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## Introduction

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

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Enhancement on multi-beam operation, mainly targeting FR2 while also applicable to FR1:
	1. Identify and specify features to facilitate more efficient (lower latency and overhead) DL/UL beam management for intra-cell and inter-cell scenarios to support higher UE speed and/or a larger number of configured TCI states:
		1. Common beam for data and control transmission/reception for DL and UL, especially for intra-band CA
		2. Unified TCI framework for DL and UL beam indication
		3. Enhancement on signaling mechanisms for the above features to improve latency and efficiency with more usage of dynamic control signaling (as opposed to RRC)
		4. For inter-cell beam management, a UE can transmit to or receive from only a single cell (i.e. serving cell does not change when beam selection is done). This includes L1-only measurement/reporting (i.e. no L3 impact) and beam indication associated with cell(s) with any Physical Cell ID(s)
			1. The beam indication is based on Rel-17 unified TCI framework
			2. The same beam measurement/reporting mechanism will be reused for inter-cell mTRP
			3. This work shall only consider intra-DU and intra-frequency cases
	2. Identify and specify features to facilitate UL beam selection for UEs equipped with multiple panels, considering UL coverage loss mitigation due to MPE, based on UL beam indication with the unified TCI framework for UL fast panel selection
 |

This summary includes the following:

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

## Summary of companies’ inputs

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

Table 1 Summary: issue 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 1.1 | **Proposal 1.A**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for Rel-17 unified TCI, when a UE is configured with separate DL/UL TCI, the largest number of configured TCI states for DL TCI state update is 128 per BWP per CC, and the largest number of configured TCI states for UL TCI state update is 64 per BWP per CC* Note: This doesn’t imply that UL TCI shares the same TCI state pool as or uses a different TCI state pool from joint DL/UL TCI

**FL Note**: This is the situation from the previous rounds**Alt1**. The largest number of configured TCI states for DL TCI state update is 128 per BWP per CC, and the largest number of configured TCI states for UL TCI state update is 64 per BWP per CC* **Support (16)**: NTT Docomo, Apple, Samsung, ZTE, Nokia/NSB (128 UL), Futurewei, LG (128 UL), Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Sony, Huawei, HiSilicon, Spreadtrum, MTK

**Alt2**. The total largest number of configured TCI states for DL TCI and UL TCI state update is 128 per BWP per CC* **Support (8)**: NTT Docomo, Ericsson, Intel, Qualcomm, OPPO, vivo, Futurewei, Convida
 | **Support/fine**: NTT Docomo, Apple, Samsung, ZTE, [Nokia/NSB], Futurewei, [LG], Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Sony, Huawei, HiSilicon, Spreadtrum, MTK, Ericsson, AT&T, CMCC, TCL**Concern**: Qualcomm (want 64 DL), OPPO (want 64 DL) |
| 1.2 | **Proposal 1.B.1:** On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for Rel-17 unified TCI, for DL channels/signals that share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update), the following option on source RSs and QCL-Types is also supported:* Option 3: CSI-RS for CSI is configured for QCL-TypeA and QCL-TypeD source RS

**FL Note**: It was explained that the so-called “circular” issue is avoided in practice via NW implementation, i.e. NW will not configure the same CSI-RS for CSI both as source and target RSs. | **Support/fine (23)**: Convida, Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, ZTE, CMCC, Samsung, Sony, Nokia/NSB, Qualcomm, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Futurewei, MTK, NTT Docomo, AT&T, Lenovo/MotM, Intel, Xiaomi, CATT, TCL **Concern**: Apple, OPPO  |
| 1.4 | **Proposal 1.B.2:** On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for Rel-17 unified TCI, for DL or UL channels/signals that can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH or dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update):* For DL: That a non-UE dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH or AP CSI-RS (per previous agreements) sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is configured via RRC.
* For UL: That an SRS (per previous agreements) sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is configured via RRC.

Note:The details of this RRC configuration (e.g. whether via a new RRC parameter or other means) is up to RAN2. FFS (RAN1): Whether this configuration is per resource, per resource set, or per CORESET. **FL Note:** Whether “not” is removed or kept seems immaterial as long as the respective RRC parameters employ correct range of values. That is, this should be up to RAN2. | **Support/fine (26)**: Convida, Ericsson, CMCC, Samsung, Sony, NTT Docomo, AT&T, Lenovo/MotM, Intel, Nokia/NSB, Qualcomm, LG, MTK, vivo, Futurewei, ZTE, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, TCL, OPPO **Concern**: Apple |
| 1.5 | **Proposal 1.H**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for the case when the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for PUSCH, PUCCH, and/or SRS are associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state per BWP, for each of the PUSCH, PUCCH, and/or SRS, one individual setting is optionally associated with each of the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state in a BWP via RRC**FL Note**: This is the situation from the previous rounds**Alt1**. Support the following: for each of the PUSCH, PUCCH, and/or SRS, one individual setting is optionally associated with each of the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state in a BWP via RRC* **Support/fine (13)**: Ericsson, vivo, Qualcomm, Intel, NTT Docomo, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/MotM, ZTE (2nd preference), Spreadtrum, Apple, LG
* **Concern**:

**Alt2**. Support the following: for each of PUSCH, PUCCH, and/or SRS, each of UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state is optionally associated with one of configured settings in a BWP via MAC-CE* **Support/fine (11)**: ZTE, Samsung, Futurewei, MTK, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Huawei, HiSilicon
* **Concern**: Ericsson, Apple, Intel, vivo, Spreadtrum

**FL Note:** RAN2 cannot decide for RAN1 whether the setting is configured via RRC or can be updated via MAC CE. Whether the additional flexibility from MAC CE is truly beneficial or not is not within RAN2 capability to assess.Thus, if there is no consensus on this issue, the previous agreement on optionally associating UL PCP setting (other than PLRS) with UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state shall be reverted, i.e. the setting is not associated with UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state – simply because such association is an incomplete feature | **Support/fine**: Ericsson, vivo, Qualcomm, Intel, NTT Docomo, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/MotM, Spreadtrum, Apple, LG, CATT, ZTE Samsung, Futurewei, MTK **Concern**:  |
| 1.7 | **Proposal 1.G**: On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, at least for discussion purposes, when both PL-RS and spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state are not the same [and they are not CSI-RS for BM with repetition ‘ON’], “beam alignment” also pertains to the following events:* The PL-RS is identical to the QCL Type-D source RS or UL spatial relation RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The QCL Type-D source RS of PL-RS is identical to the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The QCL Type-D source RS of PL-RS is identical to the QCL Type-D source RS or UL spatial relation RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state

**FL Note:** Any additional event (bullet) doesn’t seem acceptable for a number of companies. Even the above, some still have concern | **Support/fine:** Apple, MTK, Convida, Lenovo/MotM, Qualcomm, Samsung, NTT Docomo, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, Futurewei, CATT, Intel (without last bullet from prev), Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Spreadtrum, TCL**Concern:** ZTE, vivo, OPPO (4th case not included), Ericsson (use case unclear), LG (5th case not included)  |

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and update your view in Table 1**
2. **Share more inputs here if needed. For 1.4, share any response to Apple below**

**FL Note: BFR for unified TCI will be a main topic in the next meeting. Please prepare your Tdocs accordingly for RAN1#107-e** |
| Apple | 1.4: We think this needs some discussion. The first issue is SRS. If SRS does not share the indicated TCI, are we going to use spatialRelationInfo? The second issue is non-UE dedicated signal. So far we do not have definition about it, and the problem is that if non-UE dedicated signal does not share the indicated TCI, there is no legacy beam indication scheme in R16. The situation is even worse than SRS. Aperiodic CSI-RS may be easier, but there are still some problems, gNB is still able to indicate the beam by DCI, then would UE ignore it or not? Technically such RRC parameter is not helpful but it would take 10KB-25KB memory. One simple way may be to reserve one codepoint in trigger state to indicate the beam based on the shared TCI. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.A:** Support**Proposal 1.B.1:** We are fine with the proposal for progress. But this is not an essential feature.**Proposal 1.B.2:** We are fine with the direction of the proposal. However, the indication by RRC can be explicit or implicit. Example of implicit indication, is when a search space for non-UE-dedicated channel is configured to use the same CORESET of the search space of a UE-dedicated channel (e.g. USS). Therefore, we would like to update as follows:**Proposal 1.B.2:** On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for Rel-17 unified TCI, for DL or UL channels/signals that can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH or dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update):* That a DL channel/signal ~~[not]~~ sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is ~~indicated~~ configured via RRC.
* That an UL channel/signal ~~[not]~~ sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is configured ~~indicated~~ via RRC.

FFS: Whether this configuration is per resource, per resource set, or per CORESETNote: The details of this configuration is up to RAN2[Mod: Good point. OK]**Proposal 1.H:** This FL proposal (Alt1) is technically inferior than Alt2. The main issue with using RRC for the association rather than MAC CE is that it requires RRC reconfiguration to change PC settings and the association with the configured TCI states. This not only increases the reconfiguration time, but also the reconfiguration overhead associated with RRC reconfiguration (which ironically we tried to avoid in Rel-16 by using MAC-CE). It is ironic that the majority view is gravitated toward Alt1 simply because of “compromise spirit” in RAN1#106-e (mentioned by, e.g. vivo, Ericsson) rather than tangible technical merits. Having said that, unlike those voicing ”concern” on Alt2 (for the aforementioned reason), we will not voice “concern” on the FL proposal – since this seems to be the best we can do in Rel-17. We will accept the proposal for progress. Perhaps in Rel-18 or later the group may realize (just as from Rel-15 to Rel-16) that we need to upgrade this feature with MAC CE. [Mod: Thanks for being constructive despite your clearly articulated reservation (enough for a concern for sure) ☺]**Proposal 1.G:** We are support this proposal, with the change mentioned in an earlier reply. Without this change, in our view, the proposal is incomplete.**Proposal 1.G:** We support the principle of the proposal, but have a comment: If the spatial relation RS in the UL TCI state is SRS, SRS doesn’t have a QCL Type source RS, instead it has a spatial relation source RS. Therefore, we would like to update the first and third bullets to reflect this as follows (other the proposal is incomplete for that case):* The PL-RS is identical to the QCL Type-D source RS or spatial relation source RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The QCL Type-D source RS of PL-RS is identical to the QCL Type-D source RS or spatial relation source RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state

