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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.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, any SRS resource or resource set that is a valid target signal of a Rel-15/16 spatial relation based on the Rel-15/16 spatial relation rules (on source-target relations) can be configured as a target signal of a Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state pool).* Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is up to RAN2)

**FL Note**: Discussed offline [1] | **Support/fine**: Sony, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Samsung, MTK, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, CMCC, Futurewei, Intel, vivo, NEC, AT&T, NTT Docomo, QC, CATT, Xiaomi, LG, TCL, Lenovo/MotM**Concern**: OPPO, ZTE |
| 1.2 | **Proposal 1.A.2**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, for any SRS resource or resource set that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources, but can be configured as a target signal of a Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state pool), Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse the Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s) are used to update/configure such SRS(s) with Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state(s).* Applies for both intra-cell and inter-cell beam indication
* Note: The Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse the Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s) include the MAC CE defined in section 6.1.3.26 in 38.321
* Note: All the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI states configured/activated to SRS resources in the same set can, by NW configuration, be associated with the same UL PC setting.

**FL Note**: Discussed offline [1] | **Support/fine**: Sony, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Samsung, MTK, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, CMCC, Futurewei, Intel, NEC, AT&T, NTT Docomo, QC, CATT, Xiaomi, Apple, LG, TCL, Lenovo/MotM**Concern**: OPPO, ZTE |
| 1.3 | **Proposal 1.A.3**: The UE is not expected to be configured with Rel-15/Rel-16 TCI/SpatialRelationInfo if the UE is configured with Rel-17 TCI in any CC [in a band]**FL Note**: Discussed offline [1] | **Support/fine**: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Samsung, Apple, MTK, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, CMCC, Futurewei, Intel, vivo, NEC, AT&T, QC, CATT, Xiaomi, TCL, [NTT Docomo], Lenovo/MotM**Concern**: Sony, OPPO  |
| 1.4 | **Proposal 1.B**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for Rel-17 unified TCI, when a UE is configured with separate DL/UL TCI, [if it is determined necessary to define the maximum configured values for DL and UL TCI from RAN2 separate TCI signaling design perspective,] 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* The number of configured TCI states a UE can support is a UE capability including the following candidate values per BWP per CC:
	+ DL TCI: 64, 128
	+ UL TCI: 32, 64
	+ [DL TCI + UL TCI: 32, 64, 128]
* 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**: Already discussed last meeting at length | **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, CATT, TCL, Qualcomm, Lenovo/MotM, [vivo] **Concern**:  |
| 1.5 | **Proposal 1.C.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, for intra-cell beam management, after X symbols from the UE receives the BFRR from NW, the UE assumes the same QCL parameter as the ones associated with the index qnew for all PDSCH/PDCCH receptions in a CC or in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update, as well as other signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as PDSCH/PDCCH reception.* Above applies to both Rel-15 SpCell BFR and Rel-16 SCell BFR
* Note: $q\_{new}$ is a candidate beam identified by the UE in set $q\_{1}$. $q\_{1}$ is the set of candidate beams

**FL Note**: Discussed offline [1], MTK’s version only for DL | **Support/fine**: QC, CATT, NTT Docomo, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Sony, LG, Ericsson, Futurewei**Concern**:  |
| 1.6 | **Proposal 1.C.2**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, when the UE is configured with joint DL/UL TCI, after X symbols from the UE receives the BFRR from NW, the UE uses the same UL spatial filter as the one associated with the index qnew for all PUSCH transmissions and all of PUCCH resources in a CC or in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update, as well as other signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as PUSCH and all of PUCCH resources.* Above applies to both Rel-15/16 SpCell BFR and Rel-16 SCell BFR
* Note: $q\_{new}$ is a candidate beam identified by the UE in set $q\_{1}$. $q\_{1}$ is the set of candidate beams
* FFS: UL PC control including qu, qd, and closed loop index

**FL Note**: Discussed offline [1], MTK’s version only for UL | **Support/fine**: QC, NTT Docomo, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, Apple, CATT, Sony, LG, Ericsson. vivo, Futurewei**Concern**: |
| 1.7 | **Proposal 1.D**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, for [CSI-RS without QCL configuration (e.g. P/SP-CSI-RS except for P-CSI-RS for BM, BFD-RS)], the UE assumes that its QCL is based on the indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH**FL Note**: Need to discuss and clarify what ‘CSI-RS without QCL configuration’ entails (I tend to agree it is ambiguous as many pointed out – I added some examples but I don’t think it resolves the lack of clarity) | **Support/fine**: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Apple, CATT, Ericsson**Concern**: Sony, OPPO, Samsung, ZTE, MTK, Lenovo/MotM, CMCC, QC (no QCL = root), vivo, AT&T, TCL, Futurewei |
| 1.8 | **Proposal 1.E:** 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)**: Huawei/HiSi, Ericsson, ZTE, CMCC, Samsung, Sony, Qualcomm, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Futurewei, MTK, NTT Docomo, AT&T, Lenovo/MotM, Intel, Xiaomi, CATT, TCL **Concern**: Apple (object), OPPO, Nokia/NSB  |
| 1.9 | **Proposal 1.F**: After initial access or reconfiguration with sync, when a UE is configured with Rel-17 TCI, Rel-15/16 rules pertaining to QCL and UL spatial filter assumptions are reused until the UE receives a first instance of beam indication * This holds for any signal/channel that is a valid target signal/channel of Rel-17 TCI

{c.f. section 5.1.5 of TS 38.214}**FL Note**: TCI state assumption between initial access and the first instance of beam indication. This version is a revision of Samsung’s proposal (removing unnecessary/obvious parts) | **Support/fine:** Samsung (for UL follow beam of preamble), Xiaomi, Ericsson, vivo, NTT Docomo, MTK, TCL, Futurewei, Lenovo/MotM, CATT**Concern:**   |
| 1.10 | **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, “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:** MTK, Convida, Lenovo/MotM, Qualcomm, Samsung, NTT Docomo, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, Futurewei, CATT, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Spreadtrum, TCL**Concern:** ZTE, vivo, OPPO (4th case not included), Ericsson (use case unclear), LG (5th case not included), Apple (unnecessary)  |
| 1.11 | For Rel-17 unified TCI framework, on applying the indicated Rel-17 TCI state to PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, for intra-cell and inter-cell BM: * Alt1: Per search space set determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception associated with a [Type2]/Type3 CSS and an USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For other PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set by RRC
* Alt2: Per CORESET determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
		- The UE does not expect these CORESETs to be associated with CSS
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per CORESET by RRC
* Alt3: Per search space set determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception associated with a CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set by RRC
* Alt4: Per MO determination
	+ During each MO, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ During each MO, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per CORESET by RRC

**FL Note**: IMO, this can (should) be left up to the editors (i.e. as long as the agreed function is properly implemented in the specs, it shouldn’t be an issue). But we can discuss and see if there is any additional insight. | **Alt1:** Apple **Alt2:** Samsung, MTK, ZTE, NTT Docomo, TCL, Intel, Lenovo/MotM, vivo, Sony **Alt3:** QC**Alt4**: CATT |

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**
 |
| Qualcomm | For 1.A.1, supportFor 1.A.2, supportFor 1.A.3, supportFor 1.B, do not support, no need 128 DL TCI to optimize separate DL/UL TCI performance, unless 64 DL TCI and 32 for UL TCI are canadiate values for UE capabilityFor 1.C.1, supportFor 1.C.2, supportFor 1.D, do not support. Withoout QCL means this RS serves as root QCL source like SSB in current specFor 1.E, supportFor 1.F, do not support. This requires the TCI must have SSB as root QCL source RS. We think legacy rule is sufficient, i.e. CORESET follows selected SSB beam, while PUCCH follows Msg3 Tx beam. For 1.G, support  |
| Apple | For 1.A.1 and 1.A.2, we would like to suggest the proposal be more specific as follows to avoid confusion, actually RAN2 only needs to change the title in section 6.1.3.26. In addition, we think this would have some impact on UE capability on number of configured/active TCI counting. So, we suggest this should be an optional UE feature. **Proposal: Support to reuse the MAC CE defined in section 6.1.3.26 in 38.321 for UL/Joint TCI for SRS*** **Above is applied when SRS resource or resource set that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources, but can be configured as a target signal of a Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state pool)**
* **This feature is optional**

For 1.A.3: SupportFor 1.B: We share the same concern with QC.For 1.C.1, We do not think we need to differentiate common channel or dedicated channel, since common channel’s beam also failed. Such differentiation would unnecessarility create a case with >1 active TCI.**Proposal 1.C.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, after X symbols from the UE receives the BFRR from NW, the UE assumes the same QCL parameter as the ones associated with the index qnew for all ~~UE-dedicated~~ PDSCH/PDCCH receptions in a CC or in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update, as well as other signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as ~~UE-dedicated~~ PDSCH/PDCCH reception.* Above applies to both Rel-15 SpCell BFR and Rel-16 SCell BFR

For 1.C.2: There is no dedicated PUCCH for connected mode UE. We suggest the following revision.**Proposal 1.C.2**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, if the UE is configured with joint DL/UL TCI mode, after X symbols from the UE receives the BFRR from NW, the UE uses the same UL spatial filter as the one associated with the index qnew for all dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH transmissions and all of ~~dedicated~~ PUCCH resources in a CC or in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update, as well as other signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of ~~dedicated~~ PUCCH resources.* Above applies to both Rel-15 SpCell BFR and Rel-16 SCell BFR
* FFS: UL PC control including qu, qd, and closed loop index

For 1.D: SupportFor 1.E: Do not support. We object this proposal. There is no use case for such configuration.For 1.F: We suggest this proposal could be general for all CBRA procedure. In fact, it should be after CB-PRACH, otherwise, UE cannot detect RAR. We think the “dedicated” should be removed, since if a beam for common channel is indicated, UE needs to follow the indicated beam for common channel reception. So such behavior should be general.**Proposal 1.F**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, after transmitting CB-PRACH ~~initial access or reconfiguration with sync~~, the UE assumes ~~a TCI state based on~~ the SSB identified during random access for DL reception and UL transmission until the UE receives beam indication and is indicated a TCI state for the ~~UE-dedicated~~ PDCCH/PDSCH in a CC and, respectively, dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of ~~dedicated~~ PUCCH resources in a CC.For 1.G: It seems RAN4’s test case would start from the identical case, which should be the most typical case. All the other cases would not be that necessary.  |
| CATT | For proposal 1.A.1, supportFor proposal 1.A.2, supportFor proposal 1.A.3, supportFor proposal 1.B, fine. The values are aligned with what has been supported in Rel-16.For proposal 1.C.1, supportFor proposal 1.C.2, we suggest to delete the condition ‘if the UE is configured with joint DL/UL TCI mode’. For UE configured with separate DL/UL TCI mode, the new beam should also applicable to all the PUCCH/PUSCH.For proposal 1.D, support.For proposal 1.E, support.For proposal1.F, do not support. We share the similar view as QC, i.e. CORESET follows selected SSB beam, while PUCCH follows Msg3 Tx beam. For prosal 1.G, support |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1.A.1: OkayProposal 1.A.2: OkayProposal 1.A.3: Support. Current RAN1 agreements don't prevent to configure both Rel-15/16 DL TCI state pool and Rel-17 DL TCI state pool simultaneously. We see simultaneous configuration will not only causes unnecessary UE memory overhead, but also leads to an ambiguity which TCI state pool should be used. Thus, an explicit agreement is needed to prevent such simultaneous configuration.Proposal 1.B: OkayProposal 1.C.1: SupportProposal 1.C.2: SupportProposal 1.D: Not support. We fail to see the need to introduce such implicit configuration for P/SP CSI-RS, and it may cause additional ambiguities as mentioned by FL. On the other hand, RAN1 already spent much time discussing on the DL channels/signals that “can” share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state, and RAN1 reached the consensus only for AP CSI-RS for CSI/BM. Why do we need to discuss P/SP CSI-RS again at this final stage? Proposal 1.E: Okay. However, we prefer not to spend time on this issue if RAN1 cannot reach consensus. RAN1 should have conclusion in RAN1#106bis meeting, as indicated by the following agreement.**Agreement** On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for Rel-17 unified TCI:* For DL channels/signals that do not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH (via Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI TCI state update), all the QCL rules defined in section 5.1.5 in 38.214 are supported
	+ Note: For CSI-RS used to provide QCL indication for non-UE dedicated channels, the CSI-RS should only be QCLed with SSB of the same PCID as that from the serving cell
* 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 options on source RSs and QCL-Types are supported
	+ Option 1: TRS is configured for QCL-TypeA source RS and CSI-RS for BM is configured for QCL-TypeD source RS
	+ Option 2: TRS is configured for QCL-TypeA and QCL-TypeD source RS
	+ Note: For inter-cell beam management, SSB with PCID different from that from the serving cell can be used as a QCL Type-C/D source RS for CSI-RS for BM and/or TRS
	+ Further discuss and decide in RAN1#106bis-e whether CSI-RS for CSI can be used as a source RS or not, and if so whether some restriction(s) are needed

Proposal 1.F: Okay in principle. We think it is good to define a unified rule for determining the default beam for unified TCI framework. However, current proposal wording is unclear, e.g., why the SSB cannot be directly used as the default QCL assumptions as in Rel-15/16, the random access is initiated by which procedure, and whether such default beam is also applied to other channels/signals that is configured to share the same indicated Rel-17 state? Therefore, we suggest the following re-wording.**Proposal 1.F**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, after initial access or Reconfiguration with sync, the UE assumes the same QCL parameters as the ones associated with ~~a TCI state based on~~ the SSB identified during the random access procedure initiated by the initial access or Reconfiguration with sync for UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH, dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, and all of dedicated PUCCH resources ~~for DL reception and UL transmission~~ until the UE receives Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and/or DCI-based beam indication and is indicated with a TCI state for the UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH in a CC and, respectively, dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC.* FFS: Other DL signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH.
* FFS: Other UL signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, and all of dedicated PUCCH resources.

Proposal 1.G: Support.-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------We would like to point out one critical issue in Rel-17 unified that need to be addressed. According to current RAN1 agreements, UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH should always apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. Regarding non-UE-dedicated reception on CORESET(s) and the associated PDSCH, NE can configure whether to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state via RRC. However, how to reflect this in specification is not clear since the definition of “UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH” and “non-UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH” are too vague. This issue is critical for implementing RAN1 agreements in corresponding specifications by editors. In our view, there are two possible spec implementations according to current agreements, which are provided as follows for discussion.*For Rel-17 unified TCI framework, on applying the indicated Rel-17 TCI state to PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, down-select from one of the followings for intra-cell BM:* * *Alt1: Per search space set determination*
	+ *For any PDCCH reception associated with an USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.*
	+ *For any PDCCH reception associated with a CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set by RRC*
* *Atl2: Per CORESET determination*
	+ *For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with only USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.*

*For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with at least one CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per CORESET by RRC* |
| NTT Docomo | Proposal 1.A.1: SupportProposal 1.A.2: SupportProposal 1.A.3: Not support.FG 23-1-1 (Unified TCI for [intra- and inter-cell] beam management) is [per band] in R1-2110587. It means UE can report Rel.17 TCI in Band#A but not report Rel.17 TCI in Band#B. In that case, based on Proposal 1.A.3, if gNB configure Rel.17 TCI in Band#A, Band#B does not work. Hence, we suggest as:**Proposal 1.A.3**: The UE is not expected to be configured with Rel-15/Rel-16 TCI/SpatialRelationInfo if the UE is configured with Rel-17 TCI in any CC in a band.Proposal 1.B: Support. Rel.15 supports 128 TCI states for PDSCH. If we supports smaller number from Rel.15, it is degradation from Rel.15. For UL, to make system work in 64 SSB operation with the beam correspondence, we believe 64 TCI states should be supported.Proposal 1.A.1: OKProposal 1.A.2: OKProposal 1.A.3: Not support. Proposal 1.C.1: SupportProposal 1.C.2: Support. We think that we also ned to define UL PC contro parameters.Proposal 1.D: We are open to discuss. More clarification is needed.Proposal 1.E: Support.Proposal 1.F: Not support. We shouldn't overwrite RRC-configured TCI state.Proposal 1.G: Support. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.A.1**: Support**Proposal 1.A.2:** Support.Just to confirm the understanding, the second sub-bullet is guaranteed by network implementation.**Proposal 1.A.3**: Support**Proposal 1.B**: Support**Proposal 1.C.1**: Support.Add definition of $q\_{new}$: $q\_{new}$ is a candidate beam identified by the UE in set $q\_{1}$. $q\_{1}$ is the set of candidate beams.**Proposal 1.C.2**: SupportAdd definition of $q\_{new}$: $q\_{new}$ is a candidate beam identified by the UE in set $q\_{1}$. $q\_{1}$ is the set of candidate beams.**Proposal 1.D**: Don’t support in current format. CSI-RS should be allowed as root source RS. This seems to be precluded by this proposal.**Proposal 1.E**: OK**Proposal 1.F**: Support. Regarding the concern raised by Qualcomm and CATT, this proposal is not just for the CORESET and the PUCCH, but for all “UE-dedicated” DL and UL channels after initial access. For uplink the spatial domain filter used for preamble is used for uplink channels.We are also fine with the updates proposed by MediaTek, even though we think the two FFS points can be resolved now. The same QCL/spatial filter should be used for the channels that follow the TCI state of “UE-dedicated” channels.We suggest the following updates on top of the version from MediaTek (are also fine to remove the FFS and include the channels/signals in the FFS a following the same TCI state as UE dedicated channels):**Proposal 1.F**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, after initial access or Reconfiguration with sync, the UE assumes the same QCL parameters and UL spatial domain filter as the ones associated with ~~a TCI state based on~~ the SSB and preamble identified during the random access procedure initiated by the initial access or Reconfiguration with sync for UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH, Other DL signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH, dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, and all of dedicated PUCCH resources ~~for DL reception and UL transmission~~ until the UE receives Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and/or DCI-based beam indication and is indicated with a TCI state for the UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH in a CC and, respectively, dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC.* FFS: Other DL signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH.
* FFS: Other UL signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, and all of dedicated PUCCH resources.

