| **Mod** | It seems concern on L1-SINR still persists. Companies are invited to further comment on the concerns from vivo/Apple. |
| **Xiaomi** | Support Q1 and Q2 |
| **ZTE** | Support Q1 and Q2 both. Some simulation results can be found in our companion contribution.  BTW, the benefits of L1-SINR group based reporting compared with L1-RSRP have been justified in our companion contribution R1-1906248 and R1-1906249 through LLS and SLS evaluation. Since the L1-SINR based beam reporting has been introduced in Rel-16, it is straightforward that L1-SINR reporting should be futher considered. |
| **Qualcomm** | For Vivo’s comment below, reusing CMR for interference measurement is not what in our mind. To our understanding, both CMR and IMR will be configured to compute the L1-SINR. Perhaps we can leave “reusing CMR for interference measurement” as FFS or exclude it if agreeable.  Vivo’s comment:  We don’t support interference measurement model in MTRP transmission scheme that directly regarding one CMR resource in one beam pair as the interference of another CMR resource to calculate L1-SINR  For Apple’s comment, the related contribution part is copied below. But the description is a bit abstract and we do not fully understand the issue. More clarification would be helpful.  Apple’s Tdoc:  Another open issue is whether to support L1-SINR based on option 2. It might be possible that option 2 could provide some benefit for inter-beam interference. However, with regard to potential overlap between beam pairs, it is impossible for UE to measure inter-beam interference, due to UE Rx beam constraints. Figure 1 shows one example for this UE Rx beam issue. Thus, the benefit to support L1-SINR based on option 2 is questionable. The key motivation for current option 2 is to report whether 2 beams can be received simultaneously.    **Figure 1: Potential issue for inter-beam interference measurement** |
| **OPPO** | Q1: not support L1-SINR  Q2: not support inter-beam interference within a group. As explained previously, for Option 2 beam reporting, it is not feasible for the UE to measure the inter-beam interference between two CRIs/SSBRIs reported in one group because the UE is not able to apply propoer QCL to measure it. |
| **Apple** | Response to Qualcomm’s question, the problem is UE beam selection or the second panel to measure SSB1 for inter-beam interference measurement. To measure inter-beam interference for SSB 1+2, UE needs to use beam 1+2 to receive SSB1, but to measure inter-beam interference for SSB 1+3, UE needs to use beam 1+3 to receive SSB1. |
| **NEC** | Support Q1 and Q2. |
| **TCL** | For Q1, support.  For Q2, support. |
| Sony | For Q1, support in principle.  In addition to L1-RSRP, L1-SINR can be viewed as another important metric which was also supported in Rel.16 for group-based beam reporting.  For Q2, given the concern from Apple not yet addressed, we think the door on how to measure inter-beam interference may still be open. Specifically, either reusing CMR from TRP A as IMR for TRP B, or using CMR plus dedicated IMR would be possible at current stage. |
| CMCC | Q1:Support  Q2:Support. The configuration of CMR and IMR can be FFS. |
| **Nokia/NSB** | We share view with QC. At his moment, we think only dedicated IMR is clear to be applied.  To support CMR as IMR, there should be more on what CMR of the other TRP to be IMR for measuring of a CMR of a TRP. If only 1 CMR per each TRP, then it is clear. But, this doesn’t make sense to BM.  UE can consider a potential CMR as IMR when determining the reported pairs for the implementation, but it cannot be the part of specification. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| **Ericsson** | Support Q1.  For Q2, it may be good to have further discussion on how the interbeam interference would be measured. As mentioned by other companies, we should discuss whether we use dedicated IMR or CMR of the other TRP to measure inter-beam interference. |
| **Intel** | Support Q1 and Q2. We dont see why L1-SINR measurement can degrade performance as claimed by Vivo (not clear from tdoc in our view), a reasonable UE should be able to capture interference in the direction of TRP2 (corresponding to beam-pair reported) aligned with NC-JT reception. Interference from IMR or CMR can be further discussed but we dont see the issue in capturing interference from either/both CMR, IMR. |
| **Qualcomm** | To Apple: You mean UE cannot use beam 1+2 simultaneously to receive SSB 1? I just guess from the last sentence in your contribution paragraph. If so, our understanding is that the channel and interference are measured in TDMed way, so no simultaneous Rx issue to assume. Below is one possible way in our mind. Please let me know for anything infeasible.  Suppose gNB wants UE to measure cross-beam interference between gNB beam #1 and gNB beam #2. gNB can configure CMR #1 transmitted by gNB beam #1 and IMR #1 transmitted by gNB beam #2, with both received by Rx beam for gNB beam #1. Then UE can computes SINR #1 for gNB beam #1 with cross-beam interference from gNB beam #2. The CMR #1 and IMR #1 are TDMed. Similarly, UE computes SINR #2 for gNB beam #2 with cross-beam interference from gNB beam #1. If UE decides both gNB beam #1 and #2 can be received simultaneously, UE will report corresponding SINR #1 and #2. |
| **DOCOMO** | To OPPO/Apple, we do not understand why ‘UE is not able to apply propoer QCL to measure it’. When measuring the interference from gNB beam#2 to gNB beam#1, UE just need to use the QCL of CMR to measure the interference. |
| **Mod** | Added proposal based on inputs from Qualcomm, Ericsson, and Intel. |
| **LGE** | Support the latest FL proposal. |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support the FL proposal |
| ETRI | Support the latest FL proposal. |
| ZTE2 | Support the FL proposal. In our views, we need to evaluate the performance through simulation, and for the sake of comparison, we support to take RSRP-based Option-2 group reporting as a baseline.  Offline proposal 1.3.1:  For beam reporting option 2, evaluate the performance, specification, and implementation aspects of L1-SINR based beam measurement/feedback, including at least the following aspects   * L1-RSRP based reporting (option-2) is assumed as a baseline for simulation evaluation. * Measurement resource for interference measurement, e.g. * Dedicated IMR resource, and/or * CMR of the other TRP * UE behavior of interference measurement and the corresponding L1-SINR derivation |
| Mod | Wording modification based on ZTE’s suggestion. |
| Qualcomm | Support latest FL’s proposal. Please let us know for any common EVM assumption doc if exists |
| Futurewei | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Apple | Response to QC, the problem is that UE cannot receive SSB1 with beam 1+2+3. So at one time, UE can only measure mutual interference for one pair of beams. Let’s say there are 64 beams per TRP, UE has to measure mutual interference after measureing SSB1 64 times. So to measure mutual interference between CMRs would not be feasible. Then another way is to use CMR + IMR as you mentioned. But fundamentally, with this framework, UE can only measure mutual interference for 2 beams.  Comments to the proposal, since we cannot see a feasible way for mutual interference measurement, we cannot see the benefit for L1-SINR based beam selection. L1-SINR based beam selection has been evaluated quite a lot in Rel-16, and there are still some results that showed no gain or even performance loss. We suggest we should not waste effort again on it. Meanwhile, CSI enhancement has already been introduced. L1-RSRP+CSI enhancement should be sufficient. |
| ZTE3 | We are not a big fan of inter-beam/CMR interference measurement, but we are open to have further discussion.  In Rel-16, if my understanding is correct, most of simulation results are only related to non-group based reporting rather than group based reporting; also, since this L1-SINR measurement has been supported as a function, the only reason to introduce this feature is that majority companies had identified performance gain and usages (like trade-off solution between UE complexity (CSI-mTRP reporting) and accurary (L1-RSRP reporting)) and, we do believe, Rel-16 simulation results are also positive for nearly all of simulation results. So, we support the FL proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks Apple for clarification. I agree based on CMR itself is problematic. We believe TDMed CMR and IMR are needed. I think R17 only focused on 2-beam per group case. We have no issue to evaluate the gain. |

* + 1. Value of N (number of beam groups)
    2. Others

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.5 | gNB indication of Rx panel related hypothesis   * Corresponding to issue 1.4 | Support: Intel (Alt-2) |
| 1.6 | Simultaneous report of beams suitable for S-TRP and M-TRP separately | Support: vivo, |
| 1.8 | Whether to adopt additional beam measurement/reportion option   * Option 1: In a CSI-report, UE can report N>1 pair/groups and M>=1 beams per pair/group, Different beams in different pairs/groups can be received simultaneously * Option 3: UE report M(M>=1) beams in N (N>1) CSI-reports corresponding to N report setting, Different beams in different CSI-reports can be received simultaneously   + Association mechanism FFS | Option 1   * Support (5): Lenovo/MotM, OPPO, Sony, DOCOMO, * No (2): Apple, Ericsson   Option 3   * Support (8): Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, Nokia/NSB, AT&T, CATT), * No(3): Apple, Ericsson, DOCOMO |
| 1.9 | New beam measurement metric,   * Alt-1: based on throughput * Alt-2: based on latency requirement and/or power window between resources within pair/group or resources being power threshold (e.g. L1-RSRP/L1-SINR) | Alt-1:  Support: Qualcomm  Concern:  Alt-2:  Support:  Concern: |
| 1.10 | gNB indicates (for throughput or reliability), operation mode (FDM/SDM/TDM), and corresponding beam pair selection criterion (based on sum or minimum of metrics of the two reported beams). | Support: Qualcomm  Concern: |
| 1.11 | Mapping of CMR subset/set to TRP  Alt-1: spec transparent  Alt-2: specified (explicit for SSB-based CMR, implicit for CSI-RS based CMR) | Alt-1:  Alt-2: Nokia/NSB |
| 1.12 | Latency reduction:   * Support beam reporting criteria that imposes UE to rank and report only measured CSI resources being within a certain power window or above a power threshold. | Support: Nokia/NSB  Concern: |
| 1.13 | Mechanism for fallback to STRP transmission, e.g.   * Alt-1: use Rel-15 group reporting (with a restriction on ‘per TRP’ with predefined TRP) * Alt-2: use Rel-15 non-group reporting (no restriction on simultaneous reception) * Alt-3: network configures the fallback reporting (based on Alt-1 or Alt-2) | Support: Nokia/NSB  Concern: |
| 1.14 | Study enhancement for different TDD DL/UL configuration across multiple TRPs. | Support: LGE  Concern: |
| 1.15 | Reuse simultaneousReceptionDiffTypeD-r16 UE capability to indicate if the UE is capable of receiving beams within a beam pair/group with different Rx spatial filters. | Support: Ericsson  Concern: |
| 1.16 | Issue due to independent beam pair switch (c.f. R1-2104891) | Support: Intel  Concern: |

Companies are welcome to provide their views on other issues in Table I that are not covered in section 2.1.1 – 2.1.4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | Agree with FL that these can be deprioritized |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For 1.8, support Option 3, as it is beneficial for non-ideal backhaul base. |
| vivo | For issue 1.6, due to the number of report beam pairs is more than 1, we think the simultaneous report of beams suitable for S-TRP and M-TRP separately is beneficial for the network to achieve dynamic switch between MTRP and STRP flexibly, other than RRC reconfiguration or trigger another beam report.  For issue 1.8, we prefer Option 3 at least in non-ideal backhaul scenarios with following reasons:   * highest scheduling flexibility with the same UCI payload size per PUCCH/PUSCH resource for non-ideal backhaul scenarios.   throughput gain can be achieved by Option 3 in non-ideal backhaul cases, which is verified by simulation results in Table 2 to 3 in our companion contribution R1-2104345. |
| Intel | We would request to add another issue to the Table from R1-2104891:  Issue due to independent/asynchronous beam-pair switch at gNB  [mod]: added as issue 1.16 |

* 1. M-TRP Beam failure recovery
     1. Simultaneous configuration of cell-specific and TRP-specifc BFR on the same cell

In the last meeting the following proposal was discussed.

**Offline Proposal (RAN1#104b-e)**:

* FFS: whether cell-specific and TRP-specific BFR can be configured in the same CC.

Company inputs in RAN1#105-e are summarized in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.0  BFR configuration | Configuration of cell-specific BFR and TRP-specific BFR on the same cell | * Support (20): Lenovo/MotM, CMCC, Sony, Nokia/NSB (at least SpCell), Samsung (SCell triggered if both TRP fail), MediaTek (CBRA-based cell-specific on SpCell), LGE, APT/FGI (at least SpCell), TCL, Xiaomi (SpCell only) , Huawei, HiSilicon, NEC, Intel, Ericsson, InterDigital, Futurewei * No (4):, Intel, DOCOMO, , Convida, OPPO * Postpone: vivo, |

Offline proposal 2.1.1:

* Discuss whether simultaneous configuration of RACH based BFR and TRP-specific BFR on at least the SpCell is supported
  + In case of two TRPs failure for TRP-specific BFR on SpCell, RACH-based BFR can be triggered.
  + Note: if two sets of BFD-RS for TRP-specific BFR are configured on the SpCell, there is no additional configured BFD-RS for RACH-specific BFR on the SpCell.
  + FFS: above RACH-based BFR refers to CFRA-based cell-specific BFR and/or CFRA-based cell-specific BFR on SpCell