I illustrate this with a picture for better clarityWe don’t see the need for the text in square brackets in the main bullet.[Mod: OK] |
| MediaTek | **1.A**: Support. However, we would like to clarify whether or not a TCI state configured for DL TCI update can be also configured for UL TCI update. If yes, in Alt1, the max number of configured TCI states for DL TCI update may be limited by 64.[Mod: For separate DL/UL TCI, this may not always be the case in my understanding]**1.B.1:** Support.**1.B.2:** Support. We see using RRC to signal whether channels/signals share (or doesn't share) the indicated TCI state by Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication will not cause additional issues. Instead, using dynamic signaling to signaling the applicability will cause larger implementation and spec impact.According to previous agreements, only some of SRS (P/SP/AP SRS for CB, NCB, antenna switching and AP SRS for BM) can “optionally” share the indicated TCI state by Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication. For other SRS that is not impacted by Rel-17 unified TCI, legacy spatial relation should be provided to our understanding. For non-UE-dedicated reception on a CORESET and the associated PDSCH, if DL reception on the CORESET/PDSCH doesn't share the indicated TCI state by Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication (e.g., signaled by RRC for the corresponding CORESET), as agreed in previous meeting, Rel-15/16 MAC-CE-based beam indication will be used to indicate the TCI state to the corresponding CORESET.**Agreement**The following working assumption is confirmed with revision in RED.On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for any DL RS that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC, but can be configured as a target DL RS of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool), Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse the Rel-15/16 TCI state update signaling/configuration design(s) are used to update/configure such DL RS(s) with Rel-17 TCI state(s).* Applies for both intra-cell and inter-cell beam indication

**1.G:** Support. We see the content in the brackets is needed. Otherwise, these sub-bullets still canoot gurunett the beam aligment since UE may chage the beam during the P3 BM procedure. |
| Qualcomm | For 1.A, do not support. 64 DL TCIs + 64 UL TCIs should be enough. Separate DL/UL TCIs are mostly used when MPE happens, and should not be optimized at the cost of more configured TCIs than joint TCI[Mod: In Rel-15/16, when SRI is used for beam indication (analogous to separate DL/UL and UL TCI), we still have max 128 for DL TCI and max 64 for UL spatial relation. So your proposal seems to be a downgrade from Rel-15/16. Or do I miss something?]Fine for the remaining proposals |
| OPPO | Re 1.A: Do not support. We share the same understanding as Qualcomm. Increasing the total number of TCI states is over-optiomization. [Mod: See my comment to Qualcomm]Re 1.B.1: this has been dicussed multiple rounds and it was removed from the email endorsement in last week. Why do we keep discussing it? Compnies have explained the problems/concerns about this proposal a few times. [Mod: “Two” companies have explained but other companies don’t see the concerns as valid ☹]Re 1.B.2: The issue of this proposal is it includes the channels and reference signal that shall always follow the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state.* In UL, in our understanding, in UL, all the UL channels (PUCCH and PUSC) share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state. So, we do not need to configure the UL channel. The SRS rescore set for PUSCH should always follow the indicated TCI state too because those SRS resources are used to provide reference for PUSCH transmission. If the UE applies different TCI state on PUSCH and the corresponding SRS resource for PUSCH transmission, can the system work? For UL, only the SRS resource for BM can be applied with the ‘common’ TCI state or separately indicated TCI state.
* In DL: in our understanding for intra-cell BM, the non-UE dedicated PDCCH and associated PDSCH always follow the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state, as in our prevous agreement. For the CSI-RS resource for CSI, the gNB shall also apply the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state because the purpose of CSI-RS resource for CSI is to measure and provide CSI information for PDCCH/PDSCH transmission. If the UE measures CSI of channel being applied with different TCI state, how can the measured CSI be useful? Similarly, the CSI-RS for BM can be configurd to follow the indicated Rel-17 TCI state or separately indcaited TCI state because CSI-RS for BM is used to sweep the beams and find potentially good beam.

To summarise, we are fine to proposal on SRS for BM and CSI-RS for BM:**Proposal 1.B.2:** On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for Rel-17 unified TCI, for DL or UL channels/signals that can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH or dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update):* That a AP CSI-RS for BM ~~DL channel/signal~~ ~~[not]~~ sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is indicated via RRC.
* That an AP SRS for BM ~~UL channel/signal~~ ~~[not]~~ sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is indicated via RRC.

FFS: Whether this configuration is per resource, per resource set, or per CORESET [Mod: Your understanding for “non-UE-dedicated” is not according to the previous agreement as MTK pointed out which clearly says “can share” (not “always shares”) just as the agreements for CSI-RS and SRS. ]Re 1.H: Actually, Alt1 and Alt2 do not contradict to each other. Alt1 says the association can be configured in RRC and Alt2 says the association can be updated by MAC CE. We might combine them in one proposal. The similar design happened in Rel-15/16: for instance, the PL-RS for SRS is configured in RRC and then in rel16, we introduced MAC CE-based updating and another example is association between SRI codepint and PC parameters for PUSCH: the associaton is configured in RRC and then in rel-16, we introduced using MAC CE to update the association.  Our concern on agreeing Alt1 only is later on we might have to dicuss using MAC CE to update the association again.Re 1.G: Our 1st preference is to just define “beam alignment” by a general descrpption that is “PL-RS and spatial relation RS are QCLed with respect to Type D”, insteading of listing all the cases in details. If we choose to list all the cases, we have give a exhaustive list, no missing one. The case we proposed to add is: “ The QCL Type-D RSs of PL-RS and the spatial relation RS have the same source RS for QCL-TypeD” . Any reason why this case can not be counted as beam alignment? Actually from some apect the first sub-bullet “• The PL-RS is identical to the QCL Type-D source RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state” might not be beam alignment because the Rx beam on PL-RS is determined by the QCL-TypeD configured to the PL-RS, but not the PL-RS itself.[Mod: I do sympathize with your point (very much valid). Unfortunately, as we have discussed since last meeting, the three are the only agreeable ones] |
| ZTE | For 1.A. Support. In our views, up to 64 DL TCI state is too limited for NW design and unacceptable for us. As you see, besides for TCI states for DMRS of PDSCH/PDCCH (e.g., TRS+CSI-RS for BM, w.r.t., TypeA+TypeD), we still need to additionally configure other TCI states for CSI-RS for CSI, tracking and BM (e.g., SSB w.r.t. TypeC+TypeD). In technical, we may not need to distinguish a UL TCI state from a DL TCI state in the separate case. While a TCI state is activated/indicated for UL, the UE assume that the corresponding QCL-TypeD RS or spatial relation RS is applied. That’s all.For 1.B.1/2, 1.H: Support. For 1.G: Not support, due to the same reason as we mentioned before. |
| Apple | 1.B.x: We already provided our concern in last round. It seems all of them have not been resolved.[Mod: If you can point out which of your concerns haven’t been addressed (two companies tried to address above), it will help the discussion to be more productive and constructive] 1.H: We are fine in general. But we think this is for eMBB only. For URLLC, currently we have different designs.[Mod: We already have an FFS for URLLC from last meeting. Still open.] |
| CATT | Proposal 1.B.1: SupportProposal 1.B.2: Support. We fine to remove “not”. Proposal 1.H: We support Alt2 for flexibility. For progress, we could also accept Alt1.Proposal 1.G: Support  |
| LG | Proposal 1.A: Support Alt1 but preferred to same number for UL TCI as DL TCI.Proposal 1.B.2: Support the current proposal.Proposal 1.G: We agree with Samsung that we should cover additional cases in which current spec supports. In addition to the cases that Samsung raised, as we explained multiple times, the spatial relation source RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL/joint TCI state can be an SRS resource when the spatial relation RS in the UL/joint TCI state is SRS, in which the (modified) three bullets cannot cover (Note that SRS cannot be PL RS!). We prefer to clarify the meaning of ‘beam alignment’ in this case in this meeting, but if companies need more time for this case, we could leave this case as FFS.**Proposal 1.G**: On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, at least for discussion purposes, when both PL-RS and spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state are not the same [and they are not CSI-RS for BM with repetition ‘ON’], “beam alignment” also pertains to the following events:* The PL-RS is identical to the QCL Type-D source RS or spatial relation source RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The QCL Type-D source RS of PL-RS is identical to the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The QCL Type-D source RS of PL-RS is identical to the QCL Type-D source RS or spatial relation source RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* FFS: how to define “beam alignment” when the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state and spatial relation source RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state are not DL RS.

[Mod: Please see my comment to OPPO] |
| NTT Docomo | Proposal 1.A: Support. Re MediaTek's comment, our understanding is "No" (i.e. a TCI state configured for DL TCI update can NOT be also configured for UL TCI update). It is because the content of UL TCI and DL TCI are different for separate TCI, in our view.Considering that Rel.15 supports max 128 TCI states for PDSCH, 64 DL TCIs + 64 UL TCIs is too limmited.Proposal 1.B.1: Support.Proposal 1.B.2: Support Samsung's update.Proposal 1.H: Support Alt.1. We suggest to take Alt.1, because it is a common part of Alt.1-2. We can make FFS for MAC CE in Alt.1, if needed.[Mod: proposal 1.H is Alt1 ☺]Proposal 1.G: Support. |
| Mod V13 | Minor revision on 1.B.2 and 1.G per inputs  |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1.A: supportProposal 1.B.1: supportProposal 1.B.2: support, and fine with change “indicated” to “configured”. In addition, we also think it is better to list which channel/signal has fiexlibility to share same TCI state as UE-dedicated reception/transmission or not here, to make it clearer. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1.A: Thanks for the clarification from DCM and FL. However, we have different understanding from DCM. According to previous RAN1 agreements and conclusion, a TCI state configured for joint DL/UL TCI update can be also configured for DL TCI update since they share the same TCI pool, as agreed previously. [Mod: This is correct. However, the switching between joint and separate is done via RRC. As long as this is kept, this can be done regardless ofth epool design] If RAN2 designs UL TCI can share the pool of DL TCI update, i.e., the same pool for joint DL/UL update, we see a TCI state configured for joint DL/UL TCI update can be used for both DL and UL TCI update. However, we agree this is not always the case.[Mod: For UL this is not always the case (tat’s your previous question. Not DL)]We feel this issue may not be that urgent and can be decided in UE feature discussion. [Mod: I am not sure if this belongs to UE feature. The list of possible values yes, bot not the max. It may belong to maintenance but if not decided early this may derail UE feature discussion]Proposal 1.B.2: Regarding the last bullet, according to previous comments from companies, they may be confused about whether the last FFS is also up to RAN2 design, and most of the companies think the last FFS should be decided by RAN1 (including us). Thus, even we are fine with the last bullet, we suggest to clarify that the last FFS should up to RAN1 decision. FFS: Whether this configuration is per resource, per resource set, or per CORESET, this should be decided by RAN1. [Mod: OK]Proposal 1.H: Okay for the progress.Proposal 1.G: It seems there are some errors when captured the modifications from Samsung. The PL-RS shall be always DL RS, thus no spatial relation RS can be configured for PL-RS. Correction as follows:**Proposal 1.G**: On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, at least for discussion purposes, when both PL-RS and spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state are not the same [and they are not CSI-RS for BM with repetition ‘ON’], “beam alignment” also pertains to the following events:* The PL-RS is identical to the QCL Type-D source RS or UL spatial relation RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The QCL Type-D source RS of PL-RS is identical to the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The QCL Type-D source RS of PL-RS is identical to the QCL Type-D source RS or UL spatial relation RS of the spatial relation RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
 |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Proposal 1.A: We prefer the same number of TCI-states for UL and DL (128). We are OK with at least having separate numbers for UL and DL (Alt. 1)Proposal 1.B.1: SupportProposal 1.B.2: Support the updated proposalProposal 1.G: Fine with the latest version |
| Nokia/NSB | 1.4: Our understanding is that we have Rel17 TCI states and *indicated* Rel17 TCI states (one for DL and one for UL at a time). Thus, our expectation is that in uplink spatialRelationInfo is replaced either with Rel17 TCI state or that the resource follows *indicated* Rel17 TCI state per RRC configuration. [Mod: This is a relate dbut separate issue can be discussed as a next step (tend to agree)] |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1.A: Support. For DL TCI, we still need TCI states that include SSB (source for TRS) and 64 that contain TRS (source for PDCCH/PDSCH). The fact that we have separate UL TCI states does not change that. For UL TCI, 64 is enough.Proposal 1.B.1: Support. If nothing else, this will make the specification clearer to read. Proposal 1.B.2: We are probably OK, but we are checking with RAN2 if the proposed agreement provides RAN2 with sufficient background to design the signalling. In our understanding, this does not mean that we include an explicit RRC parameter in the list. Could we add an explicit note for this:**Proposal 1.B.2:** On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for Rel-17 unified TCI, for DL or UL channels/signals that can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH or dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update):* That a DL channel/signal ~~[not]~~ sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is configured via RRC.
* That an UL channel/signal ~~[not]~~ sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is configured via RRC.

