Companies are to share their inputs on the excel spreadsheet in /tsg\_ran/WG1\_RL1/TSGR1\_106b-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1.1/RRC parameters/ herein.

## Inputs on version 00

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table

Table 1 Inputs: Initial version

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| vivo | One general comment: all the RRC parameters should be per BWP if not explicitly stated otherwise.‘tci-StateType’ should be deleted. DL TCI state and UL TCI state can be activated and indicated based on network implementation from a R17 TCI pool. For exmpale, the TCI state with SRS used as spatial source RS is activated or indicated as UL TCI state. The RRC parameter to explicitly define type of a TCI state is unnecessary. Regarding ‘qcl-Type’, QCL-TypeB, QCL-TypeC also need to be included. Not sure why they are left out. This parameter is per TCI state.Regarding ‘InterCellReportType’, it can be configured using the exsiting parameter in CSI framework. This parameter is unnessisary.Regarding ‘InterCellMeasurementRS’, we don’t think this is needed explicitly since Rel-16 measurement RS indication for ‘SSB-Index’ can be re-used with additional PCI or non-serving cell information.Regarding ‘InterCellAdditionalPCI’, whether to directly adding PCI into ‘SSB-Index\_r17’ or to add a new IE to indicate the non-serving cell information the SSB resource associates with can be further discussed. This is also related to TCI state association with non-serving cell information. This parameter should be configured per SSB. |
| Ericsson | Overall, if we do not increase the number of configured TCI states, the field tci-StateId can be reused. This means that several of the RRC parameters in the list are unnecessary. For now, we suggest skipping parameters where the only change is tci-StateId-> tci-StateId\_r17For RAN2 to design the RRC signalling, we should state there are two types of TCI states: DL/joint TCI and UL TCI. The properties/contents of each type of TCI state should be described. This means that ‘tci-StateType’ is not needed.With the recent agreement that all QCL relations are inherited from R16 and that the R17 DL TCI state can be configured in place of a R16 TCI state, all QCL types must be supported.There is also a need to associate the other cell information with a TCI state. The details for this can be left to RAN2, but the relevant information is contained in the corresponding IE from the mult-TRP AI.The PC parameter structures are unnecessarily complicated. We should state that there will be a list of PC parameter sets, and that PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS can use different sets. We also need to describe that it should be possible to associate a PC parameter set with a TCI state, but also that ‘no association’, i.e., all TCI states use the same PC parameter set, should be efficiently supported.InterCellBeamMetrics is not needed - we reuse nrofReportedRS in CSI-ReportConfigInterCellMeasurementRS – here it is better to extend CSI-SSB-ResourceSet with other cell informationInterCellReportType is not needed - we reuse reportConfigType in CSI-ReportConfigInterCellAdditionalPCI – if this is the number of additional PCIs, then we propose to reuse NumberOfAdditionalPCI from mTRP AI.QCL-Info\_NeighbourCell – suggest reusing AdditionalPCIInfo from mTRP AI – this includes the quantities that are neededTCI-StateIndicationType – not needed. RAN2 will need to design two MAC CEs to support ‘joint’ and ‘separate’, and the type of TCI state(s) that are activated will be determined by which MAC CE is used.TimeDurationForQCL\_r17 is an unfortunate name, since TimeDurationForQCL is a UE capability.Change in ControlResourceSet is unnecessary in any case: TCI states cannot be configured per CORESET, and will not be activated per CORESET.TCI-StateSharingList and ApplyTCI-State-r17forSRS – unclear what this is |
| Qualcomm | On row #5, suggest to use a separate row for PL RS, or redefine field name as QCL\_PL\_RS\_Info-r17. They are different concepts to our understandingSuggest to delete row #15 on “Additional PCIs for inter-cell beam management measurement and reporting”, and add the PCI field to row #11 [valid SSB-Index values and corresponding PCI values if different from serving cell PCI] |
| MediaTek | 1. For Rel-17 unified TCI, we also prefer to reuse parameters for Rel-15/16 DL TCI as much as possible. RAN1 can just describe what functionalities need to be supported for Rel-17 unified TCI (like those comments in the table) and let RAN2 decides the parameters and structures. The following three parameters can be removed, and corresponding comments can be combined in the 2nd row.
* ~~tci-StateId\_r17~~
* ~~tci-StateType~~
* ~~QCL-Info\_r17~~
1. On TCI-StateIndicationType, we think this parameters is necessary since switching between two modes/types is done by RRC instead of MAC-CE, as RAN1 concluded.
2. On TimeDurationForQCL\_r17, we also prefer to change the name, e.g., beamApplicationTime\_r17.
3. On ControlResourceSet, we also think additional TCI pool for CORESET is not needed.
4. According to current agreements for Rel-17 unified TCI framework, the following RSs “can share”, i.e., optionally, the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated data and control channels in a CC.
* SRS resource set for CSI (including CB, NCB, antenna switching)
* Aperiodic CSI-RS resources for CSI
* Aperiodic CSI-RS resources for BM
* Aperiodic SRS resources or resource sets for BM
* DMRS(s) associated with non-UE-dedicated reception on CORESET(s) and the associated PDSCH

Instead of using TCI-StateSharingList, We prefer to use a similar parameter like ApplyTCI-State-r17forSRS to indicate whether or not the above channels/RS resource sets apply the same Rel-17 TCI state indicated by Rel-17 DCI/MAC-CE TCI-based update. Thus, in addition to ApplyTCI-State-r17forSRS, we suggest add the following parameters: * ApplyTCI-State-r17forSRS (in SRS-ResourceSet)
* ApplyTCI-State-r17forCSI-RS (in NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet)
* ApplyTCI-State-r17forCORESET (in ControlResourceSet if associated with any CSS set)
 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Inputs on version xx

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table
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