**Proposal 1.G:** SupportThe part in square brackets can be removed (~~[and they are not CSI-RS for BM with repetition ‘ON’])~~ |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1.B: Agree with Docomo’s comment: to support DL operation only, we need 128 TCI states. Any separate UL TCI states (that e.g., use SRS) would be needed on top. Although UE features are discussed separately, we could make an exception to agree on candidate values already now.Proposal 1.F: The statement “TCI state based on the SSB” is somewhat unclear. We do not really see what this adds compared to legacy. Samsung’s update seems more accurate, but we still fail to see the difference compared to legacy. |
| Nokia/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 1.E**, our concern is that for CSI-RS for CSI and CSI-RS for BM there is no support in Rel15/Rel16 to have a CSI-RS resource for CSI as source RS. Only the already agreed options, i.e. TRS + CSI-RS for BM and TRS + TRS, are the common source RSs for PDCCH, PDSCH, CSI-RS for CSI and CSI-RS for BM.  |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1.A.1:** we do not support. It causes serious issue to the specification process. We will have to resign all the MAC CE and RRC signaling to repeat the same function that is already supported in rel16. We would like to ask the company who proposed this: why is this proposal necessary to duplicate the same function supported in rel16 by causing much more unnecessary specification effort.**Proposal 1.A.2** and **1.A.3**: we do not support because proposal 1.A.1 is not needed.**Proposal 1.D**: do not support. If a CSI-RS is not provided with QCL configruaiton, it is up to UE implementation to receive it. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1.A.1 ~1.A.3, supportProposal 1.B, supportProposal 1.C.1-1.C.2, For Rel-15 SpCell BFR, we are confused that qnew is also the spatial filter for the last PRACH transmission in the case of contention based RA, thus even for separate DL/UL TCI mode, why not use the same UL spatial filter as the one associated with the index qnew for all dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH transmissions and all of dedicated PUCCH resources? Proposal 1.D, it is necessary to list all examples, and P/SP CSI-RS except for *candidateBeamRSList* should also be included. Proposal 1.F, we prefer to remove the words “and is indicated a TCI state for the UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH in a CC and, respectively, dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC”, since it can apply to any beam indication. If it is a beam indication for unified TCI state for the for the UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH in a CC and, respectively, dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC, the TCI state for these channels will be updated. If it is a beam indication for other signals/channels not share the same TCI state, the TCI state of other signals/channels will be updated. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Proposal 1.A.1, 1.A.2, 1.A.3: Support. At least the replacement of the TCI/Spatial relation info pools in Rel. 15/16 with Rel. 17 TCI state pool(s) should be supported. If there is no consensus regarding the RRC configuration of spatial relation info for individual SRS resources that don’t use a spatial relation info pool, the decision on it can be left to RAN2.Proposal 1.B: Would prefer 128 TCI states each for DL and UL, but OK to settle for the current proposal.Proposal 1.C.1: SupportProposal 1.E: SupportProposal 1.G: Support. The three bullets in the current version are sufficient to define beam alignment. |
| vivo | Proposal 1.A.1: SupportProposal 1.A.2: Support. In addition to the restriction of same UL PC setting associated with the configured TCI state for SRS resource in the same set, when the Rel-17 TCI state is updated by MAC CE, the UE also expects the same PC setting associated with the updated TCI state for all SRS resources in the same set. It is necessary to clarify how to reuse Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s) for SRS. For example, RRC configures Rel-17 TCI state ID for SRS resource to replace SRS spatial relation info, and MAC CE updates Rel-17 TCI state ID for SP-/AP-SRS resource to replace spatial relation RS ID.**Proposal 1.A.2**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, for any SRS resource or resource set that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources, but can be configured as a target signal of a Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state pool), Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse ways similar to the Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s) are used to update/configure such SRS(s) with Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state(s).* Applies for both intra-cell and inter-cell beam indication
* All the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI states configured/activated to SRS resources in the same set should be associated with the same UL PC setting.
	+ In RRC, Rel-17 TCI state ID is configured to replace SRS spatial relation info in Rel-15/16.
	+ In MAC CE, Rel-17 TCI state ID is updated for SP-/AP-SRS resource to replace the spatial relation RS ID.

Proposal 1.A.3: Support.Proposal 1.B: Do not support. We suggest to postpone this issue which requires RAN2 agreements for TCI state type.Proposal C.1 and Proposal C.2: Clarify the application of BFR for non-UE-dedicated PDCCH.First, it is necessary to clarify whether BFD is also required for non-UE-dedicated PDCCH associated with the serving cell PCI, where the non-UE-dedicated PDCCH is configured to not use the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH/PDCCH via RRC. To reuse the legacy definition of beam failure event, an explicit BFD RS QCL-ed with the non-UE-dedicated PDCCH or source RS in the indicated TCI state for the non-UE-dedicated PDCCH also needs to be detected.Then, the new beam is not only used for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH and other signals/channels configured to sharing such Rel-17 TCI state, but also for non-UE dedicated PDCCH and associated PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH.Proposal 1.D: Do not support.We would like to clarify the intention of this proposal, is it used for the case when explicit BFD-RS are configured, or beam sweeping?Proposal 1.E: Support.Proposal 1.F: Agree with QC, CATT and Ericsson. Legacy rule is used between initial access and the first instance of beam indication.Proposal 1.G: Do not support. There is no RAN1 spec impact for the other cases of beam alignment definition which should be discussed in RAN4. |
| Sony | **For 1.A.1:** Support.**For 1.A.2:** Support.**For 1.A.3**: Not support.We feel that sounds a little restrictive. At least two combinational use cases of we have in mind1. Rel.17 DL TCI states configured for DL BWP#A in a CC and spatial relation information configured for UL BWP#B in the same CC
2. Rel.17 unified TCI state configured in a CC and Rel.15/16 TCI state in other CC

Given the separated UL/DL TCI state pool configuration unsettled in RAN2, we hope we don’t rush to conclude this until we have more in-depth discussion. Perhaps, we could start discussion whether both mechanisms can be configured within a CC. **For 1.B:** Support. **For 1.C.1 and 1.C.2:** we are finewith the direction. One missing issue could be how to determine the X symbols when channel and/or signals possibly with different SCS are commonly recovered to the same new beam. **For 1.D:** No support.It seems not easy for us to follow the reason why NW configures P/SP CSI-RS without QCL assumption. Though we are fine to apply common TCI states for UE-dedicated channels and CSI-RS, the benefits of such configuration (without QCL assumption for P/SP RS) should be clarified. Additionally, there could be ambiguity period after RRC configuration on P/SP CSI-RS and before the DCI carrying the common TCI state. **For 1.E:** Support.  |
| AT&T | Proposal 1.A.1~1.A.3: supportProposal 1.B: supportProposal 1.D: still not clear to us what is the intention of the proposal isProposal 1.F: share the same view as other companies as what is the value of this proposal as compared to legacy behavior. |
| Mod V20  | **Revised proposals****Added issue 1.11 per MTK input (although IMO this can be left to spec editors)** |
| Samsung | Comments on the updated and new proposals. Earlier comments on proposals not update still stand.**Proposal 1.A.2**: Please clarify the meaning of “this feature is optional”. Does optional mean that SRS resources always follow the UE-dedicated TCI state? Or does it mean that SRS resources not configured to follow the UE-dedicated TCI state follow the Rel-15/Rel-15 SRS spatial relation.**Proposal 1.A.3**: Fine to add “in a band”**Proposal 1.B**: Support**Proposal 1.C.1**: Support**Proposal 1.C.2**: Support**Proposal 1.F**: It is not accurate to say “transmitting CB-RACH”. Not all contention based random access requires identification of new beam (e.g. arrival of UL data with PUCCH resources for SR, or PDCCH order with preamble index set to 0). I also think in some cases, (e.g. Handover) CFRA can be used to identify the new beam. So it is better to keep the original wording “initial access or reconfiguration with sync”.Proposal 1.G: Support**Issue 1.11**: A PDCCH is received in a CORESET. The CORESET is activated a TCI state that determines the QCL parameters for monitoring the PDCCH in an associated SS set.UE dedicated PDCCH channels monitored in a UE-specific search space (USS) set should be received using the UE-dedicated TCI state (Rel-17 indicated TCI state). Hence, the CORESET associated with USS set follows the UE-dedicated TCI state (by design no need for MAC CE activation or RRC configuration). All SS sets that are associated with the same CORESET as the USS set also follow the UE-dedicated TCI state. A CORESET not associated with a SS set is activated by MAC CE a TCI state following the Rel-15/Rel-16 design.Therefore, we prefer Alt2 with the following updates:* Atl2: Per CORESET determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with ~~only~~ at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is not associated with at least one ~~CSS~~ USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be ~~configured~~ activated per CORESET by ~~RRC~~ MAC CE.

 The indicated Rel-17 TCI state is the TCI state of at least UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH channels. |
| Intel | **Proposal 1.A.1:** OK**Proposal 1.A.2:** What does it mean by the “feature is optional”**Proposal 1.A.3:** OK**Proposal 1.B:** The current version seems to be similar to Rel-15/16 functionality. The candidate values for UE capability should be part of UE feature discussion.[Mod: Check comments from QC and Apple above, also Ericsson. This was a part added to facilitate compromise – principally I agree with you]**Proposal 1.C.1-2:** Can proponents clarify what is the default outcome if we do not have any agreement on this? Also we should separately discuss joint DL/UL TCI and separate DL/UL TCI**Proposal 1.F:** What is meant by “pertinent” beam indication? |
| Apple | **Proposal 1.A.2:** To clarify the question from Intel, “feature is optional” means UE can report that UE does not support separate TCI indication for SRS. From pervious discussion, many companies mentioned that normally gNB should indicate the same beam for SRS for CB/NCB and PUSCH. SRS for BM is actually an optional feature and it is not configured by network (in fact during discussion on beam correspondence, network vendors raised strong concern on the overhead for SRS for BM). SRS for antenna switching should share the same indicated DL TCI or joint TCI, otherwise, the measured CSI is not correct. So there is no good use case to have a separate/different beam indication for SRS. But that would increase UE complexity – UE needs to prepare for the case when the indicated beam for SRS is different from the beam indicated for PUSCH.**Proposal 1.C.1:** As we commented before, we suggest the recover the beam for all PDCCH/PDSCH instead of dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH only, since BFD is performed for all beams and the beam for common PDCCH/PDSCH also fails no matter whether it shares the same beam with dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH or not.**Issue 1.11.** We support Alt1 with the following modification. Whether to allow Type2 CSS can be determined by the outcome of issue 2. Type3 CSS is a bit tricky. PDCCH/PDSCH with C-RNTI can be transmitted/scheduled by Type3 CSS. It seems to be better to count it as a UE dedicated signal.* Alt1: Per search space set determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception associated with a [Type2/]Type3 CSS and an USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For other PDCCH ~~any PDCCH reception associated with a CSS set~~ and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set by RRC
 |
| NEC | **Proposal 1.C.1:** We think it’s better to discuss the whole beam failure recovery procedure in case of unified TCI framework, and there are several aspects to be clarified/added.* Besides the starting time for PDCCH monitoring (X symbols from UE receives BFRR), the ending time is also needed to be defined, for example, until a new TCI state indicated or new MAC CE activation? In case of beam indication based on DCI, the monitored PDCCH may include TCI field which indicates a new TCI state (typically a different beam from qnew), whether the UE follows the indication or ignores it until a timing (new MAC activation similar in Rel-15/16)?
* In Rel-15 SpCell BFR, after BFRR, only PDCCH monitoring in SS BFR and CORESET 0 is defined, monitoring in other PDCCH is not required, while in this proposal, does it mean more complexity for UE to monitor all PDCCHs?
* In case of unified TCI framework for CA. We think a separate discussion is needed, for example, it seems only one BFR procedure in reference CC is enough, then how to determine BFD RS and parameters (e.g. timer/counter) for BFR should be discussed. And if the list of CCs includes SpCell, beam for CSS on the SpCell may not share same indicated Rel-17 TCI state, so there may be a case that there are more than one beam on SpCell while only one beam on Scells (e.g. referring to the SpCell), then beam failure conditions on SpCell and Scells may be different, which needs further discussion.
* BFR considering inter-cell BM is also needed to be discussed.

**Proposal 1.D:** We support at least BFD RS should share the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.**Proposal 1.E:** We are open to support CSI-RS for CSI for QCL-TypeA and TypeD. Just a case for clarified or discussed, it’s typical that BFD RS (at least implicit configuration) is determined based on the indicated Rel-17 TCI state, and if CSI-RS for CSI is indicated for QCL source RS (typically this CSI-RS is larger than 1 port), how to determine BFD RS in this case (BFD RS only assumes 1 port CSI-RS)?**Issue 1.11:** We support to discuss this. Besides, the UE behavior on CSS/USS in case of sequential/simultaneously receiving Rel-15/16 MAC CE activation TCI state for PDCCH and indicated Rel-17 TCI state should be defined.  |
| ZTE | **For 1.A.1, 1.A.2:** Not support. In our views, UL TCI or joint TCI provided two types of information, i.e., spatial relation and UL power control setting. For the former, the legacy spatial relation for SRS is equivalent. For the latter, it is difficult for gNB to guarantee the same UL power control setting for all SRS resource in a set by UL TCI or joint TCI, due to the fact that the individual UL power control setting (e.g, PL-RS) is associated with the TCI (if guaranteeing by gNB. That means that duplicated RRC configuration (like ~ 128 (max #. of beam) \*32 (max #. of SRS resources in a set) = 4K TCI is needed)). [Mod: Check above 1.A.2 again especially the sub-bullet on UL PC added by MTK during offline, which should fully address your above “concern’]**For 1.A.3:** For progress, we can support the following version:**Proposal 1.A.3**: The UE is not expected to be configured with Rel-15/Rel-16 TCI/SpatialRelationInfo pool if the UE is configured with Rel-17 TCI in any CC [in a band]**For 1.B:** Support. Also we are fine to postpone this discussion.**For 1.C.1/2:** Support in principle. For PCell/PSCell BFR, the PCell/SCell-BFR is initialized only if all CORESET(s)/PDCCH(s) fail. So, all PDSCH/PDCCH/PUCCH/PUSCH should be updated accordingly.**Proposal 1.C.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, after X symbols from the UE receives the BFRR from NW, the UE assumes the same QCL parameter as the ones associated with the index qnew for all PDSCH/PDCCH receptions in a CC or in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update, as well as other signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated PDSCH/PDCCH reception.* Above applies to both Rel-15 SpCell BFR and Rel-16 SCell BFR
* Note: $q\_{new}$ is a candidate beam identified by the UE in set $q\_{1}$. $q\_{1}$ is the set of candidate beams

**Proposal 1.C.2**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, after X symbols from the UE receives the BFRR from NW, the UE uses the same UL spatial filter as the one associated with the index qnew for all PUSCH transmissions and all of PUCCH resources in a CC or in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update, as well as other signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of PUCCH resources.* Above applies to both Rel-15 SpCell BFR and Rel-16 SCell BFR
* Note: $q\_{new}$ is a candidate beam identified by the UE in set $q\_{1}$. $q\_{1}$ is the set of candidate beams
* FFS: UL PC control including qu, qd, and closed loop index

**For 1.D:** Not support. An explicit RRC parameter is supported by us.**For 1.E:** Support. The error loop can be well handled by above mentioned RRC parameter.**For 1.F:** We sympathize with this discussion. If possible, we suggest to discuss TP directly. Otherwise, it is quite difficult to provide an accurate description for this issue. For DL, we can focus on the following paragraph in Section 5.1.5 in TS 38.214:----------------------------------------When the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in slot *n* corresponding to the PDSCH carrying the activation command, the indicated mapping between TCI states and codepoints of the DCI field *'Transmission Configuration Indication'* should be applied starting from the first slot that is after slotC:\Users\10190306\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml21256\wps1.jpg where ** is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH. If *tci-PresentInDCI* is set to 'enabled' or *tci-PresentDCI-1-2* is configured for the CORESET scheduling the PDSCH, and the time offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is equal to or greater than *timeDurationForQCL* if applicable, after a UE receives an initial higher layer configuration of TCI states and before reception of the activation command, the UE may assume that the DM-RS ports of PDSCH of a serving cell are quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block determined in the initial access procedure with respect to *qcl-Type* set to 'typeA', and when applicable, also with respect to *qcl-Type* set to 'typeD'. ----------------------------------------**For 1.G:** Not support.**For 1.11:** Support Alt2 in principle. Samsung’s update looks good  |
| NTT Docomo3 | 1.A.2: Support with the update.1.3: Support with the update.This is aligned with the current UE feature discussion.Note: FG 23-1-1 (Unified TCI for [intra- and inter-cell] beam management) is [per band] in R1-2110587.1.B: Support. We’d like to make 64 as mandatory value for both UL and DL in FR2, so that system works for operation with 64SSB.1.C.1 and 1.C.2: Support. Rel.16 supports CBRA-BFR on SpCell BFR with BFR MAC CE containing on Msg.3/A as agreed in RAN1#103e, hence we suggest to update:* Above applies to both Rel-15/16 SpCell BFR and Rel-16 SCell BFR

Re intel’s question of 1.C.2: if we don’t update PUCCH beam after BFR, our understanding is that system is broken. Even if gNB sends MAC CE to update UL/DL TCI state, the TCI state is updated 3ms after ACK transmission. However, UE sends ACK in failed beam, and most probably ACK is not received at gNB. Hence, gNB cannot update the beam anymore, which means system becomes broken.1.F: For “transmitting CB-RACH”, we agree with Samsung. We had misunderstanding of the original proposal. We are fine with the original proposal.1.G: We are fine. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1.F:Does it mean that there will be no beam update if beam indication for other signals/channels not share the same TCI state for the UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH is received?Issue 1.11, we prefer Alt 2 since the TCI state is configured per CORESET in existed spec. |
| Apple | 1.F: @Samsung @Docomo, we think the timeline should start from RAR reception. Otherwise, UE cannot receive RAR. Regarding the type of CBRA like “initial access or reconfiguration with sync”, in our view, “initial access” is not necessary, since UE is in idle mode, and no unified TCI is provided. “reconfiguration with sync” is reasonable, but it seems this is not enough. BFR could be type of RACH procedure. I guess another way is to use the wording as we used for CORESET #0 beam update like random access procedure except for PDCCH ordered PRACH.1.A.3: We do not find a use case for one CC to use R16 TCI while another CC uses R17 TCI. We also noticed the CC list for TCI update in R16 can contain any CC across bands. Then such mixture could be tricky. We suggest we consider it as a per UE configuration as originally proposed by FL – either R16 TCI is configured for a UE or R17 TCI. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 1.A.2:** Regarding the contents in the brackets:* It is unclear why Rel-16 MAC-CE-based update has to be pointed out. It is already a part of “Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s)”, is it?
* It is unclear if UE doesn't support this feature, how to provide Rel-17 TCI state for those UL signals?