Note: this does not mean that RAN1 will include a specific RRC parameter for this purpose.FFS: Whether this configuration is per resource, per resource set, or per CORESET. The details of this configuration is up to RAN2.[Mod: OK]Then we agree with Nokia that the spatial relations will be redundant, and replaced with UL TCI states. This is an important topic for RAN1#107-e. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Proposal 1.A: We are OK with it for the sake of meeting progress.Proposal 1.B.2: Support |
| Mod V20 | Minor revisions per comments |
| Futurewei | Proposal 1.A: Support.Proposal 1.B.1: Support.Proposal 1.B.2: Support the latest proposal.Proposal 1.H: Our preference is Alt 2 as it can provide more flexibility. However, for the sake of progress, we can accept Alt 1. [Mod: Appreciate the constructiveness]Proposal 1.G: Support. |
| Mod V22 | No revision on proposals |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1.H:** Similar view as SS, OPPO, and CATT. [Mod: Appreciate the constructiveness] |
| AT&T | Proposals 1.A, 1.B.1, 1.B.2: support |
| Mod V26 | No revision on proposals |
| vivo | **Proposal 1.A**: We don’t see the necessity. Views similar as before. **Proposal 1.B.2:**  OK.**Proposal 1.H**: OK. **Proposal 1.G**: Don’t support this proposal. Overdesign especially considering there is no RAN1 specifcation impact for this. |
| Convida | Proposal 1.A: In our understanding, an UL TCI can be derived from a joint DL/UL TCI state. If so, and if the UE is configured with 128 TCI states for joint DL/UL TCI, why can’t 128 UL TCIs be derived from those 128 TCI states for joint DL/UL?[Mod: I have replied to this before. While pool design is up to RAN2, switching between joint and separate DL/UL is done via RRC. Therefore I am not sure what you mean by “UL TCI can be derived from a joint DL/UL TCI state ... why can’t 128 UL TCIs be derived from those 128 TCI states for joint DL/UL?“. The bottom line for proposal 1.A is that we want to have the same max # configured TCI states for DL and UL (UL analogous to spatial relation).]The other proposals look fine. |
| Mod V29 | No revision on proposals |
| LG | Proposal 1.B.2: Added note creates some confusion to us. How we can configure these without RRC parameter? Can someone clarify? [Mod: See MediaTek’s comment below, also Samsung’s previous comment in round 2 and Ericsson’s comment above – reworded to avoid confusion] |
| CMCC | Proposal 1.A：Support. Add our position in the table. |
| MediaTek | @LG, to our understading, the note doesn't preclude to introduce an RRC parameter to configure the applicability, however, this will be decided by RAN2 instead of RAN1. |
| OPPO | Re proposal 1.B.2, suggest to make the following wording change to clarify what kind of channels or RS shares the rel-17 indicated TCI state, as in our previous agreement:**Proposal 1.B.2:** On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for Rel-17 unified TCI, for DL or UL channels/signals that can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH or dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update):* That a ~~DL channel/signal~~ non-UE dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH or AP CSI-RS (which were agreed previously) sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is configured via RRC.
* That an ~~UL channel/signal~~ SRS (which was agreed previously) sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all of dedicated PUCCH resources (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update) is configured via RRC.

Note: this does not mean that RAN1 will include a specific RRC parameter for this purpose. The details of this configuration is up to RAN2. FFS (RAN1): Whether this configuration is per resource, per resource set, or per CORESET. [Mod: Appreciate the constructive proposal - done] |
| Spreadtrum | Support these proposals. And for Proposal 1.G, we noticed that we are marked as concerned by mistake. Our positioning has been updated. |
| Intel |  OK with the current proposals.  |
| TCL | Proposal 1.A: Support. In our opinion, the number of DL TCI state on Rel. 17 should not be less than that on Rel. 16 at least.Proposal 1.B.1: Support.Proposal 1.B.2: Support.Proposal 1.H: Support. |
| Apple | For 1.B.x, as suggested by FL, our view is provided again:1.B.1: * This shared TCI state would anyway be applied to aperiodic CSI-RS when scheduling offset is below threshold, but CSI-RS for CSI should not be the QCL source for other CSI-RS.
* The use case is unclear. Usually gNB needs to provide TRS. If CSI-RS for CSI is configured as QCL source, such CSI-RS should be QCLed with TRS. Then this unnecessariliy brings in an additional stage in QCL chain.
* There would be a risk for no TRS. If the CSI-RS for CSI is not configured with any QCL source, UE cannot identify any TRS.
* CSI-RS for CSI usually contains >1 ports. So such CSI-RS cannot be used for RLM/BFD. This would require explicit configuration of BFD/RLM RSs. Explicit configuration would require RRC reconfiguration.

1.B.2: We think this needs some discussion. The first issue is SRS. If SRS does not share the indicated TCI, are we going to use spatialRelationInfo? The second issue is non-UE dedicated signal. In addition, how to interpret the SRI (especially for NCB) if the SRS and PUSCH are configured with different beams? So far we do not have definition about it, and the problem is that if non-UE dedicated signal does not share the indicated TCI, there is no legacy beam indication scheme in R16. The situation is even worse than SRS. Aperiodic CSI-RS may be easier, but there are still some problems, gNB is still able to indicate the beam by DCI, then would UE ignore it or not? Technically such RRC parameter is not helpful but it would take 10KB-25KB memory. One simple way may be to reserve one codepoint in trigger state to indicate the beam based on the shared TCI. |
| Mod V42 | Minor revision of 1.B.2 per OPPO’s comment (by elaborating per previous agreements). Rewordingon Notes to avoid confusion.**@1.B.2 proponents: any response to Apple?** |
| MediaTek | On Apple’s questions, we already provided response in previous comments. Repeat again as follows:* If SRS does not share the indicated TCI, are we going to use spatialRelationInfo?
	+ Unlike DL channels/signals, where RAN1 has an agreement that they still can be configured with Rel-17 DL TCI (i.e., use the same TCI pool) even they don't share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state. If no new agreement is reached for SRS that doensnt share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state, our understading is spatial relation should be reused. However, as pointed out by Nokia and Ericsson, we can further dicuss whether the SRS can be also configured with Rel-17 UL TCI instead of spatial relation.
* Non-UE dedicated signal?
	+ For non-UE dedicated signal that does not share the same indicated TCI state, RAN1 aleady agreed Rel-15/16 signaling mechanism is reused to provide Rel-17 DL TCI for them.

**Agreement**The following working assumption is confirmed with revision in RED.On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for any DL RS that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC, but can be configured as a target DL RS of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool), Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse the Rel-15/16 TCI state update signaling/configuration design(s) are used to update/configure such DL RS(s) with Rel-17 TCI state(s).* Applies for both intra-cell and inter-cell beam indication
* How to interpret the SRI (especially for NCB) if the SRS and PUSCH are configured with different beams?
	+ We think the beam aligment can be gurunteed by NW implementation, even let SRS for CSI share the same indicated TCI state is much simpler.
* gNB is still able to indicate the beam by DCI, then would UE ignore it or not?
	+ Sorry we don't get the poit of this question …

In summary, we see using RRC to signal whether channels/signals share (or doesn't share) the indicated TCI state by Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication will not cause additional issues. Instead, using dynamic signaling to indicate the applicability will cause larger implementation and spec impact. |
| Ericsson | We think Apple raises a few good points on 1.B.2. Last bullet first: we do not believe that we should introduce an explicit parameter for the UE to follow the common beam – the UE would follow the common beam when no TCI state is explicitly provided. We hope that RAN2 will use this signallign design principle, to reduce RRC signaling overhead.Then, in general, a configured parameter overrides a default. So we do believe that unless we agree on something else, the UE shall follow a configured spatial relation. Then we think that for SRS, we should replace the spatial relation configuration with an UL TCI. Still, the same statement holds: if an UL TCI is RRC configured, the UE should follow that.Configuring NCB-SRS with a beam different from the common beam is not a good configuration, but I don’t see that it needs to be forbidden – there is nothing that prevents the UE from using different beams, as long as they are not transmitted at the same time.For aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE would follow an explicitly configured TCI state. If there is no TCI state provided, the UE would follow the common beam. This again assumes that RAN2 will adopt the principle “default = common beam” |
| Apple | @MTK, thank you for the comments. some follow-up as follows.* If SRS does not share the indicated TCI, are we going to use spatialRelationInfo?
	+ Unlike DL channels/signals, where RAN1 has an agreement that they still can be configured with Rel-17 DL TCI (i.e., use the same TCI pool) even they don't share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state. If no new agreement is reached for SRS that doensnt share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state, our understading is spatial relation should be reused. However, as pointed out by Nokia and Ericsson, we can further dicuss whether the SRS can be also configured with Rel-17 UL TCI instead of spatial relation.
	+ [Apple] Do you think this is aligned with the following statement “We think the beam aligment can be gurunteed by NW implementation, even let SRS for CSI share the same indicated TCI state is much simpler.”?
* Non-UE dedicated signal?
	+ For non-UE dedicated signal that does not share the same indicated TCI state, RAN1 aleady agreed Rel-15/16 signaling mechanism is reused to provide Rel-17 DL TCI for them.
	+ [Apple] What is R15/R16 mechanism?
* How to interpret the SRI (especially for NCB) if the SRS and PUSCH are configured with different beams?
	+ We think the beam aligment can be gurunteed by NW implementation, even let SRS for CSI share the same indicated TCI state is much simpler.
	+ [Apple] Do you agree UE needs to prepare for beam misalignement in implementation?
* gNB is still able to indicate the beam by DCI, then would UE ignore it or not?
	+ Sorry we don't get the poit of this question …
	+ [Apple] For AP-CSI-RS, the beam indication is based on scheduling DCI, and gNB can indicate the same beam as the indicated share TCI. What is the point to introduce additional RRC configuration?