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | In our view, by default this is allowed, which is subjected to UE capability.  We would like to understand why such restriction is needed. Could proponents clarify it? |
| **Lenovo&MotM** | Support. |
| APT/FGI | Support |
| LGE | We think simultaneous configuration of cell-specific BFR and TRP-specific BFR is valid at least for SpCell, in order to support RACH-based BFRQ in SpCell, in addition to TRP-specific BFRQ. |
| Qualcomm | Not support simultaneous configuration of both in the same CC. UE needs to measure more BFD RSs, manage multiple types of PHY indicator triggers, and the MAC-CE needs to indicate which failure type per CC. Also, TRP specific BFR can also indicate cell level BFR if both TRPs fail. So no use case to configure both. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share similar view as LG. |
| MediaTek | Supprot for SpCell only, i.e., RACH-based BFR + TRP-specific BFR can be allowed for SpCell |
| vivo | We would like to postpone the discussion of this issue until the procedure of TRP-specific BFR is clearer. Without the basic design and common understanding of how TRP-specific BFR procedure works, it would be too complicated to consider how TRP specific BFR and cell specific BFR are bundled. |
| Samsung | Corrected a typo in our views. Support SpCell BFR when two TRP BFRs occur within a time period. |
| DOCOMO | We should clarify what does ‘cell-specific and TRP-specific BFR can be configured in the same CC’ mean.  If it means that UE can be configured with 3 sets of BFD-RSs (2 sets for TRP-specific BFR, 1 set for cell-specific BFR), we do not support it.  But if it means that in case of two TRPs failure for TRP-specific BFR on SpCell, RACH-based BFR can be performed, we can support it.  [mod]: My personal understanding is the second. Added an offline proposal with clarification. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| ZTE | Support the FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Suggest to add the following clarification mentioned by DCM. Otherwise, it may imply 3 sets of BFD RS are still needed.   * Discuss whether simultaneous configuration of cell-specific BFR and TRP-specific BFR on at least the SpCell is supported   + Note: Herein the simulateous configuration refers to the configuration of RACH-based BFR and TRP-specific BFR on the same CC.     - In case of two TRPs failure for TRP-specific BFR on SpCell, RACH-based BFR can be triggered. |
| Fujitsu | Support FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | First of all, We do not support to configure cell-specific BFR and TRP-specific BFR simultaneously.  Secondly, the wording in the proposal 2.1.1:  Question 1: RACH-based BFR means what? CBRA or CFRA?  Question 2: the second bullet is not valid. The event of “In case of two TRPs failure for TRP-specific BFR on SpCell..” since the beam failure detection for each TRP are conducted in MAC layer separately based on the separate beam failure instance reporting from PHY layer. Generally, the periodicity of beam failure instance reporting of each TRP are different. When beam failure is declared for one TRP, the MAC layer does not wait to see if the other TRP will fail in the future.  [mod]: Thanks for the comment. The pre-requisite of triggering RACH on SpCell (as formulated in the proposal) is when both TRP fail. If one fail, TRP-specific BFR will be triggered. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal except the last sub-bullet.  Maybe we need to clarify whether it is CBRA or CFRA. If concurrent configuration for two types of BFR is allowed, maybe a simple way is to trigger cell-specific BFR if both TRP fails.  [mod]: Given Rel.16 SCell RACH-based BFR is based on CBRA, my understanding (and reading from company contributions) is the former. Revised proposals. Companies are invited to further check and comment. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| TCL | Support the FL proposal. Maybe we need to clarify the BFD-RS for cell-specific BFR. |
| Sony | In our view, at least for SpCell, we should allow both the fallback BFR (cell-specific) and TRP-sepcific BFR configured.  [mod]: Added an FFS bullet on this issue. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. The beam failure detection part for TRP specific and cell specific would be the same i.e. no additional sets of q0. UE monitors TRP specific sets and could fallback to cell BFR e.g. when both TRPs fail. If UE can find candites for the failed TRP, it should still recover using the TPR recovery. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support. These are independent configurations. Total UE complexity must be considered, e.g., the total number of BFD RSs to monitor should be limited. |
| Intel | Support, In our point of view TRP specific BFR should be defined incorporating RACH-based fall-back and can be sufficient to support full BFR procedure on PCell without the need to configure cell specific BFR. This avoids the discussion of UE complexity when both are supported in the same CC and also simplifies specification in our view. |
| Convida Wireless | We don’t support the proposal, at least at this point.  It is also unclear to us what the proposal means. Is the intention that two separate BFR procedures are running in the MAC layer, one cell-BFR procedure and one per-TRP-BFR procedure, with separate timers, counters, etc? From some companies comments, it instead seems that the intention is to have a single per-TRP-BFR procedure running in the MAC layer, but to include CBRA triggering within the single per-TRP-BFR procedure, e.g. if two TRPs have failed. However, this is different from the proposal.  We also share the concerns with having BFD-RS and NBI-RS sets for both “cell-specific” and “TRP-specific” BFR. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the latest proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We have concern on the FFS. As commented before, 3 sets of BFD-RS are not needed. We suggest replacing the FFS with following note.  Note: if two sets of BFD-RS for TRP-specific BFR are configured on the SpCell, there is no additional configured BFD-RS for cell-specific BFR on the SpCell.  [mod]: revised accordingly. Thanks. |
| AT&T | Support with the clarification from Docomo |
| LGE | Support the main bullet. But for cell-specific BFR for SpCell, CFRA should be firstly used when it is configured by gNB as legacy system. |
| Lenovo&MotM | Same view with LGE, CFRA is the base scheme of cell-specific BFR for SpCell. |
| ETRI | Support the latest proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Similar view as DOCOMO. |
| ZTE2 | We share the same views with LGE and Lenovo that CFRA should be considered firstly rather than CBRA. If seems that CBRA design was from RAN2 and therefore any update for CBRA design can also be left to RAN2 also. |
| Mod | Added a FFS bullet on CFRA, to address the views of LGE, ZTE and Lenovo/MotM. |
| Futurewei | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Apple | We feel this proposal needs some further discussion and clarification.  For CBRA based BFR, does it mean R15 CBRA based BFR? If this is the case, after BFR, the UE would operate in a single-beam operation. Another possible interpretation for CBRA based BFR is CB-PRACH + R17 BFR MAC CE.  In addition, what is the exact event to trigger this CBRA BFR? Let’s say 2 BFD RS per set is configured. As said in the note, no additional BFD RS needs to be configured for cell-specific BFR. For cell-specific BFR, UE only monitors 2 RSs. Then should UE trigger the CBRA if beam failure is detected from the 2 RSs for cell-specific BFR or 4 RSs for TRP-specific BFR?  Of cause all the detailed questions above depend on outcome of the main-bullet. Maybe we can focus on the main-bullet only at current stage. |
| DOCOMO | Support FL’s proposal.  To answer Apple’s question,  for CBRA based BFR, yes, it means R15 CBRA based BFR. And after this CBRA BFR, UE will operate in a single-beam operation.  For event to trigger this CBRA BFR, one example is that, if two sets of BFD-RS (for TRP-specific BFR) fail, CBRA-BFR can be triggered. |
| Xiaomi | Support the FL proposal |
| LGE | We are not saying that the last FFS bullet is needed. As we said, CFRA-based BFR should be firstly used when it is configured by gNB as legacy behavior. CBRA-based BFR is to be used when CFRA is not configured or CFRA-based BFR is not successful, as Rel-15/16.  [mod]: Thanks for the clarification. On CFRA-based BFR,   1. Just to clarify, is it a common understanding that Rel.15/16 CFRA-based BFR can be configured on SpCell while TRP-specific BFR is configured on other Scells? I’d like to hear companies’ views. 2. Next, is there a common understanding that Rel.15/16 CFRA-based BFR and Rel.17 TRP-specific BFR can be configured on SpCell?   If LGE (and ZTE/Lenovo/MotM) are OK, the last FFS bullet can be removed for now. |
| CMCC | Regarding the first question raised by Apple, we have different views with DOCOMO.  In current spec, BFR MAC CE can be transmitted in Msg 3 or Msg A. We think it can be extended to R17 BFR MAC CE. And after CBRA BFR, whether UE would operate in a single-beam or multi-beam will depend on the candidate beams it reported in the MAC CE. If the UE reported two candidate beam indexes from two NBI-RS sets, it could operate in multi-beam. |
| Mod | @ZTE/Lenovo/MotM: please see question to LGE above. |
| Qualcomm | Support FL’s latest proposal |
| MediaTek | Support the FL proposal. For CFRA, we can further discuss. |
| ZTE3 | First of all, we think that the Rel/15/16 CFRA-based BFR can be configured on SpCell, while TRP-specific BFR is configured on other SCells or SpCell.   * If we can reach consensus on that, we prefer to have a clear conclusion/agreement on that. * If not, the last FFS bullet should be kept. |
| Lenovo&MotM | For the CFRA-based BFR, we support the clarification of 1 and 2. |
| DOCOMO | For CFRA-based BFR, we can agree with ZTE3’s comment. |
| LGE | We are also both “Yes” for moderator’s question 1 and 2.  I think more discussion is needed at this stage. Then, can I suggest to modify the proposal as below?  Offline proposal 2.1.1:   * Discuss whether simultaneous configuration of RACH-based BFR and TRP-specific BFR on at least the SpCell is supported   + In case of two TRPs failure for TRP-specific BFR on SpCell, RACH-based BFR can be triggered.   + Note: if two sets of BFD-RS for TRP-specific BFR are configured on the SpCell, there is no additional configured BFD-RS for RACH-based BFR on the SpCell.   + FFS: above RACH-based BFR refers CFRA-based cell-specific BFR and/or CBRA-based cell-specific BFR on SpCell |
| Mod | It seems companies want to walk back the proposal a bit and further study whether this is supported for CFRA- or CBRA-based. Updated the proposals per LG comment. Please comment if you prefer the previous or the latest version. |
| vivo | As for the moderator’s questions, question 2 is more in line with my understanding. TRP-specific BFR can be configured in SpCell or/and SCell, which is up to gNB implementation. As we can see, so many complicated issues and details need to be solved in the case of simultaneous configuration. Therefore, we would better discuss it after the common procedure of TRP-specific BFR is determined. |
| Convida Wireless | In general OK with the proposal.  However, simultaneous *configuration* might not be needed, at least for CBRA, since no BFD-RS configuration for RACH-based is needed. Therefore, my suggestion is:   * Discuss whether ~~simultaneous configuration of~~ RACH based BFR fallback for~~and~~ TRP-specific BFR on at least the SpCell is supported   + In case of two TRPs failure for TRP-specific BFR on SpCell, RACH-based BFR can be triggered.   + Note: if two sets of BFD-RS for TRP-specific BFR are configured on the SpCell, there is no additional configured BFD-RS for RACH-specific BFR on the SpCell.   + FFS: above RACH-based BFR refers to CB~~F~~RA-based cell-specific BFR and/or CFRA-based cell-specific BFR on SpCell   FFS: whether additional configuration for RACH based BFR is needed if TRP-specific BFR is configured. |

* + 1. BFD-RS number

It was agreed in the last meeting to down select from two options on the number of BFD-RS resources per BFD-RS set in RAN1#105-e. It appears the number of supporting companies are close, with slightly more companies supporting to introduce a UE capability rather than reusing a fixed value (2) in Rel.16.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1  BFD-RS | # of BFD-RS resources per set   * Alt1: max value is 2 * Alt2: max value is a UE capability, including possible candidate value of 1 | * Alt1 (7): Huawei, HiSilicon, InterDigital, Nokia/NSB, Convida, ZTE * Alt2 (10): vivo, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, Apple, LGE, TCL, ETRI, DOCOMO, CATT, APT/FGI, MTK, Futurewei   + Concern: Ericsson, Convida, Intel, |

Offline proposal 2.2.1A: (proposed working assumption)

* Introduce a UE capability on the maximum number of BFD-RS resources per set, which includes possible candidate value of 1.
  + NOTE: This UE capability may consider the relation with Rel.16 UE capability of # of CORESETs per CORESETPoolIndex.

Support: Futurewei, Apple, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, LGE, vivo, Huawei, HiSilicon, CMCC, Sony, MediaTek

Vs.

Offline proposal 2.2.1B:

* Postpone the decision on the number of BFD-RS resource per set beyond RAN1#105-e.
* FFS: introduce a UE capability on the maximum number of BFD-RS resources per set, which includes possible candidate value of 1.
  + NOTE: This UE capability may consider the relation with Rel.16 UE capability of # of CORESETs per CORESETPoolIndex.
  + NOTE: If introducing a UE capability on the maximum number of BFD-RS resources per set is not adopted, the number of BFD-RS resources per BFD-RS set may take value from 1 to Nmax – 1, where Nmax is the maximum total number of BFD-RS resources in a BWP (which has been agreed as a UE capability), as long as the total number of BFR-RS resources per BWP does not exceed Nmax.

Support: Convida

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| **Lenovo&MotM** | Support. |
| APT/FGI | Support |
| LGE | Support. |
| Qualocmm | Support |
| MediaTek | Support offline proposal |
| vivo | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support the offline proposal |
| ZTE | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| NEC | Support |
| TCL | Support |
| Sony | Support the offline proposal |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | This capability should consider the relation with Rel-16 UE capability of # of CORESETs per coresetPoolIndex.  [Mod]: This could be discussed in UE capability session in later stage of Rel.17, but I am fine to add a note. Please check. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Why is the number of BFD-RSs per set important? Shouldn’t the UE capability count all BFD-RS, across both sets, and also including the BFD-RSs for cell-specific BFD? |
| Intel | Similar view as E/// but should this limit be also across multiple supported CCs? |
| Convida Wireless | Not support.  In the previous meeting, we introduced a UE capability for the total number of BFD RS resource in the two sets. This capability should reflect the BFD effort by the UE. We don’t understand the motivation to introduce another UE capability for the number of BFD RS resource in each set. |
| Mod | Companies are invited to address the concerns from Ericsson, Intel, and Convida.  To Ericsson/Intel/Convida: If the max # of RS per set is implicitly determined based on the max # of RS across two sets (Nmax, which is a UE capability), is it the correct understanding that the number of RS per set may take value from 1 to Nmax -1, as long as the total number of RS doesn’t exceed Nmax? |
| LGE | UE capability report on the maximum number of BFD-RSs per BFD-RS set is needed to avoid some extreme configuration from gNB, e.g. UE reports total BFD-RS number as 6 then gNB configures 5 and 1 BFD-RSs, respectively for each BFD-RS set. |
| ETRI | Support. We have a similar view as LGE regarding the concerns. |
| Convida Wireless | To Mod: Yes, we have the same understanding.  To LG and other proponents: Could you please clarify why the UE BFD effort is significantly different between these two cases, assuming the maximum across both sets is 6?  Case 1: number of BFD RS per set: 3 + 3  Case 2: number of BFD RS per set: 5 + 1  In my understanding, the radio link quality computation is per BFD RS and this computation is independent of the number of other BFD RS in the same set. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Support. |
| ZTE2 | We prefer the original proposal, and the updated note is very confusing. Considering that it is related to UE capability design, we can postpone this discussion. |
| Mod | @ZTE: we had an agreement in the last meeting to decide in RAN1#105-e, but I agree this is not the most critical issue. If everyone agrees we can postpone. Added to the proposal.  @All: Added a note to capture the alternative method raised by Convida. Revise the main bullet to “FFS” (e.g. postpone the decision beyond RAN1#105-e) |
| Qualcomm | We also prefer original proposal. Suppose UE support max 4 BFD RS per BWP. But UE may prefer max 2 BFD RS per TRP, instead of 3 on TRP1 and 1 on TRP2. So UE can reuse the PHY indicator evaluation architecture similar to that for cell level BFR, where the PHY indicator is evaluated based on max 2 BFD RS. Otherwise, a new architecture is needed to handle max 4 BFD RS for evaluating the PHY indicator. |
| Mod | Two versions of proposals are provided, version 2.2.1A and 2.2.1B. |
| Futurewei | Support Proposal 2.2.1A. |
| Apple | Support Proposal 2.2.1A. At least we can make it as a WA. We do not see the need to postpone the decision. |
| DOCOMO | Support Proposal 2.2.1A. |
| Xiaomi | Support proposal 2.2.1A |
| LGE | Support Proposal 2.2.1A. |
| Vivo | Support Proposal 2.2.1A. |
| Mod | Given the majority view, can companies accept proposal 2.2.1A as a working assumption? |
| Qualcomm | Support 2.2.1A. It may not need WA if all UE vendors support. No need further check in that case |
| MediaTek | Share the same view with QC. In Rel-15/16, beam failluure instance is evaluated based on at most 2 BFD RSs in Rel-15/16, and we don’t see the need to increase the number in Rel-17.  Support Proposal 2.2.1A w/o working assumption |
| Mod | Given the amount of support 2.2.2.1-A, removed “working assumption”. A down selection can be made between version A and version B. |
| Convida Wireless | The proposal could be acceptable if a valid technical justification is presented. Below is my understanding, please correct me if I’ve misunderstood.   * The UE evaluation of radio link quality of a BFD-RS (hypothetical PDCCH BLER) is independent of if it’s in a BFD-RS set of size 1, 2 or 3. * The UE complexity for determining radio link qualities of 4 BFD-RS (in a BWP) is independent of if these 4 BFD-RS are divided into BFD-RS sets as 2+2 or 3+1. * Given the 4 radio link quality statuses of the 4 BFD-RS (status1, status2, status3, status4), the UE shall determine two BFR-RS set statuses (BFD-RS set 1 status and BFD-RS set 2 status).   If the BFD-RS sets include 2+2 BFD-RS, the UE has to do the following operation   * Operation1:   + BFD-RS set 1 status = status1 OR status2   + BFD-RS set 2 status = status3 OR status4   If the BFD-RS sets include 3+1 BFD-RS, the UE has to do the following operation   * Operation2:   + BFD-RS set 1 status = status1 OR status2 OR status3   + BFD-RS set 2 status = status4   The proposal is to introduce a UE capability for the following:   * For a UE that supports Operation1, it also supports Operation2.   It seems overkill to introduce a UE capability for such a simple logical operation, but perhaps I’ve missed something? |
| Xiaomi | Support proposal 2.2.1A |
| Sony | Support Proposal 2.2.1A.  For UE complexity of monitoring BFD RS(s) from each TRP, UE capability across BFD RS sets from up to 2 TRPs (up to 5 CORESETs in Rel.16) seems insufficient. And we don’t think to postpone it beyond 105e is necessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In principle, we are fine with the direction of Proposal 2.2.1A.  We are wondering what is the implication of “may” in the note. In our reading, by saying “may”, it also includes the possibility of not considering such relation, with which “or not” needs to be added at the end of this bullet. |
| Ericsson | Regarding FL’s question above:  [FL]: If the max # of RS per set is implicitly determined based on the max # of RS across two sets (Nmax, which is a UE capability), is it the correct understanding that the number of RS per set may take value from 1 to Nmax -1, as long as the total number of RS doesn’t exceed Nmax?  [Ericsson]: Yes. This is our understanding as well.  Among the two versions, we have a preference for Proposal 2.2.1B. |

It was agreed in the last meeting that the total number of BFD-RS resources in a DL BWP is a UE capability. One company proposes to clarify UE ehavior when the total number of QCL-typeD RS of all CORESETs exceeds UE capability. Note this issue assumes implicit BFD-RS determination will be adopted in Rel.17.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.2 BFD-RS | Clarify whether/how to define BFD-RS selection rule for implicit BFD-RS when total number of QCL-typeD RS of all CORESETs exceed UE capability | Support: LGE, Apple, MTK  Concern: |

Offline proposal 2.2.2:

* Clarify whether/how to define BFD-RS selection rule for implicit BFD-RS when total number of QCL-typeD RS of all CORESETs exceed UE capability

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | Support to define a clear rule for mDCI BFR. This is helpful for UE capability to avoid potential under-report like approach, as discussed in R16. |
| LGE | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support to clarify |
| MediaTek | Supprot |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Mod | Given supporting views so far, this is added as an offline proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the offline proposal |
| ZTE | We are open to further discussion. |
| OPPO | Open to dicuss it |
| NEC | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | The scenario to be clarified first. In general, NW may consider such UE capability when configure BFD-RSs. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Seems like an unnecessary agreement. Furthermore, we have not agreed to have a capability for the total number of BFD-RSs, have we? |
| Intel | we can discuss it but this seems second order discussion and can be taken up after more progress is made |
| Qualcomm | Support the latest proposal |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Fine to discuss. |
| Futurewei | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Vivo | We don’t even know the number of RS supported. Thus may not be necessary to first agree on how to handle the case exceeding UE capability. |

* + 1. BFD-RS set determination

It was agreed in RAN1#104-e to support both M-DCI and S-DCI (with lower priority) in Rel.17, without precluding a unified framework. It has also been agreed that at least one of explicit and implicit BFD-RS set determination is to be adopted. Company inputs are summarized below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.3  BFD-RS | Explicit vs. Implicit BFD-RS  Q1 : Explicit configuration  Q2: Implicit configuration of BFD-RS set k (k=0,1) for M-DCI   * Based on TCI of CORESETs with CORESETPoolIndex = k   Q3 – alt-1: Implicit configuration BFD-RS set k for S-DCI   * Based on TCI of CORESETs with CORESETPoolIndex = k * Extend CORESETPoolIndex to S-DCI (for BFD-RS set generation)   Q3 – alt-2: Implicit configuration BFD-RS set for S-DCI   * BFD-RS set k = 1 is based on the second TCI state associated with the TCI codepoint in the TCI-activation MAC-CE * FFS: BFD-RS set k = 0 | * Q1 (17): vivo (both), Spreadtrum, ZTE, Qualcomm, Fujitsu, Sony, Samsung, MediaTek, AT&T, LGE, Ericsson, APT/FGI (both), Convida, ETRI, DOCOMO, Huawei, HiSilicon,TCL, InterDigital, Futurewei * Q2 (23): vivo, ZTE, Qualcomm, OPPO (CORESETPoolIndex), Apple (CORESETPoolIndex), Sony, NEC, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, MediaTek, AT&T, LGE, Ericsson, APT/FGI, Convida, ETRI, Intel, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CATT, Huawei, HiSilicon,TCL, InterDigital, Futurewei * Q3   + alt-1 (15): vivo (when one TRP fail in CC1 and no TRP fail in CC2, FFS other cases), Sony, NEC (both S/M), Samsung, MediaTek (extend CORESETPoolIndex), AT&T, LGE, ETRI, Intel (extend CORESETPoolIndex to SDCI), CATT, Huawei, HiSilicon, InterDigital. Qualcomm, Futurewei   + alt-2 (2): Nokia/NSB   + Postpone (5): Convida, OPPO, Apple, ZTE, Ericsson |

Proposal 2.3.1:

For beam failure detection of TRP-specific BFR in Rel.17, support the following BFD-RS set configuration methods

* Explicit configuration, for both S-DCI and M-DCI
* Implicit BFD-RS set configuration for M-DCI
  + BFD-RS set k (k= 0, 1) is determined based on TCI states of CORESETs configured with *CORESETPoolIndex* = k.
* FFS: Implicit BFD-RS set configuration for S-DCI, down select between
  + Alt-1: Introduce a CORESET specific higher-layer parameter “xyz” when UE is configured with S-DCI, at least for the purpose of implicit BFD-RS configuration.
    - FFS: exact name “xyz” (e.g. *CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI* or *CORESETPoolIndexforBFD*, or leave it to RAN2)
    - BFD-RS set k (k= 0, 1) is determined based on TCI states of CORESETs configured with the above CORESET specific higher-layer parameter “xyz” = k
  + Alt 2: BFD-RS set k = 0 and 1 are determined based on the first and the second TCI state of the TCI codepoint in the TCI-activation MAC-CE for PDSCH, respectively.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Qualcomm | We are fine for Q1-Q3. In Q3, another name can be used to diffentiate from mDCI, e.g. CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI  [mod]: From my own perspective your suggestion is fine to me. Let’s hear other companies views. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For Q1, Q2 and Q3, support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Supprot for Q1, Q2, and Q3. |
| Vivo | We support explicit configuration for MDCI and SDCI, and implicit configuration at least for MDCI. |
| DOCOMO | Support Q1 and Q2. |
| Xiaomi | Support Q1, Q2 and Q3 |
| ZTE | Support Q1 and Q2 at least. QC’s suggestion seems to be a good move-forward solution. |
| Mod | Given the status of discussion, added proposal 2.3.1 |
| Fujitsu | Support FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | First of all, since we have agreed that sDCI is low priority, we shall delete all the sDCI in the proposal.  [Mod]: my understanding of the agreement on “low priority” is so that sDCI will not incur a substantially different design than that of mDCI, and should reuse mDCI design as much as possible. This is also another agreement that “a unified design should not be precluded”.  [OPPO:] low priority means we dicuss it after the high priority issue is completed, which is same understanding applied on the issue of simultaneous receiption of signals with different QCL-TypeD  [Mod]: Thanks Li for your view. My understanding of the proponents of Q3 is to have a single framework for sDCI and mDCI to minimize spec impact, based on the agreement of “not precluding a unified solution for S-DCI and M-DCI”. Just wanted to understand your consideration of not discussing Q3 in this meeting, is it based on which of the following reasons?   1. Not to support implicit BFD-RS for sDCI, or 2. Technical concerns on Q3, and/or an different solution?   If it’s 2, your further technical clarification will be helpful.  Secondly, for mDCI, we think only implicit method can be supported because the explicit configuration does not work. The TCI state of PDCCH can be updated through MAC CE but the explicitu configuration method use RRC. Thus the explicit method can never follow the PDCCH beam switch. In rel17, the TCI state for PDCCH can be even switched by DCI.  [mod]: In the previous meeting some companies asked why explicit is needed if implicit is supported. There was one answer from OPPO that explicit configuration is needed because QCL-typeD RS of CORESETs state may be aperiodic and cannot be used for beam failure detection. Just to clarify my understanding, is OPPO proposing that configuration of aperiodic QCL-typeD RS in CORESET TCI states should be ruled out in Rel.17? If so we can discuss this.  [OPPO:] For multi-DCI mTRP per-TRP BFR, the concern is the explicit BFD RS method is slower than beam switch on PDCCH. When the TCI state for PDCCH is switched, the system can not update the BFD RS in time and thus mismatch between BFD RS and TCI state on PDCCH would happen, then false alarm or miss detection on beam failure would happen.  Proposal 2.3.1:  For beam failure detection of TRP-specific BFR in Rel.17, support the following BFD-RS set configuration methods   * ~~Explicit configuration, for both S-DCI and M-DCI~~ * Implicit BFD-RS set configuration for M-DCI   + BFD-RS set k (k= 0, 1) is determined based on TCI states of CORESETs configured with *CORESETPoolIndex* = k. * ~~Implicit BFD-RS set configuration for S-DCI~~   + ~~BFD-RS set k (k= 0, 1) is determined based on TCI states of CORESETs configured with~~ *~~CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI~~* ~~= k.~~   + ~~Introduce a CORESET specific higher-layer parameter~~ *~~CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI~~* ~~when UE is configured with S-DCI, at least for the purpose of BFD-RS configuration.~~ |
| Apple | We can decide sDCI later. For mDCI, we support implicit configuration.  For sDCI, the first issue is whether UE needs to keep BFD/BFR procedure when gNB activates 1 TCI for all TCI codepoint by MAC CE.  [Mod]: My understanding is that PDSCH and PDCCH are two separate blocks. Regardless of the TCI codepoints for PDSCH (e.g. whether they are associated with 1 or 2 TCI states), TCI of different CORESETs can be different. Some CORESETs can be used for PDCCH on TRP1, and the others can be used for PDCCH on TRP2, so BFR is still needed. The agreement in the last meeting doesn’t rule out this case. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| TCL | Support Q1 and Q2. For Q3, we are fine to discuss S-DCI later. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Q1, Q2.  Do not support Q3.  Since only upto 3 CORESETs are configurable for S-DCI, dividing them into 2 with fixed mapping to a TRP is too restrictive. Instead, we can reuse the mapping of Rel-16 MAC-CE based TCI mapping.  For S-DCI, MAC-CE for PDSCH TCI is always received. If two TCI states are activated in one or more codepoints, the second TCI states in the codepoints can be grouped into the second BFD-RS set.  [mod]: add as another alterantive for M-DCI in the table above. Let’s hear some comments. One question for clarification: how is the 1st BFD-RS set generated?  From my personal perspective, SDCI (with M-TRP beam diversity) should be supported even if all TCI codepoints of PDSCH are associated with only 1 TCI state. Also, the beam of PDCCH (allocated by NW) may be different from that of PDSCH, e.g. PDCCH with wider beams for robustness and PDSCH with narrower beam for higher throughput, so assuing the PDSCM TCI as PDCCH TCI may limit the use cases. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Similar to Nokia, we are fine to support explicit configuration for both S-DCI and M-DCI. We are also fine to support implicit BFD-RS set configuration for M-DCI. But we have concerns with introducing a new CORESETPoolIndex for S-DCI. If we assume Rel-16 S-DCI based MTRP schemes, the DCI is received in a single CORESET from one TRP although the PDSCH is transmitted from two TRPs. So how would per-TRP beam failure be detected in this case? Or do companies have the Rel-17 S-DCI based MTRP schemes in mind? As suggested by Apple, we need further discussion on implicit configuaration for S-DCI. Hence, we suggested the following revision:  Proposal 2.3.1:  For beam failure detection of TRP-specific BFR in Rel.17, support the following BFD-RS set configuration methods   * Explicit configuration, for both S-DCI and M-DCI * Implicit BFD-RS set configuration for M-DCI   + BFD-RS set k (k= 0, 1) is determined based on TCI states of CORESETs configured with *CORESETPoolIndex* = k. * ~~Implicit BFD-RS set configuration for S-DCI~~   + ~~BFD-RS set k (k= 0, 1) is determined based on TCI states of CORESETs configured with~~ *~~CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI~~* ~~= k.~~   + ~~Introduce a CORESET specific higher-layer parameter~~ *~~CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI~~* ~~when UE is configured with S-DCI, at least for the purpose of BFD-RS configuration.~~ |
| Intel | To Ericsson, our understanding of S-DCI operation is that PDCCH can be transmitted from either TRP-1 or TRP-2, therefore the need for TRP specific BFR is exactly the same as M-DCI (is this not common understanding?). We dont support explicit configuration because it is not efficient due to the issue of RRC reconfiguration as mentioned by OPPO. In the spirit of comprimize we support the FL proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support the FL proposal. Note that for S-DCI, the CORESET pooling is not needed only for implicit BFD-RS determination, but also for applying new beam to which CORESET(s) after NW response. |
| Convida Wireless | Support Q1 and Q2, which were discussed in several meetings. For Q3, more discussion is needed. |
| Qualcomm | Support FL’s latest proposal. The use case of per TRP BFR for sDCI is as valid as mDCI to our understanding. |
| AT&T | Support FL’s proposal. Share the same understanding of Intel and Qualcomm on the use case for S-DCI per TRP BFR. |
| LGE | Support the FL proposal in principle. We’d like to propose to revise the RRC name from ***CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI***to ***CORESETPoolIndexforBFD*** since it could be misread that two CORESET pools are allowed for S-DCI MTRP. |
| Mod | Based on input from LGE, revised proposal to leave the higher-layer IE naming FFS |
| ETRI | Support the FL’s proposal except for the third bullet (implicit BFD-RS set configuration for S-DCI) that may need further discussion. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with FL’s latest proposal. Suggest the following reordering and rewording.   * Implicit BFD-RS set configuration for S-DCI   + Introduce a CORESET specific higher-layer parameter “xyz” when UE is configured with S-DCI, at least for the purpose of BFD-RS configuration.     - FFS: exact name “xyz” (e.g. *CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI* or *CORESETPoolIndexforBFD*, or leave it to RAN2)   + BFD-RS set k (k= 0, 1) is determined based on TCI states of CORESETs configured with *~~CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI~~* the above CORESET specific higher-layer parameter “xyz” = k.   [mod]: Thanks. Accepted. |
| Futurewei | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Apple | We can only support implicit BFD RS for mDCI part. For sDCI, more discussion is needed.  Response to FL’s comments: Our understanding is that for sTRP mode, UE should not be required to keep this TRP-specific BFD. Otherwise, this turns to be a partial BFR for sTRP. It is true that sDCI based mTRP and sTRP is mainly for PDSCH. That’s why we mentioned sDCI based mTRP should not be supported in last meeting. But now that it has been agreed, we worry there would be some abuse of TRP-specific BFR for sTRP mode. |
| DOCOMO | We can try to agree the first two bullets at least, and make the third bullet FFS. |
| Xiaomi | We support the latest FL proposal. And we are also fine that more discussion on the implicit BFD-RS set configuration for S-DCI . |
| vivo | We share a similar view with DOCOMO. |
| Mod | Added FFS to 3rd bullet. |
| Qualcomm | For the progress, we are fine with the FFS. |
| MediaTek | Okay to the FL porpsal.  However, we still think implicit BFD RS should be unified for both MDCI and SDCI, as agreed in the prevuous meeting.  Agreement   * Support S-DCI and M-DCI in TRP-specific BFR in Rel.17   + S-DCI is low priority, M-DCI is high priority   + Unified design for S-DCI and M-DCI should not be precluded due to the prioritization |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the first two bullet.  For the third part, please keep alt 2.  For beam failure detection of TRP-specific BFR in Rel.17, support the following BFD-RS set configuration methods  For beam failure detection of TRP-specific BFR in Rel.17, support the following BFD-RS set configuration methods   * Explicit configuration, for both S-DCI and M-DCI * Implicit BFD-RS set configuration for M-DCI   + BFD-RS set k (k= 0, 1) is determined based on TCI states of CORESETs configured with *CORESETPoolIndex* = k. * FFS: Implicit BFD-RS set configuration for S-DCI, down-selection between   + Alt-1: Introduce a CORESET specific higher-layer parameter “xyz” when UE is configured with S-DCI, at least for the purpose of implicit BFD-RS configuration.     - FFS: exact name “xyz” (e.g. *CORESETPoolIndex-sDCI* or *CORESETPoolIndexforBFD*, or leave it to RAN2)     - BFD-RS set k (k= 0, 1) is determined based on TCI states of CORESETs configured with the above CORESET specific higher-layer parameter “xyz” = k   + Alt 2: BFD-RS set k = 0 and 1 are determined based on the first and the second TCI state of the TCI codepoint in the TCI-activation MAC-CE for PDSCH , respectively. |
| Mod | Revised proposal based on Nokia/NSB suggestion. |
| Xiaomi | As for the added Alt 2, we want to clarify that which TCI codepoint will be used? Or it means that the first TCI state of all codepoints will be included in BFD-RS set k=0, and the second TCI state of all codepoints will be included in BFD-RS set k=1? How to handle it if the number of RS is larger than UE capability? |

For explicit BFD-RS (if supported), two companies propose to introduce MAC-CE for dynamically updating explicit BFD-RS sets. The motivation is to allow faster update of RRC configured BFD-RS set.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.4  BFD-RS | Introduce MAC-CE for updating explicit BFD-RS set   * NOTE: This applies if implicit BFD-RS configuration is not supported in Rel.17 | * Support: ZTE, CATT (if implicit BFD-RS is not supported), DOCOMO, NEC |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | Do not support. This is to implement the functionality of implicit configuration. We think it is a redundant approach |
| **Lenovo&MotM** | Same view with Apple, don’t support. |
| LGE | Agree with Apple and Lenovo/MotM. |
| Qualcomm | No need. gNB can choose implicit way |
| DOCOMO | We can further study it. It is useful in case of explicit BFD-RS configuration. |
| Xiaomi | No need |
| ZTE | Support, considering the case that there is no implicit manner for S-DCI. |
| OPPO | Do not support. In our view, only implicit method is fine. Using MAC CE to update explicit BFD-RS set introduce redundant approach. |
| NEC | Support MAC CE based updating BFD RS set. |
| Sony | Same view as Apple that it seems redundant function. |
| Nokia/NSB | Share view with Apple. The functionality is required for implicit configuration.  [mod]: added a restriction. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | This may have some merit if implicit BFD-RS set configuration is not supported for S-DCI. We support to study this further. |
| Intel | Depends on outcome of 2.3.1 |
| MedaiTek | Okay to study |
| Convida Wireless | We are open for further discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Open to study this. Suggest the following generic proposal:  Study fast update of explicitly configured BFD-RS or QCL of explicitly configured BFD-RS.   * E.g., introduce MAC-CE for updating explicitly configured BFD-RS set * Note: Other solutions are not precluded |
| Futurewei | We are ok to study this. |

For a CORESET with two activated TCI states (e.g. Rel.17 PDCCH enhancement), at least one company proposes to include both TCI states in implicit BFD-RS determination. An offline proposal was discussed in the last meeting but no conclusion was reached.