**Proposal 1.A.3:** We prefer this applies per UE instead of per band, which can greatly simply UE implementation. However, we understand this will depend on whether capability of Rel-17 unified TCI is signaled per band or per UE. We can keep [in a band] in the brackets, and resolve it after RAN1 concludes in UE feature AI.**Proposal 1.C.2:** We are fine to remove “dedicated” from the proposal. However, following the same principle, we should remove “UE-dedicated” from Proposal 1.C.1 as well.**Proposal 1.C.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, after X symbols from the UE receives the BFRR from NW, the UE assumes the same QCL parameter as the ones associated with the index qnew for all ~~UE-dedicated~~ PDSCH/PDCCH receptions in a CC or in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update, …**Proposal 1.F**: We prefer to support the behavior only for initial access and reconfiguration with sync, similar to Rel-15/16.**Issue 1.**11: We think it is better to decide in RAN1 which alternative is RAN1 understanding. Even RAN1 has common understanding that per CORESET determination is adopted, companies may still have different understanding on the details (i.e., the two sub-bullets). These issues need to be addressed instead of leaving them to spec editor. Re comment from Samsung: We are also fine with the revision. But for the second bullet, even for a CORESET not associated with any USS set (i.e., purely non-UE-dedicated), NW still can configure it to share the indicated Rel-17 state according to the following agreement. Note that whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state or not can be configured by RRC is also agreed in RAN1#106bis meeting.**Agreement**On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for intra-cell beam indication, the following DL RSs can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC: * DMRS(s) associated with non-UE-dedicated reception on CORESET(s) and the associated PDSCH
* FFS (to be concluded in RAN1#106bis-e): Non-UE-dedicated PUCCH and non-UE-dedicated PUSCH

Thus, we prefer the following change instead:* Atl2: Per CORESET determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with ~~only~~ at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is not associated with ~~at least one CSS~~ any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per CORESET by RRC.
 |
| LG | Proposal 1.A.1: SupportProposal 1.B: Fine in principleProposal 1.C.1 and 1.C.2: SupportProposal 1.D: It should be clarified for the reason that NW configures P/SP CSI-RS or BFD RS without QCL assumption. Proposal 1.F: We are confused on the intention of the proposal. Does this proposal intend to introduce some new behaviour on CBRA? If the intention is to use legacy behaviour, any further agreement seems unnecessary.[Mod: From the Rel-17 CR email discussions, it is evident that any spec change requires some agreement. As of now there is no agreement to extend this legacy behaviour to Rel-17 unified TCI]Proposal 1.G: We think that the use case of this proposal needs to be clarified first. If this is only related to the definition of a UE feature, i.e. whether UE supports beam misalignment, it is better to be discussed in UE feature session. If this intends to be captured in RAN1 specification regarding how to align PL RS between source RS and target RS, we think that there are more cases that needs to be considered, e.g. the case when an SRS resource is used as UL TCI spatial relation RS. |
| Mod V32 | **Revised proposals.** **For 1.A.1/2 and 1.F some of the changes in V20 were reverted due to inputs from companies** |
| TCL | **Proposal 1.A.1~3:** Support.**Proposal 1.B:** Support.**Proposal 1.D:** Not support. We think this proposal needs to be clearer. For example, how to assume or configure.**Proposal 1.E,F:** Support.**Proposal 1.G:** Fine. **Issue 1.11:** We support Alt 2 because UE receiving PDCCH is in CORESET. |
| MediaTek | **Issue 1.11:** Regarding the second bullet in Alt2, we think even for a CORESET not associated with any USS set (i.e., purely non-UE-dedicated), NW still can configure it to share the indicated Rel-17 state according to the following agreement. Note that whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state or not can be configured by RRC is also agreed in RAN1#106bis meeting.**Agreement**On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for intra-cell beam indication, the following DL RSs can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC: * DMRS(s) associated with non-UE-dedicated reception on CORESET(s) and the associated PDSCH
* FFS (to be concluded in RAN1#106bis-e): Non-UE-dedicated PUCCH and non-UE-dedicated PUSCH

Thus, we prefer to keep the later part of the 2nd bullet w/o change as follows.* Atl2: Per CORESET determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per CORESET by RRC

**[Mod: Correct]** |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1.A.1: supportProposal 1.A.2 : The last subbullet specifies NW behavior, and has no spec impact. We propose the following update:**Proposal 1.A.2**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, for any SRS resource or resource set that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources, but can be configured as a target signal of a Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state pool), [Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse the Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s) are][the MAC CE defined in section 6.1.3.26 in 38.321 is] used to update/configure such SRS(s) with Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state(s).* Applies for both intra-cell and inter-cell beam indication
* Note: All the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI states configured/activated to SRS resources in the same set can, by NW configuration, be associated with the same UL PC setting.

Proposal 1.B: SupportProposal 1.C.1: SupportProposal 1.C.2: SuppportProposal 1.D: Support. Some comments are provided that state what it means if a CSI-RS is provided without a QCL source. We should note there is no such behavior defined in the spec. There have been attempts by e.g. Huawei to specify default R15/16 behavior, but those attempts have been unsuccessful. Hence, the UE may do what it likes if there is no QCL source provided, it may even shut down. This means that in practice, the QCL source of CSI-RS is a mandatory parameter. Proposal 1.D aims to correct that. If companies are OK to have the QCL source as mandatory, then we should leave it at that.Proposal 1.E: SupportProposal 1.F: SupportProposal 1G: So the proposal says “for discussion purposes”. Does it mean we will have no specification impact? Now, we already see proposals for UE features based on “beam alignment”, which we still struggle to define. We would prefer to state that * The support for a configured PL RS is optional
* A UE that does support a configured PL RS supports any configuration.

1.11: As we understand it, for intra-cell, we have already agreed that all receptions are received using the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. For the two bullets in the alternatives, they seem decoupled. Question 1: What PDCCHs are always received using indicated Rel-17 TCI state?Question 2: What about other PDCCHs?Maybe we could answer question 1 first?**[Mod: Check MTK’s response and see if its addressed]** |
| vivo | **For Proposal 1.B**RAN2 is still discussing the signaling design. We may not need to spend time on this before it is necessaryIf it can make the Moderator happier, we would accept the following change:**Proposal 1.B**: If RAN2 signaling design needs the max number of configured UL TCI state or DL TCI state, one of the following is supported **Alt 1**: 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* The number of configured TCI states a UE can support is a UE capability including the following candidate values per BWP per CC:
	+ DL TCI: 64, 128
	+ UL TCI: 32, 64
* 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

**Alt 2:** 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 and UL TCI state update is [128] per BWP per CC.* The total number of configured TCI states a UE can support is a UE capability including the following candidate values per BWP per CC: 32, 64, 128;

[Mod: See revised version. The note should address your concern (hopefully make you happy) regarding the open issue on “pool” design (currently assumed separate in RAN2 subject to future confirmation). Note that the option of using >64 states for UL even with Alt2 is already objected by Qualcomm, Apple, and some more companiesIf we leave it to Alt1/2, RAN2 cannot proceed with their design and UE feature discussion cannot be concluded early next year. So not postponing is not a matter of making me happier. It is simply necessary. UE feature and RRC have to be concluded early next year. Given the poorer status of other WIs, there is no guarantee that FeMIMO will be allocated sometime for maintenance before the deadline for RRC and UE feature in 1Q2022. You may check with the Chairman.]**For proposal 1.C.2**, this should be limited to the case when joint TCI indication is enabled. Moreover we would like to clarify as note that “BFR for inter-cell BM is not supported in Rel-17”.[Mod: This may not be necessary if we conclude on 2.C.2 one way or another]**For 1.11:** Support original Alt2.In our understanding, non-UE-dedicated channels include the PDCCH on the CORESETs associated with type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set and the scheduled PDSCH by the PDCCH, where the non-UE-dedicated CORESET is mainly used to transmit common information, such as SIB, MIB and paging information. Thus, we prefer the non-UE-dedicated CORESET refers to the CORESET that is associated with at least one CSS set. The TCI state determination per SS set in Alt1 will have a serious impact on legacy spec. The TCI state of a CORESET should be applied to all PDCCHs in the associated SS set(s). The description “whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be activated per CORESET by MAC-CE” seems to say that the application of Rel-17 TCI for a CORESET is activated by MAC CE, which violates the previous agreements of RRC configuration for Rel-17 TCI application.Besides, according to the agreements in RAN1 #106 meeting, for inter-cell beam management, the supported Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and/or DCI-based beam indication applies to the channels and signals as for intra-cell beam management except for non-UE-dedicated channels/signals. Thus, this restriction of Rel-17 TCI application should be added. For Rel-17 unified TCI framework, on applying the indicated Rel-17 TCI state to PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, for intra-cell and inter-cell BM: * Alt1: Per search space set determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception associated with a [Type2]/Type3 CSS and an USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For other PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set by RRC
* Atl2: Per CORESET determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with ~~at least~~ only USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is not associated with ~~any~~ at least one C~~U~~SS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be ~~activated~~  configured per CORESET by ~~MAC-CE~~ RRC for intra-cell beam indication.

[Mod: Once conclusion 2.B is endorsed, no need to limit to intra-cell only in my understanding] |
| MediaTek | On Issue 1.11, @Ericsson, if we don't misunderstand the following RAN1 agreements, some DL channels/signals only “can” share the indicated Rel-17 TCI state rather than “always”. We believe the two alternatives (per search space set determination or per CORESET determination) is provided for clarifying your first question, where PDCCH reception should be configured though the two settings. Or to be clear, what PDCCHs are always received using indicated Rel-17 TCI state and what PDCCHs can be configured by RRC to be received using indicated Rel-17 TCI state? Regarding your second question, we think RAN1 has concluded in previous meeting according to the following 2nd agreement.**Agreement**On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for intra-cell beam indication, the following DL RSs can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC: * DMRS(s) associated with non-UE-dedicated reception on CORESET(s) and the associated PDSCH
* FFS (to be concluded in RAN1#106bis-e): Non-UE-dedicated PUCCH and non-UE-dedicated PUSCH

**Agreement**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: A non-UE dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH associated with the serving cell PCI or AP CSI-RS for BM or CSI (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: An SRS for BM, for antenna switching, or for codebook/non-codebook based uplink transmission (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. This does not imply that a new RRC parameter(s) is necessary from RAN1 point of view.FFS: Relevant UE capability to be discussed under UE feature agenda item. |
| Mod V40 | **Small revisions per company inputs** |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 1.A.1**: Support.**Proposal 1.A.2**: Support in general. Our view is that the text in bracket “the MAC CE defined in section 6.1.3.26 in 38.321 is” is not needed.**Proposal 1.A.3**: Support.**Proposal 1.B**: Support.**Proposal 1.C.1**: Support.**Proposal 1.C.2**: Our view is that this proposal should only apply to the case of joint DL/UL TCI mode. So the text in bracket “when the UE is configured with joint DL/UL TCI” should be kept.**Proposal 1.D**: Not support. It is unclear to us what usage scenario this proposal is targeted at.**Proposal 1.E**: Support.**Proposal 1.F**: We are in general ok with the latest version but not sure if this proposal is needed.**Proposal 1.G**: Support.**Issue 1.11**: We are open to both alternatives. |
| Samsung | **Proposals 1.A.1, 1.A.2, 1.A.3, 1.B:** Support**Proposal 1.C.1:** This proposal should be limited to intra-cell as UE-dedicated channels can be received on a cell with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving (and this could be the cell of q\_new), but the common channels are received on the serving cell.Therefore, we would like to make the following update:**Proposal 1.C.1**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, for intra-cell beam management, after X symbols from the UE receives the BFRR from NW, the UE assumes the same QCL parameter as the ones associated with the index qnew for all PDSCH/PDCCH receptions and in a CC or in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update, as well as other signals/channels configured to sharing the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as PDSCH/PDCCH reception.* Above applies to both Rel-15 SpCell BFR and Rel-16 SCell BFR
* Note: $q\_{new}$ is a candidate beam identified by the UE in set $q\_{1}$. $q\_{1}$ is the set of candidate beams

Alternatively, we can add back “UE-dedicated” and this could then apply to both intra-cell and inter-cell beam management BFR.**Proposal 1.C.2**: Fine, even though we don’t understand the rationale to delete “dynamic grant/configured grant based” before PUSCH. Is there a PUSCH that is not dynamically scheduled or scheduled by a configured grant?[Mod: Agree, but then whether it is deleted or not doesn’t really matter]**Proposal 1.D:** Same concern as expressed before.**Proposal 1.E**: Support**Proposal 1.F**: We should use “spatial filter” rather than “spatial relation info”. Spatial relations are configured after the UE gets a dedicated configuration with the spatial domain information:**Proposal 1.F**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, after initial access or reconfiguration with sync, Rel-15/16 rules pertaining to QCL and spatial ~~relation info~~ filter assumptions are reused until the UE receives a first instance of beam indication * This holds for any signal/channel that is a valid target signal/channel of Rel-17 TCI

This is also aligned with terms that have been used in previous agreements:**Agreement RAN1#102-e****Note**: the enumeration for issues (such as “issue 1a), 1b), 6) in the proposal below refers to the enumeration within the proposals, not Table 1 in the FL summary.* [Issue 1] For Rel.17 NR FeMIMO, on the unified TCI framework
	1. Support joint TCI for DL and UL based on and analogous to Rel.15/16 DL TCI framework
		+ The term “TCI” at least comprises a TCI state that includes at least one source RS to provide a reference (UE assumption) for determining QCL and/or spatial filter

**Proposal 1.G**: support**Issue 1.11**: Support Alt2. |
| Qualcomm | For latest 1.B, fineFor latest 1.C.1 and 1.C.2, fine. To vivo, our understanding is that R15/16 SpCell/SCell BFR can also be applicable to inter-cell BM case, so we prefer not to add any restriction noteFor latest 1.F, suggest to remove “initial access”, because UE does not know whether R17 TCI will be configured or not. Same concern for “reconfig with sync” if R17 TCI is not configured for the target cell.[Mod: Good point, please see revision (initial access is still there but the condition is added]For 1.11, do not support both current Alt1 and Alt2. We support Alt3 below, which is aligned with the agreement to our understanding, i.e. CSS can be associated with unified TCI, non-CSS must be associated with unified TCI* Alt3: Per search space set determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception associated with a CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set by RRC

For other PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. |
| Intel | **Proposal 1.B:** The added example to the note is not necessary. We need not speculate about RAN2’s decision**Proposal 1.C.2:** What about the case when UE is configured with separate DL/UL TCI? **Proposal 1.G:** We are not sure what is meant by “discussion purposes” since this is the last meeting. If there is no spec impact, then this proposal is not necessary.**Issue: 1.11:** Support Alt. 2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1.F:** In principle, we prefer not to touch initial access or handover procedure. Given that the proposal is to reuse R15/R16, it is then not needed.[Mod: There hasn’t been any agreement on this issue when a UE is configured with Rel-17 TCI. Check latest version] |
| Lenovo/MotM | **Proposal 1.A.1/1.A.2:** We had concern with the proposal because of the issue with the power control paramters. We are now OK with it with the note in 1.A.2. Thanks to the Moderator for addressing our concern. [Mod: Thanks for your understanding]**Proposal 1.A.3**: We can support it for the sake of progress. **Proposal 1.B**: Support.**Proposal 1.E**: Support.**Proposal 1.F**: Support.**Issue 1.11**: Support Alt 2. We think it is better to apply R17 TCI to CORESET as this is consistent with R15/16 TCI.  |
| vivo | **For 1.B,** @Moderator, if RAN2 signaling design is using shared pool, why do we need separate max value for DL and UL TCI? We offer another version of compromise:**Proposal 1.B**: If it is determined necessary to define the maximum configured values for DL and UL TCI from RAN2 separate TCI signaling design perspective, 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* The number of configured TCI states a UE can support is a UE capability including the following candidate values per BWP per CC:
	+ DL TCI: 64, 128
	+ UL TCI: 32, 64
	+ DL TCI + UL TCI: 32, 64, 128
* 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. ~~For example, if RAN2 decides that UL TCI shares the same pool as joint DL/UL TCI, the above constraints still hold while the largest number of configured TCI states for joint DL/UL TCI state update is 128 per BWP per CC (per previous agreement)~~

**[Mod: Thanks. IMO this text is fine. I put this in brackets first for companies to comment]****For 1.11:**According to the following agreements, for TCI state determination for PDCCH reception, there are three cases to be considered, i.e. UE-dedicated reception PDCCH, non-UE-dedicated reception on PDCCH for intra-cell, non-UE-dedicated reception on PDCCH for inter-cell. The first PDCCH above are always received using the indicated Rel-17 TCI state, the second one can be configured by RRC to using the indicated Rel-17 TCI state, but last one associated with serving cell PCI is received using different TCI state from that of UE-dedicated channel.***Agreement****On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for intra-cell beam indication, the following DL RSs can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC:* * *DMRS(s) associated with non-UE-dedicated reception on CORESET(s) and the associated PDSCH*
* *FFS (to be concluded in RAN1#106bis-e): Non-UE-dedicated PUCCH and non-UE-dedicated PUSCH*

*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*

For the first sub-bullet of Alt2, if a CORESET is associated with USS set and CSS set, it means that the non-UE-dedicated PDCCH on CSS set and other associated common information are always received using the indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated channel, which seems to violate the previous agreements for non-UE-dedicated channel reception, e.g. the second PDCCH and last PDCCH mentioned above. Thus, to align the previous agreements, the signal type needs to be restricted for indicated Rel-17 TCI state.For Rel-17 unified TCI framework, on applying the indicated Rel-17 TCI state to PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, for intra-cell and inter-cell BM: * Alt1: Per search space set determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception associated with a [Type2]/Type3 CSS and an USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For other PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set by RRC
* Atl2: Per CORESET determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
		- UE does not expect these CORESETs to be associated with CSS.
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per CORESET by RRC