@Ericsson, thank you for the clarification. Please find our view inline.We think Apple raises a few good points on 1.B.2. Last bullet first: we do not believe that we should introduce an explicit parameter for the UE to follow the common beam – the UE would follow the common beam when no TCI state is explicitly provided. We hope that RAN2 will use this signallign design principle, to reduce RRC signaling overhead.[Apple] I also think no explicit parameter is needed, as there is no separate beam indication for common signals. Instead, some QCL rule is needed. If this RRC is introduced and configured as enabled, the beam for RAR would become the first issue. It is not reasonable to follow the indicated beam for RAR reception.Then, in general, a configured parameter overrides a default. So we do believe that unless we agree on something else, the UE shall follow a configured spatial relation. Then we think that for SRS, we should replace the spatial relation configuration with an UL TCI. Still, the same statement holds: if an UL TCI is RRC configured, the UE should follow that.[Apple] I agree that we should avoid mixing spatial relation and UL TCI. This would unnecessarily require more memory.Configuring NCB-SRS with a beam different from the common beam is not a good configuration, but I don’t see that it needs to be forbidden – there is nothing that prevents the UE from using different beams, as long as they are not transmitted at the same time.[Apple] The problem is that currently SRI is used for both digital precoder and beam selection, if such beam mismatch happens, how to select the digital precoder?For aperiodic CSI-RS, the UE would follow an explicitly configured TCI state. If there is no TCI state provided, the UE would follow the common beam. This again assumes that RAN2 will adopt the principle “default = common beam”[Apple] I agree that this is one possible way. Actually, another way is to do nothing. The NW can always indicate the TCI = shared TCI in trigger state. That is why we feel current proposal is not needed.  |
| vivo | One minor comment regarding explicitly spelling out all the signals, do we need to clarify the UL part also includes those PUCCH/PUSCH associated with non-UE dedicated CORESETs?  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1.B.2:** “Non-UE-dedeidcated PDCCH/PDSCH” here are those associated with the serving cell PCI, right? If so we prefer to make this clear.  |
| MediaTek | Some comments in response to Apple:* If SRS does not share the indicated TCI, are we going to use spatialRelationInfo?
	+ [MTK] Unlike DL channels/signals, where RAN1 has an agreement that they still can be configured with Rel-17 DL TCI (i.e., use the same TCI pool) even they don't share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state. If no new agreement is reached for SRS that doensnt share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state, our understading is spatial relation should be reused. However, as pointed out by Nokia and Ericsson, we can further dicuss whether the SRS can be also configured with Rel-17 UL TCI instead of spatial relation.
	+ [Apple] Do you think this is aligned with the following statement “We think the beam aligment can be gurunteed by NW implementation, even let SRS for CSI share the same indicated TCI state is much simpler.”?
	+ [MTK] If Apple prefer to revert the previous agreement to make SRS for CSI always share the same indicated TCI state for UL, we are also fine ☺.
* Non-UE dedicated signal?
	+ For non-UE dedicated signal that does not share the same indicated TCI state, RAN1 aleady agreed Rel-15/16 signaling mechanism is reused to provide Rel-17 DL TCI for them.
	+ [Apple] What is R15/R16 mechanism?
	+ [MTK] The mechanism specified in current spec.
* How to interpret the SRI (especially for NCB) if the SRS and PUSCH are configured with different beams?
	+ We think the beam aligment can be gurunteed by NW implementation, even let SRS for CSI share the same indicated TCI state is much simpler.
	+ [Apple] Do you agree UE needs to prepare for beam misalignement in implementation?
	+ [MTK] If Apple prefer to revert the previous agreement to make SRS for CSI always share the same indicated TCI state for UL, we are also fine ☺.
* gNB is still able to indicate the beam by DCI, then would UE ignore it or not?
	+ Sorry we don't get the poit of this question …
	+ [Apple] For AP-CSI-RS, the beam indication is based on scheduling DCI, and gNB can indicate the same beam as the indicated share TCI. What is the point to introduce additional RRC configuration?
	+ [MTK] If gNB want to trigger AP-CSI-RS measurement for the beam other than the indicated share TCI.
 |

### Issue 2 (inter-cell beam management)

Table 3 Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2.2 | **Proposal 2.H**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, in RAN1#107-e, select one of the following alternatives:* **Alt1.** Rel-15 L1-RSRP reporting format is reused for all SSBRI-RSRP pairs in one L1-RSRP reporting instance, i.e. for K>1, (K-1) 4-bit differential L1-RSRP(s) calculated relative to the reference (absolute) 7-bit L1-RSRP
* **Alt2**. Differential L1-RSRP per non-serving cell/serving cell is used:When more than one SSBRI/L1-RSRP pairs associated with a same PCI are reported, Rel-15 L1-RSRP reporting format is used for pairs associated with the same PCI, i.e. 4-bit differential L1-RSRP(s) calculated relative to the PCI-specific reference (absolute) 7-bit L1-RSRP

 **FL note:** This is the situation from the previous rounds**Alt1.** Rel-15 L1-RSRP reporting format is reused for all SSBRI-RSRP pairs in one L1-RSRP reporting instance, i.e. for K>1, (K-1) 4-bit differential L1-RSRP(s) calculated relative to the reference (absolute) 7-bit L1-RSRP* Support **(16):** Samsung, MTK, Qualcomm, Ericsson, NTT Docomo, vivo, Nokia/NSB, Apple, Intel, OPPO, AT&T, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSilicon

**Alt2**. Differential L1-RSRP per non-serving cell/serving cell is used:When more than one SSBRI/L1-RSRP pairs associated with a same PCI are reported, Rel-15 L1-RSRP reporting format is used for pairs associated with the same PCI, i.e. 4-bit differential L1-RSRP(s) calculated relative to the PCI-specific reference (absolute) 7-bit L1-RSRP* Support **(6):** ZTE, CMCC, Lenovo/MotM, Qualcomm (2nd preference), Sony

However, since this is the first time the topic was brought up, it would benefit from more careful comparison (TBD RAN1#107-e)  | **Support/fine:** Samsung, MTK, Sony, Apple, CATT, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, ZTE, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo, NEC, Xiaomi, ...**Concern:** |
| 2.3 | **Proposal 2.I**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management, on QCL assumption for paging reception after being activated with only one TCI state associated with PCI different from serving cell, the UE is to monitor paging in CSS configured for paging with the [SSB associated with] newly activated TCI state**FL note:** This is the current situationQCL assumption for paging reception after being activated with only one TCI state associated with PCI different from serving cell [2]**Alt0.** UE not required to monitor paging associated with the newly activated TCI state* Support: OPPO, vivo, Lenovo/MotM, MTK (2nd), CATT
* Concern: Huawei, HiSilicon, Samsung, Apple

**Alt1**. UE to monitor paging in USS associated with the newly activated TCI state [11]* Support: Huawei/HiSi (2nd), Ericsson, Samsung (2nd preference), Spreadtrum, AT&T, Nokia/NSB
* Concern: MTK

**Alt2**. UE to monitor paging in CSS configured for paging with the newly activated TCI state [offline]* Support: Huawei/HiSi (1st), NTT Docomo, Apple, ZTE, Samsung (1st preference), Futurewei, Spreadtrum, AT&T, Sony, MTK (1st), NTT Docomo, Xiaomi

Also check comments from Ericsson, NTT Docomo, and Huawei (thorough explanation on RAN2 info)  | **Support/fine:** Huawei/HiSi, NTT Docomo, Apple, ZTE, Samsung, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, AT&T, Sony, MTK, NTT Docomo, Xiaomi, CMCC, [NEC], **Concern:** vivo, Lenovo/MotM, LG, Intel |
| 2.4 | **Proposal 2.F**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for inter-cell beam management, the supported Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and/or DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation), the non-UE dedicated channels/signals (on which such inter-cell beam indication does not apply) comprise:* All PDCCH receptions on CORESET(s) along with the respective PDSCH receptions and respective PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions if the CORESET(s) is associated with Type3 CSS set only in SCell (not PCell), Type2 CSS (when >1 activated TCI states are associated with PCI(s) different from serving cell), and any Type0/0A/1 CSS set
	+ FFS: the CORESET(s) associated with any Type2 CSS set when only 1 activated TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell (depending on the outcome of the paging issue)

**FL note**: This may be linked with 2.3 (2.3 needs to be resolved first):* If 2.3 is resolved with Alt0 or only Alt1, 2.F seems to be fine as is
* If 2.3 is resolved with Alt2 (or Alt1 + Alt2), 2.F needs to be refined
 | **Support/fine:** MTK, vivo, Lenovo/MotM, Qualcomm (with 3), Samsung, LG, AT&T, CMCC, CATT, NTT Docomo, Intel, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi**Resolve issue [2.3] first:** Apple, Huawei/HiSi, Nokia/NSB, Futurewei, Sony, ZTE **Concern:** Ericsson **(**activated TCI states should not be associated with CORESETs**)**, Apple (same concern as Ericsson)  |
| 2.1 | **Proposal 2.E**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, support event-driven beam reporting* If UE consecutively identify an event happens, UE can trigger the L1-RSRP report
* The event at least includes:
	+ The L1-RSRP from one SSB within list of SSBs with PCIs different from serving cell is larger than the best L1-RSRP measured from a list of serving cell SSB plus an offset, where the offset is configured by RRC
	+ The L1-RSRP from one SSB within list of SSBs with PCIs different from serving cell is larger than a pre-defined value which is configured by RRC
	+ The list of serving cell SSBs and SSBs with PCIs different from serving cell are configured by RRC
	+ Indication for activating a reporting configuration
* The L1-RSRP report is transmitted by MAC CE, which includes
	+ SSBRI from the list of SSBs with PCI different from serving cell
	+ L1-RSRP for the corresponding SSB
* A prohibit timer is introduced to prohibit UE sends multiple L1-RSRP report MAC CEs, which is similar to PHR
 | **Support/fine**: Apple, NTT Docomo, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Qualcomm, AT&T, Xiaomi, Sony, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT**Concern**: Futurewei, Intel, LG (concern on MAC CE), MTK, Ericsson, Samsung (concern on MAC CE), OPPO, vivo, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MotM (remove last bullet)  |