**Offline Proposal (RAN1#104b-e):**

* For a CORESET associated with more than 1 activated TCI states
  + For implicit BFD-RS set determination, BFD-RS set associated with this CORESET is based on QCL-typeD source RS of all activated TCI states
  + FFS: BLER determination based on two TCI states, e.g. whether separate BLER are independently derived from each TCI state, or a common BLER is derived from all TCI states, or leave to RAN4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.5  BFD-RS | Implicit BFD-RS generation, when a CORESET is configured with two TCI states   * Alt1: based on both TCI states | * Support: Ericsson, NEC * Postpone: Convida |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | As announced by Chair in last meeting, it is to be handled in SFN AI |
| APT/FGI | We have the same understanding as Apple |
| LGE | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| DOCOMO | Agree with Apple to handle it in SFN AI. |
| Xiaomi | Agree to discuss in SFN AI |
| ZTE | We are fine with Apple’s suggestion. |
| OPPO | Same understanding as Apple |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Sony | Discussed either in AI 8.1.2.4 (HST-SFN) or here is fine to us. Given the number of remaining meetings and the progress in AI 8.1.2.3, we slightly prefer to discuss this issue here (in AI 8.1.2.3) to avoid deplicate the BFR work. |
| Nokia/NSB | There are two cases.  Two TCI states are activated 🡺 SFN PDCCH and which is handled under AI 8.1.2.4  Two TCI states are configured 🡺 TDM/FDM PDCCH, and this can be discussed later anywhere in AI 8.1.2.3 or AI8.1.2.4. But, we prefer to keep this to under AI8.1.2.4. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Ok to handle in HST SFN AI |
| Intel | Same understanding as Apple |
|  |  |

* + 1. NBI-RS set

It has been agreed there is a 1-to-1 association between BFD-RS set and NBI-RS set. The following proposal has been discussed in RAN1#104b-e.

Offline Proposal (RAN1#104-e)

* On the 1-to-1 association between BFD-RS sets and NBI-RS sets, support the following association
  + Alt-1: First BFD-RS set associated with first NBI-RS set, and second to the second (NOTE: how to capture this can be up to RAN2)

Company views in this meeting on their association are summarized below. The FL proposes to continue using the offline proposal in RAN1#104b-e as a starting point for discussion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.6  NBI-RS | Association between BFD-RS set k and NBI-RS set j   * Alt-1: 1-to-1, fixed in spec * Alt-2: 1-to-1, configurable * Alt-3: 1-to-1, leave it to RAN2 | Alt-1 (20): CMCC, Apple, ETRI, CATT, Intel, Huawei, HiSilicon, Lenovo/MotM, LGE, DOCOMO, Fujitsu,TCL Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Convida, NEC, Xiaomi, Futurewei  Alt-2 (3) : Qualcomm, , ZTE, vivo  Alt-3 (4) : OPPO, Ericsson (2nd choice), LGE (2nd choice), Qualcomm |

Offline Proposal 2.4.1

* On the 1-to-1 association between BFD-RS sets and NBI-RS sets, down-select from the following association
  + Alt-1: First BFD-RS set associated with first NBI-RS set, and second to the second (NOTE: how to capture this can be up to RAN2)
  + Alt-2: Configurable association between the first/second BFD-RS sets and the first/second NBI-RS sets
  + Alt-3: leave it to RAN2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| **Lenovo&MotM** | Support Alt 1. |
| LGE | Either alt-1 or alt-3 is fine for us. |
| Qualcomm | Support Alt2 for flexibility |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Slightly prefer Alt-1. Can accept Alt-2. |
| Vivo | Support Alt-2 if two NBI-RS sets are configured. |
| DOCOMO | Support Alt.1. Such flexibility of Alt.2 is unnecessary. |
| Mod | Reformulated the offline proposal to include alt-2 and alt-3. More discussion is needed. |
| Xiaomi | Support Alt 1 |
| ZTE | Support Alt-2, but we can live with Alt-3. |
| Fujitsu | Support Alt-1. |
| OPPO | Support Alt-3. It is purely a control ehavior design issue and it shall be handled by RAN2. |
| CATT | Support Alt-1. Don’t see the need of Alt-2. |
| NEC | Prefer Alt-1. |
| TCL | Support Alt-1. |
| CMCC | Support Alt-1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Alt-1. Signaling is upto RAN2. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support Alt-1, but also ok with Alt-3. |
| Intel | Support Alt-1 |
| Convida Wireless | Support Alt-1. |
| Qualcomm | We are also fine for Alt3 to save RAN1 time |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support Alt-1. |
| ETRI | Support Alt-1. |
| Futurewei | Support Alt-1. |

It was discussed in the previous meeting whether two NBI-RS resource sets should be disjoint, but no concusion was reached. FL proposes to clarify this issue.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.7  NBI-RS | NBI RS sets are disjoint | Support: Convida  Concern: |

Offline Proposal 2.4.2:

* When two NBI-RS sets are configured , set k and j are disjoint (k, j = 0, 1)
  + This applies to at least SCell. FFS for SpCell (e.g. whether NBI-RS set associated with TRP associated with CORESET #0 may include NBI-RS associated with the other TRP)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | Do not support the proposal. Both sets can have common beams from a thrid TRP. |
| APT/FGI | Do not support. It seems network impletation. |
| LGE | We think the proposal is not needed. It is more related with gNB implementation. |
| Qualcomm | No need. It should be NW implementation |
| MediaTek | No need. Up to NW implementation. |
| Vivo | We have some concern on the offline proposal. If two NBI-RS set are configured, the RS resources in each set may not only from one TRP, but from multiple TRPs. In such way, UE can select any other TRPs in a goog radio link freely to maintain MTRP operation mode as much as possible. Sine some RS resources in two NBI-RS sets may be from the same TRP other than the two working TRPs, the two NBI-RS set can not be disjoint. |
| DOCOMO | No need. Up to NW implementation. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to leave it as NW implementation. |
| ZTE | No need. |
| OPPO | Not needed. It can be up to gNB implementation. |
| NEC | Not needed. |
| CMCC | Not needed. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not support. This is up to NW implementation. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Leave to NW implementation |
| Intel | This can be left to implementation |
| ETRI | Not support. |
| Futurewei | This can be up to NW implementation. |

It was agreed in previous meetings that “For M-TRP BFR, support 1-to-1 association between each BFD-RS set and an NBI-RS set”, therefore the number of BFD-RS sets and NBI-RS sets can be the same in one CC. One company proposes to allow configuration of NBI-RS to be optional, e.g. only BFD-RS sets are configured in a CC.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.8  NBI-RS | NBI-RS configuration is optional   * If not configured, UE supports triggering of A-CSI to obtain new beams | Support: vivo  Concern: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | Do not support. We can use similar approach in SCell BFR like gNB should configure at least 1 CBD RS. This does not increase overhead, since cross-CC CBD RS is allowed, and gNB can simply configure the SSBs if overhead is a problem. |
| Lenovo&MotM | Same view with Apple, don’t support. |
| Qualcomm | No need. The same rule for SCell BFR should be applied. |
| MediaTek | Fail to see the need |
| **vivo** | Support. We don’t think the configuration of TRP-specific NBI-RS set(s) for TRP-specific BFR is a necessity, and it can be replaced by aperidic beam report, especially for multi-DCI-based MTRP. And compared with periodic measurement of NBI-RS resources configured in the two sets, aperiodic beam measurement consumes less resource, which is beneficial for the network to schedule within the limited UE capability flexibly. |
| DOCOMO | No need. |
| Xiaomi | No need |
| ZTE | No need |
| Fujitsu | No need |
| OPPO | Not needed |
| NEC | Not needed. |
| TCL | Not needed |
| Nokia/NSB | Not needed |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Unclear how this would work: how can the UE initiate an A-CSI transmission? |
| Intel | Not needed |
| ETRI | Not needed. |
| Futurewei | Not needed. |
| Vivo | Rel-15 PCell BFR allows optional candidate beam RS configuration. Does not see why this is prohibited in Rel-17.  @E///, the A-CSI is triggered by the network. There is no specification impact for this part. |

* + 1. PUCCH-SR

For the case where two PUCCH-SR resources are configured, it was agreed in the previous meeting to discuss UE ehavior in terms of PUCCH-SR resource selection for LRR transmission, and down-select from the following three alternatives in RAN1#105-e. One company suggests this issue should be discussed together with the association between PUCCH-SR and SR configuration.

***Agreement (RAN1#104b-e)***

*For the TRP specific BFR, for a UE configured with two PUCCH-SR resources in a cell group when beam failure is detected in a one or more CCs in one or more of BFD-RS sets configured in one or more of CCs,*

* *Down select one of the following PUCCH-SR resource selection rules when SR is triggered (or their combinations) for the study, without precluding other alternatives, in RAN1#105-e*
  + *Alt-1: PUCCH-SR resource associated with other/non-failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS*
  + *Alt-2: PUCCH-SR resource associated with failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS*
  + *Alt-3: Leave it up to UE implementation*
* *Note: PUCCH-SR resource is PUCCH resource carrying SR*
* *FFS: Whether two PUCCH-SR resources are under the same or different SR resource configuration or SR configuration (eventual decision may or may not happen in RAN1)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.9  PUCCH-SR resource | Whether/how to associate PUCCH-SR resource and SR configuration   * Alt-1: 2 PUCCH-SR are associated to 1 SR configuration * Alt-2: 2 PUCCH-SR are associated to 2 separate SR configuration * Alt-3: leave to RAN2 (no RAN1 impact) | Alt-1 (14): Qualcomm, DOCOMO, CATT, APT/FGI, Sony, CMCC, Intel, Convida, ETRI, Apple, LGE, Fujitsu,InterDigital  Alt-2 (7): OPPO, ZTE, Apple, LGE, vivo, Fujitsu, InterDigital  Alt-3 (10): APT/FGI, Huawei, HiSilicon,TCL, Nokia/NSB, Convida (2nd choice), Ericsson, Futurewei |
| 2.10  PUCCH-SR resource | PUCCH-SR resource selection rule for LRR feedback   * Alt-1: PUCCH-SR resource associated with other/non-failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS * Alt-2: PUCCH-SR resource associated with failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS * Alt-3: Leave it up to UE implementation * Alt-4: higher layer configure the association between SR configuration and per-TRP beam failure according to the current RAN2 specification on SR configuration. * FFS: discuss separately for cases where TRP-specific is or is not configured in the cell where the PUCCH-SR resources are configured. | Alt-1 (12): Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, Lenovo/MotM (1 TRP fail, or when 1 SR configuration has 2 PUCCH-SR), Sony, NEC (when SpCell has two TRP), Samsung (if PUCCH-SR has 1 filter), Ericsson, ETRI, DOCOMO, Futurewei  Alt-2 (20): InterDigital, vivo, Lenovo/MotM (1 TRP fail), ZTE, Qualcomm, Fujitsu,, Apple (if each PUCCH-SR belongs to one SR configuration), Nokia/NSB, ASUSTek, Xiaomi, CATT, MTK, InterDigital, Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd choice), MediaTek, vivo, Ericsson  Alt-3 (13): Lenovo/MotM (when neither/both TRP fail in the PUCCH-Cell, or when 2 SR configurations are configured each with 1 PUCCH-SR), Spreadtrum, Apple (if both PUCCH-SR belongs to one SR configuration), NEC (when SpCell is configured with one TRP), Samsung (if PUCCH-SR has two filters), LGE, APT/FGI, Convida, Intel,TCL, CATT  Alt-4: OPPO |

**Observations:**

* Issue 1: Whether two PUCCH-SR resources are under the same or different SR resource configuration or SR configuration (eventual decision may or may not happen in RAN1)
* Alt-1: 2 PUCCH-SR are associated to 1 SR configuration
  + Supporte (14): Qualcomm, DOCOMO, CATT, APT/FGI, Sony, CMCC, Intel, Convida, ETRI, Apple, LGE, Fujitsu,InterDigital,
* Alt-2: 2 PUCCH-SR are associated to 2 separate SR configuration
  + Supporte (7): OPPO, ZTE, Apple, LGE, vivo, Fujitsu, InterDigital
* Alt-3: leave to RAN2 (no RAN1 impact)
  + Supporte (10): APT/FGI, Huawei, HiSilicon,TCL, Nokia/NSB, Convida (2nd choice), Ericsson, Futurewei
* Issue 2: PUCCH-SR resource selection rule (if needed)
* Alt-1: PUCCH-SR resource associated with other/non-failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS
  + Support (12): Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, Lenovo/MotM, Sony, NEC, Samsung, Ericsson, ETRI, DOCOMO, Futurewei
* Alt-2: PUCCH-SR resource associated with failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS
  + Support (20): InterDigital, vivo, Lenovo/MotM, ZTE, Qualcomm, Fujitsu,, Apple, Nokia/NSB, ASUSTek, Xiaomi, CATT, MTK, InterDigital, Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd choice), MediaTek, vivo, Ericsson,
* Alt-3: Leave it up to UE implementation
  + Support (13): Lenovo/MotM, Spreadtrum, Apple, NEC, Samsung, LGE, APT/FGI, Convida, Intel,TCL, CATT

Given that a decision is due in RAN1#105-e, the following offline proposals are suggested:

Offline proposal 2.5.1:

For TRP-specific BFR, on the association of 2 PUCCH-SR resources to SR configuration(s) (when 2 PUCCH-SR resources are configured), adopt alt-1:

* 2 PUCCH-SR are associated to 1 SR configuration

Offline conclusion 2.5.2:

On PUCCH-SR resource selection rule when SR is triggered and 2 PUCCH-SR resources are configured, there is no consensus to adopt alt-1 or alt-2. PUCCH-SR resource selection is up to UE implementation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | For 2.9, we are fine with either Alt1 or Alt2. If we go with Alt3, it would be difficult to handle 2.10, and this is like RAN1 agrees something but do not know the usage and lets RAN2 decide. It may be possible that RAN2 just reverts what RAN1 agreed. |
| **Lenovo&MotM** | For 2.10, the PUCCH-SR resource selection should consider whether the cell where the PUCCH-SR resources configured to be transmitted is configured with TRP-specific BFR.If yes, then Alt 1 or Alt 2 is selected. If not, then Alt 3 is selected. It should be discussed separately.Therefore, we propose that to refine the proposal 2.10 as follows:  PUCCH-SR resource selection rule for LRR feedback when TRP-specific is configured in the cell where the PUCCH-SR resources are configured to be transmitted.   * Alt-1: PUCCH-SR resource associated with other/non-failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS * Alt-2: PUCCH-SR resource associated with failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS * Alt-3: Leave it up to UE implementation   PUCCH-SR resource selection rule for LRR feedback when TRP-specific is not configured in the cell where the PUCCH-SR resources are configured to be transmitted.   * Alt-1: PUCCH-SR resource associated with other/non-failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS * Alt-2: PUCCH-SR resource associated with failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS * Alt-3: Leave it up to UE implementation   [mod]: added an FFS bullet. |
| APT/FGI | Regarding 2.10, we support Alt. 3.  One reason is UE ehavior would be unclear when failed TRP(s) is different across serving cells. Under such case, we may need other rules or a default PUCCH-SR. In our views, the benefit of Alt.1/2 exists when there is only one failed TRP.  Another one is that UE does not always need a PUCCH-SR to acquire UL grant or convey information of failed TRP(s). UE can transmit a TRP-BFR MAC-CE whenever there is available PUSCH resource. Even we introduce a selection rule, we may not usually experience so-called benefit. |
| LGE | We are fine with either Alt-1 or Alt-2 for 2.9. |
| Qualcomm | For 2.9, support Alt1 to save SR ID  For 2.10, support Alt2. Alt1 may not work for more than 2 TRPs which may happen in future release |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For 2.9, support Alt-3.  For 2.10, slightly prefer Alt-1. Can aceept Alt-2. |
| MediaTek | On 2.10, Supprot Alt2. Much straitforword. We would like to clarify is does 2.10 only focus on one CC?  [mod]: This is based on the formulation from the last meeting. At least this should apply to one CC. Other cases (e.g. multi-CC) may require further discussion. |
| Vivo | For issue 2.9, we prefer Alt-2 to configure 2 PUCCH-SR resources to 2 separate SR configuration, each SR configuration assocating with a SR resource configuration and a TRP. In such way, the high level parameters, like *sr-TransMax* and *periodictyAndOffset* can be configured independently, and the MAC layer operation, like *sr-ProhibitTimer* and *SR\_COUNTER* can be excuted independently, which is more flexible and in line with TRP-specific procedure.  For issue 2.10, we think both Alt-1 and Alt-2 are OK. |
| DOCOMO | For 2.9, support Alt1.  First, SR ID can be saved since the number of SR configurations is limited and up to 8 per cell group. Second, the purpose of SR for BFR is to ask for UL grant, hence, there is no need to configure two SR configurations for the same purpose. Third, in case of 2 SRs, when a SR is triggered for a TRP, the corresponding PUCCH-SR resource is transmitted. There is no need to further discuss the PUCCH-SR resource selection rule in RAN1. But RAN2 needs to further consider the relationship and procedures of the two SR configurations, which is not preferred considering limited TU in RAN2. So that it is better for RAN1 to finish the per-TRP BFR design.  For 2.10, support Alt.1. It is related to the logic to configure the association between PUCCH and TRP, which is not a pure RAN2 issue.  The SR for BFR can be shared with other logic channel based on RAN2 spec. So it means that the SR can be used in normal operation, e.g., to be used to ask for UL grant for the associated TRP when the TRP is in normal operation and does not fail. In this case, when the TRP fails, the SR for BFR, which is shared with other logic channel, cannot work anymore. Only the SR associated with the other non-failed TRP can work. We think this should be the logic of association configuration between SR and TRP. |
| Xiaomi | For 2.10, support Alt 2 |
| ZTE | For 2.10, Alt2 is supported. |
| Fujitsu | For 2.9, we are fine with either Alt-1 or Alt-2.  For 2.10, we support Alt-2. |
| OPPO | For 2.10: suggest to add one more Alt:  Alt-4: higher layer configure the association between SR configuration and per-TRP beam failure according to the current RAN2 specification on SR configuration.  [mod]: Alt-4 in my understanding covers both issue 2.9 and 2.10. Although I prefer to treat 2.9 and 2.10 separately (to avoid too many combinations), it’s OK to have alt-4 for discussion. Technically speaking, for issue 2.10, the agreement in RAN1#105 is to down-select only among alt-1, 2, and 3. |
| NEC | For 2.10, we share similar view as Lenovo, and we are fine with the proposal with added FFS. |
| TCL | For 2.9, we support Alt-3.  For 2.10, we support Alt3. UE could select one out of the two PUCCH-SRs for transmission. |
| Sony | For 2.9, support Alt-1.  For 2.10, support Alt-1. |
| CMCC | For 2.9, we support Alt-1.  For 2.10, we think Alt-1 and Alt-2 can be the same if the selected PUCCH-SR resource could be transmitted to the non-failed TRP. |
| Nokia/NSB | For 2-9, this should be up to RAN2.  For 2-10, Support Alt 2 (or alt 1), What we need is to distinguish failed TRP by PUCCH-SR resource.  Naturally, when two PUCCH-SR resources are configured, and each is associated a TRP,  if a TRP is failed, PUCCH-SR should be sent to the other TRP. |
| InterDigital | For 2.9, we are fine with either Alt1 or Alt2.  For 2.10, support Alt2 so the per-TRP BFR procedure doesn’t rely on another TRP to complete. |
| Ericsson | For 2.9, we prefer Alt-3.  For 2.10, in Alts 1 and 2, we should first clarify the ‘association details FFS’ part. Is it the common understanding that UE can associate a PUCCH-SR resource with a spatial relation given by an RS in the nonfailed/failed BFD-RS set? We think either Alt 1 or Alt 2 could work.  [mod]: My understanding of the “association” refers to the association between the index of PUCCH-SR resource and the index of failed/non-failed BFD-RS set, not about the spatial relation of PUCCH-SR. Maybe other companies can clarify too. |
| Intel | for 2.9, support Alt-1, we can inform RAN2 is any concerns (agree with Apple that we can decide here)  for 2.10, Alt-3 is sufficient. Its not clear what is the benefit of additional specifications. Since this is multi-CC case, if beam failure occurs in a CC with 1 BFD/NBI-RS set, what is the UE behavior given by Alt-1 ? |
| Convida Wireless | For 2.9, but prefer Alt-1, but can also accept Alt-3.  For 2.10, support Alt-3. |
| ETRI | For 2.9, we prefer to support Alt-1.  For 2.10, support Alt-1. |
| Futurewei | For 2.9, support Alt-3.  For 2.10, support Alt-1. |
| DOCOMO | For 2.9, Alt-2 is not acceptable to us. And we believe it is important to make a decision in RAN1 on this issue.  In addition, please also note that if we go with Alt-2 of 2.9 (2 SRs for BFR), there is no need to discuss Issue 2.10. Because, once a SR is triggered, corresponding PUCCH-SR resource should be transmitted. There is no need of PUCCH-SR selection rule. In this case, we only need SR triggering rule, which becomes a RAN2 job. |
| Vivo | For 2.9, some confusing issues should be clarified on Alt-1 as following:   * Only one PUCCH resource and its *periodictyAndOffset* are configured per SR configuration in the current spec. If two PUCCH resources per SR Configuration is allowed, whether to configure a *periodictyAndOffset* for each PUCCH resource or reuse Rel-16 so that both PUCCH resources share a *periodictyAndOffset*? * The high layer parameter *sr-TransMax*, and MAC layer operations, like *sr-ProhibitTimer* and *SR\_COUNTER* is executed per SR configuration in Rel-16. If Alt-1 is adapted, how to count the times of SR transmitted by two PUCCH resources, especially for the case that both TRPs fail asynchronously in SCell? |
| Mod | Added proposal 2.5.1 and 2.5.2. Let’s see if the majority views are agreeable. |
| Qualcomm | Support both 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 |
| MediaTek | Support both 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 |
| ZTE3 | Not our preference, but we can live with proposal 2.5.1 and proposal 2.5.2. |
| Lenovo&MotM | We don’t support 2.5.2. Because the PUCCH-SR resources can only be configured in SpCell or PUCCH-SCell, while the failed TRP may be in a cell which is not the cell configured with PUCCH-SR resource for TRP-specific BFR. If a TRP is failed in one cell, it doesn’t mean it is failed in the cell where PUCCH-SR resources are configured to be transmitted. Therefore, we propose to discuss the issue 2 (PUCCH-SR resource selection) according to whether the cell configured with PUCCH-SR resources is configured with TRP-specific BFR. |
| DOCOMO | Support 2.5.1.  Do not support 2.5.2.  We’d like to emphasize the logic to configure the association between a PUCCH resource and a TRP.  Based on current RAN2 spec., the SR for BFR can be shared with other logic channel. So it means that the SR can be used in normal operation, e.g., to be used to ask for UL grant for the associated TRP when the TRP is in normal operation and does not fail. In this case, when the TRP fails, the SR for BFR, which is shared with other logic channel, cannot work anymore. Only the SR associated with the other non-failed TRP can work. We think this should be the logic of association configuration between SR and TRP.  Regarding QC’s comment ‘Alt1 may not work for more than 2 TRPs which may happen in future release’, We think it is not valid. If in the future release, there are 4 TRPs, when TRP#1 fails, UE should be able to select one PUCCH-SR resource associated with non-failed TRP#2, #3, or #4 for transmission. It is not good if NW configures a beam from one TRP (e.g., TRP#2) for SR for TRP#1. Because in this case, if TRP#1 fails, UE can only transmit a PUCCH-SR to TRP#2. What if TRP#2 also fails? Hence, based on QC’s comment, if we should consider more than 2 TRPs in future release, we should support Alt.1 instead of Alt.2. |
| LGE | We can see the majority view, and thanks for the FL proposal. Re Offline proposal 2.5.2, we can understand the motivation for UE to send BFRQ PUCCH toward non-failed TRP. HOWEVER, we think the proposal is insufficient.  First, as Lenovo&MotM mentioned, TRP failure status of SCell and of SpCell can be different, wherein PUCCH-SR would be transmitted in the SpCell. So, non-failed TRP index in the SCell could be failed in SpCell in some cases. Then, the PUCCH selection can be meaningless. It means that BF status of SpCell should be prioritized for PUCCH selection.  Second, as we mentioned in previous meeting, TRP-specific BF can happen across multiple CCs simultaneously, and TRP failure status can be different across multiple CCs. For example, TRP #1 is failed in SCell #1 and TRP #2 faild in SCell #2, then which PUCCH should be selected? This also should be discussed and clarified. |
| Mod | It seems 2.5.2 is not stable yet.  For LGE and Lenovo’s comment, one possibility is to first discuss the case of a single CC in a cell-group. Then for the case of more than one CC per cell-group, more discussion can be had. But I didn’t change the proposal accordingly given the deadlock between alt-1 and 2. |
| vivo | Do not support 2.5.1. If two PUCCH resources are configured under the same SR configuration, could you please clarify two questions in our last comments? Thanks. |
| Convida Wireless | For 2.5.2: Suggest to conclude that there is no consensus and that it is left to UE implementation. |
| Mod | Companies are encouraged to reach concensus during the remainder of between alt-1 or alt-2.  If not possible, what Patrick suggested will be proposed as a conclusion. |
| Xiaomi | For proposal 2.5.2, can we update it as follows:  On PUCCH-SR resource selection rule when SR is triggered and 2 PUCCH-SR resources are configured, adopt alt 2 if all failed BFD RS sets are associated with a same PUCCH SR resource, else PUCCH-SR resource selection is up to UE implementation.  [Mod]: If the PUCCH-SR resource is the same, technically there is only one PUCCH-SR configured, and nothing is needed for selection rule. I think this change is not necessary. |
| Sony | Support Proposal 2.5.1.  Regarding Conclusion 2.5.2, though we were proponent of Alt-1, for progress wise, we are fine to leave it to UE implementation. |
| vivo | For proposal 2.5.2, consider the case of both TRPs fail is complicated to discuss, which may correspond to different operations on SpCell and SCell separately and need to further study, so we add a condition and revise the proposal as follows:  Offline conclusion 2.5.2:  On the PUCCH-SR resource selection rule when SR is triggered and 2 PUCCH-SR resources are configured, and at most one BFD RS set fails per CC, adopt alt 2 if all failed BFD RS sets cross CCs are associated with the same PUCCH SR resource, else PUCCH-SR resource selection is up to UE implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 2.5.1: We think the questions from vivo are valid, and we are not sure whether RAN1 has full expertise to answer these questions. We still slightly prefer to leave this to RAN2. |
| CMCC | Conclusion 2.5.2:  For progress, we can support either FL’s proposal or vivo’s update. But for vivo’s update, we think the following FFS is needed:  FFS: association details between PUCCH-SR resource and BFD-RS set. |
| Mod | @Propoent of alt-1 for proposal 2.5.2: Please check if vivo’s revision is acceptable. |
| Ericsson | Ok with proposal 2.5.1, but also ok to leave it to RAN2.  ok with offline conclusion 2.5.2 from the FL. |

In Rel.16, a PUCCH resource can have 1 activated UL spatial relation info at any time. With Rel.17 PUCCH enhancement for M-TRP, it is possible that a PUCCH resource can have more than 1 activated UL spatial relation info. Several companies discussed whether Rel.17 PUCCH-SR for M-TRP BFR should be allowed to have more than 1 activated UL spatial relation info, and if so, transmission scheme. Companies are invited to share more views below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.11  PUCCH-SR resource | Whether PUCCH-SR resource can have 1 or 2 activated spatial filters  Alt-1: Only 1  Alt-2: up to 2; diversity (e.g. AI 8.1.2.1) when 2 spaial filters are activated  Alt-3: up to 2; filter selection when 2 spatial filters are activated  Alt-4: up to 2; transmission method undefined when 2 spatial filters are activated | Alt-1 (5): Spreadtrum, Intel, Nokia/NSB (at least for Rel-16 PUCCH), CATTAlt-2 (7): vivo, APT/FGI, DOCOMO, CMCC, InterDigital, Convida,  Alt-3 (6): Qualcomm (select filter associated with failed TRP), Xiaomi, ZTE, Sony, Nokia/NSB (if rel.16 PUCCH), ERI  Alt-4 (2): Apple, LGE, |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support Alt-1. |
| Qualcomm | Support Alt3 to minimize resource usage. |
| Vivo | In our view, up to two spatial filters per PUCCH-SR resource are enough. When two PUCCH-SR resources are configured, each one having one spatial filter towards a TRP, one of them should be selected to transmit based the above selection rules. And when only one PUCCH-SR resource, configuring two spatial realtions is aimed for reliability of PUCCH. |
| DOCOMO | Previously we agreed to support up to 2 PUCCH-SR resources (one PUCCH-SR per TRP) for BFR, and we believe the intension is to exclude Alt.3.  In this case, whether each PUCCH-SR resource can have 1 or 2 activated spatial filters is up to gNB and may be configured. To keep the logic of ‘one PUCCH-SR per TRP’, the two spatial filters/beams should be for repetition purpose and from the same TRP.  Hence, we support Alt.2. |
| Xiaomi | Support Alt 3 |
| ZTE | Fail to understand the meaning of Alt-4. Alt3 is our first preference.  [mod]: Per my understanding of the proposal, whether 1 or 2 spatial filters are activated for PUCCH-SR is up to NW configuration. When 2 spatial filters are configured, it is up to UE how to use these two filters for transmission. For instance the UE may choose to select one spatial filter for Rel.16 type of PUCCH transmission, or use both filters for Rel.17 diversity (AI 8.1.2.1) transmission schemes (if capable). This is transparent to the NW and gNB receiver has to take this into account. |
| OPPO | The issue of PUCCH resource configured with one or two spatial relation info is not related with beam failure recovery.  For BFR, we only send scheduled request in PUCCH resource to ask for uplink grant. No matter if the PUCCH resource is configured with 1 or 2 spatial relation info, or PUCCH resource is configured with repetition or not, the UE just send the SR in the PUCCH.  So we do not think this issue is needed. |
| Sony | Support Alt-3 |
| CMCC | Support Alt-2. |
| Nokia/NSB | At least for Rel-16 PUCCH, single sparial relation information is natural choice.  For Rel-17 M-TRP PUCCH, we can further discuss later. |
| InterDigital | Support Alt-2. PUCCH can be configured with two spatial relation in Rel-17 but only for reliability enhancement as agreed in 8.1.2.1. |
| Intel | Alt-1 should be baseline, additionally we can discuss if Alt-2 is further supported |
| Convida Wireless | Alt-2 is supported in Rel-17 by default, since it has been agreed in AI 8.1.2.1.  Furthermore, Rel-17 BFR will support (subject to UE capability):   1. multi-TRP transmission of a PUCCH resource (w. 2 spatial relations) used as BFR PUCCH-SR 2. multi-TRP transmission of PDCCH that schedules BFRQ-PUSCH 3. multi-TRP transmission of BFRQ-PUSCH 4. multi-TRP transmission of BFRR PDCCH   There is no need to discuss the 4 issues above in this sub-agenda item, unless there is a strong technical reason preclude any of these multi-TRP enhancements if they specifically carry a BFR-related information |
| Mod | It seems Alt-1 at least can be accepted as one operable alternative. Whether Alt.2/3 is further supported can be further discussed.  Suggest to continue discussion. |
| ETRI | We actually prefer to support Alt-3. |
| Apple | To clarify our view is that UE follows whatever gNB configures. This is the way for normal SR. The BFR SR should not be that special. We do not think any enhancement about it is needed. |

Another issue is whether reusing PUCCH-SR for SCell BFR (if configured) for TRP-specific BFR should be supported. Companies are invited to provide their views.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.12  PUCCH-SR resource | Whether to reuse PUCCH-SR of SCell BFR for MTRP BFR   * Alt-1: leave to gNB implementation * Alt-2: Yes * Alt-3: No | Alt-1 (5): Apple, APT/FGI, ZTE, OPPO, Nokia/NSB  Alt-2 (8): CMCC, LGE, MTK, Qualcomm, DOCOMO  Nokia/NSB, Futurewei  Alt-3: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | views |
| Apple | Support Alt1 |
| Lenovo&MotM | Firstly, whether the SR configuration ID of SCell BFR is same to the SR configuration ID of TRP-specific BFR should be further clarified. If there are different, whetheter a same PUCCH-SR can be configured in two SR configurations. In our opinion, it can’t since gNB can’t distinguish the two SR configurations. Therefore, it needs more clarify about this issue. |
| APT/FGI | Support Alt-1 |
| LGE | Support Alt-2. |
| Qualcomm | Support Alt2 to minimize overhead. |
| MediaTek | Support Alt-2. |
| DOCOMO | Support Alt-2. One SR for BFR is sufficient. |
| Mod | Seems views are diverging. |
| ZTE | Alt-1 |
| OPPO | The association between SR configuration and MAC layer logical channel/SCell BFR/per TRP BFR and LBT is up to higher layer configuration. We do not need dicuss this issue. |
| CMCC | Support Alt-2. |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine with Alt-1 and Alt-2. Up to NW to configure (i.e. it should not be restricted by spec) |
| InterDigital | Support Alt-2. |
| Intel | Alt-1 may be fine unless we see some issues for further specifications |
| Convida Wireless | Support Alt-2. |
| ETRI | Support Alt-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Support Alt-2 |
| Futurewei | Support Alt-2. |

* + 1. BFRA MAC-CE content

The following offline proposal was discussed in RAN1#104b-e but was not agreed. There are basically two issues, e.g. whether 1 or 2 MAC-Ces are used for BFRQ reports, and contents of the MAC-CE. The second issue depends on the outcome of the first.