**[Mod: Agree]MO** |
| Sony | **Issue 1.11:** We add our preference in the table. From our reading, Alt2 is more aligned with the Spec in the aspect that PDCCH on a CORESET which is associated with either a USS or CSS.  |
| CATT | For proposal1.F, support the revised proposal.For issue 1.11, per our understanding, the detection of USS/CSS is performed in each measurement occasion (MO). Whether to applied the Rel-17 TCI state should be determined per MO instead of per CORESET or per search space. Namely, for each MO, if both USS and CSS associated with the same CORESET have to be monitored, the CORESET should follow the indicated common beam. If only CSS is monitored, whether to apply the common beam on this CORESET depends on RRC configuration. Therefore, we suggest to add the following alternative:* Atl3: Per MO determination
	+ During each MO, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ During each MO, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per CORESET by RRC
 |
| Mod V52 | **Minor revisions on proposals based on inputs** |
| Convida | **Proposal 1.A.1:** support**Proposal 1.A.2:** support**Proposal 1.A.3:** support**Proposal 1.B:** not support. We generally share the view of vivo. Also, it doesn’t seem critical to agree on the maximum number(s) now, before the TCI state pool design is more clear in RAN2. Suggest to postpone decision to a later meeting. The added text in brackets is not so clear. Is the intention to say that the agreement applies only if RAN2 agrees on separate TCI state pool for separate UL TCI?**Proposal 1.C.1:** support**Proposal 1.C.2:** support**Proposal 1.D:** OK**Proposal 1.E:** neutral, it doesn’t seem essential to include CSI-RS for CSI.**Proposal 1.F:** support |
| NTT Docomo4 | **Proposal 1.A.3:** Not support. Before deciding the UE feature of Rel.17 TCI state is per band or per UE, we think it is too early to agree. We suggest to postpone the discussion until the UE feature is decided.**Proposal 1.C.2:** Question to Futurewei, why you think “*the proposal should only apply to the case of joint DL/UL TCI mode”*? Even for separate UL/DL TCI mode, UE should update UL TCI assumption to q\_new after BFR, otherwise PUCCH beam is kept as failed beam. **Proposal 1.C.1 and 1.C.2**: Support. Rel.16 supports CBRA-BFR on SpCell BFR with BFR MAC CE containing on Msg.3/A as agreed in RAN1#103e, hence we suggest to update:* Above applies to both Rel-15 SpCell BFR, Rel-16 CBRA based SpCell BFR, and Rel-16 SCell BFR

**Proposal 1.F**: Thank you Apple for your comment (*the timeline should start from RAR reception. Otherwise, UE cannot receive RAR*). Based on the current spec., RAR reception (and DCI reception with RA-RNTI) is QCLed with the SSB. Isn’t it correct that we can reuse the existing spec. without spec. enhancement to receive RAR?We agree that we don’t need to consider the initial access because Rel.17 TCI state is not configured. Then, how about the following?BTW, is it possible to clarify “Rel-15/16 rules pertaining to QCL and spatial relation info assumptions are reused” in the proposal?**Proposal 1.F**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, if UE is configured with Rel.17 TCI states, after CBRA/CFRA completion ~~initial access or reconfiguration with sync~~, Rel-15/16 rules pertaining to QCL and spatial relation info assumptions are reused until the UE receives a first instance of beam indication * This holds for any signal/channel that is a valid target signal/channel of Rel-17 TCI

 |
| MediaTek | On Proposal 1.F, we think it is better to clarify the Rel-15/16 rules pertaining to QCL and UL spatial filter assumptions since we are afraid that people may have different understandings. The following is our understanding: For a DL signal/channel that is a valid target signal/channel of Rel-17 TCI, the UE assumes that the DM-RS antenna port associated with the DL signal/channel reception is quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block the UE identified during the initial access procedure, or the SS/PBCH block or the CSI-RS resource the UE identified during the random access procedure initiated by the Reconfiguration with sync procedure as described in [12, TS 38.331].From TS38.213 – 10.1 UE procedure for determining physical downlink control channel assignmentFor a CORESET other than a CORESET with index 0, - if a UE has not been provided a configuration of TCI state(s) by tci-StatesPDCCH-ToAddList and tci-StatesPDCCH-ToReleaseList for the CORESET, or has been provided initial configuration of more than one TCI states for the CORESET by tci-StatesPDCCH-ToAddList and tci-StatesPDCCH-ToReleaseList but has not received a MAC CE activation command for one of the TCI states as described in [11, TS 38.321], the UE assumes that the DM-RS antenna port associated with PDCCH receptions is quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block the UE identified during the initial access procedure; - if a UE has been provided a configuration of more than one TCI states by tci-StatesPDCCH-ToAddList and tci-StatesPDCCH-ToReleaseList for the CORESET as part of Reconfiguration with sync procedure as described in [12, TS 38.331] but has not received a MAC CE activation command for one of the TCI states as described in [11, TS 38.321], the UE assumes that the DM-RS antenna port associated with PDCCH receptions is quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block or the CSI-RS resource the UE identified during the random access procedure initiated by the Reconfiguration with sync procedure as described in [12, TS 38.331].For a UL signal/channel that is a valid target signal/channel of Rel-17 TCI, the UE transmits the UL signal/channel using the same spatial domain transmission filter as for a PUSCH transmission scheduled by a RAR UL grant as described in clause 8.3.*From TS38.213 – 9.2.1 PUCCH Resource Sets**The UE transmits the PUCCH using the same spatial domain transmission filter as for a PUSCH transmission scheduled by a RAR UL grant as described in clause 8.3.* If this is common understanding, we prefer to clarify it in the proposal as well. For example:**Proposal 1.F**: After initial access or reconfiguration with sync, when a UE is configured with Rel-17 TCI, Rel-15/16 rules pertaining to QCL and UL spatial filter assumptions are reused until the UE receives a first instance of beam indication * For any DL signal/channel that is a valid target signal/channel of Rel-17 TCI, the UE assumes that the DM-RS antenna port associated with the DL signal/channel reception is quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block the UE identified during the initial access procedure, or the SS/PBCH block or the CSI-RS resource the UE identified during the random access procedure initiated by the Reconfiguration with sync procedure as described in [12, TS 38.331].
* For any UL signal/channel that is a valid target signal/channel of Rel-17 TCI, the UE transmits the UL signal/channel using the same spatial domain transmission filter as for a PUSCH transmission scheduled by a RAR UL grant as described in clause 8.3.

On Issue 11, regarding the current version of Alt2, we think the intension is to prevent CCS set always need to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state, which should be configurable according to the agreement. However, we should not limit the NW configuration. Instead, we think the original version should be fine for vivo. Regarding Alt3, we think it is one possible solution of Alt1, thus can be merged. Regarding Alt4, the difference between Atl2 is unclear. We suggest to decide which alternative (Alt1, 2, or 3) should adopted, then the details. Otherwise, there could be a lot of alternatives. According to the comments from companies so far, possible solutions can be summarized as follows.For Rel-17 unified TCI framework, on applying the indicated Rel-17 TCI state to PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, for intra-cell and inter-cell BM: * Alt1: Per search space set determination
	+ Alt1-1: For any PDCCH reception associated with a [Type2]/Type3 CSS and an USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. For other PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set by RRC
	+ Alt1-2: For any PDCCH reception associated with a CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set by RRC
* Alt2: Per CORESET determination
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with only USS set(s) w/o CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with any CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per CORESET by RRC
* Alt3: Per MO determination
	+ During each MO, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is associated with at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.
	+ During each MO, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per CORESET by RRC

  |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.A.2**: We support this proposal, but we would like to given RAN2 some design freedom whether to choose the MAC CE design of section 6.1.3.26 or something similar. Therefore, we suggest: **Proposal 1.A.2**: On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, for any SRS resource or resource set that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources, but can be configured as a target signal of a Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state pool), Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse the Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s) are used to update/configure such SRS(s) with Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state(s).* Applies for both intra-cell and inter-cell beam indication
* Note: The Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse the Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s) can include the MAC CE defined in section 6.1.3.26 in 38.321
* Note: All the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI states configured/activated to SRS resources in the same set can, by NW configuration, be associated with the same UL PC setting.

**Issue 11.1**: For the case of intra-cell beam management, the PDCCH monitoring occasion of CSS set can follow the UE-dedicated TCI state. Therefore, we would like to remove the newly added sentence in Alt2: “The UE does not expect these CORESETs to be associated with CSS”. There is no need for such restriction. In case of inter-cell beam management network configures a different CORESET for CSS. This is allowed by Alt2. If companies, would still like to only have a CORESET associated only with USS, we suggest that this become a new alternative.For Alt3, in Rel-15/16 the TCI state is associated with a CORESET. Associating a TCI state with a SS set departs from this design. Therefore, we don’t prefer Alt3.For Alt4, a TCI state is associated with a CORESET, rather than a Monitoring Occasion. Therefore, we don’t prefer Alt4. |
| Ericsson | On issue 11, we feel that the discussion is diverging, with more options and details. We should take a step back and think about what we are actually trying to solve. Based on the agreements, we have the situation that* UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH shares the indicated TCI state
* Non-UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH can share the indicated TCI state
* PDCCHs that don’t share the indicated TCI state rely on Rel-15 mechanisms, i.e., RRC/MACCE/DCI signaling related to the corresponding CORESET.

To us, this feels complete, if we can just figure out how this is signalled. We could for instance state that an explicit configuration overrides the indicated TCI state. But there is no need to determine rules on which search spaces or CORESETs use which behavior: this is handled by NW configuration.On the other hand, if we feel there is a need to change the signaling related to CORESETs, or say that also non-UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH shall use the indicated TCI state, we can discuss this. The second option should definitely be explored – after all we are trying to reduce the signalling. |

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

Table 3 Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2.1 | **Proposal 2.A**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, 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**FL Note: This was discussed in the last meeting at length and during offline [1]** | **Support/fine**: Apple, OPPO, MTK, NTT Docomo, Samsung, LG, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, Sony, Xiaomi, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Huawei/HiSi, Lenovo/MotM, ZTE, AT&T, Intel, Ericsson, Futurewei**Concern**:  |
| 2.2 | **Conclusion 2.B:** On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management, in line with existing agreements, the UE monitors/receives paging and short message only from the serving cell * [Note: This holds even if only one TCI state associated with a PCI different from the serving cell is activated]

**FL Note: This was discussed in the last meeting at length and during offline [1]**On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management, on QCL assumption for paging and short message reception after being activated with [only one] TCI state[(s)] associated with PCI different from serving cell:* Alt0. The UE is not required to monitor paging and short message associated with the newly indicated TCI state associated with a PCI different from the serving cell
* Alt1. The UE is to monitor paging and short message in USS configured for paging and short message with the newly indicated TCI state associated with a PCI different from the serving cell
* Alt2. The UE is to monitor paging and short message in Type2 PDCCH CSS configured for paging and short message with the newly indicated TCI state associated with a PCI different from the serving cell

**Alt0 (default – without any agreement this is the outcome).** * Support: OPPO, vivo, Lenovo/MotM, MTK (2nd), CATT, NTT Docomo, Intel, NEC, Qualcomm
* Concern: Huawei, HiSilicon, Apple

**Alt1**. * Support: Huawei/HiSi (2nd), Ericsson (>=1), Samsung (2nd preference), Spreadtrum, AT&T, Nokia/NSB
* Concern: MTK, OPPO, NTT Docomo, ZTE, Qualcomm

**Alt2**. * **Support/fine:** Huawei/HiSi, Apple, ZTE (>=1), Samsung (>=1), Futurewei, Spreadtrum, AT&T, Sony (>=1), MTK, Xiaomi, CMCC, Nokia/NSB,CATT
* **Concern:** vivo, Lenovo/MotM, LG, Intel, Qualcomm, OPPO
 |
| 2.3 | **Conclusion 2.C.1:** On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, in Rel-17, there is no consensus on supporting event-driven beam reporting**Proposal 2.C.2**: On Rel-17 enhancements for PCell and SCell BFR in inter-cell beam management, support to configure an SSB associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell for candidate beam detection .**FL Note**: The latest proposal below from last meeting was discussed at length and concerns still remained. Proposal 2.C.2 was added by Apple**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)  | **Proposal 2.C.2:*** **Support/fine**: Samsung, Intel, NEC, NTT Docomo, ZTE, Futurewei, QC, CATT
* **Concern:** MTK, Ericsson, vivo, Sony
 |
| 2.4 | **Proposal 2.D**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, a CSI-SSB-ResourceSet configured for L1-RSRP measurement/reporting includes a set of SSB indices where different PCI indices associated with the set of SSB indices, respectively. The PCI indices refer to PCIs within the set of PCIs configured for inter-cell beam management or inter-cell multi-TRP.* The additionalInfo associated with SSB(s) with PCI(s) different from the serving cell agreed in RAN1 Agenda Item 8.1.2.2 is also applicable to inter-cell BM
* Detailed signaling design is up to RAN2
* [The above L1-RSRP measurement/reporting also includes group-based beam report for inter-cell mTRP]

**FL Note**: Added to address an issue raised by MTK. Since the inclusion of PCI in TCI state configuration can be left to RAN2, the proposal only addresses beam measurement/reporting | **Support/fine**: Samsung, Intel, NEC, NTT Docomo (with modification), MTK, Apple, ZTE, Xiaomi, Ericsson, Futurewei, QC, Lenovo/MotM, Sony, CATT **Concern:**  |
| 2.5 | For UEs configured with only 1 active TCI state: In a certain duration, gNB has to provide 2 TCI states.* Option 2: UE does not need to monitor non-UE dedicated signals when a different TCI is indicated for dedicated signals.
* Option 3: Inter-cell BM is only supported for SCell

**FL Note**: Added to address an issue raised by Apple (only two options are kept since Opt1 is based on a non-agreeable solution for paging) | **Opt2:** Intel (default option), QC, Huawei, HiSi, vivo**Opt3:** **None of the above:** Samsung NTT Docomo, ZTE (implementation), MTK (up to implementation), Sony, CATT (support 2 states) |
| 2.6 | On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, the UE behavior when there is overlap for L1-RSRP measurement for SSB associated with serving cell PCI and PCIs different from the serving cell PCI:* Alt-1: limit L1-RSRP based inter-cell measurement within SMTC window
* Alt-2: define a higher layer configured measurement pattern to measure the SSB of each measurement cell in turn
* Alt-3: UE expects the active resources for UE to measure L1-RSRP are always non-overlapping based on CSI report/resource configurations
* Alt4: No RAN1 specification impact is needed
 | **Alt1:** **Alt2:** **Alt3:** Sony**Alt4:** Samsung, Intel, CATT |

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**
 |
| Qualcomm | For 2.A, supportFor 2.B, no need for such conclusion. The agreement is already clear, i.e. only UE dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH can be on non-serving PCI. Given this agreement, UE will not receive paging/short message on non-serivng PCI. The agreement also says if gNB wants UE to receive paging, MAC-CE will be used to switch UE back to serving cell. So the issue is already addressed without ambiguity. For 2.C, fine |
| Apple | 2.A: Support2.B: as we discussed in our contribution, we found something is msising in previous agreement. In a certain duration, gNB has to provide 2 TCI states.There can be 3 options to fix this issue:* Option 1: The signals associated with USS and Type 2/3 CSS share the same indicated TCI.
* Option 2: UE does not need to monitor non-UE dedicated signals when a different TCI is indicated for dedicated signals.
* Option 3: Inter-cell BM is only supported for SCell

We think option 1 is aligned with current Alt2. Option 2 is outcome of Alt0. Maybe we can start from option 3. Then we can finalize inter-cell BM for PCell in Rel-18. Current assumption is not fully based on technical aspects, but the key reason is lack of RAN2’s TU.2.C: We think event based beam report is an important aspect. Current BFR cannot support to configure non-serving cell SSB for CBD. Event-based beam report can be helpful for this case. If this is not supported, we suggest the following proposal:**Proposal: Support to configure non-serving cell SSB for candidate beam detection.** |
| CATT | For proposal 2.A, support.For conclusion 2.B, fine. Considering spec impact and flexibility, we are also OK with Alt2.For 2.C. Event-driven reporting has been supported in the L3-based beam measurement and reporting for handover. This feature should be inherited and supported in L1/L2 inter-cell beam measurement and reporting. For event driven reporting, we prefer MAC-CE based event-driven beam reporting considering that the event to trigger the beam reporting is not predictable from gNB side and allocating periodic resource might cause a waste of resources. |
| MediaTek | For 2.A~2.C, support.For 2.C, as mentioned by CATT, L3-based beam measurement and reporting has been supported for handover. However, no cell change is allowed by Rel-17 inter-cell BM. We suggest to leave it to Rel-18 mobility enhancement.---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------We would like to point out one critical issue in Rel-17 unified that need to be addressed. According to current RAN1 agreements, it is still unclear how to configure SSBs with PCID(s) different from the serving cell in L1-RSRP measurement and reporting. In our view, a CMR resource set can include all the SSBs with the same or different PCIDs, where both of the SSB-indexes and the associated PCIDs should be included in such CMR resource set. Then, UE can directly report the selected SSBs within the configured CMR resource set thought the SSBRIs in the L1-RSRP reporting instance, as in Rel-15/16 L1-RSRP reporting.*Issue 2.4: Configuration and reporting of SSBs with PCID(s) different from the serving cell in L1-RSRP measurement and reporting* |
| NTT Docomo | Proposal 2.A:SupportConclusion 2.B: Not support. We should make clear agreement that “UE monitor/receive paging and short message from serving cell only”. We should be informed to RAN2, because this reply was pending.Conclusion 2.C: Fine, considering the limitted remaining time. Technically, we believe event trigger beam reporting is quite benefitial. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.A**: Support**Conclusion 2.B**: While the conclusion is stating a fact that there is “no consensus”, we think that receiving paging and short messages on serving cell, when the UE-dedicated messages are being received on a cell with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving is sub-optimal for performance. If the majority is supporting Alt0, we can accept for progress.**Conclusion 2.C**: OKWhile we would have liked a different outcome, given that this is the last meeting, this seems to be the most expedient option. |
| Ericsson | On conclusion 2.B: If we cannot reach consensus on this, alt0 will be the outcome, and so be it. However, there are some arguments that do not seem accurate:* We have not agreed what “non-UE-dedicated reception on CORESET(s) and the associated PDSCH” is, and we have not agreed that it is based on RNTI, which we think would be somewhat non intuitive.
* There is no RAN2 impact of this – this is all in RAN1’s domain. When I asked RAN2 why P-RNTI cannot be monitored in USS, they answered “Ask RAN1”
* The spec impact of alt2 is very limited: the only thing that is necessary is to add P-RNTI to the RNTIs that are monitored in USS. (Implementation impact is of course another matter, but hopefully it is small)