Table 4 Additional inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and update your view in Table 3**
2. **Share more inputs here if needed**
 |
| Ericsson | On 2.3, this is from 38.331:**- RRC\_CONNECTED:**- The UE stores the AS context;- Transfer of unicast data to/from UE;- At lower layers, the UE may be configured with a UE specific DRX;- For UEs supporting CA, use of one or more SCells, aggregated with the SpCell, for increased bandwidth;- For UEs supporting DC, use of one SCG, aggregated with the MCG, for increased bandwidth;- Network controlled mobility within NR and to/from E-UTRA;- The UE:- Monitors Short Messages transmitted with P-RNTI over DCI (see clause 6.5), if configured;- Monitors control channels associated with the shared data channel to determine if data is scheduled for it;- Provides channel quality and feedback information;- Performs neighbouring cell measurements and measurement reporting;- Acquires system information;- Performs immediate MDT measurement together with available location reporting.So the UE is supposed to monitor for P-RNTI for paging messages. |
| NTT Docomo | Issue 2.3: As in WID, UE can always receive from serving cell. Even for minimum UE capability (i.e. one PCI for either serving cell PCI or non-serving cell PCI), and if UE is activated with one Rel.17 TCI state from non-serving cell PCI, UE must receive Type0/0A/1/2[/3] CSS with Rel.15/16 TCI states or Rel.17 TCI states from serving cell.

|  |
| --- |
| iv. For inter-cell beam management, a UE can transmit to or receive from only a single cell (i.e. serving cell does not change when beam selection is done). This includes L1-only measurement/reporting (i.e. no L3 impact) and beam indication associated with cell(s) with any Physical Cell ID(s) |

Hence, UE can receive paging (in Type2 CSS) from serving cell. Based on this understanding, we are fine with Alt.0.Short Message should be also considered with Paging. We believe it is very important to ensure that UE can always receive Paging/Short Message. Short Message includes ETWS (Earthquake and Tsunami Warning System), which is very important to protect human’s life, especially in Japanese environment.After some discussion with our RAN2 colleagure, as long as UE can receive Paging/Short Message from serving cell, there is no need to receive it from non-serving cell. However, if UE cannot receive Paging/Short Message from serving cell, UE should be able to receive it from non-serving cell. Hence, we keep our name noted in Alt.2. In Alt.2, TCI state of CORESET with Type2-CSS set can be updated, when Rel.17 TCI states are updated to non-serving cell PCI, but TCI states of CORESET with Type0/0A/1 cannot be updated to non-serving cell PCI.For Alt.1, we think the spec. impacts to introduce USS for paging are large, hence it is not preferred.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Issue 2.3:** We checked with our RAN2 colleagues, and are informed that:* + - 1. In connected mode, UE should monitor P-RNTI (as mentioned by E///), not just for paging message but also other short messages such as ETWS/CMAS (as mentioned by DCM).
			2. Though system information can be updated by RRC signaling, other short messages such as ETWS/CMAS should be delivered with low latency.

Here, the underlying assumption is UE supports only one active TCI state and/or UE has been activated with only one active TCI state (associated with PCI different from serving cell). In this case, the UE will not actively maintain the beamformed communication link with serving cell TRP, so we are not sure whether it is reliable for the UE to monitor paging from serving cell TRP.  With the discussions thus far, to us, it is now more sensible that UE monitors paging from the activated/maintained communication link with TRP with different PCI. In addition, with Alt-2, the only change is QCL assumption for CSS for paging monitoring, and no other changes are expected. We updated our preferences in table above. |
| Samsung | **Propoasl 2.H:** We support this proposal. We prefer Alt1, Alt2 unnecessarily complicates the design as the size of the measurement report with Alt2 depends not only on the number of measurements K, but also on the PCI(s) the measurements belong to. But we agree that finalizing it in the next meeting gives us a chance to study this a bit more**Issue 2.3:** After reading the RAN2 specs and discussing with the RAN2 collegueaus we think that paging messages can be sent in RRC connected state, and could plausibly be sent when a UE has beam on a neighboring cell with PCI different from that of the serving cell. Therefore, Alt0 is not a viable option. In Rel-15/16 paging is sent using Type2-PDCCH CSS, Alt1 (paging on USS) deperats from the Rel-15/16 design principle and so it is less preferred. Alt2 keeps the Rel-15/16 design of pagaing (for the search space), we would like to further persue this option to minimize the changes. The concern from Ericsson and Apple on “activated TCI states should not be associated with CORESETs” is not clear to us. In Rel-15/Rel-16 the PDCCH derives its TCI state from the CORESET, we believe that the same principle should be followed in Rel-17. The unified TCI state becomes the TCI state of the CORESET assoiciated with UE dedicated channels.**Proposal 2.F**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for inter-cell beam management, the supported Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and/or DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation), the non-UE dedicated channels/signals (on which such inter-cell beam indication does not apply) comprise:* All PDCCH receptions on CORESET(s) along with the respective PDSCH receptions and respective PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions if the CORESET(s) is associated with any Type0/0A/1/[2]/3 CSS set

**Proposal 2.F:** Support, with changes. In general, for inter-cell beam management, the UE should not receive dedicated-UE-channels on CSS, as CSS would also be associated with non-UE-dedicated channels, which don’t follow the unified TCI state. However, given issue 2.3, we would like to consider one exception which is Type2-PDCCH CSS that can be used for paging, we think that this search space can follow the unified TCI state.[Mod: OK. Type2 is now FFS]**Proposal 2.E:** We support event driven reporting, but have concern on MAC CE based even driven reporting. This requires involvement of RAN2 in the design of the corresponding MAC CE, we have concern given that we are approaching the end of Rel-17. Event driven reporting is not esstential to the completion of Rel-17, therefore we can consider postponing to a future release. |
| MediaTek | **Issue 2.3:** * Alt0, we share similar view with DCM that UE still can receive paging if the beam switch back to the serving cell. Alt0 doesn't prohibit UE from receiving paging if UE supports only one activated TCI states.
* Alt1, since it may cause large implementation and spec impact, we don't prefer it.
* Alt2, we are also okay to this alternative, and remove Type2 CSS from Proposal 2.F.

**2.H**: Support. Okay to postpone it to the next meeting.**2.F:** Support. We are okay to remove Type2 CSS from the list if Alt2 in Issue 2.3 is adopted in the end. One suggestion is we can put “Type2” in brackets, and resolve the brackets after Issue 2.3 is resolved.[Mod: Done]**2.E:** Not support |
| Sony | **Proposal 2.H**: support.**Issue 2.3**: thanks to the explanation from Erisson, Docomon and Huawei, we tend to agree for UE with only one active TCI state from NSC and NO active TCI state from SC, the UE should be able to monitor paging from NSC. That seems the only choice under such circumstance. So we change our preference on Alt.2. **Proposal 2.F:** since there is an extreme case in issue 2.3, our preference is to resolve it first, i.e. whether the CORESET associated with Type2 CSS set can be deemed as non-UE-dedicated channel. Then come back to handle the non-UE-dedicated channel/signal. [Mod: Yourcinput is resolved in revised version]**Proposal 2.E**: supportive. Though we prefer the UCI-based event reporting, for the sake of avoid further delaying this decision process, we can live with the MAC CE based event reporting.  |
| Qualcomm | For 2.H, support with 1st preference for Alt1For issue 2.3, support Alt0. This is already agreed to our understanding, i.e. in the agreement for switching between serving and non-serving cell with 1 active TCI state[Mod: I tend to agree with this]For 1st 2.F, supportFor 2nd 2.F, support |
| OPPO | Re 2.H: Suggest to do the down-selection now, no next meeting. Alt1 has clear majority.Re 2.F: we are ok to include the Type 3 CSS here. But not all the Type 3 CSS. In PCell, the UE monitors C-RNTI, MCS-RNTI and CS-RNTI in Type 3 CSS set. Therefore, in PCell, the Type 3 CSS shall follow the rel-17 indicatd TCI state:[Mod: I tend to agree with this. Revised. Let’s see if other companies are ok. Else we can leave the whole Type3 FFS]**Proposal 2.F**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for inter-cell beam management, the supported Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and/or DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation), the non-UE dedicated channels/signals (on which such inter-cell beam indication does not apply) comprise:* All PDCCH receptions on CORESET(s) along with the respective PDSCH receptions and respective PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions if the CORESET(s) is associated with any Type0/0A/1/2~~/3~~ CSS set and Type 3 CSS set (in SCell Only, not primary cell)
 |
| NEC | Proposal 2.H: Support to decide in RAN1#107e.Issue 2.3: For **Alt2**, monitoring paging in USS is a bit contradictory to common practice, thus it is not preferred.For **Alt1**, although we support UE to monitor paging in CSS, we believe that we haven’t had agreement that the newly activated Rel-17 inter-cell TCI state would be applied to non-UE dedicated channel/RS. In this case, UE would always have a separated QCL assumption (e.g., previous TCI associated with serving cell) other than newly activated TCI state associated with different PCI, to receive the non-UE dedicated channel/RS, including paging.With that being said, we tend to agree with DoCoMo and MediaTek on Alt 0, if it means that UE can still receive paging in CSS from serving cell. If this is correct understanding, maybe we can clarify this for Alt 0: **Alt0.** UE not required to monitor paging associated with the newly activated TCI state, and UE can monitor paging in CSS configured for paging with the previous activated TCI state associated with serving cell. [Mod: Not sure if this wording reflects what’s being sai by Docomo and MTK. It is only valid for 1 atcive TCI state. Please also check Qualcomm’s point. I tend to agree that Alt0 is already supported.]Proposal 2.F: prefer to solve issue 2.3 firstly. |
| ZTE | For 2.H, support. Some further discussion is needed. In general, the SSB Tx power from different cell may be quite different, and we may also need to consider RSRP definition herein (e.g., whether a coupling loss is much better). For 2.3/2.4, we suggest to complete 2.3 firstly and then we can further review 2.4. |
| Apple | 2.E, we can add “a dedicated SR for event-driven report can be optionally configured”, if this can be helpful for progress. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.H: Support Alt1. If the L1-RSRP of a beam is out of range, it means the beam quality is not good. Then such beam should not be reported.Issue 2.3: Support Alt0. UE should receive paging from its serving cell.Proposal 2.F: Support.Proposal 2.E, for the last sub-bullet of the second bullet, the detailed indication message needs to be clarified. Does it mean the similar parameter as TimeToTrigger in L3-based mobility measurement? |
| LG | Issue 2.3: Alt0 is supported. For inter-cell beam management, we have a similar view with Docomo that UE is possible to receive paging in CSS ‘from a serving cell’ with one active TCI state.Proposal 2.E: Update the table that we support event-driven beam reporting but not based on MAC CE as similar to Samsung. |
| NTT Docomo2 | Proposal 2.H: Support, with 1st preference for Alt1.Issue 2.3: after reviewing companies’ comments, we feel old beam in serving cell may be outdated in Alt.0. Since ETWS should be received in low latency, if gNB needs to send MAC CE to update old beam in serving cell to update the old beam, it would be too late to receive ETWS. On the other hand, in Alt.2, the new beam in non-serving cell is the latest beam. Hence, the new beam in non-serving cell is more reliable. Based on this, Alt.2 is more preferable. Proposal 2.F: We suggest to complete 2.3 firstly and then we can further review 2.4.Proposal 2.E: Support. We think this is useful. |
| Mod V13 | Revised 2.F based on Samsung’s/MTK’s and OPPO’s comments.**Re issue 2.3, please check Qualcomm’s point that Alt0 is already supported by default for 1 active TCI state scenario. But a number of companies opine that this is not enough** |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.H: support and slightly prefer Alt 1 for signaling overhead reduction since the difference of L1-RSRP between these two TRPs will be not very large. Else, inter-cell beam management will be not triggered.Issue 2.3: It was agreed in 106e meeting that**Agreement**On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for inter-cell beam management, the supported Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and/or DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) applies to:* The channels and signals as for intra-cell beam management except for non-UE dedicated channels/signals.