***Offline Proposal (RAN1#104b-e)***

* *A single MAC-CE is used for BFRQ report for all TRPs in all CCs in a cell group*
* *The MAC-CE carries information of failed TRP identifiers, e.g.* 
  + *Alt-1: indices of BFD-RS set where beam failure is detected,*
  + *Alt-2: implicitly through resource index representing identified new beam, if found, else explicitly through BFD-RS set index*
  + *other alternatives are not precluded*
* *For each failed TRP for a CC, BFRQ carries information whether a new candidate beam is found, and resource index representing identified new beam (if found).*

Company views on MAC-CE design/contents in this meeting are summarized below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.13  MAC-CE | Q: One or two MAC-CE for TRP-specific BFR   * Alt-1: one MAC-CE * Alt-2: two MAC-CE * Alt -3: leave it to RAN2 | Alt-1 (20): Lenovo/MotM, CATT, MediaTek, LGE, TCL, Intel, Apple, Spreadtrum, APT/FGI, Huawei, HiSilicon, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, Sony, Nokia/NSB, InterDigital, CMCC, InterDigital, Ericsson, Futurewei  Alt-2: ZTE,  Alt-3: vivo, ZTE |
| 2.14  MAC-CE | Indication of failed TRP in MAC-CE (NOTE: this question may depend on the outcome of 2.13)   * Alt-1: indication of failed BFD-RS set * Alt-2: indication of CORESETPoolIndex * Alt-3: implicit indication through candidate beam index, if found, else explicit indication of BFD-RS set(s) as in Alt-1 | Alt-1 (14): Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, vivo, Nokia/NSB, LGE, Apple,Spreadtrum, MTK, DOCOMO,TCL, InterDigital, CMCC, InterDigital, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Futurewei  Alt-2 (3): OPPO, Sony, ZTE  Alt-3(1): Convida |
| 2.15  MAC-CE | Indication of new beam in MAC-CE   * Alt-1: resource index representing identified new beam (if found) for only 1 failed TRP, irrespective of 1 or 2 TRP failure * Alt-2: resource index representing identified new beam (if found) for each failed TRP | Alt1:  Alt2 (17): Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, DOCOMO, Apple,Spreadtrum, APT/FGI, LGE, Xiaomi, ZTE,TCL, Sony, Nokia/NSB, Interdigital, CMCC, InterDigital, Ericsson, Futurewei |

***Offline Proposal 2.6.1***

* A single MAC-CE is used for BFR report for all TRPs in all CCs [in a cell group]
* The MAC-CE carries information of failed TRP based on one of the following alterntives, to be down selected in RAN1#106-e (August)
  + Alt-1: indication of BFD-RS set(s) where beam failure is detected
  + Alt-2: indication of CORESETPoolIndex
  + Alt-3: implicitly through identifier of RS associated with identified new beam, if found, else explicitly through BFD-RS set index
* For each failed TRP for a CC, BFR MAC-CE carries information whether a new beam is identified, and an identifier of RS associated with idenfitied new beam
  + ~~FFS: format of identifier of new candidate beam, to be down-selecte in RAN1#106-e~~
    - ~~Alt-1: resource index representing identified new beam (if found).~~
    - ~~Alt-2: candidate beam index~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | Our view is provided. |
| Lenovo&MotM | For 2.13, Alt-1.  For 2.14, Alt-1,  For 2.15, Alt-2. |
| LGE | Our view is added. |
| Qualcomm | For 2.13: support Alt1  For 2.14: support Alt1  For 2.15: support Alt2 |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | For 2.13, support Alt-1.  For 2.14, support Alt-1.  For 2.15, support Alt-2. We suggested some rephrasing to avoid “beam index” and align with current spec language |
| MediaTek | For 2.13, support Alt-1.  For 2.14, support Alt-1. |
| Vivo | For issue 2.13, we prefer only one BFR MAC CE for TRP-specific BFR and specific design can be left to RAN2.  For issue 2.14, considering the unified design for sDCI and mDCI scenes, we think Alt-1 is better. |
| Samsung | For 2.14, support Alt. 1 |
| DOCOMO | For 2.13, Alt-1.  For 2.14, Alt-1. |
| Mod | Added offline proposal based on views received so far. Please continue discussion. |
| Xiaomi | Support the offline proposal |
| ZTE | We can not support the offline proposal. The separate MAC-CE is beneficial for signaling design and can be left to RAN2. Meanwhile, what’s the meaning of Alt1 in second bullet. It’s confusing.  [Mod]: According my understanding of company proposals, UE performs beam measurement in each BFD-RS set independently. If beam failure is detected in a BFD-RS set, information on the index of the set (where failure is detected) is reported in the MAC-CE (as TRP identifier). |
| Qualcomm | Fine for the offline proposal. Otherwise, UE may need to send two MAC-Ces for cell-level and TRP-level BFR if both simultaneously happen on some CCs. Also, this two MAC-Ces may correspond to different SR IDs and PUCCH resources. For Alt1, to our understanding, 2 bits can be used per CC configured with TRP specific BFR, and to indicate which TRP(s) failed. |
| Fujitsu | For 2.13, support Alt-1.  For 2.14, support Alt-1,  For 2.15, support Alt-2. |
| Apple | For offline proposal 2.6.1, it seems Alt-2 is different from the Alt-2 in 2.14? If no one supports current Alt-2 in proposal 2.6.1, is it possible to go with Alt-1?  [mod]: Alt-2 was supported by some companies in the last meeting, and for now it is kept there so companies can comment. If concensus on alt-1 is reached, alt-2 will be removed in the final proposal.  In addition, can we add a bracket for “in a cell group” in the first main-bullet at current stage? We are not sure whether this is needed.  [mod]: Thanks. Added. |
| NEC | Fine with the proposal. |
| TCL | For 2.13, support Alt-1.  For 2.14, support Alt-1.  For 2.15, support Alt-2. |
| CMCC | For 2.13: support Alt1  For 2.14: support Alt1  For 2.15: support Alt2 |
| Nokia/NSB | For 2.13, support Alt-1.  For 2.14, support Alt-1,  For 2.15, support Alt-2. |
| InterDigital | 2.13: support Alt-1.  2.14: support Alt-1.  2.15: support Alt-2. |
| Ericsson | For 2.13, support Alt-1.  For 2.14, support Alt-1,  For 2.15, support Alt-2.  Fine with offline proposal. We prefer Alt-1: BFD-RS set indices are reported explicitly |
| Intel | Support, prefer Alt-1 |
| Convida Wireless | In general we are fine with the FL proposal.  However, we suggest to use “candidate beam index” instead of “resource index representing identified new beam”, which seems to be more aligned with the current spec.  From 38.321, section 6.1.3.23:  “Candidate RS ID: This field is set to the index of an SSB with SS-RSRP above *rsrp-ThresholdBFR* amongst the SSBs in *candidateBeamRSSCellLis*t or to the index of a CSI-RS with CSI-RSRP above *rsrp-ThresholdBFR* amongst the CSI-RSs in *candidateBeamRSSCellLis*t. Index of an SSB or CSI-RS is the **index of an entry in *candidateBeamRSSCellLis*t corresponding to the SSB or CSI-RS. Index 0 corresponds to the first entry in the *candidateBeamRSSCellLis*t, index 1 corresponds to the second entry inthe list and so on***.* The length of this field is 6 bits.”  [mod]: Revised. Let’s hope everyone is fine ☺ |
| Qualcomm | Prefer Alt-1 in FL’s latest proposal |
| DOCOMO | Support Alt-1 in FL’s latest proposal |
| LGE | Support offline proposal from FL. Some editorial suggestion on the proposal as below (to our understanding, BFRQ means ‘BFR dentif’ so it is more relevant to BFR-PRACH or LRR-PUCCH transmission, not for MAC-CE based BFR report. In current TS38.321, it is written as BFR MAC-CE)  ***Offline Proposal 2.6.1***   * A single MAC-CE is used for BFR report for all TRPs in all CCs [in a cell group] * The MAC-CE carries information of failed TRP identifier(s) based on Alt-1.   + Alt-1: indication of BFD-RS set(s) where beam failure is detected, * For each failed TRP for a CC, BFR MAC-CE carries information whether a new candidate beam is found, and candidate beam index (if found). |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support the FL proposal |
| Mod | Revised per LGE suggestion. |
| ETRI | Support the latest FL proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We support Alt 2 and want to keep it in the proposal. We can down-select in the next step.  ***Offline Proposal 2.6.1***   * A single MAC-CE is used for BFR report for all TRPs in all CCs [in a cell group] * The MAC-CE carries information of failed TRP identifier(s) ~~based on Alt-1~~.   + Alt-1: indication of BFD-RS set(s) where beam failure is detected,   + Alt-2: implicit indication through candidate beam index, if found, else explicit indication of BFD-RS set(s) as in Alt-1. * For each failed TRP for a CC, BFR MAC-CE carries information whether a new candidate beam is found, and candidate beam index (if found). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Suggest changing “candicate beam index” as “resource index representing identified new beam”, as there is no “beam index” in RAN1 spec. Even in RAN2 specs quoted by Convida, there is no “beam index”, but only “RS ID”. |
| Mod | On issue 2.14, add back the alternatives by Convida. Propose to down-select in RAN1#106 (August).  On the format of the dentified new beam, list the two alternatives from Convida and HW. Propose to down-select in RAN1#106. |
| Futurewei | For 2.13, support Alt-1.  For 2.14, support Alt-1.  For 2.15, support Alt-2.  Support FL’s proposal. |
| Apple | We suggest we remove the following FFS and its sub-bullet. The format sounds like a RAN2 issue, and since we failed to see any reason to enhance it compared to legacy candidate beam index.  FFS: format of identifier of new candidate beam, to be down-selecte in RAN1#106-e |
| vivo | We have some confusion on the two sub-bullets of the identifier of the new candidate beam mentioned by Huawei and Convida. In our understanding, the new beam is identified by resource indices based on the number of RS resources at least cross RS lists in Alt-1, while it is identified by resource indices based on the number of RS resources in associated RS lists in Alt-2. Please point out if we misunderstand. |
| Mod | @HW/Convida: please see comments from Apple and vivo, and if you are OK to remove the last FFS bullet. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the latest proposal |
| MediaTek | Okay to the latest proposal |
| ZTE | Regarding to the comments from the FL, we think that RAN1 only need to specify which parameters need to be reported, rather than MAC-CE format. So, we suggest to leave the first bullet to RAN2 design. Please check our following suggestion:  ***Offline Proposal 2.6.1***   * A single MAC-CE to contain BFR report for all TRPs in all CCs or independent MAC-CE to contain BFR report for each TRPs in all CCs is up to RAN2 signaling design * The MAC-CE carries information of failed TRP identifier(s) based on Alt-1.   + Alt-1: indication of BFD-RS set(s) where beam failure is detected, * For each failed TRP for a CC, BFR MAC-CE carries information whether a new candidate beam is found, and candidate beam index (if found).   [mod]: From moderator perspective, as much as I would like to accomondate different companies’ views, there seems to be a super majority. I will bring up your proposal online and see if the group can agree. Thanks.  [ZTE3] Thank you. We support to bring up this issue during online and let’s clarify and discuss why/whether the first bullet can be left to RAN2. |
| Convida Wireless | @HW: Candidate RS ID is the index in the list *candidateBeamRSSCellLis*t. In other words, it’s not “CSI-RS resource configuration indexes and/or SS/PBCH block indexes” as in the RAN1 spec. Since we’re talking about the MAC CE fields, it seems more appropriate to use follow MAC spec than the RAN1 spec. Anyway, it’s probably best to leave this detail to RAN2.  We’re also fine with the proposal, with minor update:   * + Alt-3: implicitly through the identifier of the new candidate beam~~resource index representing identified new beam~~, if found, else explicitly through BFD-RS set index * For each failed TRP for a CC, BFR MAC-CE carries information whether a new candidate beam is found, and an identifi~~t~~er of the new candidate beam |
| Mod | Updated per Convida. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are still uncomfortable to say “identifier of the new candidate beam”, as beam is not defined in RAN1 or RAN2 spec. Reading the response from Convida, we suggest changing it to “identifier of RS associated with identified new beam”, and hope this is fine. We also sugget removing “indentifier(s)” from the 1st bullet to avoid the impression that a “TRP identifier” is being discussed here. We took some liberty to make revisions to the proposal above directly. |

It is also proposed to support BFRA MAC-CE transmission for SpCell with normal PUSCH. Companies are invited to share their views.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.16  MAC-CE | Q: whether to support BFRQ MAC-CE for SpCell with normal PUSCH   * NOTE: In Rel.16 it is only supported in msg3 | Support: MediaTek, Support, APT/FGI, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, Convida, Ericsson  Concern: LGE (not needed), DOCOMO |

Offline proposal 2.6.2:

* FFS: whether to support BFRQ MAC-CE for SpCell with any PUSCH, and if so, under which condition.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | Support to have a unified solution |
| Lemovo&MotM | Would you further clarify the normal PUSCH? Does it mean that BFRQ MAC CE is transmitted in a PUSCH not triggered by a PUCCH-SR? If yes, support it since Scell BFR is already supported. |
| LGE | From existing RAN2 SR/BFR procedure perspective, it is natural to send a MAC-CE if UL-SCH is already available (i.e. on any PUSCH scheduled previously). If it is not available, SR PUCCH is triggered. Thus, we think that we do not need any agreement in RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| MedaiTek | Supprot. Current RAN2 spec only suuprt transmit BFRQ MAC-CE for SpCell in Msg3.  Maybe we can change “normal” PUSCH to “any” PUSCH. |
| DOCOMO | Need further discussion on the condition to support BFRQ MAC-CE for SpCell with any PUSCH. |
| Mod | Added offline proposal. Seems most companies are OK with the direction. |
| Xiaomi | Open to discuss it |
| ZTE | Open to discuss it. |
| NEC | Open to discuss. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | How can this be avoided? If the UE has an UL grant, it will multiplex any MAC CE into the corresponding PUSCH. |
| Convida Wireless | Support. |
| Futurewei | Open to discuss it. |

* + 1. UE assumption after BFR response

The following offline proposal was discussed in RAN1#104b-e.