Both alt1 and alt2 propose to reduce the UE complexity. Alt0 will simply lead to higher requirements on the UE. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.A:** support.**Conclusion 2.B:** we do not need a conclusion to capture that. Alt 0 is by default the outcome since there is no consensus to support other Alt.**Conclusion 2.C:** support.  |
| NTT Docomo2 (v10) | **Conclusion 2.B**: In offline (R1-2111716), regarding to our question that “with Alt-0, *UE can receive paging/short message from serving cell even if it supports only one active TCI and/or being activated/indicated with one TCI associated with PCI different from serving cell”*, FL replied that gNB can update TCI state (associated with non-serving cell 🡺 serving cell). However, it takes more than 3ms + 20ms (usual SSB periodicity) latency, considering TCI state switching delay in TS38.133. If we need to send MAC CE (for TCI state) and more than 23ms latency, every time before and after UE monitors/receives Paging/Short message/system information, we don’t believe it is called system works. UE monitors Paging very frequently.Hence, our understanding of the consequence of the Conclusion 2.B (or Alt.0) is the following in real:* Opt.1: UE can receive paging/short message from serving cell even if it supports only one active TCI and/or being activated/indicated with one TCI associated with PCI different from serving cell
* Opt.2: The minimum UE capability supports 1PCI in addition to the serving cell PCI. Whatever the mandatory value in standard is, operators/gNB vendors require UE to support it, to use L1/L2 inter cell mobility. The UE supporting 2 PCIs can receive paging/short message/system information from serving cell, and receive other signal (e.g. UE-dedicated PDSCH) from non-serving cell.
 |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.A, supportConclusion 2.B, with Alt 0, there are some cases that UE monitors paging and short message without the best TCI state. Anyway, it is same as the existed system without inter-cell beam management. Conclusion 2.C, we prefer to support event-driven beam reporting. But considering the remaining time, we can accept this conclusion. |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.A:** Support**Conclusion 2.B:** Fine. **Conclusion 2.C:** Fine.Besides the issues mentioned above, an FFS left from the last meeting also needs to be discussed and resolved in this meeting, otherwise the feature of inter-cell measurement shall be incomplete.  **Agreement**On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, NMAX (the maximum number of RRC-configured PCIs different from the serving cell for measurement/reporting) is up to UE capability with candidate values of at least 1 and X.* Note: The upper bound for X as agreed in AI 8.1.2.2
* When NMAXis configured to be X, the UE is RRC-configured for L1-RSRP measurement with up to X PCIs different from the serving cell PCI
* Additional restriction may be added by RAN4
* FFS: UE measurement behavior when SSBs associated with different PCIs overlap, including whether this is up to UE capability

[Mod: Please come up with a concrete proposal that the group can interact with and see if it can be agreed] |
| Sony | **2.A**: Support. **2.B**: fine to the conclusion. **2.C**: as a few of the proponents, we also believe the event-based beam reporting can be beneficial. Similar to L3-mobility, the L1/L2 centric inter-cell mobility (changed to inter-cell B.M.) relies on the events defined in Proposal 2.E. Though due to lack of time, RAN1 may not be able to complete it in Rel.17, we can try to pave the way for Rel.18, just as what we did on inter-cell B.M. for Rel.18 mobility enhancement. Hence, hope this can be further discussed and we move on in next release.  |
| Nokia/NSB | **2.A:** Support**2.B:** If there is majority in one of the alternatives or majority of companies supporting *other alternative* than alt0 it may not be feasible to conclude that no consensus. We would agree that if majority supports alt0 that would be a choice, however if majority supports e.g. Alt2 that should be selected and not revert to “no consensus i.e. select alt0” Our concern on the Alt0 is that UE would need to switch back and forth between the cells for short message or NW would need to trigger the switch. Although the latency may not be the issue, NW based switching could potentially increase the signaling overhead. Inter-cell BM is a special operation mode in NR i.e. up to R16 there are only serving and non-serving cells and now UE has serving cell and another cell (different PCI) serving additionally the UE. As UE monitors the PDCCH on different PCI, it would make sense to monitor short messages on that PCI as well. In case of monitoring short message on different PCI, UE would read SI still from serving cell (i.e. the serving cell has not changed for UE).Thus, the alt.2 could be selected, even if we need to revise the agreement. **2.C:** Support proposal, some details need to be still discussed considered by RAN1 e.g. when event is triggered, is the assumption to trigger MAC CE or (dedicated) SR-MAC CE (similar to SCell BFR). Prohibit timer needed/not needed should be up to RAN2. |
| AT&T | 2.A: support2.B: If the conclusion is the best we can do in Rel. 17 based on majority view then we are fine, but we think Alt. 2 is a more efficient solution with a good amount of support2.C: Fine with the conclusion |
| Mod V20 | **Revised proposals/conclusions****Added23 proposals (1 from Apple 2.C.2, 1 from MTK 2.D) and issue 2.5 (from Apple)** |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.C.2: Support, we would like to reword (following the agreed terminology) as follows**Proposal 2.C.2**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management, support to configure ~~non-serving cell~~ an SSB associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell for candidate beam detection.**Proposal 2.D**: Support in principle, rather than including the PCID (10 bits), an index referring to a PCI in the set of configured PCIs for beam measurement is included.Proposal 2.D: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, a CSI-SSB-ResourceSet configured for L1-RSRP measurement/reporting includes at least a set of SSB indexes and a set of ~~PCIDs~~ PCI indices associated with the set of SSB indexes, respectively. The PCI indices refer to PCIs within the set of PCIs configured for beam measurement.**Issue 2.5**: Neither option is preferred. A UE should be able to support 2 TCI states, if the gNB provides 2 TCI states.**Conclusion 2.B**: While not our preference as this could lead to degraded performance for Paging/Short Messages, we can accept for progress in Rel-17 and revisit in a later release. |
| Intel | Views are updated in the Table.**For Issue 2.5**, we do not think there is any issue. UE is expected to monitor paging for serving cell PCID, if UE is switched to TCI associated with PCID other than serving cell, it is up to network to switch the UE back to TCI of serving cell PCID such that paging can be monitored i.e., Option 2 is assumed by default. This is also in line with Conclusion 2.B. If this is the RAN1 conclusion, then only Option 2 can be supported.  |
| Apple | Proposal 2.D: Agree with the modification from Samsung. We would like to add another clarification on top of the version from Samsung.Proposal 2.D: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, a CSI-SSB-ResourceSet configured for L1-RSRP measurement/reporting includes at least a set of SSB indexes and a set of ~~PCIDs~~ PCI indices associated with the set of SSB indexes, respectively. The PCI indices refer to PCIs within the set of PCIs configured for beam measurement.* The additionalInfo for non-serving cell agreed in 8.1.2.2 is also applicable to inter-cell BM

Issue 2.5: We do not understand Samsung’s comments. If UE only supports 1 active TCI state, how to support 2 TCI states for this case?Issue 2.2: In our view, for UE with a single TCI state capability, UE cannot monitor paging in some cases as the figure in issue 2.5.  |
| NEC | **Proposal 2.A**: support**Proposal 2.C.2**: support**Proposal 2D**: support |
| ZTE | **For 2.A/2.C.1:** Support for progress.**For 2.C.2:** If our understanding is correct, the intention of this proposal is for PCell/SCell-BFR, right? If so, we suggest to have the following update based on Samsung’s version. **Proposal 2.C.2**: On Rel-17 enhancements for PCell and SCell BFR in inter-cell beam management, support to configure ~~non-serving cell~~ an SSB associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell for candidate beam detection.**For 2.D:** We are fine with Apple’s update.**For 2.5:** In our initial thought, the TCI 1 for common signal should be deactivated by gNB implementation. **For 2.B:** We can live with it for progress.  |
| NTT Docomo3 | 2.C.2: Support with Samsung’s update.2.D: Agree with Samsung. We don’t need to include the PCID (10bits), and indices is more suitable and aligned with M-TRP inter cell agreements. We support with Samsung’s update.Issue 2.5: We cannot accept any of option. UE must receive/monitor Paging/Short message/System information in any cases. UE should support 2 TCI states. In Rel.15, the minimum UE capability was 1 active TCI state for PDSCH/PDCCH and 1 additional active TCI state for PDCCH.In Rel.15, even for the minimum capability UE, UE could receive/monitor Paging/Short message/System information in any cases.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2-4a(new FG) | Additional active TCI state for PDCCH | Support one additional active TCI state for control in addition to the supported number of active TCI states for PDSCH | 2-1 | Yes | No additional TCI state for control | Type 1  | N.A.  | N.A. |  | Note: Only applicable if Component-1 of 2-4 is set to 1 |  | Mandatory with capability signalling  |

2.B: Support.  |
| Xiaomi | Conclusion 2.C.1, our first preference is Proposal [2.E], and we can accept Conclusion 2.C.1.Proposal 2.C.2, we want to clarify that the candidate beam detection means to select qnew for beam failure recovery? If the answer is yes, does it mean that UE will perform RA to non-serving cell if qnew is a non-serving cell SSB for Rel-15 SpCell BFR?Proposal 2.D: share same view with Samsung that PCID is not necessary and it can be replaced by an index. Issue 2.5, it is a same issue as Conclusion 2.B.Conclusion 2.B: our first preference is Alt 2 to improve the performance of paging and short message reception by inter-cell beam management. With Alt 0, it is same as the existed spec without inter-cell beam management.  |
| Apple | Issue 2.5: @Docomo, we have agreed to support more than 1 active TCI is optional. Even the R15 FG cannot help, as paging is transmitted by PDSCH. @ZTE, it seems there is no way to deactivate one TCI in current spec. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.C.2:** Not only CBD RS, but also BFD RS need to be supported. We feel this may start a new discussion on iter-cell BFR, and we don't think it is proper to introduce this at this final stage.**For 2.D:** We are fine with the updates.  |
| LG | Proposal 2.A: SupportConclusion 2.C.1: Fine due to the lack of time. It can be discussed further in next release.Conclusion 2.B: Fine with the conclusion |
| Mod V32 | **Slight modification on 2.C.2 and 2.D** |
| MediaTek | Issue 2.5: After further check the example, we think this scenario should not happen. If UE supports only one activated TCI state, how NW activates two TCI states at the same time? If this case really happens (violates UE capability), how to handle it should be up to UE implementation. |
| Apple | Issue 2.5: @MTK, the only way to avoid this case is not to enable inter-cell BM, isn’t it? |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.A: SupportConclusion 2.C.1: SupportProposal 2.C.2: Although we sympathize with the proposal, we believe that this will require the UE to monitor RAR from non-serving cell, at least for CBRA. It would seem appropriate to postpone this to Rel-18.Proposal 2.D: Support.Conclusion 2.B: OK |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.C.2:** Do not support to introduce the new feature of inter-cell BFR in the final meeting of Rel-17, since RS configuration for RLM and BFD would both be influenced, and association of new beam RS with PCI, RACH-based BFRQ and beam reset would also require additional discussion.**Proposal 2.D:** Do not support. Compared with introducing a set of PCI indices associated with the set of SSB indexes, where the PCI indices refer to PCIs within the set of PCIs configured for beam measurement, we prefer to introduce a new field in high layer parameter *SSB-Index* to associate SSB resource with corresponding non-serving cell information.*SSB-Index* information element-- ASN1START-- TAG-SSB-INDEX-STARTSSB-Index ::= SEQUENCE {Index INTEGER (0..maxNrofSSBs-1)AdditionalPCI INTEGER (0..maxNrofNon-servingCellInfo-1) OPTIONAL,}-- TAG-SSB-INDEX-STOP-- ASN1STOPTherefore, we revise Proposal2.D as follows:**Proposal 2.D**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, a CSI-SSB-ResourceSet configured for L1-RSRP measurement/reporting includes ~~at least~~ a set of SSB indexes, where some SSB indexes can associated with an index for PCIs different from the serving cell PCI. ~~and a set of PCIDs associated with the set of SSB indexes, respectively.~~* The additionalInfo for non-serving cell, e.g., non-serving cell information, agreed in 8.1.2.2 is also applicable to inter-cell BM

[Mod: Check latest version]**Conclusion 2.B:** With latest wording we don’t think any conclusion is needed. Previous agreement is clear that MAC CE based beam indication is used for switching between two cells. If people still want to conclude this issue, the note should be deleted, we don’t need to emphasize the case with one TCI state or two TCI states since they are both the same. **Conclusion 2.B:** In line with previous agreement, on Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management, the UE monitors/receives paging and short message only from the serving cell ~~Note: This holds even if only one TCI state associated with a PCI different from the serving cell is activated~~[Mod: Check latest version]For the FFS left from the last meeting that UE measurement behavior when SSBs associated with different PCIs overlap, including whether this is up to UE capability, we see the following alternatives:**New Proposal 2.E**: Down-select one of the following to support UE behavior when there is overlap for L1-RSRP measurement for SSB associated with serving cell PCI and PCIs different from the serving cell PCI* Alt-1: limit L1-RSRP based inter-cell measurement within SMTC window
* Alt-2: define a higher layer configured measurement pattern to measure the SSB of each measurement cell in turn

Alt-3: UE expects the active resources for UE to measure L1-RSRP are always non-overlapping based on CSI report/resource configurations |
| Mod V40 | **Minor revision on proposals.****Added issue 2.6 per vivo’s input – please comment** |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 2.A**: Support.**Conclusion 2.C.1**: We are supportive of event-driven beam reporting. However, given the limited remaining time for Rel-17, we are ok with the conclusion.**Proposal 2.C.2**: We are in general ok with the proposal.**Proposal 2.D**: Support.**Conclusion 2.B**: In our view, Alt. 2 can reduce beam switching latency, especially when only one active TCI state is support.**[Mod: IMO I agree that Alt2 is the cleanest solution. We can/should revisit this in Rel-18 mobility enhancement]** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.A**: Support**Conclusion 2.C.1**: Support**Proposal 2.C.2**: Fine with some commentsIs conclusion 2.C.1 and proposal 2.C.2 related? They are both under the same issue 2.3.In Rel-15/Rel-16, q\_0 (BFD RS) is a CSI-RS resource. Therefore, it is better to delete the part in square brackets [and BFD RS][Mod: Yes, it was proposed by Apple to replace event-driven reporting as a quasi-mechanism for BFR]**Proposal 2.D**: Support**Issue 2.6**: This issue is best handled in RAN4. If RAN4 identified an impact, RAN1 can investigate if further specification is needed. Therefore, for now, we support Alt4. |
| Qualcomm | For 2.C.2, support.For 2.D, suggest to add the following note in red. Otherwise, SDM in inter-cell mTRP will not work to our understanding.**Proposal 2.D**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, a CSI-SSB-ResourceSet configured for L1-RSRP measurement/reporting includes at least a set of SSB indexes and a set of PCI indices associated with the set of SSB indexes, respectively. The PCI indices refer to PCIs within the set of PCIs configured for beam measurement.* The additionalInfo for non-serving cell agreed in 8.1.2.2 is also applicable to inter-cell BM
* The above L1-RSRP measurement/reporting also includes group-based beam report for inter-cell mTRP

For 2.5, support Option 2, which is already agreed to our understanding, i.e. only UE dedicated can be transmitted on non-serving PCIFor 2.B, support |
| Intel | **Issue 2.6:** Should be left to RAN4.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 2.D:** Suggest changing “non-serving cell” as “SSBs with PCI different from the serving cell”.**Conclusion 2.B:** We share similar view as 1st round comments from Ericsson/DOCOMO/Nokia. **Issue 2.5:** Prefer Option 2, if cannot go with Alt-1/2 in Issue 2.2. |
| Lenovo/MotM | **Proposal 2.E**: Support. Event-driven L1-RSRP report is necessary to reduce the UL overhead. Reporting of SSB from non-serving cell is not always required considering the UE is not always in the cell edge. Using L1-RSRP of SSB from the serving cell to determine when to report L1-RSRP of SSB from non-serving cell reduces the measuring and reporting overhead. Only event-driven report can harvest this overhead reduction. **Proposal 2.D:** Support. |
| vivo | For **Issue 2.5**, our understanding is also Option2. For **Proposal 2.D**: It may not necessary to emphasize the CSI-SSB-ResourceSet to include a set of PCI indices. The detailed signaling design can be up to RAN2. The following is a preferred version.**Proposal 2.D**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, a CSI-SSB-ResourceSet configured for L1-RSRP measurement/reporting includes ~~at least~~ a set of SSB indexes. ~~and a set of~~ Different PCI indices can be associated with the set of SSB indexes, respectively. The PCI indices refer to PCIs within the set of PCIs configured for ~~beam measurement~~ inter-cell beam management or inter-cell mTRP.* The additionalInfo for cell with PCI different from the serving cell PCI ~~non-serving cell~~ agreed in RAN1 Agenda Item 8.1.2.2 is also applicable to inter-cell BM
* Detailed signaling design is up to RAN2.
 |
| Sony | **Proposal 2.C.2:** In our view, it is highly likely that the event-driven beam reporting will be excluded as in Conclusion 2.C.1. And in nature we think the BFR procedure fall into the category of event-based procedures, due to the beam failure event identified in physical layer. Thus, it seems 2.C.2 would also be concluded as in 2.C.1. **Proposal 2.D:** Our view added in Table 3.**Issue 2.5:** Option 2: non-UE dedicated channel is normally assigned with higher priority than UE-dedicated channel. It seems Opt2 does the opposite. Option 3: our thought is that inter-cell B.M. would pave the way for L1/L2 centric mobility in Rel.18. If it can only be applied to SCell, we then don’t know how to handle the mobility of PCell. Given above reasons, we choose None of the above. **Issue 2.6:**Via NW’s careful implementation, we believe such SSB measurement collision can be avoided. Hence, we added our view in Table 3 for Alt-3.  |
| CATT | For proposal 2.C.1, we still think event-driven beam reporting is needed for L1/L2 inter-cell beam reporting. For proposal 2.C.2, we support to configure an SSB associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell for candidate beam detection. But for BFD RS, it might need a long time discussion since current spec doesn’t support explicitly configure BFD RS of other CCs as BFD RS. So it’s better to delete the part in square brackets [and BFD RS].For proposal 2.D, support the revised proposal.For issue 2.5, neither option is preferred. A UE should be able to support 2 TCI states, if the gNB provides 2 TCI states.For conclusion 2.B: we slightly prefer Alt. 2 considering beam switching latency reduction. For progress, we could support this conclusion.For issue 2.6, we are fine to leave this issue to RAN4. |
| Mod V52 | **Revised wording (not content) per inputs** |
| MediaTek | On Proposal 2.D, we are also fine to let RAN2 design the details. However, we don't see all the PCI indices associated with the SSBs need to be different. Thus, we suggest the following change. For the last bullet, RAN1 never discussed support of group-based beam report for inter-cell mTRP. We suggest to remove it.**Proposal 2.D**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, a CSI-SSB-ResourceSet configured for L1-RSRP measurement/reporting includes a set of SSB indices where same or different PCI indices are associated with the set of SSB indices, respectively. The PCI indices refer to PCIs within the set of PCIs configured for inter-cell beam management or inter-cell multi-TRP.* The additionalInfo associated with SSB(s) with PCI(s) different from the serving cell agreed in RAN1 Agenda Item 8.1.2.2 is also applicable to inter-cell BM
* Detailed signaling design is up to RAN2
 |
| Samsung | For Proposal 2.D: It is better to keep “at least” as the report can include CSI-RS from the serving cell. Also fine with the updates suggested by MediaTek**Proposal 2.D**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, a CSI-SSB-ResourceSet configured for L1-RSRP measurement/reporting includes at least a set of SSB indices where same or different PCI indices are associated with the set of SSB indices, respectively. The PCI indices refer to PCIs within the set of PCIs configured for inter-cell beam management or inter-cell multi-TRP.* The additionalInfo associated with SSB(s) with PCI(s) different from the serving cell agreed in RAN1 Agenda Item 8.1.2.2 is also applicable to inter-cell BM
* Detailed signaling design is up to RAN2
 |