Thus our initial preference is Alt 0. Thanks for the explantion from Ericsson, NTT Docomo and Huawei, we agree that UE need to monitor P-RNTI for short message at least, even the only one activated TCI state is associated with non-serving cell. In this case, compared Alt 1 and Alt 2, we slightly prefer Alt 2 with less standard impact.Proposal 2.F: we agree to leave type 2 CSS set FFS, but we are not clear about the motivation of Type 3 CSS set.Proposal 2.E: we support event-driven beam report and fine with this proposal. While for the L1-RSRP report is transmitted by MAC CE, which at least includes SSBRI from the list of non-serving cell SSB and its L1-RSRP. In addition, the L1-RSRP of the best L1-RSRP of the serving cell SSB can also be included. |
| Nokia/NSB  | **Proposal 2.H**: Alt 1. Ok to discuss further in #107. **Proposal 2.E:** Support **Issue 2.3:** UE monitors paging in CONNECTED for Short Message and in case the SM indicates SI update the SI is still read from serving cell. Thus, USS could be considered.  **Proposal 2.F**: Resolve 2.3 first.   |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.3 and 2.4 are indeed coupled. To us, 2.4. actually seems more fundamental. Signals transmitted in CSS can reach more UEs at the same time: for instance, SI, paging or RAR can reach several UEs at a time. Hence, all signals scheduled using CSS are inherently “non-UE-dedicated”.One of the issues with the Rel-15 framework was association between a TCI state and a CORESET, and at the same time having no association between the signals scheduled using a CORESET. This lead to several difficult discussions, e.g., on CORESET#0. Now, the same assumed property complicates this discussion. Splitting the different CSS simply seems to complicate the issue. |
| Lenovo/MotM | 2.3: We still do not see the need for the UE to receive paging message sent from a neighbor cell. Paging message is initiated at L3, is sent in a paging area and is not gNB specific. The UE is OK as long as the UE receives paging message from the serving cell. If a UE has minimum capability and can only receive paging from either the serving cell or a non-serving cell (as pointed out by Huawei), this problem can be handled with gNB implementation (TCI state update and scheduling). UE operation is much simpler than Alt 1 or 2. Our position is still Alt 0. Proposal 2.F: Suppose Alt 0 is adopted for issue 2.3, we support 2.F as is. Proposal 2.E: We are OK with this proposal in principle, but have some concerns regarding the details:In the first bullet “If UE consecutively identify an event happens, UE can trigger the L1-RSRP report”, it is not clear what “concecutively” means to the UE. Is it left for UE implementation? We think it shall be specified and RAN2 can work on the details. Similarly, the prohibition timer is also a RAN2 issue and shall be specified by RAN2.  |
| Mod V20  | Slight revision |
| Futurewei | Proposal 2.H: Support and we prefer Alt 1.Issue 2.3: Based on companies’ comments, we prefer Alt 2 as it has less specification impacts.Proposal 2.F: Prefer to solve Issue 2.3 first.Proposal 2.E: Support the latest proposal for the sake of progress. |
| Mod V22  | No revision on proposals.Proposal 2.H has been endorsed OFFLINE (email endorsement 4) |
| Huawei, HiSilicion | **Issue 2.3:** To facilitate the decision, we tentatively removed our 2nd-preference support on Alt-1. But if the group can converge on Alt-1, we can support it. In our reading, the CSS and P-RNTI dedicated to paging are shared among cells and UEs while it can still be used to find particular UEs, so they are not UE-dedicated or non-UE-dedicated from functionality perpective. As the change required by Alt-2 is relatively smaller, we hope it can serve as a middle ground between <need to know UE QCL assumption for urgent paging> and <extra UE complexity or specification efforts>.  **Proposal 2.E:** To be consistent, we suggest changing “non-serving cell SSB” in the 2nd sub-sub-bullet as “SSB with PCI different from serving cell”.[Mod: Done] |
| AT&T | Proposal 2.H: ok to defer to RAN1#107eIssue 2.3: based on Huawei/Ericsson/Docomo comments, we are ok with Alt.2 Proposal 2.F: support with Mediatek modifications based on issue 2.3 |
| Mod V26 | **Added proposal 2.I on paging assumption given the majority view**  |
| vivo | **Issue 2.3:** Alt2 reverts previous agreement. Also similar understanding as QC that this has already been agreed in previous meeting for UEs with single TCI state when the bullet explicitly says to switch between different cells when needed.

|  |
| --- |
| * *For inter-cell beam management, the support of more than one Rel-17 active DL TCI state / QCL per band is a UE capability*
	+ *If UE does not support such capability, MAC-CE based beam indication (activation of one TCI state) can be used to switch between two different DL receptions along two different beam*
 |

[Mod: Alt2 doesn’t revert previous agreement since the definition of non-UE-dedicated for inter-cell BM is still pending]**Issue 2.E:** At least for cases with two active TCI, this issue is not coupled with issue 2.3.[Mod: Good point.] |
| Lenovo/MotM | **Proposal 2.I:** we still have concern about receiving CSS configured for paging from a non-serving cell. First it reverts our previous agreement from the previous meeting. Second the delay to switch back to the serving cell to receive the paging message, even when only 1 TCI is activated and MAC-CE is used for switching, is unimportant because the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED mode. Any delay sensitive information can be sent to the UE in the dedicated PDSCH channel being received from the non-serving cell, so there will be no need to switch back to the serving cell. UE only needs to receive system information update via paging, where delay is not an issue. **[Mod: What constitutes non-UE-dedicated in inter-cell scenario is still under discussion in 2.F]** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.I:** support FL proposal. Based on the discussion above, we think Alt0 may cause beam switching latency and Alt1 will cause large spec impact. |
| NEC | **Proposal 2.I:** we also have concerns to enable UE to receive paging via the newly activated TCI state associated with a different PCI. We believe it means that gNB of the cell with PCI different from the serving cell need to prepare UE-specific paging transmissions for each UE with the newly activated TCI states associated with this different PCI, for example, via the narrower beams indicated in those TCI states.We have concerns on gNB complexity if it is the case. It is more reasonable to assume that the neighbor cell gNB would not do additional paging transmission other than those already transmitted via SSB beams. Therefore, besides our preference on Alt0, we can live with current proposal with following suggested modification.* **Proposal 2.I**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management, on QCL assumption for paging reception after being activated with only one TCI state associated with PCI different from serving cell, the UE is to monitor paging in CSS configured for paging with the SSB associated with newly activated TCI state
 |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.I:** Support**Proposal 2.J:** Support, where the FFS can be resolved if Proposal 2.I is agreed |
| ZTE | **Proposal 2.F:** Why we need to distinguish CSS Type 3 for SCell? Some clarification is highly appreciated. As you see, the CSS Type 3 can also initialize PDSCH transmission scheduled by C-RNTI. Then, the other types of CSS or USS should be excluded in the UE non-dedicated CORESET, right? [Mod: Plese check OPPO’s input above] |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.E**: We are not clear on the definition of event, since it says ‘the event at least includes…’ are we going to support all these events? Regarding ‘The list of serving cell SSBs and SSBs with PCIs different from serving cell are configured by RRC’, it should be a RRC configuration rather than an event. |
| LG | **Proposal 2.I:** We have a concern on the proposal. If the reception of paging can be possible from the non-serving cell, it is unclear for that of system information in case of inter-cell BM. That is, based on the reply LS so far, it is questionable to handle the SI/paging independently. On the concern of quality/latency when UE cannot receive Paging/Short Message from serving cell, it is difficult to operate inter-cell BM efficiently in that case. Also, it is not critical on the latency for switching back to the serving cell since the beam change for paging reception occurs about once in the monitoring duration of paging (about 10s). |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.I:** We support Alt. 0. Alt-2 implies that the common control signaling is received from non-serving cell which is not consistent with previous agreements. **[Mod: What constitutes non-UE-dedicated in inter-cell scenario is still under discussion in 2.F]****Proposal 2.E:** We don’t support MAC-CE based reporting. |
| Mod V42 | **Revised proposal 2.I (bracketerd text from NEC, if it is agreeable to 2.I proponents) and 2.F (per vivo’s previous input).**  |
| NTT Docomo | **Issue 2.3:** When FL makes proposal, could you add “Short Message” in addition to “Paging”? According to our RAN2 colleagure, these two are different. In addition, the RAN2 LS also includes “short message”. **--**b) **System information and short message (e.g. paging):** If UE is receiving DL data from *TRP with different PCI* on dedicated channels, is the UE still able to receive short message (e.g. paging) and system information from *serving cell TRP* at the same time? |
| Nokia/NSB | **Issue 2.3:** lots have been said above (thanks for the good discussion) but we not favoring the direction of the current proposal. As we see it now, we start adding design elements (like the “particular” addition of the SSB association) which need to be digested further, in fact this being the case for both alternatives 1 and 2. In principle we want to understand better the implication of the SSB mention, but this does not mean we are fine with the agreement if we remove the SSB. Our understanding is that we should be fine with Alt0 in the sense that this applicable if nothing else is agreed further. Not being our first choice, it might be a good compromise fo this meeting to allow companies some time to further digest the options ahead in case some optimization is needed. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.I:** Regarding the content in the brackets, is that mean SSB associated with other PCID is allowed as direct source RS for paging reception? We share similar view with Nokia that we don't prefer to introduce such optimization to resolve a particular issue. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2.3:** Like Nokia,we do not see what the addition of [SSB associated with] adds. Then we think that this issue should be resolved, both Alt1 and Alt2 improves performance at a very small complexity increase at the UE. But we are OK to postpone this to RAN1#107-e**Issue 2.4:** Why do we need to include CORESET in the proposal? Association of TCI states with CORESETs is a left-over from Rel-15. Can we simply write:**Proposal 2.F**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for inter-cell beam management, the supported Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and/or DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation), the non-UE dedicated channels/signals (on which such inter-cell beam indication does not apply) comprise:* All PDCCH receptions along with the respective PDSCH receptions and respective PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions monitored in Type3 CSS set only in SCell (not PCell), Type2 CSS (when >1 activated TCI states are associated with PCI(s) different from serving cell), and any Type0/0A/1 CSS set
	+ FFS: PDCCH monitored in any Type2 CSS set when only 1 activated TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell (depending on the outcome of the paging issue)