*Offline proposal (RAN1#104-e) : After receiving BFR response*

* *For each failed TRP, the DL QCL-typeD assumption of all CORESETs associated with that TRP with 1 activated TCI state is updated by the RS associated with the latest reported new candidate beam (if found when NBI-RS set is configured).*
  + *FFS: How to associate CORESET(s) with each TRP*
  + *FFS: timeline for the new beam updte after receiving BFR response*
* *FFS: Update of QCL-type D assumption UL spatial filter/power control assumption for PUCCH, and other channels/RSs.*
* *The above applies at least to SCell; FFS SpCell*

Company views in RAN1#105-e are summarized below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.17  Beam update | Q: UE assumption of DL QCL-typeD and UL filter/power control after receiving gNB response  Q1: If a single TRP fails   * Failed TRP update by new beam (if reported)   Q2: If both TRPs fail   * Each failed TRP updated by its corresponding new beam (if reported)   Q3: Applicable channel   * at least PDCCH, * FFS: others * FFS: association of PUCCH with TRP (if PUCCH beam update is supported)   Q4: deactivation of CORESETs for a TRP, if no new beam is found | Q1 (14): vivo, Qualcomm, CATT,Spreadtrum, APT/FGI. LGE, MTK, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, ZTE, Fujitsu,TCL, Sony  Q2 (14): vivo, Qualcomm, CATT,Spreadtrum, LGE, Huawei, HiSilicon, MTK, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, ZTE, Fujitsu,TCL, Sony, Futurewei  Q3:   * PDCCH: Sony, OPPO, CATT, vivo, ZTE, Qualcomm, MediaTek, ETRI, Spreadtrum, LGE, Huawei, HiSilicon, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, Fujitsu,TCL * PDSCH: vivo (M-DCI), Apple * PUCCH: Support (ZTE, Qualcomm, Sony, ETRI, DOCOMO, Apple, CATT, Fujitsu), No (OPPO, Spreadtrum) * All channels: Apple, APT/FGI, ZTE   Q4:  Support: vivo, ZTE  Concern: |

**Offline proposal 2.7.1:**

28 symbols after receiving BFR response

* For each failed BFD-RS set, the DL QCL assumption of all CORESETs associated with that BFD-RS set with 1 activated TCI state is updated by the RS associated with the latest reported new candidate beam (if found when NBI-RS set is configured).
  + FFS: How to associate CORESET(s) with each BFD-RS set
  + FFS: SCS determination for 28 symbols
* FFS: Update of UL spatial filter/power control assumption for PUCCH, and other channels/RSs.
* The above applies to SCell [and SpCell]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | We think this is for mDCI only.  [mod]: could you pleae elaborate why this does not apply to S-DCI? Personally I think this update should be applicable to both S- and M-DCI. For S-DCI, the set of CORESETs associated to a failed TRP can be updated by the corresponding new beam (from the associated NBI-RS set). |
| Lenovo&MotM | For Q1: support.  For Q2: support.  For Q3: support.  For Q4: Not support. |
| LGE | Our view is added. |
| Qualcomm | For Q1: support  For Q2: support  For Q3: support  For Q4: No need. It is up to gNB for further beam training or deactivation  We are fine for the offline proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Added our views to table above. |
| MediaTek | For Q1: support.  For Q2: support.  For Q3: support. |
| DOCOMO | For Q1: support.  For Q2: support.  For Q3: support.  For Q4: Not support. |
| Xiaomi | Support the offline proposal |
| ZTE | We have the following suggestion for this FL proposal. Firstly, we prefer to complete M-DCI M-TRP firstly, and S-DCI can be further discussed. Then, QCL assumption should be updated together rather than QCL-Type D only (based on Rel-15/16 design). After that, we think that 28 symbols can be reused rather than introducing a new timeline. Finally, we think SpCell should be considered together (it seems that the upper questions do NOT involve this sub-bullet at all).  **Offline proposal:**  28 symbols after receiving BFR response at least for M-DCI M-TRP   * For each failed TRP, the DL QCL assumption of all CORESETs associated with that TRP is updated by the RS associated with the latest reported new candidate beam (if found when NBI-RS set is configured).   + The TRP corresponds to CORESETPoolID   + FFS: How to associate CORESET(s) with each TRP in S-DCI M-TRP   + FFS: SCS determination for 28 symbols * FFS: Update of QCL-type D assumption UL spatial filter/power control assumption for PUCCH, and other channels/RSs. |
| Mod | Revised proposals based on ZTE’s inputs. @Bo: The first FFS poiont is related to section 2.2.3 and can wait for that discussion. Added “**at least** 1 activated TCI state” since CORESET with more than 1 activated TCI state is yet unresolved in section 2.2.3 |
| Fujitsu | For Q1: support.  For Q2: support (PDCCH and PUCCH).  For Q3: support.  Support the updated FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | We share the same understanding as ZTE. We have agreed that sDCI is low prioroity. SO we shall complete the design for mDCI first. And we also think this shall be applied to both PCell and SCell.  So suggest to revise the proposal as follows:  **Offline proposal:**  28 symbols after receiving BFR response   * For each failed TRP, the DL QCL assumption of all CORESETs associated with that TRP with at least 1 activated TCI state is updated by the RS associated with the latest reported new candidate beam (if found when NBI-RS set is configured).   + ~~FFS: How to associate CORESET(s) with each TRP~~   + The TRP corresponds to CORESETPoolIndex value   + FFS: SCS determination for 28 symbols * FFS: Update of QCL-type D assumption UL spatial filter/power control assumption for PUCCH, and other channels/RSs. * ~~The above applies at least to SCell; FFS SpCell~~   [mod]: If the preference is to support both SCell and SpCell, it can be captured explicitly. Please see revised proposal. On mDCI vs. sDCI, please see comment in section 2.2.3. |
| Apple | Response to FL’s question, in our view, in sDCI, it is still with good backhaul, so gNB can still update the beam based on beam indication when one TRP fails. If both TRP fail, it tends to be like a cell-specific BFR operation, maybe we need some further discussion about it.  [mod]: Open to discuss. First, my understanding is how PDCCH is transmitted is a general NW design issue that is agnostic to S. vs. M-DCI. Regardless how the TCI codepoints of PDSCH scheduling is configured, PDCCH diversity applies in a universal manner.  Another problem is that if UE is switched to sTRP mode during the BFR for sDCI. In that case, should we consider this beam update is still valid or not.  [mod]: By “switching to sTRP mode”, are you referring to the update of TCI codepoints for PDSCH scheduling (e.g. all TCI codepoints are associated with 1 TCI state)?  I think we need to add “at least for mDCI based mTRP” as ZTE suggested. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| TCL | For Q1: support.  For Q2: support.  For Q3: support.  Support the updated FL’s proposal. |
| Sony | The modified offline proposal from FL looks fine to us. Supportive. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Our understanding is that TRP will not be captured in the specs. So we suggest to replace ‘failed TRP’ with ‘failed BFD-RS set’  Like Oppo, we think it’s strange to limit this to SCell – the most important case would seem to be when SpCell fails.  Otherwise OK.  [mod]: revised accordingly. |
| MediaTek | Support FL proposal.  Regarding “TRP” in the proposal, we suggest to use BFD-RS set instead, following the principle we used in previous agreements.  **Offline proposal:**  28 symbols after receiving BFR response   * For each failed BFD-RS set, the DL QCL assumption of all CORESETs associated with that BFD-RS setwith at least 1 activated TCI state is updated by the RS associated with the latest reported new candidate beam (if found when NBI-RS set is configured).   + FFS: How to associate CORESET(s) with each BFD-RS set   + FFS: SCS determination for 28 symbols * FFS: Update of QCL-type D assumption UL spatial filter/power control assumption for PUCCH, and other channels/RSs. * The above applies to SCell and SpCell   [mod]: Done. Thanks for the suggestion. |
| Qualcomm | Support FL’s latest proposal |
| LGE | Fine with FL’s proposal in principle. Several comments as below:   * ‘at least 1 activated TCI state’ seems a bit confusing. Is it for SFNed CORESET or different TCIs across CORESET in a CORESET pool?   [mod]: The intention is to cover the case of Rel.15/16 PDCCH transmission scheme. Per chairman’s instruction, whether/how Rel.17 PDCCH enhancement is supported can be handled in 8.1.2.4. Removed “at least” to be clearer.   * On the second bullet, there is no QCL-type D for UL so we suggest the following change:   FFS: Update of UL spatial filter/power control assumption for PUCCH, and other channels/RSs.   * On the last bullet, not sure this approach is possible for SpCell when both TRPs are in failure since currently new beam information is delivered by the selected PRACH resource in Rel-15/16, not by MAC-CE content. It would be safer to leave this case open for now.   [mod]: add a bracket to SpCell. |
| ETRI | Support the latest proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Support latest FL proposal |
| ZTE2 | For mDCI-mTRP, the association is very clear, and we have the following suggestion:  **Offline proposal:**  28 symbols after receiving BFR response   * For each failed BFD-RS set, the DL QCL assumption of all CORESETs associated with that BFD-RS set with 1 activated TCI state is updated by the RS associated with the latest reported new candidate beam (if found when NBI-RS set is configured).   + For mDCI-mTRP, each of BFD-RS sets is assocaited with a CORESETPoolID   + FFS: sDCI-mTRP   + FFS: SCS determination for 28 symbols * FFS: Update of UL spatial filter/power control assumption for PUCCH, and other channels/RSs.   The above applies to SCell [and SpCell]  [mod]: I think the added bullet belong to section 2.2.3. If it is agreed there then we don’t need to capture it again here?  [ZTE3]: For implicit manner, it should be fine, but our concern is related to explicit manner that also need the association between CORESETPoolID and BFD-RS sets (that is explicitly configured). |
| Futurewei | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Apple | It seems we need more discussion for this.  We think this is for mDCI only. We failed to see the necessity for sDCI. The statement of “all CORESETs associated with that BFD-RS set” is also a bit unclear. Let’s say UE is configured with 5 CORESETs: 3 from TRP 1 and 2 from TRP 2, but UE can only support 1 BFD RS per set. Should we update the beam for all the 3 CORESETs or only 1 CORESET if TRP 1 fails.  [mod]: From 2.2.3, there will be an association between CORESETs to BFD-RS set. If the number of CORESETs (e.g. CORESETPoolIndex = 0) associated to a BFD-RS set is greater (e.g. 3) than the maximum number of RS that can be configured for a BFD-RS set (e.g. 1), some RS selection rule may or may not be introduced. Regardless, the association between CORESETs to BFD-RS sets should be defined, per 2.2.3. Second, this seems a common problem to both sDCI and mSDCI. |
| MediaTek | Support the latest FL proposal, which aims to support a unfied design for MDCI and SDCI. |
| ZTE | Please review our above reply in [ZTE3] |

* + 1. RACH-based fallback

The following offline proposal was discussed in RAN1#104b-e without conclusion.

*Offline Proposal (RAN1#104-e): CBRA-based transmission can be triggered on a SpCell for per-TRP BFR as least in the following scenarios*

* *Scenario 1: When beam failure is detected on all BFD-RS sets on the SpCell*
* *FFS: other scenarios*
  + *Scenario 2: at least one TRP fails on SpCell*
  + *Scenario 3: at least one pre-defined TRP fails on SpCell*
  + *Scenario 4: at least one TRP fails and no PUCCH-SR is configured, and no UL grant is available*
  + *Scenario 5: If MAC-CE based reporting does not work (details FFS)*
  + *Scenario 6: When no PUCCH-SR is configured*
* *NOTE: It is RAN1’s understanding that RAN1 decision does not preclude RAN2 from studying other scenarios.*

Company inputs in this meeting is summarized below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.18  RACH | Q1: CBRA based RACH  Q2: CFRA-based RACH | Q1:  Support: ZTE/Intel/DOCOMO  Concern: OPPO  Q2:  Support: OPPO |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | We support CBRA based RACH when BFR-SR is not configured, which is similar to R16 BFR |
| Lenovo&MotM | We support CFRA based RACH if it’s configured, if not, then support CBRA based RACH. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine for CBRA only or CFRA if configured + CBRA otherwise, slightly prefer CBRA only to reduce overhead |
| DOCOMO | Fine to support both. |
| ZTE | Support both and FL’s proposal. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Support CBRA based RACH. |
| Nokia/NSB | CBRA can be used without any restriction. CFRA can be used if configured. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | CBRA should be enough |
| MediaTek | CBRA can be used without any restriction. CFRA can be used if configured.  It seems this issue can be discussed together with Offline proposal 2.1.1? |
| Convida Wireless | OK with CBRA. |
| LGE | Support both CFRA and CBRA (when CFRA is not configured or CFRA based BFR is not successful) as Rel-15/16. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | Fine to support both. |
| Futurewei | Support both CFRA-based and CBRA-based RACH. |

* + 1. Others

For issues in Table II (section 2.2) that are not covered in the above sections, companies are invited to share their views.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.19  other | New BFRR mechanism  a MAC CE activation command to update the TCI states for the CORESET(s) related to the TRP/BFD-RS set in beam failure.  a MAC CE deactivation command to de-activate the failed TRP so that to achieve the switch of transmission hypothesis from MTRP to STRP.  a PDCCH to trigger a beam measurement and reporting procedure for the failed TRP. | Support: vivo  Concern: |
| 2.20  other | Implicit BFD-RS is only supported if Rel.17 TCI framework supports M >1 | Support: Futurewei  Concern: |
| 2.21  Other | Prioitize TRP1 of PCell, if beam failure is detected on both TRP | Support: InterDigital  Concern: |
| 2.22  Other | Fallback to single-TRP transmission   * Conditions FFS (e.g. 1 TRP fail without new beam found, or 2 TRPs fail and new beam found on 1 TRP) | Support: vivo  Concern: |
| 2.23  other | LRR has higher priority than normal SR   * FFS: prioritization between LRR for TRP-specific BFR and LRR for SCell BFR | Support: Lenovo/MotM  Concern: |
| 2.24  other | Study how to avoid transmission of PUSCH carrying MAC-CE to failed TRP | Support: Lenovo/MotM  Concern: |
| 2.25  other | For mDCI mTRP, the implicit BFD RSs associated with a *CORESETPoolIndex* can be the QCL-TypeD RSs in up to X TCI states for CORESETs sharing the same *CORESETPoolIndex*.   * X can be determined in spec or via UE capability. | Support: Qualcomm  Concern: |
| 2.26  other | support per-TRP BFD-RS configurations for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation. | Support: Ericsson  Concern: |
| 2.27  other | M-DCI in TRP-specific BFR, if one TRP is declared beam failure and if the time offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is less than a threshold, UE keeps one default Rx beam for receiving potential PDSCH transmitted from non-failed TRP | Support: ASUSTek  Concern: |
| 2.28  other | If the UE detects beam failure in the first BFD-RS set, it shall try to  find a new candidate beam from the first NBI-RS set with L1-RSRP above a threshold, if any. If the UE detects beam failure in the second BFD-RS set, it shall try to find a new candidate beam from the second NBI-RS set with L1-RSRP above a threshold, if any. | Support: Convida  Concern: |
| 2.29  other | * For multi-TRP BFR, upon request from higher layers to evaluate candidate beams in a first NBI-RS set, the UE indicates to higher layers whether there is at least one periodic CSI-RS configuration index and/or SS/PBCH block index from the first NBI-RS set with corresponding L1-RSRP measurements that are larger than or equal to the Qin,LR threshold, and provides the periodic CSI-RS configuration indexes and/or SS/PBCH block indexes from the first NBI-RS set and the corresponding L1-RSRP measurements that are larger than or equal to the Qin,LR threshold, if any. * For multi-TRP BFR, upon request from higher layers to evaluate candidate beams in a second NBI-RS set, the UE indicates to higher layers whether there is at least one periodic CSI-RS configuration index and/or SS/PBCH block index from the second NBI-RS set with corresponding L1-RSRP measurements that are larger than or equal to the Qin,LR threshold, and provides the periodic CSI-RS configuration indexes and/or SS/PBCH block indexes from the second NBI-RS set and the corresponding L1-RSRP measurements that are larger than or equal to the Qin,LR threshold, if any. | Support: Convida  Concern: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| vivo | For issue 2.19 and 2.22, to consume less resource and align the operation between gNB and UE, the BFRR mechsim needs to be enhanced. Three schemes for BFRR enhancement in different use cases are listed as following:   * When new beam(s) has been found and reported, except legacy BFRR mechaim, a MAC CE activation command to update the TCI states for the CORESET(s) related to the failed TRP/BFD-RS set is first way of enhanced BFRR. Compared with legacy mechsim, the new mechsim may avoid extra signal to update or reconfigure the BFD-RS if implicily configured, because it is updated with the updated CORESET(s).   When no NBI-RS is configured or NBI-RS(s) is configured but no new beam is found, a MAC CE to deactivite the failed TRP to fallback to sTRP, or a PDCCH triggering a aperiodic beam report for the failed TRP is the second and third way of enhanced BFRR respectively. Compared with legacy mechsim, the second mechsim triggers UE behaviour to fallback to sTRP operation mode and align operation on transmitter and recevier, and the third mechsim triggers to find new beam(s) to maintain mTRP operation mode as much as possible. |