### Issue 3 (signaling medium)

Table 5 Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 3.1 | **Proposal 3.A**: On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the UE is configured with one beam application time (BAT) per BWP per CC* TBD (RAN1#107-e): whether a second configured BAT is also supported, e.g. for MPUE or inter-cell BM, per BWP per CC

**FL Note**: This is the situation:The number of BAT values a UE can be configured with (per CC/BWP):* Alt1. One
* Alt2. Two for MPUE
	+ BAT1 for beam switching within the same panel
	+ BAT2 for beam switching across different panels where both panels are activated

Alt1: Ericsson, OPPO, QC, NTT Docomo, Sony, Xiaomi, vivo, IntelAlt2: Samsung, CATT, [Apple], LG, Huawei, HiSiliconAlt3: MTK (two for beam switching between different cells), NEC | **Support/fine**: Ericsson, OPPO, QC, NTT Docomo, Sony, Xiaomi, vivo, ZTE, MTK, Lenovo/MotM, CATT**Concern**:  |
| 3.2 | Further enhancements on ACK/NAK for DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment when used for beam indication  | **DCI ACK/NAK:** CATT, Apple, Xiaomi, Samsung, Intel (with higher priority for beam indication DCI ACK/NACK)**DL assignment ACK/NAK, but only ACK can be used to confirm beam indication:** NEC, OPPO, NTT Docomo (already agreed), Huawei. HiSilicon, Xiaomi, QC, Nokia/NSB (already agreed), LG (already agreed)  |
| 3.3 | Support for additional beam indication scheme for Rel-17 unified TCI framework beyond agreement to-date | **No additional beam indication scheme is supported:** CATT, Samsung, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, Futurewei**DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 with UL grant (for UL-only TCI of separate DL/UL TCI)**: IDC, LG, Sony, MTK, Intel, Xiaomi, TCL, Qualcomm, NEC**New dedicated DCI format for beam indication**: **Group-common DCI**: Sony, Intel, MTK, NTT Docomo, Qualcomm**When more than one TCI codepoints are activated by MAC CE, the activated TCI state(s) for the lowest codepoint is/are applied**: Huawei/HiSi, vivo (until DCI is indicated), Convida (after MAC CE activation), MTK (until DCI is indicated, only for the case if the currently applied TCI state is not one of the activated TCI states), NTT Docomo, NEC, Nokia/NSB (until indicated via DCI + HARQ-ACK + BAT) |
|  |  |  |

Table 6 Additional inputs: issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and update your view in Table 5**
2. **Share more inputs here if needed**
 |
| Qualcomm | For 3.1, support Alt1For 3.2, reusing PDSCH ACK is sufficient. If NACK, gNB can just retransmit for the worst case. Scheduled PDSCH BLER should be controlled to be low anywayFor 3.3, support UL grant also indicating unified TCI, and group common DCI to reduce DCI overhead |
| Apple | 3.1: This depends on the outcome of issue 4. We are not sure whether there is still enough time to finish issue 4. But if issue 4 is supported, we think 2 action delay should be considered.3.2: We think it is more reasonable to use ACK/NACK for DCI since usually the link budget for PDSCH is not as good as PDCCH.3.3: We failed to see the necessity for this. But one thing we would like to clarify, is it correct understanding that UE should ignore the TCI indicated in DCI without data for other purposes, e.g. SPS-release? |
| CATT | For issue 3.1, support Alt2. Due to panel activation, BAT should be larger for beam switching across panels.For issue 3.2, support ACK/NACK for DCI. As PDSCH is less robust than PDCCH, if only ACK is allowed to confirm beam indication, the probability of beam indidcation restransmission will be higher.For issue 3.3, there is no need to introduce additional beam indication scheme. The current supported scheme would work. |
| MediaTek | For 3.1, considering NW is not able to differentiate whether the TCI state update will trigger panel switching even RAN1 has any progress in Issue 4, we prefer to have one BAT for MP-UE. However, DCI-based beam switching between different cells is possible for inter-cell BM, and UE may require additional latency when it switches between different cells. Therefore, for inter-cell beam indication, UE can report an additional capability with a larger value of minimum application time.For 3.2, these optimizations are not necessary. |
| NTT Docomo | Issue 3.1: We think Alt.1 (One) is default, unless we make additional agreement.Issue 3.2: We have concern to include "NACK", because the NACK to ACK error probability is 1%. On the other hand, ACK to NACK error probability is 0.1%. If the miss-understanding of the acknowledgement happens at gNB, serious beam miss alignment issue happens. This is why Y-symbol is agreed to be counted after the acknowledgement (not DCI). Also, in our understanding, "after ACK" is already agreed, and we don’t need to discuss this. Question to supporters of ACK/NACK of DCI: why we define Y-symbol from the acknowledgement? We believe it is to avoid the beam miss alignment issue. If we include NACK as the acknowledgement, there is no benefit to count Y-symbol from the acknowledgement, from reliability perspective. The miss detection probability of DCI is usually 1%, and NACK to ACK error probability is also 1%.Rather than this issue, we should discuss how to select the beam indication DCI, if multiple ACK are transmitted in a PUCCH/PUSCH.Issue 3.3: Considering the limited remaining time, we are fine with no additional beam indication scheme in Rel.17. |
| Samsung | **Issue 3.1**: Support Alt2 (pending the outcome of issue 4).**Issue 3.2**: Both ACK/NACK can be used when there is no ambiguity between NACK and DTX.To address the comment from NTT Docomo, as to why the BAT is from the HARQ-ACK feedback and not from the DCI in case of a NACK. When sending PDCCH/PDSCH to the UE, there are three possible outcomes:* PDCCH not received 🡺 DTX
* PDCCH is received by PDSCH is not successfully decoded 🡺 NACK
* PDCCH is received and PDSCH is successfully decoded 🡺 ACK

If the PDCCH is received whether the PDSCH is successfully decoded or not, the UE can apply the indicated beam, the network doesn’t know if the PDCCH is received until it gets the HARQ-ACK, hence the BAT is always from the HARQ-ACK feedback.**Issue 3.3**: There are many good ideas for additional beam indication mechanisms that enhance the performance of beam indication. But alas! We are at the last meeting of Rel-17 and there is little time to introduce additional beam indication schemes. |
| Ericsson | Issue 3.1: After checking with RAN4 colleagues, I’ve understood that RAN4 cannot design tests for the two scenarios (same/different panels). Therefore, there would seem to be no point in agreeing to two BATs in RAN1.Issue 3.2: For the proposal “DL assignment ACK/NAK, but only ACK can be used to confirm beam indication”, this is up to NW implementation. (The proposal seems like a reasonable way to implement it.) |
| Nokia/NSB | 3.1 This probably needs to be discussed together with issue 4 (timeline aspects when triggering SRS resource set after UE has reported SSBRI/CRI + capability set index). 3.2 Our understanding is that it has been already agreed that only ACK can be used to confirm beam indication.3.3 We think there is no time any more to discuss about additional beam indication schemes. One open item that may require discussion is related to the application time of the beam indication in the case that the same UL slot conveys HARQ-ACK information related to the multiple DCIs (and scheduled PDSCHs if DCI sent with DL assignment). Should it be discussed whether clarification is needed which DCI of the multiple ones carries the TCI state to be applied after the BAT? |
| OPPO | 3.1: Support Alt1. Alt2 seems to assume the panel activation is controlled by the gNB, which contradict with the discussion in Issue 4 if company think 3.1 is related with issue 4. The proposal in issue 4 is “UE-initiated panel..”3.2: for DCI with PDSCH assignment, we support using the ACK only. Because using NACK would cause some technical problem: the UE does not receive DCI correctly but the gNB can still receive NACK bit in PUCCH.3.3: there is no time to discuss those. They are not essential issues. |
| NTT Docomo2 (v10) | 3.2: Thank you Samsung for your reply. In your explanation, even if UE understands “PDCCH is received by PDSCH is not successfully decoded” and UE sends “NACK” to gNB, NACK transmission is missed with 1% probability. When NACK transmission is missed, UE updates the unified TCI state, but gNB does not, in the proposal of “DCI ACK/NACK”. Hence, the beam miss alignment issue happens with 1%.On the other hand, if we rely on ACK-only, the error requirement of “ACK” is 0.1%. Hence, the beam miss alignment issue happens with much lower probability. This is why usually MAC CE is updated 3ms after ACK transmission. |
| ASUSTeK | 3.2: After seeing other company’s comments, we are fine about DL assignment ACK/NAK, but only ACK can be used to confirm beam indication for beam indication DCI with DL assignment.  |
| Xiaomi | 3.1, slightly prefer Alt 13.2, we prefer to use dedicated HARQ-ACK for DCI since it is possible that DCI was successfully decoded but not for PDSCH.3.3, we prefer to support DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 with UL grant, but it seems there is no time to discuss it. |
| vivo | For 3.1, support Alt1.This issue depends on issue4. In enhanced beam report, the UE panels corresponding to the indexes/ID can be considered as active. Thus, there is no need to consider additional delay for panel selection.For 3.2, agree with QC and Ericsson. This can be up to NW implementation, e.g. gNB schedules retransmission of indicates different PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK of beam indication DCI and other HARQ-ACK.For 3.3, do not support to introduce additional beam indication scheme for Rel-17 unified TCI framework. |
| Sony | **Issue 3.1**: support Alt.1 as it is unified solution for all cases. As observed by many companies, Alt.2 is highly related to Issue 4 which seems not quite stable yet. Once MP-UE can be supported, we are not sure whether the beam switch (via DCI indication) within a panel or cross a panel is transparent to NW. If that’s case, the timeline between NW and UE could be misaligned. Then we have to figure out way to keep both sides on the same page in symbol level. **Issue 3.2**: we are open for its discussion. As mentioned by Samsung that NACK can be useful when there is no ambiguity between NACK and DTX. One may expect that there could be cases that ambiguity exists between NACK and DTX. Sorry for not being an HARQ expert. But the ambiguity case we have in mind is when UE count cDAI and compare it with tDAI, in order to find out the DCI misdetection, if any. Once UE realizes that one DCI (happen to carry the unified TCI) is missed, it will generate a NACK in the corresponding position of HARQ codebook. For this case, NW is not able to know whether the NACK corresponds to missed DCI or failed PDSCH (but detected DCI). If I get it wrong, please correct me. Thank you.Anyway, we are fine to use NACK, but we hope RAN1 can clarify under what circumstance the NACK is not ambitious to NW. **Issue 3.3:** we are fine to revisit other DCI format (other than DCI 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DLA) for unified TCI state indication in later releasee, if possible.  |
| Samsung2 | **Issue 3.2**: We would like to thank NTT Docomo for the follow on issue 2. Upon checking, the RAN4 specifications (TS 38.104), we found that the ACK missed detection probability for PUCCH Format 0 (Clause 8.3.2.2) and PUCCH Format 1 (Clause 8.3.3.2.2) and PUCCH Format 2 (Clause 8.3.4.1.2) shall not exceed 1% at the SNR given in the tables of the respective clauses. We could not find the NACK missed detection probability, but I would assume that it could be similar to that of ACK (assuming same detection thresholds in the gNB Modem) as just a different cyclic shift is being used to differentiate ACK and NACK.TS 38.104 also has NACK to ACK requirements for PUCCH Format 1 of 0.1% (Clause 8.3.3.1.2).By not using NACK as an indication of the UE’s successful reception of the beam indication in the DCI, the latency of beam indication increases, beam indication becomes contingent on successfully receiving the data (PDSCH), which could have a BLER for the initial of transmission of 10 to 20%. In high speed train scenarios this could lead to beam failures as the current beam is rapidly deteriorating.Maybe to address your concern, we can allow the network the configure either ACK only or ACK/NACK and depending on the scenario, the network selects the appropriate configuration. |
| Mod V20 | **Added proposal 3.A which should be agreeable to everyone (i.e. at least one configured BAT is needed for sure, and TBD if BAT2 is needed).** |
| Samsung | Proposal 3.A: Prefer to wait for conclusion of issue 4 first before making this agreement.[Mod: No technical reason whatsoever to postpone agreeing on the first BAT – whether 4A is agreed or not, one configured BAT is still needed. Meaning that if 4A fails, one BAT is needed. If 4A passes, it doesn’t automatically imply that two configured BATs are needed since the technical motivation (see Ericsson’s comment) is unclear. So at least one configured BAT is needed. I fail to see the rationale for “prefer(ring) to wait ...”]  |
| Intel | Views updated in the table.**For Issue 3.3**., we still think UL DCI formats should be supported for beam indication since requiring UL only TCI state indication using a DL TCI format mandates an additional DCI on top of UL scheduling DCI. This does not seem like an efficient way to operate separate UL TCI cases. |
| NEC | **Issue 3.1:** We support Alt3 in FL Note to have more time for cell switch. In addition, we believe it hold for BWP switch too.**Issue 3.2**: In case of no HARQ-multiplexing, it’s true that DTX/HARQ can be applied to distinguish whether PDCCH is successfully received or not. But in case of HARQ-multiplexing as mentioned by Sony and Nokia, each HARQ bit is predetermined, NACK can not be applied to confirm beam indication. So at least in case of HARQ multiplexing, we support to use ACK only to confirm beam indication. And to keep a unified design, we are OK to support ACK only regardless HARQ multiplexing or not. In addition, we share similar view with Nokia on the open issue, in case of HARQ multiplexing, there may be multiple DCIs indicating different TCI states, clarification is needed on which TCI states should be applied after BAT. For example, network may decide to indicate a different TCI state in a PDCCH in middle of multiple PDCCHs corresponding to a same HARQ-ACK codebook. And in case of separate DL/UL TCI state, it’s possible that DL only TCI state and UL only TCI state are indicated in different PDCCHs. |
| ZTE | Our further views are provided in the table.For 3.A: Support. For second BAT, we share the same views with Samsung that we need to wait the conclusion for fast panel switching. |
| NTT Docomo3 | Issue 3.2: Thank you very much Samsung for your reply. You are right TS38.104 says “NACK to ACK = 0.1%”, “ACK to NACK = 1%”. (Sorry for my confusion) When gNB detects ACK, it means UE sent ACK with 99.9% probability. When gNB detects NACK, it means UE sent NACK with 99% probability. In that sense, we think relying on ACK is more accurate.We can understand your motivation of faster beam indication, but we already agreed the beam indication DCI without DL assignment, and by using the feature, UE sends HARQ ACK to the beam indication DCI, which is not affected by PDSCH miss detection probability. So, we can use the feature for the faster beam indication. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 3.A: Okay. However, we think this is supported by default if no further agreement on the 2 BATs?[Mod: If no further agreement, only one configured BAT is supported. See also comment to Samsung] |
| LG | Issue 3.1: Our view is added in the table.Issue 3.2: We have a similar understanding with Docomo and Nokia that the indicated beam is updated after the ‘ACK’ agreed already and the optimization including NACK wouldn’t be necessary.Issue 3.3: Same view as Intel. For separate DL/UL TCI, it is not efficient to update UL TCI with DL DCI formats, which requires additional PDCCH transmission unnecessarily. |
| Mod V32 | **No revision on proposal 3.A** |
| MediaTek | On Issue 3.2, according to the following RAN1 agreement, we fail to see only “ACK” of PDSCH is agreed as the “ACK” of beam indication.AgreementOn beam indication signaling medium to support joint or separate DL/UL beam indication in Rel.17 unified TCI framework:* Support L1-based beam indication using at least UE-specific (unicast) DCI to indicate joint or separate DL/UL beam indication from the active TCI states
	+ The existing DCI formats 1\_1 and 1\_2 are reused for beam indication
	+ Support a mechanism for UE to acknowledge successful decoding of beam indication
		- The ACK/NAK of the PDSCH scheduled by the DCI carrying the beam indication can be used as an ACK also for the DCI
		- FFS: Whether any additional specification support is needed
* Support activation of one or more TCI states via MAC CE analogous to Rel.15/16:
	+ At least for the single activated TCI state, the activated TCI state is applied
	+ The content for the MAC CE is determined based on the outcome of issue 1
	+ FFS: If supported, default TCI state when more than one TCI states are activated by MAC CE