There is also something strange with the text on activated TCI states associated with PCI different from serving cell: in general, the UE can have more than one activated TCI state that are associated with the other PCI, the difficult part is to have a mix. Furthermore, this should not have an impact on what is considered to be non-UE-dedicated channels. |
| Apple | Do not support the bracket text for 2.I. TRS should be provided for connected mode UE.For proposal 2.F: we do not think the definition of non-UE dedicated channel depends on number of active TCI state. We should consider a general rule. |
| vivo | Regarding the comment that proposal 2.I does not revert previous agreement, is there anyone denying that PDCCH transmitted with P-RNTI is non-UE dedicated?We are fine with E///’s revision if another clarification added. Otherwise, the original wording from FL is more appropriate for clear UE behavior.**Proposal 2.F**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for inter-cell beam management, the supported Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and/or DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation), the non-UE dedicated channels/signals (on which such inter-cell beam indication does not apply) comprise:* All PDCCH receptions along with the respective PDSCH receptions and respective PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions monitored in Type3 CSS set only in SCell (not PCell), Type2 CSS (when >1 activated TCI states are associated with PCI(s) different from serving cell), and any Type0/0A/1 CSS set
	+ FFS: PDCCH monitored in any Type2 CSS set when only 1 activated TCI state is associated with a PCI different from serving cell (depending on the outcome of the paging issue)
* For inter-cell beam management, UE does not expect to be configured with a CORESET associated with USS if the CORESETs is associated with Type3 CSS set only in SCell (not PCell), Type2 CSS (when >1 activated TCI states are associated with PCI(s) different from serving cell), and any Type0/0A/1 CSS set
 |
| MediaTek | We cannot agree the change of PDCCH beam behavior from Rel-15/16. Yes, CORESET is a left-over from Rel-15, but we don't the need to change it. |

### Issue 4 (MP-UE)

Table 5 Summary: issue 4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 4.1 | **Proposal 4.A**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, * Support the UE reporting a list of UE capability values without repetition
	+ FFS: Whether each UE capability value comprises the number of SRS ports, number of UL transmission layers, coherence type, TPMI, or number of SRS resources within one SRS resource set
	+ FFS: Whether the UE capability value set can be common across a set of BWPs/CCs
* The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a UE capability value from the reported list of UE capability values is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a beam reporting instance.
	+ The Rel-15/16 beam reporting is reused, i.e. L1-RSRP and L1-SINR along with the companion SSBRI/CRI (up to 4 pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) with the correspondence information included in the beam reporting UCI
* Support multiple codebook-based SRS resource sets with different maximum number of SRS ports
	+ The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to one SRS resource set which is selected by the UE and aligned with the UE capability based on the informed correspondence

**FL Note: Unless there is some critical, I suggest that companies not propose more refinement on the proposal. To reiterate, “logical index” isn’t agreeable to Ericsson.** | **Support/fine**: Lenovo/MotM, IDC, NTT Docomo, MTK, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Qualcomm, LG, Spreadtrum, Huawei, HiSilicon, Sony**Concern**: Intel, Apple (last bullet), OPPO (last bullet), CATT |

Table 6 Additional inputs: issue 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and update your view in Table 5**
2. **Share more inputs here if needed**
 |
| Samsung | **Proposal 4.A:** Although we prefer to minimize number of FFSs, but can support it for progress |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Sony | We are supportive to the direction. From our understanding, we think the following editorial change can be considered. For the 1st change, the reason is simply because a UE may report more than 1 sets for multiple panels or even single panel in different format from time to time.For the 2nd change, we tend to think the intention is to build the correspondence between a DL RS and a UE capability value set, rather than one UE capability value, e.g. the number of SRS ports. * Support the UE reporting a list of UE capability value sets
	+ FFS: Whether each UE capability value set comprises the number of SRS ports, number of UL transmission layers, coherence type, TPMI, or number of SRS resources within one SRS resource set
	+ FFS: Whether the UE capability value set can be common across a set of BWPs/CCs
* The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a UE capability value set from the reported UE capability value set is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a beam reporting instance

Hope I get it right, but if not, please correct me, thank you.[Mod: Correct, done] |
| Qualcomm | Suggest the following wording change. Below is an example to my understanding. For example, UE reports a list including the following 3 value sets with each set reflecting one type of panel. Then, UE reports a particular set associated with a reported DL RS. Either reporting the set ID or all values in that set in the beam report is TBD. I think this corresponds to Scheme 1 and 2 in previous agreementUE capability value set #0: {SRS port # = 1, max # of layers = 1, # of SRS resources = 1}UE capability value set #1: {SRS port # = 2, max # of layers = 2, # of SRS resources = 1}UE capability value set #2: {SRS port # = 4, max # of layers = 4, # of SRS resources = 2}* Support the UE reporting a list of UE capability value set(s)
	+ FFS: Whether each UE capability value set comprises the number of SRS ports, number of UL transmission layers, coherence type, TPMI, or number of SRS resources within one SRS resource set
	+ FFS: Whether the UE capability value set can be common across a set of BWPs/CCs

The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a UE capability value set from the reported list of UE capability value set(s) is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a beam reporting instance[Mod: OK now I understand. Done] |
| OPPO | The last sub-bullet is still unclear. “One SRS resource which is aligned with UE capabilty”? All the CB-based resource sets configured to one UE shall be aligned with the UE capability, right? Since this proposal is for UE-initiated panel activation and selection, as in the main bullet. That means the SRS resource set is selected by the UE, which shall be clear in the proposal. Therefore, the indicated SRI would be based one SRS resource in the CB-based SRS resource selected by the UE, which is of course aligned with the UE capability too. So, suggest to update the poosal as follows:**Proposal 4.A**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, …* Support multiple codebook-based SRS resource sets with different maximum number of SRS ports
	+ The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to one SRS resource set which is selected by the UE and aligned with the UE capability

[Mod: OK] |
| NEC | Support. |
| ZTE | We are fine with QC’s update. Regarding the OPPO’s comment, we can understand their motivation, but for making this proposal consistency, we have the following suggestion based on QC’s update:**Proposal 4.A**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, …* Support multiple codebook-based SRS resource sets with different maximum number of SRS ports
	+ The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to one SRS resource set which is aligned with the UE capability value set based on the informed correspondence.

[Mod: OK] |
| Apple | OK with ZTE’s update. If ths logic index is not agreeable, we do not know how to support the bullet “The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a UE capability value from the reported UE capability value set is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a beam reporting instance”. Would Ericsson clarify it a little bit? |
| CATT  | Proposal 4.A seems to Scheme 1+ Scheme 2 in previous agreement. Per our understanding, the capability value set corresponds to the different UE panels. Suppose UE has two panels, the two panels have same capability value set and UE reports the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a same UE capability value to gNB, how the reported information is used for the use case of uplink panel selection for interference mitigation needs to be clarified.  |
| LG | Support the proposal. Further clarification of wording from Sony/Qualcomm is also good. |
| NTT Docomo | Support the proposal and support the revision from Qualcomm. |
| Mod V13 | Revised per comments. **@Ericsson: please check Apple’s question and respond if possible****@All: Is it possible to resolve some of the FFS points. There are four big ones and not including other open issues (e.g. supported capability value sets, whether 2 BATs are needed)** |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Ok with the latest version |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | In our understanding, the foreseen functionality was that the UE would report a list of, e.g,., number of UL transmission layers. Our interpretation of the extension to “value capability set(s)” is that the UE should now report many capabilities. We do not see the meaning of this: the foreseen functionality was to optimize performance for future UEs, equipped with “panels” with different numbers of UL max layers. We would then select among the listed capabilities, not using all of them. Hence, our take of this functionality is that the UE reports one list of capabilities, and not a list of UE capability value set(s).We also think that we should clarify that the list of capability values is without repetition.Since the UE determines the correspondence, and then informs the NW about the correspondence, is it so that the UE cannot change the correspondence between measurements? Never? This issue is bigger than the timeline: in many cases, the UE changes the correspondence without a report, for the P3 procedure based on SSB or CSI-RS with repetition ‘on’. Can we add a note on that, irrespective of the timeline discussion? We had a comment on “different max number of SRS ports” in the last bullet. Does the current statement mean that the SRS resources in one SRS resource set can have different number of ports? Can someone clarify?Then, we again see that the agreement seems to regulate how the NW chooses the SRI. Although the statement seems reasonable, it is up to NW implementation.@Apple: the statement would imply that the UE reports, e.g., the maximum UL rank, e.g., 4. The NW would use that to signal an SRI corresponding to an SRS resource with 4 ports.In issue 3, there has been a discussion on different BATs for different “panels”. Does this proposal has any impact on that discussion? Can this be clarified? Summing up, we propose the following modifications:**Proposal 4.A**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, * Support the UE reporting a list of UE capability values without repetition
	+ FFS: Whether the UE capability value comprises the number of SRS ports, number of UL transmission layers, coherence type, TPMI, or number of SRS resources within one SRS resource set
	+ FFS: Whether the UE capability value set can be common across a set of BWPs/CCs
* The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a UE capability value from the reported list of UE capability values is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a beam reporting instance. The UE shall not update the correspondence between beam reporting instances.
	+ FFS: Whether and how to define the timeline for applying the correspondence
	+ FFS: How to inform the correspondence to NW in the reporting instance
	+ FFS: What type of beam reporting instance is considered, e.g. L1-RSRP/L1-SINR/BFRQ
* Support multiple codebook-based SRS resource sets with different maximum number of SRS ports

[Mod: I understand your concerns (tend to sympathize). I accepted the changes except for the last one. I keep the last bullet FFS rather than removing it to accommodate popular demand] |
| Lenovo/MotM | OK with the update. |
| Mod V20/V22 | Revised per Ericcson’s comments. **In addition, the FL has some serious concern that there are too many FFSs here. So I took the liberty of resolving some for you. I hope it is acceptable.**  |
| Ericsson | We agree that time is short, and that it is critical to resolve as many FFSs as possible as soon as possible:* We think it’s a good idea to reuse the Rel-15/16 beam reporting,
* We don’t understand how the correspondence can be signalled via the existing mechanism for UE capability signalling, this would seem to contradict with the main bullet.