* 1. Simultaneous reception of signals with different QCL-typeD assumption

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue and proposals** | **Companies’ views** |
| 3.1 | Alt1: **To enhance priority rule to facilitate UE  to receive downlink  signals with two different QCL -TypeD properties, e.g. PDCCH QCL prioritization rule enhancement**  Alt2: **To release some scheduling restrictions which mandate gNB to schedule downlink  signals with the same QCL -TypeD property or prohibit to schedule some downlink  signals overlapped in time domain, e.g. PDSCH + SSB** | Alt1:  Support: Spreadtrum (Rel.16 rule applied for each TRP), ZTE, Qualcomm (for each CooolsetPool), LGE, Apple, Ericsson, Mediatek  Concern:  Alt2:  Support: Apple  Concern; |
| 3.2 | NW provides indication of antenna group ID to DL channel/RS | Support: ZTE  Concern: Apple, Ericsson |
| 3.3 | Type of combinations to be enhanced:  Case 1: PDCCH+PDCCH  Case 2: PDCCH+PDSCH  Case 3: CSI-RS + CSI-RS | Case 1:  Support: Spreadtrum, MediaTek, LGE, Apple, Ericsson, Qualcomm, DOCOMO  Concern:  Case 2:  Support: ~~Spreadtrum,~~ MediaTek, Apple, DOCOMO  Concern:  Case 3:  Support: Lenovo/MM, Apple, Ericsson  Concern: |
| 3.4 | Study both S-DCI and M-DCI | Support: DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Ericsson  Concern: |

Companies are invited to share their views below. From the FL’s perspective, it appears that there are some interests on Alt-1 (issue 3.1), at least for the case of PDCCH + PDCCH simultaneous reception.

Offline Proposal 3.1.1:

* For simultaneous reception of channels/RS with different QCL-typeD assumption, adopt the following enhancement in Rel.17:
  + Alt-1: e**nhanced priority rule to facilitate UE to receive downlink signals with two different QCL -TypeD properties**
  + **Alt-1 applies at least to simultaneous reception of** 
    - **PDCCH + PDCCH**
    - **FFS: PDCCH+ PDSCH, PDSCH+CSI-RS, and CSI-RS + CSI-RS,**
  + FFS: whether/how **to  release some scheduling restrictions which mandate gNB to schedule downlink  signals with the same QCL -TypeD property or prohibit to schedule some downlink  signals overlapped in time domain**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Technical views |
| Apple | Our view is provided.  For issue 3.1, our understanding is that Alt1 and Alt2 are not competing alterantives, but to handle different kinds of issues. There are two ways for QCL typeD collision handling defined in R15:   1. Priority rule (RAN1) 2. Scheduling restriction (partly in RAN1, partly in RAN4)   Alt1 is to enhance current priority rule and alt2 is to release some scheduling restrictions. |
| Qualcomm | For 3.1, support Alt1.  For 3.2, it seems not a complete solution. But might be useful to combine with 3.1 Alt1  For 3.3, at least PDCCH.  For 3.4, support |
| MediaTek | For 3.1, support Alt1. Scheduling restriction part can be left to RAN4  For 3.2: Not support  For 3.3: Supprot at least Case 1 and 2  For 3.4: Suppeor at least M-DCI |
| DOCOMO | For 3.1, agree with Apple.  For 3.3, Case1 and 2 can be prioritized.  For 3.4, support |
| Ericsson | For 3.1, we support Alt 1.  For 3.2, we do not support.  For 3.3, we support Cases 1 and 3. Case 2 sounds more like a corner case and can be downprioritized.  For 3.4, we support studying for both S-DCI and M-DCI. |
| Mod | Added proposal 3.1.1 based on company inputs |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support the FL proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon (2nd) | It has come to our attention that simultaneous reception of two CORESET(s) with two different TypeD QCL assumptions has been proposed and discussed in the agenda of 8.1.2.1, where it is natural to discuss priority rule (to select two TypeD QCL assumptions) when multiple CCs are involved. So we suggest coordinating with 8.1.2.1 and decide where/what to discuss.  [mod]: we can discuss whether it should be handled in AI 8.1.2.1. |
| ZTE2 | Support the FL proposal in principle. It seems that we also need to consider the case of PDCCH+ PDSCH, and CSI-RS + CSI-RS as the same priority level as PDCCH+PDCCH. Also, we also identify another case of PDSCH+CSI-RS. |
| Mod | Added PDSCH+CSI-RS. |
| Qualcomm | Support FL’s latest proposal |
| MediaTek | Support FL’s latest proposal |
| ZTE3 | Support FL’s latest proposal |

1. Previous agreements
   1. RAN1#102-e

**Agreement**

For L1-RSRP, consider measurement / reporting enhancement to facilitate inter-TRP beam pairing

* Option-1: Group-based reporting,
  + e.g., beam restriction to facilitate inter-TRP pairing.
* Option-2: Non-group-based reporting

**Agreement**

Evaluate and study at least but not limited to the following issues for multi-beam enhancement

* Issue 1: Consideration of inter-beam interference
* Issue 2: For group-based reporting, increased number of groups and/or beams per group
* Issue 3: UE Rx panel related beam measurement/report
  + NOTE: “UE panel” is used for discussion purpose only

**Agreement**

* Evaluate enhancement to enable per-TRP based beam failure recovery starting with Rel-15/16 BFR as the baseline.
* Consider following potential enhancement aspects to enable per-TRP based beam failure recovery
  + Issue 1: TRP-specific BFD
  + Issue 2: TRP-specific new candidate beam identification
  + Issue 3: TRP-specific BFRQ
  + Issue 4: gNB response enhancement
  + Issue 5: UE behavior on QCL/spatial relation assumption/UL power control for DL and UL channels/RSs after receiving gNB response

**Agreement**

Study Rel.17 enhancements on beam management for multi-TRPs with following priority

* High priority:
  + Beam measurement/reporting enhancement
  + Beam failure recovery for multi-TRP
* Low priority
  + Simultaneous reception of same type of channel/RS with different QCL-TypeD
  + Simultaneous reception of different type of channel/RS with different QCL-TypeD
  1. RAN1#103-e

Agreement

Down-select at least one of the following options for beam measurement/reporting enhancement to facilitate inter-TRP beam pairing in RAN1 #104-e

* Option 1: In a CSI-report, UE can report N>1 pair/groups and M>=1 beams per pair/group
  + Different beams in different pairs/groups can be received simultaneously
  + FFS: whether M is equal or can be different across different pair/group
* Option 2: In a CSI-report, UE can report N(N>=1) pairs/groups and M (M>1) beams per pair/group
  + Different beams within a pair/group can be received simultaneously
* Option 3: UE report M(M>=1) beams in N (N>1) CSI-reports corresponding to N report setting
  + Different beams in different CSI-reports can be received simultaneously
  + FFS: whether/how to introduce an association between different CSI-reports
  + FFS: whether/how to differentiate reported measurements for beams that are received simultaneously vs. beams that are not received simultaneously
    - whether/how to introduce an indication along with the CSI-reports to indicate whether the beams in different CSI-reports can be received simultaneously
* FFS: value of N and M in each option
* FFS: Association between different beams in above options and different TRP/UE panels
* FFS: Identify new use cases per option compared with R16 (including backhaul)
* FFS: whether different beams in different pairs/groups/reports can be received by same spatial filter per option

**Agreement**

* For M-TRP beam failure detection, support independent BFD-RS configuration per-TRP, where each TRP is associated with a BFD-RS set.
  + FFS: The number of BFD RSs per BFD-RS set, the number of BFD-RS sets, and number of BFD RSs across all BFD-RS sets per DL BWP
  + Support at least one of explicit and implicit BFD-RS configuration
    - With explicit BFD-RS configuration, each BFD-RS set is explicitly configured
      * FFS: Further study QCL relationship between BFD-RS and CORESET
    - FFS: How to determine implicit BFD-RS configuration, if supported
* For M-TRP new beam identification
  + Support independent configurat**i**on of new beam identification RS (NBI-RS) set per TRP if NBI-RS set per TRP is configured
    - FFS: detail on association of BFD-RS and NBI-RS
    - Support the same new beam identification and configuration criteria as Rel.16, including  L1-RSRP, threshold

Agreement

* Support TRP-specific BFD counter and timer in the MAC procedure
  + The term TRP is used only for the purposes of discussions in RAN1 and whether/how to capture this is FFS

Agreement

* Support a BFRQ framework based on Rel.16 SCell BFR BFRQ
  + In RAN1#104-e, select one from the following options
    - Option 1: Up to one dedicated PUCCH-SR resource in a cell group
      * A cell group refers to either MCG, SCG, or PUCCH cell group
      * FFS: number of spatial filters associated with the PUCCH-SR resources
      * FFS: How the SR configuration is done
    - Option 2: Up to two (or more) dedicated PUCCH-SR resources in a cell group
      * A cell group refers to either MCG, SCG, or PUCCH cell group
      * FFS: whether each PUCCH-SR resource is restricted to be associated to one spatial filter
      * FFS: How the SR configuration is done
  + FFS: Whether no dedicated PUCCH-SR resource can be supported in addition to Option 1 or Option 2
* Study whether and how to provide the following information in BFRQ MAC-CE
  + Index information of failed TRP(s)
  + CC index (if applicable)
  + New candidate beam index (if found)
  + Indication whether new beam(s) is found
  + FFS: whether/how to incorporate multi-TRP failure
  1. RAN1#104-e

**Agreement**

For beam measurement in support of M-TRP simultaneous transmission

* Support a single CSI-report consisting of N beams pairs/groups and M (M>1) beams per pair/group, and different beams within a pair/group can be received simultaneously
  + Support M = 2
  + Support extending the maximum value of N > 1, exact value FFS
  + N=1 and N=2
    - FFS: Other values larger than 2
    - FFS: Whether the UE could report beams are received with different RX beams
* Further study the support of option 1 and option 3
* The above applies at least for L1-RSRP
  + FFS: L1-SINR

**Agreement**

* For M-TRP BFR Support 1-to-1 association between each BFD-RS set and an NBI-RS set
  + FFS: Association details

**Agreement**

For M-TRP BFR

* Support 2 BFD-RS sets per BWP, and up to N resources per BFD-RS set
  + FFS: value of N (e.g. fixed in specification, or UE capability)
* FFS: number of BFD RSs across all BFD-RS sets per DL BWP (e.g. fixed maximum value or UE capability)

**Agreement**

For BFRQ of M-TRP BFR

* Option 3: Up to two dedicated PUCCH-SR resources in a cell group
* FFS: Whether PUCCH-SR for SCell can be reused for M-TRP
* Support BFRQ MAC-CE that can convey information of failed CC indices, one new candidate beam for the failed TRP/CC (if found), and whether new candidate beam is found
  + Support at least indication of a single TRP failure
    - FFS: whether/what information of failed TRP(s) is conveyed in the MAC-CE
    - FFS: whether/how to support indication of more than one TRP failure, corresponding BFR procedure, and applicable cell type (SCell vs. SpCell)
* FFS: UE behavior when TRP failure status is different across cells
* FFS: Whether PUCCH SR resource can be configured with 2 spatial relations
  1. RAN1#104b-e

**Agreement**

For beam reporting option 2

* On the maximum number of beam pairs/groups (N) that can be reported in a single CSI-report, discuss and down-select from the following two alternatives in RAN1#105-e:
  + Alt1: Support maximum value N = {1, 2}
  + Alt2: Support maximum value N = {1, 2, 3, 4}
* FFS: Introduce a UE capability Ncap on the maximum value of N in Rel.17
* On the number of beam pairs/groups (N) reported in a single CSI-report, discuss and down select between the following two alternatives in RAN1#105-e
  + Alt1: The value of N is fixed by RRC configuration
  + Alt2: The value of N is upper bounded by a maximum value Nmax configured by RRC, and dynamically selected/indicated by UE

**Agreement**

On CMR resource configuration for beam reporting option 2, adopt the following alternative:

* Two CMR resource sets or subsets, per periodic/semi-persistent CMR resource setting
  + FFS: extension to aperiodic CMR resource setting
* Each reported beam pair in a single CSI-report consists of M = 2 SSBRI / CRI values, where each SSB-RI / CRI points to a CMR resource in a different CMR resource set or subset.
* Decide in RAN1#104b-e whether to adopt “set” or “subset” in the above.

**Agreement**

* Support simultaneous configuration of cell-specific BFR and TRP-specific BFR in different CCs.
* FFS: whether cell-specific and TRP-specific BFR can be configured in the same CC.

**Agreement**

* Support S-DCI and M-DCI in TRP-specific BFR in Rel.17
  + S-DCI is low priority, M-DCI is high priority
  + Unified design for S-DCI and M-DCI should not be precluded due to the prioritization

**Agreement**

On BFD-RS of TRP-specific BFR

* BFD-RS resource number:
  + The total number of RSs in two BFR-RS sets per DL BWP is a UE capability
  + On the maximum number of RS per BFD-RS set, down-select from the following two alternatives in RAN1#105-e
    - Alt1: max value is 2
    - Alt2: max value is a UE capability, including possible candidate value of 1

**Agreement**

Adopt the following beam failure detection criteria for each BFD-RS set

* The physical layer in the UE assesses the radio link quality per BFD-RS set and indicates the BFD-RS set index to higher layers every X ms, if the hypothetical PDCCH BLER of all BFD-RS in the corresponding set of BFD-RS is higher than a threshold
  + X is max{minimal periodicity of BFD RS in the set, 2ms}

**Agreement**

A UE configured with TRP-specific BFR can be configured with 1 PUCCH-SR resource in a cell group

* NOTE: it has been agreed in RAN1#104-e that a UE can be configured with up to 2 PUCCH-SR resources in a cell group

**Agreement**

For the TRP specific BFR, for a UE configured with two PUCCH-SR resources in a cell group when beam failure is detected in a one or more CCs in one or more of BFD-RS sets configured in one or more of CCs,

* Down select one of the following PUCCH-SR resource selection rules when SR is triggered (or their combinations) for the study, without precluding other alternatives, in RAN1#105-e
  + Alt-1: PUCCH-SR resource associated with other/non-failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS
  + Alt-2: PUCCH-SR resource associated with failed BFD-RS set, association details FFS
  + Alt-3: Leave it up to UE implementation
* Note: PUCCH-SR resource is PUCCH resource carrying SR
* FFS: Whether two PUCCH-SR resources are under the same or different SR resource configuration or SR configuration (eventual decision may or may not happen in RAN1)

**Agreement**

On CMR resource configuration for beam reporting option 2, decide in RAN1#105-e whether to adopt “set” or “subset”:

* NOTE: the following has been agreed
  + Two CMR resource sets or subsets, per periodic/semi-persistent CMR resource setting
    - FFS : extension to aperiodic CMR resource setting if two CMR resource sets are supported
  + Each reported beam pair in a single CSI -report consists of M = 2 SSBRI/CRI values, where each SSBRI /CRI points to a CMR resource in a different CMR resource set or subset.
* FFS : bitwidth of each SSBRI/CRI determined based on the number of SSB/CSI-RS resources from the associated set/subset, or across two sets/subsets
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