Note: There is no implications on the support of single TRP or multi-TRP  |
| Ericsson | Proposal 3.A: Support |
| Futurewei | **Issue 3.3:** Given the limited remaining time for Rel-17, our view is that no additional beam indication scheme should be supported. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Issue 3.1:** Added our views. |
| Lenovo/MotM | **Proposal 3.A:** Support. This simplifies the UE behavior.**Issue 3.2:** Support. |
| vivo | **For Proposal 3.A,** we prefer to clarify it is configured per BWP/CC.**Proposal 3.A**: On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the UE is configured with one beam application time (BAT) per BWP/CC* TBD (RAN1#107-e): whether a second configured BAT is also supported, e.g. for MPUE or inter-cell BM
 |
| Sony | **On Proposal 3.A:** Support. **On Issue 3.2:** along with the agreement pointed out by MTK, we also find another agreement @104bis-e. It seems NACK can be interpreted in different ways. For DCI with DLA, NACK can be viewed as an ACK for the DCI (according to the agreement in MTK’s comment). In addition, if Type1 (semi-static) HARQ-ACK codebook is applied, we tend to think even if a UE misses a DCI, it can also report a NACK in the corresponding position of a codebook, thanks to counting on DAI. Hope I didn’t get it wrong. For DCI without DLA, NACK can be deemed as a NACK for the DCI (according the agreement below). The meaning implied to NW by sending a NACK seems depending on which DCI types (i.e. with DLA or without DLA) we are referring to. If RAN1 is willing to move forward on this direction, using NACK as an ACK, we think the conditions should be clarified. **Agreement**For beam indication with Rel-17 unified TCI, support DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 without DL assignment:* Use ACK/NACK mechanism analogous to that for SPS PDSCH release with both type-1 and type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook:
	+ Upon a successful reception of the beam indication DCI, the UE reports an ACK
		- Note that upon a failed reception of the beam indication DCI, a NACK can be reported.
		- For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, a location for the ACK information in the HARQ-ACK codebook is determined based on a virtual PDSCH indicated by the TDRA field in the beam indication DCI, based on the time domain allocation list configured for PDSCH
		- For type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, a location for the ACK information in the HARQ-ACK codebook is determined according to the same rule for SPS release
	+ The ACK is reported in a PUCCH *k* slots after the end of the PDCCH reception where *k* is indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI format, or provided *dl-DataToUL-ACK* or *dl-DataToUL-ACK-ForDCI-Format1-2-r16* if the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is not present in the DCI
 |
| CATT | Proposal 3.A: Fine. We also share the similar view as Samsung and ZTE to wait for conclusion of issue 4 first. For issue 3.2, in case of no HARQ-multiplexing, as mentioned by NEC, DTX/HARQ can be applied to distinguish whether PDCCH is successfully received or not. The error probability of ACK-to-NACK or NACK-to-ACK would not impact the understanding of gNB on the beam indication. In this scenario, both ACK/NACK should be allowed to confirm beam indication. If only ACK is allowed but NACK is ignored, the latency of beam indication increases due to the high BLER of PDSCH. However, in case of HARQ-multiplexing, each HARQ bit is predefined in the codebook. If NACK is fed back, gNB could not differentiate whether the corresponding DCI is received or not. In this way, we prefer to introduce additional 1bit ACK/NACK for this DCI. |
| Mod V52 | **Minor clarification on 3.A per vivo’s comment** |
| NTT Docomo4 | **On Issue 3.2:** Thank you MediaTek and Sory for sharing the agreement. Regarding to the MediaTek’s agreement in RAN1#103e, it does not mention anything about the beam application timing, and the agreement was very general. So, there is no conflicting between the agreements each other.As Sory pointed out, in Type 1 (semi-static) HARQ codebook, even if UE miss detects DCI, UE transmits NACK. So, at least for Type 1 (semi-static) HARQ codebook, which is mandatory feature in Rel.15, using ACK/NACK does not work. We think it is simpler approach to use “ACK” for all cases (i.e. all HARQ codebook types, DCI with/without DL assignment). |

### Issue 4 (MP-UE)

Table 7 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 value sets
	+ Each UE capability value set comprises [at least] the max supported number of SRS ports
	+ No two value sets can have identical entries
	+ FFS: which type(s) of UE capability other than the max supported number of SRS ports is included in a UE capability value set and whether the UE capability value set can be common across all BWPs/CCs in same band or BC are discussed under UE feature agenda item
* The correspondence between each reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and one of the UE capability value sets in the reported list 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. the index of corresponding UE capability value set is reported along with the pair of SSBRI/CRI and L1-RSRP/SINR (up to 4 pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) in the beam reporting UCI
	+ The UE shall assume that the correspondence report is activated from the time instance of the reporting
	+ FFS (RAN1#107-e): Whether ACK mechanism from NW to UE is needed and, if so, the scheme
	+ FFS (RAN1#107e): The supported time-domain behavior(s)
* Support SRS resource set with usage ‘codebook’ with different number of SRS ports for different SRS resources

**FL Note: Discussed offline at length [1]. I removed the sub-bullet of 3rd bullet since it is not proper to define NW behavior. Added red text in brackets to address Ericsson’s concern** | **Support**: InterDigital, ZTE, Sony, Xiaomi, Lenovo/MotM, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Nokia/NSB, AT&T, Samsung, MediaTek, QC, IDC, LG, vivo**Concern**: OPPO, Intel, [Apple], [CATT] |

Table 8 Additional inputs: issue 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and update your view in Table 5**
2. **Share more inputs here if needed**
 |
| Qualcomm | For 4.A, support and also fine for the red text in 1st bullet |
| Apple | We think there is not enough time to finish all aspects for panel selection in R17. One way is to finish the report related aspects, and let the gNB configuration part open – any gNB configuration that follows the UE capability should be fine. From gNB side, it can either use RRC reconfiguration, or BWP switching or any other ways to update the configuration to follow the UE capability. We can optimize the gNB signaling in R18. So we suggest we start from the following proposal from our comments in the offline discussion.**Proposal: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection,** * **Support the UE reporting a list of non-repeated UE capability values**
	+ **Each UE capability value set comprises at least the max supported number of SRS ports**
* **The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and one of the UE capability value sets in the reported list is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a reporting instance.**
	+ **The reporting may be either periodic or triggered by a certain event.**
	+ **FFS: details for the reporting**
* **For each indicated TCI state, the corresponding configuration, e.g. number of ports for each SRS resource, should follow the latest reported UE capability**
	+ **How to provide the configuration is up to gNB implementation**
 |
| MediaTek | For 4.A, for progress, we are fine with the red text in brackets. |
| NTT Docomo | Support. We are fine to have the red text in the 1st bullet.And we would like to share our views on the FFS under the last bullet. In our understanding, if UE may only activate panel corresponding to **one** SRS resource set at a time, then we agree the SRS resource set is selected by UE as well as the activated panel is selected by UE, and in this case the selection needs to be known by NW so that NW can indicate SRI. However, if UE may activate panels corresponding to **multiple** SRS resource sets, then we think the SRS resource set can be selected by NW similar as SRI is selected by NW in legacy procedure. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 4.A**: Support |
| Ericsson | As Apple writes, time is short. To clarify also the final FFS, we propose the following modification:**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
	+ Each UE capability value set comprises at least the max supported number of SRS ports
	+ [No two value sets can have identical entries]
	+ FFS: which type(s) of UE capability other than the max supported number of SRS ports is included in a UE capability value set and whether the UE capability value set can be common across all BWPs/CCs in same band or BC are discussed under UE feature agenda item
* The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and one of the UE capability value sets in the reported list 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. the index of corresponding UE capability value set is reported along with the pair of SSBRI/CRI and L1-RSRP/SINR (up to 4 pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) in the beam reporting UCI
* Support ~~multiple codebook-based~~ SRS resource set~~s~~ with usage ‘codebook’ with different number of SRS ports
	+ ~~The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to a selected SRS resource set [which need to be aligned with the UE capability based on the informed correspondence]~~
	+ ~~FFS: Decide in RAN1#107e, whether the SRS resource set is selected by the UE or NW~~

This would complete the functionality, increase the NW flexibility, and would also mirror the type of functionality of UL full-power transmission. |
| Nokia | Regarding * + FFS: Decide in RAN1#107e, whether the SRS resource set is selected by the UE or NW

as it is said in the Proposal 4.A, the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and one of the UE capability value sets in the reported list is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a beam reporting instance. In that the Rel-15/16 beam reporting is reused. It’s then logically expected that the gNB can assume the reported correspondence at least until the next report. Consequently, the UE is expected to receive/follow configurations based on the reported correspondence |
| OPPO | As we commented in offline discussion. We need to first conclude that it is UE who select the SRS resource set for PUSCH transmisison. Because it has critical impact on the designs of all the other aspects. We are not ok with a proposal with FFS on 4.5 because it will not work. From the perspective of UE, the selection of SRS resource set shall be controlled by the UE. Please note the main bullet of Proposal 4.A is “UE-initiated …”. If the SRS resource set is selected by the NW, how can we call it “UE-initiated”. Please see the updates for 3rd bullet.If the UE selects the SRS resource set (i.e., selecting a UE capability value set or a panel), then the beam reporting enhancement is not needed. Because once the UE selects one SRS resource set, i.e., one UE capability value set or a panel, the beam reporting would correspond to that panel naturally. And the UE capability value set index does not need to be included in the beam reporting again. Furthermore, in practical system, it is not feasible for the UE to report different value sets for different CRI/SSBRI in one reporting set. Because that would force the UE to turn on all the panel to do the measurement, which contradicts with the motivation of power saving by turning off some panel. Therefore, we suggest to remove the 2nd bullet.Here is the suggested proposal:**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
	+ Each UE capability value set comprises at least the maximum supported number of SRS sorts and coherence type
	+ FFS: Whether the UE capability value set can be common across all BWPs/CCs in same band or BC
* ~~The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and one of the UE capability value sets in the reported list 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. the index of corresponding UE capability value set is reported along with the pair of SSBRI/CRI and L1-RSRP/SINR (up to 4 pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) in the beam reporting UCI~~
* Support multiple codebook-based SRS resource sets with different number of SRS ports and each SRS resource set corresponds to one UE capability value set.
	+ The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to a selected SRS resource set. The SRS resource set is selected by the UE and the selection is reported to the NW. ~~need to be aligned with the UE capability based on the informed correspondence~~
	+ ~~FFS: Whether the SRS resource set is selected by the UE or NW~~
 |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 4.A, we are fine with the red texts in the bracket |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support in principle. We would prefer to allow for repetition of the UE capability sets in the first bullet – OK to keep the red text in brackets or remove it. For the FFS in the third bullet, prefer that the SRS resource set selection is performed by the UE. We are also OK with changes from OPPO to the third bullet regarding the association of an SRS resource set with a UE capability value set. |
| vivo | Agree with Apple and Ericsson to focus on the reporting part in principle.  |
| Sony | We are generally fine with the direction of Proposal 4.A. Regarding the 1st bullet, we have voiced our concern during offline discussion that if two value or value sets cannot have identical entries, it may force UE to implement asymmetric UE panels (e.g. panel#1 with 2 SRS ports and port#2 with SRS port number other than 2) or trick UE to make a false value set reporting when two identical panels are equipped. We understand that’s a compromise from Ericsson and we hope the symmetric panel implementation (e.g. panel#1 with 2 SRS ports and panel#2 with 2 SRS ports) can be supported in further release (possibly in Rel.18) given only single RAN1 meeting left. So, can we suggest to add a FFS as below? But if I get it wrong, please feel free to let me know. Thanks. * Support the UE reporting a list of UE capability value sets
	+ Each UE capability value set comprises at least the max supported number of SRS ports
	+ [No two value sets can have identical entries]
	+ FFS the case when value sets are reported with identical entries in later release

FFS: which type(s) of UE capability other than the max supported number of SRS ports is included in a UE capability value set and whether the UE capability value set can be common across all BWPs/CCs in same band or BC are discussed under UE feature agenda it |
| InterDigital | Support Proposal 4.A, and the red text in brackets is also okay. |
| AT&T | Support current proposal 4.A |
| Mod V20 | **Revised proposal 4.A based on Ericsson’s and Apple’s comments****Added “across different SRS resources” (which seems to be missing from Ericsson’s input – my understanding is that the purpose of the proposal is to circumvent the use of SRS resource set and hence the controversial FFS issue on set selection, i.e. one resource set which includes multiple resources is used instead of multiple resource sets)**  |
| Intel | Since this is the final meeting, we do not believe we have enough time to finish the details for this feature. Nonetheless, for progress, we can accept some parts of the proposal. We are not OK with the following part of the FFS in the first bullet – “which type(s) of UE capability other than the max supported number of SRS ports is included in a UE capability value set”. The capability value set should be decided as a part of this agreement since this this determines how the UE associates a so-called panel to this value set. This is not part of UE capability discussion. The second part of the FFS can be relegated to UE capability discussion.On the second bullet, we still feel that there should be an ACK mechanism from gNB to UE to align understanding. Otherwise, if gNB misses the UCI report, gNB and UE may not be aligned on which panel correspondence is active. This is specially if UE switched from a more capable panel (e.g., 4-port) to a less capable panel (e.g., 2-port). Even if the gNB does not expect the UE to change correspondence between reports, the UE should know that the gNB has successfully received the UCI containing the updated correspondence report.We don’t think the third bullet is required. We have commented before that current specification can be used. Note again, that this problem of MIMO layer adaptation for asymmetric panels exists not only for UL but for DL as well. |
| Apple | We share similar view with Intel regarding the second and third bullets. In addition, we think the third bullet only would lead to NW controlled UE panel selection.We suggest we remove the last bullet, and for the second bullet we need to think about a more reliable reporting mechanism. In addition, we suggest this reporting can be periodic, otherwise if gNB triggers it only once, UE cannot change the panel any more. **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
	+ Each UE capability value set comprises at least the max supported number of SRS ports
	+ No two value sets can have identical entries
	+ FFS: which type(s) of UE capability other than the max supported number of SRS ports is included in a UE capability value set and whether the UE capability value set can be common across all BWPs/CCs in same band or BC are discussed under UE feature agenda item
* The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and one of the UE capability value sets in the reported list is determined by the UE ~~(analogous to Rel-15/16)~~ and is informed to NW in a periodic ~~beam~~ reporting instance.
	+ FFS: Details for the reporting
	+ ~~The Rel-15/16 beam reporting is reused, i.e. the index of corresponding UE capability value set is reported along with the pair of SSBRI/CRI and L1-RSRP/SINR (up to 4 pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) in the beam reporting UCI~~
* ~~Support SRS resource set with usage ‘codebook’ with different number of SRS ports for different SRS resources~~
	+ ~~The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to a selected SRS resource set [which need to be aligned with the UE capability based on the informed correspondence]~~
 |
| Samsung | For progress, we continue to support this proposal. One clarification comment:* When N>1 (CRI/SSBRI, L1-RSRP/SINR) pairs are reported, does the UE report one or multiple correspondence? In our view, the answer is one, but it is good to clarify by adding a sub-bullet on this.
 |
| ZTE | To be honest, we do not know how to provide our comments herein. There are many candidate proposals pointing to totally different way-forward direction J.In short, we strongly support the following bullet which is essential for guaranteeing the UE-initialized panel activation/selection, and then, we share the same views with Intel that there should be an ACK mechanism form gNB to UE to align the understanding. Finally, if having the bullet of ‘No two value sets can have identical entries’, any proponent companies can nicely clarify whether we have this type of UE panels with different capability, e.g., different ports for each of panels, in the market? If not we suggest to remove the bullet of ‘No two value sets can have identical entries’. * + The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to a selected SRS resource set which need to be aligned with the UE capability based on the informed correspondence

  |
| LG | We support previous version but current version is also acceptable (per resource instead of per resource set analogous to Rel-16 UL fullpower Tx) if different power control configuration is possible across resources within a set to enable panel-specific power control (this seems possible with rel-17 unified TCI??).@OPPO: As explained during offline discussion, we should allow UE to activate multiple panels to support ‘FAST’ panel switching (as stated in the WID), which means that UE is allowed to report different UE capability value sets for different CRI/SSBRI in the second bullet. If UE activates only one panel, UE can report same UE capa value set to NW so there is no problem. @Intel/Apple: When UE activates multiple panels, it is possible for UE to switch panel symbol-by-symbol. So, we don’t think that existing BWP switching or RRC reconfiguration can be used to support ‘FAST’ panel switching. Without the third bullet, how we can support ‘FAST’ panel switching? |
| Mod V32 | **Revised proposal (added brackets to bullet 3 and FFS in bullet 1 per Intel’s comment), clarify bullet 2 per Samsung’s comment** |
| MediaTek | Re comments from Intel and ZTE: According to the comments from companies, if UE receives the activation command from NW that activates TCI states corresponding to the reported beams, UE will know that the gNB has successfully received the UCI containing the updated beams and correspondence info. We are not sure whether you have any concern on this? Re Samsung, according to the proposal, when N>1 pairs are reported in one reporting instance, UE can report one or more correspondence associated with the pairs, which depends on UE implementation. We don't see the need to ask UE to activate only one panel in specification. We are fine with the clarification made by FL.Regarding the 2nd bullet, we are fine to limit it to periodic, but we prefer not to add FFS or introduce any new porting format at this final stage  |
| Apple | @LG, in fact, the minimal panel switching delay is still unclear, according to RAN4 LS R4-2103290. In addition, it seems unreasonable for UE to keep all panels activated all the time. We can be open to report something related to the minimal delay, but it seems this would open another discussion point. |
| Ericsson | We note that if the third bullet is kept, there is also a need to discuss activation time. If the NW would rely on BWP or RRC switching, the activation would follow from that procedure.[Mod: Added a sub-bullet on bullet 2. It seems natural to use CSI timeline for this] |
| Mod V40 | **Slight revision on 4.A.****Upon further thought, the 3rd bullet is needed and cannot be kept in brackets (sub-bullet can be removed)** |
| Qualcomm | We cannot accept the added brackets in 1st bullets. To discuss in UE feature is reasonable. Other info will also benefit for both sides to our understanding. Why should we forbid the discussion?In addition, we share the same view as Intel and ZTE that ACK is needed. Otherwise, both sides may be misaligned on the panel type if the report is missed. One possible ACK is for gNB to indicate the selected SRS resource set ID as well in the DCI indicating SRI, so both sides are aligned with the panel type assumption, including SRS port #. This also gives gNB flexibility in case that gNB prefers to use another panel type different from the reported one. So we suggest to add the bullet in red to 3rd bullet* Support SRS resource set with usage ‘codebook’ with different number of SRS ports for different SRS resources
	+ The DCI indicating SRI also carries info of the corresponding SRS resource set ID

**[Mod: Added FFS]** |
| Intel | Based on the responses above we still have concerns on this current proposal. We still do not think the third bullet is necessary. Additionally, we do not understand what “legacy CSI reporting timeline” means in the second bullet in the context of application time for the indicated correspondence. Does it mean that the UE activates the reported panel after a fixed delay?We also provide responses to some comments from other companies. **On Fast Panel Switching** @LGE: We do not think that if a UE activates multiple panels, the UE can switch panels per symbol based on RAN4 discussion as Apple also pointed out. It may be possible is some implementation where the panels share all baseband operation but is certainly not the norm. Therefore, interruption is in general expected. The UE example that was provided, where the UE is assumed to have multiple active panels at any given time is one possible case and not the norm. Additionally, we also wonder if UE with multiple active *asymmetric* panels, is a typical case. Finally, as we pointed out before, the adaptation of MIMO layers for UL asymmetric panel switching which is being addressed here is also a problem for DL where the MIMO layer adaptation cannot be performed dynamically. Therefore, our understanding is that “FAST” per-symbol panel switching is not a realistic goal unless we address both DL and UL and there is no interruption time for panel activation. Given, this at this late stage of the release, we think it is reasonable to use specification-based methods e.g., BWP switching. **On ACK for UCI** @MTK: Let’s assume UE rotates and wants to change correspondence to another panel, but the SSB is still the same i.e., the same TCI state is activated but for a different panel at the UE. For this case, unless the panels are identical, there needs to be reconfiguration e.g., MIMO layer adaptation etc. If gNB misses the UCI but activates the same TCI state, going by your example, without any ACK mechanism, the UE will think gNB has received updated correspondence information whereas in reality, the gNB still assumes that the UE has the previous activated panel. So, the implicit ACK may work only in some cases but not universally. Please let us know if we misunderstood the proposal in your comments. [Mod: I agree. Added FFS on this] |
| LG | We disagree with Apple/Intel’s comment that it is not possible/normal that panel switching can be done symbol by symbol. **Our understanding of RAN4 LS is exactly opposite from Apple/Intel, i.e. panel can be switched symbol by symbol if panels are ready/active**. The first LS was R4-2103290 (as Apple indicated previously), captured below:* RAN4 needs more discussion to conclude the transient period for cases with cross panel beam switch and/or if the spatial filter to transmit the beam is unknown and/or UL timing is different between different UL beams.