[Mod: Revised proposal, basically including the correspondence in the UCI for beam reporting. Sorry for the mistake] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The restriction of “The UE shall not update the correspondence between beam reporting instances” sounds a bit strong to us, and we suggest keeping it as FFS. [Mod: OK. My understanding is that if the correspondence is included in the UCI, this feature is an add-on since the correspondence is a part of UCI and hence updated everytime the UE send out beam reporting]Alternatively, similar to Issue 6, we can consider suspending the work on fast UL panel selection for the remaining time of R17 (due to lack of time) and continue the effort in R18.[Mod: I think we are close as long as we keep the # FFSs low] |
| AT&T | The latest proposal revision is not clear to us. In particular, how is the correspondence signaled is still not clear, with Ericsson’s comment and the FL revision on re-using the Rel.15/16 beam reporting framework. [Mod: I have revised the correspondence signaling (now included as a part of UCI) – sorry for the mistake] |
| Mod V26 | Revised per Ericsson’s and Huawei’s inputs |
| LG | First bullet: * Value sets vs. Values: We slightly prefer ‘value sets’ since this feature is related to multiple functionalities such as UE reporting of panel correspondence (second bullet), panel-specific PUSCH transmission (third bullet), and possibility for different BAT for panel switching. Note that the usage of the second bullet is not directly tied to the usage of the third bullet so panel-specific properties other than the max layers can be included in the UE capability. Even for one usage (panel-specific PUSCH transmission), both port-coherence information and the info for max layers (or max ports) can be included in each set. If this is controversial, we think that this can be decided in Nov meeting depending on the decision on exact UE capability value(s).
* Adding ‘without repetition’: we think that this has dependency on the above issue. If value set is used, one value can be repeated, e.g. for port-coherent + max layers: (full, 4), (partial, 2), (full, 2) 🡪 full and 2 are repeated. Thus, we prefer not to have this restriction at this moment.

Second bullet (editorial issue): seems the last subbullet and the added last sentence of the second main bullet are same but one with FFS and the other without FFS. Resolution is needed. |
| CMCC | For the second bullet, “The UE shall not update the correspondence between beam reporting instances” can be removed, since it is moved to the FFS part. |
| MediaTek | We are okay to the proposal. As indicated by CMCC, the sentence “The UE shall not update the correspondence between beam reporting instances” can be removed. |
| ZTE | Firstly, we share the same views with LGE and CMCC. Then, the timeline for applying the correspondence should be defined later as a necessary functionality. Based on that, we have the following suggestion:**Proposal 4.A**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, * Support the UE reporting a list of UE capability value sets
	+ FFS: Whether each UE capability value comprises the number of SRS ports, number of UL transmission layers, coherence type, TPMI, or number of SRS resources within one SRS resource set
	+ FFS: Whether the UE capability value set can be common across a set of BWPs/CCs
* The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a UE capability value set from the reported list of UE capability value set(s) is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a beam reporting instance.
	+ The Rel-15/16 beam reporting is reused, i.e. L1-RSRP and L1-SINR along with the companion SSBRI/CRI (up to 4 pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) with the correspondence information included in the beam reporting UCI
	+ FFS: Whether, in addition, the UE can update or shall not update the correspondence between beam reporting instances, and how to define the timeline for applying the correspondence

…  |
| OPPO | We can not accept to put the last sub-bullet to FFS because the whole proposal is for UE-initiated panel selection. If the SRS resource set is not selected by the UE, how can it be called “UE-initiated panel selection”? So, we suggest to remove the “FFS” in the last bullet. The 3rd FFS bullet is not needed. Because as in one previous agreement, the correspondence is controlled by the UE. It does not make sense to FFS on that any more.Therefore, suggest to revise the proposal as follows:**Proposal 4.A**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, * Support the UE reporting a list of UE capability values without repetition
	+ FFS: Whether each UE capability value comprises the number of SRS ports, number of UL transmission layers, coherence type, TPMI, or number of SRS resources within one SRS resource set
	+ FFS: Whether the UE capability value set can be common across a set of BWPs/CCs
* The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a UE capability value from the reported list of UE capability values is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a beam reporting instance. The UE shall not update the correspondence between beam reporting instances.
	+ The Rel-15/16 beam reporting is reused, i.e. L1-RSRP and L1-SINR along with the companion SSBRI/CRI (up to 4 pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) with the correspondence information included in the beam reporting UCI
	+ ~~FFS: Whether, in addition, the UE can update or shall not update the correspondence between beam reporting instances~~
* Support multiple codebook-based SRS resource sets with different maximum number of SRS ports
	+ ~~FFS:~~ The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to one SRS resource set which is selected by the UE and aligned with the UE capability based on the informed correspondence
 |
| Intel | On this proposal, we have some further questions for clarification.1. As we commented earlier, dynamic switching between UE panels with different configuration would also require dynamic adaptation of the MIMO layers in DL. In this case, the only option is to reuse Rel-16 power saving framework and configure multiple BWPs with different number of MIMO layers and use dynamic switching between BWP to enable dynamic adaptation for the number of MIMO layers.  We want to check why RAN1 doesn’t want to reuse the same BWP based approach for adaptation of UL parameters including parameters of SRS. According to our understanding, the exssting signalling framework already supports the required functionality.
2. We are not sure how the proposed dynamic indication of UL parameters has impact on UE rate matching which is dependent on number of MIMO layers. We would prefer to have some clarification on this aspect.
3. We noticed that dynamic adaptation of some parameters by BWP e.g., number of SRS ports and max MIMO layers may create interruption time on some of the CCs (TS 38.133 Table 8.2.1.2.7-1/2). We want to understand whether the same issue would also exist for the proposed solution due to change in SRS antenna ports and what the implications are.

Table 8.2.1.2.7-1: interruption length X

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **NR Slot length (ms)** | **Interruption length X (slots)** |
| 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0.5 | 1 |
| 2 | 0.25 | 3 |
| 3 | 0.125 | 5 |
| Note1:    void |

Table 8.2.1.2.7-2: Parameters which cause interruption other than SCS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Comment** |
| *locationAndBandwidth* | From TS 38.331 [2] |
| *nrofSRS-Ports* |  |
| *maxMIMO-Layers-r16* |  |

1. We are wondering why the precoding on UE panel with larger number of SRS ports cannot be supported without spec change, e.g., by virtualization to smaller number of ports (equal to the number of SRS ports used by anther panel) and selection of the virtual beam using DL measurements?
2. Finally, for the UCI based reporting of the correspondence, we want to clarify the implications if the gNB misses the UCI. In this case, since there is no acknowledge mechanism and correspondence application timing defined, the UE and gNB might be “misaligned” in terms of the correspondence of the CSI-RS/SSB resource index with the UE capability. This is not an issue for Rel-15/16 beam reporting since no correspondence change happens, but in this MP-UE case, this UCI is similar to beam application DCI in that there may need to be some acknowledgement mechanism for the gNB and UE to maintain common understanding.
 |
| Apple | We think the last subbullet should be supported. This is an important aspect to support UE initialized panel switching. NW should not control UE panel. UE panel switching can be based on some measurement results, but that is not the only reason. If we cannot reach consensus for such UE initialized panel switching, which has been agreed before, maybe we have to stop discussion for the whole issue 4 in Rel-17. |
| Mod V42 | With all the conflicting inputs, I have tried to revise 4.A to make everyone almost equally unhappy. No need to mention whether update between reports can be done or not if what we may agree on is to include the correspondence as a part of UCI |
| NTT Docomo | We prefer to put the last bullet in FFS. Actually, we think SRS resource set can be selected and indicated by NW. In our understanding, NW indicating SRS resource set+SRI is similar as NW indicating SRI in Rel-15/16. Regarding “UE initiated”, the correspondence between CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and panel is determined by UE and informed to NW. That is not contradictory. Based on the beam reporting and correspondence informed by UE, NW can indicate SRS resource set and SRI which is aligned with UE capability. NW can select SRI in legacy procedure, why NW cannot select SRS resource set?Meanwhile, if SRS resource set is selected by UE, the SRS resource set selected by UE needs to be informed to NW, how to inform the selected SRS resource set is not clear. |
| InterDigital | We share similar views as LGE, CMCC, and ZTE. Fine to have FFS on the last bullet based on the explanation by Docomo for progress in this meeting. |
| Ericsson | We still do not understand how this would work if the UE can update the relation between the CRI/SSBRI and the capability at any point in time. Say that the UE reports in UCI that it supports 4 layers for a certain TCI. The NW would then schedule an UL transmission assuming that the UE supports 4 layers. Now, if the UE has changed the mapping between the reporting and the scheduling instant, the UL transmission cannot be received by the NW. It would seem that if the UE can change this mapping at any time, how could the NW use the information?We also think that Intel has a valid point: why can’t we use the BWP framework for this? Then there is no need to introduce the multiple CB SRS resource sets with different number of ports. The BWP then also provides an ACK mechamism from the NW. We are still wondering if the last bullet should really be the “different maximum number of SRS ports” or simply “different number of SRS ports”– can someone clarify?Then, for the last bullet, it is clearly so that the choice of which SRI to choose is up to the NW. This should not be part of the specification. The lasts subbullet should thus be removed. Since the UE provides the NW with the capability information, we see it as UE-initiated. The procedure begins when the UE includes a changed capability in UCI. |
| Apple | We found to report such information by UCI may have one potential problem. Currently there is no acknowledgement for UCI. The mismatch between gNB and UE may happen.We also notice that we do not need to configure multiple SRS resource sets. One simple way is to configure a single SRS resource and introduce a MAC CE to update some configuration for the SRS. But we can also accept to configure multiple resource sets with the last sub-bullet to make sure this is aligned with UE’s latest capability. |
| NTT Docomo | @Apple @OPPO: With the correspondence between beam and UE capability value informed to NW, we don’t think NW will indicate an SRI that is not aligned with UE capability. That’s why we think “SRS resource set which is selected by the UE” is not needed. Could you give an example why NW’s indication of SRI will violate UE capability?  |
| vivo | We do not see the necessity to have the restriction of adding “without repetition” in the first sub-bullet. |