After that, there was **a second LS from RAN4(R1-2104169)** saying that no additional beam switching gap is defined in RAN4 for cross panel case, captured below:UL timing is different between different UL beams and Cross panel beam switch: Thus far at least until Rel-16, RAN4 requirements have been established in a panel agnostic way, i.e. transparent to network so that beam switching requirements defined in Rel-15 are applicable for both the same panel and cross panel beam switch cases in RAN4. And there are no specific requirements discussed so far considering different UL timing between different UL beams. Hence, no further answer from this aspect from RAN4 is provided unless RAN4 sees the need to discuss it.Regarding ACK for UCI, our question is why gNB cannot trigger another beam report if gNB could not receive UCI? It may depend on whether to support aperiodic report for the second bullet. Our preference is to support the second bullet for aperiodic, semi-persistent, and periodic and handle the panel misalignment issue by NW implementation (i.e. NW triggers aperiodic beam report if it did not receive UCI correctly).  |
| Lenovo/MotM | We also think ACK is needed to avoid misunderstanding between gNB and UE.  |
| OPPO | The proposal 4.A technically makes sense only if multiple SRS resource sets for CB are configured and the UE selects one of those SRS resources and indicates that to the gNB. Then the gNB and UE would transmit the PUSCH with a reference to the SRS resource set selected by the UE. Only that can be aligned with the “UE-initiated panel activation and selection” which is in the main bullet of Proposal 4.A.Re the second bullet on beam reporting: we question on the use case of such a beam reporting. As we agreed in previous meeting, the correspondence between UE panel and CSI-RS resource is controlled by UE and is part of UE implementation. Reporting such information is not useful for the system operation. For instance, the UE reports L1-RSRP of CRI #1 to the gNB. Later one, if CRI#1 is indicated in beam indication, the UE would choose the proper Tx beam/panel to transmit PUSCH. And the reception behavior of gNB does not change with or without UE reporting the corresponding index. So we suggest to remove the 2nd bullet and revise the 3rd bullet as follows and add two sub-bullet to clarify that UE reports one selected SRS resource set ID to the gNB.**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
	+ Each UE capability value set comprises at least the maximum supported number of SRS sorts and coherence type
	+ FFS: Whether the UE capability value set can be common across all BWPs/CCs in same band or BC
* ~~The correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and one of the UE capability value sets in the reported list 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. the index of corresponding UE capability value set is reported along with the pair of SSBRI/CRI and L1-RSRP/SINR (up to 4 pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) in the beam reporting UCI~~
* Support multiple codebook-based SRS resource sets with different number of SRS ports and each SRS resource set corresponds to one UE capability value set.
	+ The UE indicates the set ID of one of those SRS resource sets to the gNB.
	+ The UE transmit PUSCH with a reference to the SRS resource set that is indicated to the gNB

[Mod: Unfortunately the direction of this alternative proposal is too different from the super-majority view] |
| vivo | It is necessary to clarify what “legacy CSI reporting timeline” means. Why are the panels indicated by the correspondence in beam report not active? Our understanding is that the reported panel is assumed to be activated all the time.[Mod: Good point]Moreover, we don’t think the restriction that No two values sets can have identical entries need to be listed.[Mod: This is to accommodate Ericsson otherwise the proposal is not acceptable ]**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
	+ Each UE capability value set comprises [at least] the max supported number of SRS ports
	+ ~~No two value sets can have identical entries~~
	+ [FFS: which type(s) of UE capability other than the max supported number of SRS ports is included in a UE capability value set and whether the UE capability value set can be common across all BWPs/CCs in same band or BC are discussed under UE feature agenda item]
* The correspondence between each reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and one of the UE capability value sets in the reported list is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) and is informed to NW in a [periodic] beam reporting instance.
	+ The Rel-15/16 beam reporting is reused, i.e. the index of corresponding UE capability value set is reported along with the pair of SSBRI/CRI and L1-RSRP/SINR (up to 4 pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) in the beam reporting UCI
	+ The UE shall assume that the correspondence report is activated from the reporting instance. ~~according to the legacy CSI reporting timeline~~
* Support SRS resource set with usage ‘codebook’ with different number of SRS ports for different SRS resources
 |
| Sony | We are generally fine with Proposal 4.A which we think is very tricky to balance all the needs. But we do have following comments to share. First, on the sub-sub-bullet of NO identical entries in UE capability value sets, we have to repeat ourselves and share similar view with ZTE and Intel that the case of symmetric UL panels implementation is artificially excluded. From the aspect of the UE capability, the identical value is surely the same to NW, but when it comes to the correspondence between DL RSs and UL panels, the identical values (i.e. SRS port numbers in current case) can be referred by NW as two different UE panels. Second, we admit the importance of ACK/NACK for UCI carrying correspondence information. But we think it might be too late to start such design in last RAN1 meeting. In addition, if NW cannot decode UCI correctly in a few of occasions, we tend to trust NW would figure out other ways (implementation based) to get it right, e.g. by changing spatial relation (in Rel.15/16) of PUCCH or UL TCI in Rel.17.  |
| Mod V52 | **Revision per inputs** |
| LG | Re Oppo’s proposal, we tend to agree that some explicit/implicit association between SRS resources or resource sets and UE capability value sets may be needed. But, as we explained during offline email discussion, the suggested UE reporting of activated panel or SRS resource set can be achieved by the second bullet (i.e. enhanced beam reporting) by adding a restriction such that the indicated SRI for PUSCH should correspond to at least one of the UE capability value set(s) reported most recently. In this regard, we’d like to suggest to rephrase the subbullet of the last bullet to avoid defining gNB behavior. We think that adding this subbullet would prevent for gNB to indicate SRI for inactive panel, e.g. when UE activates only 2-port panel(s) but gNB indicates 4 port SRI. * Support SRS resource set with usage ‘codebook’ with different number of SRS ports for different SRS resources
	+ ~~The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to a selected SRS resource set [which need to be aligned with the UE capability based on the informed correspondence]]~~ UE expects that the indicated SRI corresponds to at least one of the UE capability value set index(es), which is included in the most recent beam reporting.

Regarding the timeline, the UE reporting information in the second bullet is based on current UE panel status, i.e. which panel is the best for which CRI/SSBRI among the currently activated panels. So, we are not sure on the need for defining timeline from when the UE shall assume that the correspondence report is activated.  |
| Ericsson | We think it is not appropriate to discuss additional UE capability types in the UE feature AI – this is part of the normative specification work.We also think that the report must be ACKed. If a report is lost, where the UE indicates a reduction in the number of SRS ports, it may become impossible to receive any PUSCH. The natural option would be to rely on a TCI update – the new properties take effect when the TCI state is update in accordance with the report. |

### Issue 5 (MPE)

Table 9 Summary: issue 5

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 5.1 | **Proposed conclusion 5.A**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, there is no consensus on a specification-based criterion for selecting N from a candidate SSB/CSI-RS resource pool**FL Note**: This is the current situation. On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, the selection of N from a candidate SSB/CSI-RS resource pool: * Alt1. Based on L1-RSRP minus P-MPR value for each resource
* Alt2. No RAN1 spec impact (possibly left to RAN4)
* Alt3: Based on modified vPHR (with per beam PMPR and PL) for each resource.

Alt1:* **Support**: Ericsson, Samsung, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, IDC, Sony, Nokia/NSB
* **Concern**: vivo, OPPO, Apple, Huawei, HiSilicon

Alt2: * **Support**: vivo, Intel, OPPO, Apple, MTK, LG, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT
* **Concern**:

Alt3: * **Support**: NTT Docomo, ZTE
* **Concern**: OPPO
 | **Support/fine**: vivo, Intel, OPPO, Apple, MTK, LG**Concern**:  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 10 Additional inputs: issue 5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and update your view in Table 5**
2. **Share more inputs here if needed**
 |
| Qualcomm | Support Alt1 to have aligned understanding between gNB and UE |
| Apple | We do not support to define additional scheme for beam selection. We can be open for gNB to update the candidate SSB/CSI-RS resource pool based on some L1/L2 signaling. But which beam to be reported should be up to UE implementation.In addition, we think for MPE related issue, a more important aspect is the triggering condition. Now P-MPR is defined in beam level, legacy trigger condition is unclear. |
| MediaTek | We are fine to leave it as UE implementation. In one example, UE can report L1-RSRP values in L1-RSRP reporting and P-MPR values in P-MPR reporting, respectively, for the same set of SSBRIs/CRIs, if both L1-RSRP reporting and P-MPR reporting are associated with the same SSB/CSI-RS resource set. Then, NW can perform UL beam selection based on the two information. However, in order to make sure that UE can perform measurement on the same set of RS resources and report the SSBRIs/CRIs for L1-RSRP/SINR and P-MPR reporting, the SSB/CSI-RS resource set associated with P-MPR reporting should be also associated with L1-RSRP/SINR reporting. |
| NTT Docomo | We think the selection rule should be defined. So, we donot support Alt2.But Alt1 may be not good since the beam with best L1-RSRP minus P-MPR may not be the beam with best UL RSRP, considering L1-RSRP also depends on DL Tx power. Hence, we prefer to use modified vPHR (with per beam PMPR and PL) to select the best UL beams because modified vPHR can represent UL Tx power – PL. We suggest adding following Alt3.Alt3: Based on modified vPHR (with per beam PMPR and PL) for each resource. |
| Samsung | Support Alt1 |
| Ericsson | We find it strange that the beam selection would be up to UE implementation. We also noted that there are statements that the Rel-15 specification does indicate that the UE should report the highest RSRP values. With that interpretation, there is no need to define any new P-MPR reporting: the UE could simply report the best UL beams also in the Rel-15 DL RSRP report.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Alt1. It’s important to define selection metric as done for the L1-RSRP reporting for DL (best values).  |
| OPPO | We do not support to define any specification on how to select CRI or SSBRI for P-MPR reporting at the UE side. It is totally a UE implementation issue.Regarding the L1-RSRP reporting: RAN1 spec does not specify any rule on how to select CRI or SSBRI. The so called “largest RSRP” is the largest one among those K selected CRIs or SSBRIs.Furthermore, both Alt1 and Alt 3 have technical problems:* The problem of Alt1 is: The value of L1-RSRP – P-MPR does not have any physical meaning. It has nothing to do with the actual Tx power if that Tx beam is used.
* The problem of Alt 3: it is not feasible for the UE to calculate the vPHR of each CRI or SSBRI because the CRI or SSBRI does not have any PC parameters and path loss RS. Please note only the joint TCI state or UL TCI state is associated with valid PC parameters and path loss RS.

In summary, we do not need this proposal.  |
| Xiaomi | We slightly prefer to support Alt 1. And Alt 1 indicates UE to select candidate SSB(s)/CSI-RS(s) based on L1-RSRP minus P-MPR value for each resource, not means that UE must select candidate SSB(s)/CSI-RS(s) with the highest L1-RSRP minus P-MPR value. It is similar to existed beam report, UE report CRI/SSBRI based on L1-RSRP, but not means that UE must report the CRI/SSBRI with the largest L1-RSRP.  |
| vivo | Support Alt2.Defining new metrics to select beams is not helpful here. The following simulation results show that the performance is very similar/neglegible using L1-RSRP as the metric or using other metric.* + Case 1(baseline): when MPE event is declared by UE, a modified L1-RSRP is triggered. The UE reports the uplink RSRP that considers the impact of blockage and MPE power back-off for panel/beam switching. gNB selects and determines the panel/beam switching according to the reported uplink RSRP.
	+ Case 2: when MPE event is declared by UE, a Rel-15 L1-RSRP report is triggered by gNB. The UE reports 4 beam pairs between gNB and UE based on downlink RSRP that considers the impact of blockage. gNB selects and determines the panel/beam switching according to the reported DL RSRP and P-MPR.
1. UL performance with full buffer traffic model for panel/beam switching

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Dense Urban | Indoor Hotspot |
|  | Mean SE of cell | 5%SE | 50%SE | Mean SE of cell | 5%SE | 50%SE |
| Case1 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Case2 | 0.04% | -2.10% | -0.23% | -0.04% | 0.00% | 0.01% |

 |
| Sony | Support Alt.1.The intention is clear at least to us that the selection of CRI/SSBRI (associated with P-MPR) taking into account of UE power backup in UL (due to MPE) is to assist NW to pick up best UL beam(s). Though the Tx power between SSB and CSI-RS can be different, the ratio between them is known by NW itself. Hence with Tx different of different DL RS, somehow NW can identify the best UL beam(s) via Alt.1.In addition, we tend to believe the CRI/SSBRI selection is not fully up to UE implementation. Back in Rel.15/16, like many pointed out, the best DL beam is selected based on the strongest L1-RSRP or L1-SINR, which is clearly captured in Spec. For the UL case, we think at least a rule should be defined.  |
| InterDigital | Support Alt.1. To alleviate concerns from companies, Apple’s suggestion on updating the candidate SSB/CSI-RS resource pool based on some L1/L2 signaling is also okay, as this can help gNB would adjust candidate UL beams that UE can select among them. Configuring the candidate SSB/CSI-RS resource pool, by RRC only, cannot properly track good candidate UL beams, as the beam changes are not semi-static in nature. Regarding the L1/L2 signaling for updating the candidate SSB/CSI-RS resource pool, we think MAC-CE signaling for that seems sufficient. |
| Mod V19 | **No revision. Note that Alt2 is the default conclusion unless Alt1/3 can be agreed** |
| Samsung | We also find it strange to specify how UE determines beams for reporting in Rel.15/16, but not in Rel.17 for MPE. Similar to R15/16, the reported beams have to be sorted (based on some metric), otherwise, the NW can’t distinguish them.[Mod: I tend to agree. But it seems some ‘UE vendors’ are highly and assuredly confident that their implementation can solve the MPE mitigation problem even without any specified selection rule or even RAN4 test!] |
| ZTE | Support Alt.3. * + In technical, if beam reporting is only based on MPE rather than both MPE and the virtual/real transmission, the UL beam (with low MPE but large path loss) recommended by reporting may be useless, and more power is wasted for keeping the same performance. The UE shall report SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) along with the virtual PHR with the objective of maximizing PHR value, i.e., minimizing the value of P-MPR and PL.
	+ On the other hand, beam specific PHR reporting, i.e., difference between Pcmax and the required transmission power, can well present the MPE impact transparently, and a UL beam re-indication can be performed by gNB if a low PHR, e.g., 0-dB or negative, is received for the current beam.
	+ Besides, DL-RSRP can be derived according to P-MPR and the modified virtual PHR.
 |
| Xiaomi | As we all know that, for beam failure recovery, UE need to report the qnew with radio link quality higher than Qin. It can be a sub-optimal one, but it need to be better than the failed beams. Thus, we think it needs to define criteria to select candidate SSB/CSI-RS for MPE. According to the agreement in last meeting, we should know that, for each P-MPR value, up to 1 SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) will be selected. Here “up to 1” means it can be 0 or 1. A criteria is needed for UE to determine it is 0 or 1 for P-MPR value indicating panel/beam without MPE issue, and a similar criteria is specified for the presence of qnew. If UE report a SSB/CSI-RS which can’t solve the MPE issue, why to report it?On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, support the following enhancement on the Rel-16 event-triggered P-MPR-based reporting (included in the PHR report when a threshold is reached, reported via MAC-CE):* In addition to the existing field in the PHR MAC-CE, N≥1 P-MPR values can be reported
	+ The N P-MPR values are reported together with the following:
		- For each P-MPR value, up to M SSBRI(s)/CRI(s), where the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) is selected by the UE from a candidate SSB/CSI-RS resource pool (FFS: how to perform the selection)
			* Support M=1
 |
| LG | Our view is updated in the table where the selection from candidate resource pool for MPE is up to UE implementation. For Alt1 and Alt3, it is possible to choose a DL resource with a large P-MPR value depending on L1-RSRP. Hence, it may deviate from the intention for MPE mitigation and cause additional complexity on comparing between L1-RSRP quality and different P-MPR values. |
| Mod V32 | **Added proposed conclusion 5.A (needed since there was an FFS on “how to perform the selection”** |
| MediaTek | We are fine with the conclusion. The problem in Alt1 and Alt3 is, even UE can report SSB(s)/CSI-RS(s) according to the certain measured values, the measured values still cannot be reported along with the MPE report. We fail to see how NW can perform selection from the SSB(s)/CSI-RS(s) only based on P-MPR values. |
| Apple | Support the conclusion.  |
| Vivo | Fine with the conclusion. |
| Mod V40 | No revision |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Issue 5.1:** Added our preferences.  |
| Sony | With conclusion 5.A, it seems totally up to UE implementation on why one particular SSBRI/CRI is selected from a resource pool. And NW can only know the association between P-MPR and SSBRI/CRI. Next, NW may need to check the received beam reporting on the SSB/CSI-RS reported via SSBRI/CRI to find out at least its L1-RSRP and determine proper UL beam. What if the beam reporting is somehow out of date, or even without any beam reporting on that SSB or CSI-RS? So, if we conclude 5.A in this manner, it seems the P-MPR reporting is not fully enhanced over its Rel.16 version.But anyway, we respect the fact that there is no consensus in RAN1 on Alt.1/Alt.3. |
| CATT  | Support Alt.2. We are also open to Alt.1. for progress if most company support it.  |
| Mod V52 | **No revision** |
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