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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, Convida  **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 mechanisms 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 * Note: It is up to RAN2, if needed, to design MAC-CE signaling for the Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse mechanisms similar to the Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s) * [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.] * [All the Rel-17 UL or, if applicable, joint TCI states configured/activated to SRS resources in the same set are 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, Convida  **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~~]~~   * ~~[The above is at least applicable for UE that supports no less than N configured unified TCI States per CC, where N is 64 for FR2 and N is maximum number of configured SSBs for FR1]~~   **FL Note**: Discussed offline [1]. Suggest to remove brackets around [in a band] and remove the bullet. | **Support/fine**: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Samsung, Apple, MTK, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (remove bullet), CMCC, Futurewei, vivo, NEC, AT&T, QC (remove bullet), CATT (remove bullet), Xiaomi, TCL, Lenovo/MotM (remove bullet), Convida, NTT Docomo (concern without bullet or without “in a band”), Sony (if “in a band” is kept), Intel (ok “in band”, not ok with bullet)  **Concern**: OPPO |
| 1.4 | **Agreement**  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 [failed CC(s)] 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.   * The above applies to Rel-15 SpCell BFR, [Rel-16 CBRA based SpCell BFR,] and Rel-16 SCell BFR * Note: qnew is a candidate beam identified by the UE in set q1. q1 is the set of candidate beams   Additional suggestions:   * (Apple) Add Note: q\_new only provides QCL-TypeD indication for CCs different from the failed CC * (Samsung) revise 1st text as “Or corresponding RS in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update”   **FL Note**: The bracketed texts are pending. If no consensus to remove the brackets, the text will be removed. | **1st bracketed text (CA):**   * **Remove brackets:** Apple, NTT Docomo, MTK, ZTE, Samsung, Intel, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, CATT, Futurewei * **Remove text:** OPPO   **2nd bracketed text (CBRA):**   * **Remove brackets:** Apple NTT Docomo, Samsung, Intel, OPPO, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Futurewei * **Remove text:** * **Keep bracket and text:** ZTE (postpone it after R15/16 BFR is stable) |
| 1.5 | **Agreement**  On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, [at least 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 or the last PRACH transmission] for all PUSCH transmissions and all of PUCCH resources in a CC [or [failed CC(s)] 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.   * The above applies to Rel-15/16 SpCell BFR, [Rel-16 CBRA based SpCell BFR,] and Rel-16 SCell BFR * Note: qnew is a candidate beam identified by the UE in set q1. q1 is the set of candidate beams * FFS (RAN1#107-e): if the above also applies when the UE is configured with separate DL/UL TCI * FFS: UL PC control including qu, qd, and closed loop index   Additional suggestions:   * (Samsung) Revise 2nd text as “one associated with ~~the index q~~~~new~~ ~~or~~ the UL spatial domain filter of the last PRACH transmission associated with the index qnew”   **FL Note**: The bracketed texts are pending. **If no consensus to remove the brackets, the text will be removed.**   * 1st bracketed text is to be discussed with the FFS * 2nd bracketed text seems to depend on 1st bracketed text + 1st FFS | **3rd bracketed text (CA):**   * **Remove brackets:** Apple, NTT Docomo, MTK, ZTE, Samsung, Intel, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, CATT, Futurewei * **Remove text:** OPPO   **4th bracketed text (CBRA):**   * **Remove brackets:** Apple, NTT Docomo, Samsung, OPPO, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Futurewei * **Remove text:** * **Keep bracket and text:** ZTE (postpone it after R15/16 BFR is stable)   **Applicability (1st bracket + 1st FFS):**   * **Only joint DL/UL TCI:** MTK, Samsung, Futurewei * **Joint and separate DL/UL TCI:** Apple, NTT Docomo, ZTE, Intel, OPPO, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, CATT   **2nd bracketed text (last PRACH):**   * **Remove brackets:** Apple, MTK, ZTE, Samsung (with update), OPPO, Qualcomm (but remove PRACH), Xiaomi, Futurewei * **Remove text:** NTT Docomo |
| 1.6 | **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, CMCC, Samsung, Sony, Qualcomm, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Futurewei, MTK, NTT Docomo, AT&T, Lenovo/MotM, Intel, Xiaomi, CATT, TCL, ZTE  **Concern**: Apple (object), OPPO, Nokia/NSB |
| 1.7 | **Proposal**: 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, support per CORESET determination as follows:   * For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET other than CORESET#0 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 CORESET#0 or a CORESET (other than CORESET#0) that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is determined per CORESET by RRC   (Version with more refinement for inter-cell to address the non-UE-dedicated reception issue for inter-cell)   * For intra-cell beam indication, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET other than CORESET#0 that is associated with at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. * For intra-cell beam indication, for any PDCCH reception on CORESET#0 or a CORESET (other than CORESET#0) that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is determined per CORESET by RRC * For inter-cell beam indication, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET other than CORESET#0 that is not associated with any CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. * For inter-cell beam indication, for any PDCCH reception on CORESET#0 or a CORESET that is associated with any CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE does not apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.   **FL Note**: Summary of companies’ views  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 (potential refinement for inter-cell per MTK’s input between V40 and V47)   + For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET other than CORESET#0 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 CORESET#0 or a CORESET (other than CORESET#0) that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is determined 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   + For other PDCCH reception and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. * 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   **Alt1:** Apple  **Alt2:** Samsung, MTK, ZTE, NTT Docomo, TCL, Intel, Lenovo/MotM, vivo, Sony, NEC, Ericsson, OPPO, ZTE, Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Futurewei  **Alt3:** QC, NTT Docomo  **Alt4**: CATT  **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. | |
| 1.8 | **Proposal 1.F**: After a UE is configured with more than one Rel-17 TCI states, before the UE receives and applies a first instance of Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication   * 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, the QCL assumption for corresponding DM-RS/CSI-RS antenna port follows the Rel-15/16 rules for PDCCH DM-RS (other than CORESET#0) * 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, the UE transmits the UL signal/channel using the same spatial domain transmission filter based on the Rel-15/16 rules for PUCCH transmission when a UE doesn't have dedicated PUCCH resource configuration. Note: For the case after a UE is configured with only one Rel-17 TCI state, the configured TCI state applies (without any need for beam indication)   **FL Note**: A more concise version of proposal 1.F (from the previous version). After further thinking, we need “after initial access or reconf sync” since this behavior shouldn’t be used when a UE has a prior Rel-17 TCI state configuration. Also, the verbose description (which has caused debates during endorsement) is now streamlined.  **FL Note 2**: It seem difficult to come up with precise wording without any reference to a spec text. Perhaps this can be left to maintenance as ZTE suggested. | **Support/fine:** Samsung, Lenovo/MotM, MTK, CATT  **Concern:** |

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**    1. **Proposal 1.A.1/2: proponents, please interact with the concern from OPPO (see x11715)**    2. **Proposal 1.A.3: proponents, please interact with the concern from OPPO/Sony (see x11715)**    3. **Proposal 1.E: proponents, please interact with concern from OPPO, Apple, Nokia (see x11715)**   **FL comment:**   * **The concerns on 1.A.1/2/3 should have been resolved with the added note in 1.A.2 (**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.**)** * **Re Nokia’s concern on 1.E, there mihht be some misunderstanding from Nokia since Opt3 is actually supported in Rel-15/16 QCL rule as repeatedly pointed out by the proponents** |
| vivo | P**roposal 1.A.1, 1.A.3**, Support.  For proposal 1.A.2, the Rel-15/16 signaling may not be directly used since the spatial relation info is referring directly to CSI-RS ID, rather than a TCI state ID. The corresponding signaling design should be up to RAN2 including whether to reuse legacy MAC CE or design new MAC CE for this.  **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 mechanisms 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 * Note: It is up to RAN2 to design MAC CE signaling for the Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse mechanisms similar to 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  **For 1.7**, to align the current spec for TCI state determination of a CORESET and the Rel-17 agreements, we suggest to have a conclusion or to add “UE does not expect these CORESETs to be associated with CSS.” To the first sub-bullet of Alt2 as mentioned in Round0.   * 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.     - 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 |
| Apple | 1.A.2: We think it is important to keep per set level PC. Resource level PC may lead to symbol level Tx power change, which is challenging from UE implementation perspective.  **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 * UE ignores the power control parameters associated with the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, and legacy power control parameters configuration signaling is reused * ~~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.~~   1.4 and 1.5, our view was provided above. |
| Mod V04 | **Revised per inputs.**  **Also revised 1.A.3 per offline input from NTT Docomo, Apple, and MTK** |
| NTT Docomo | Proposal 1.A.1: Support.  Proposal 1.A.2: Support.  Proposal 1.A.3: Support.  If any company remove the sub-bullet, we will have concern to remove “in a band”. The reason of our concern comes from the mandatory supported value/number of UE capability in Rel.17 TCI state. In Rel.15 TCI state, there was mandatory supported value/number of UE capability. For example, in Rel.15, mandatory value of RRC-configured TCI state for PDSCH is 64 in FR2 and “the max number of SSBs in the band (= max. 8)” in FR1. We are not sure whether Rel.17 TCI state can also support at least the same mandatory values in both FR1 and FR2. If not (e.g. Rel.17 TCI state can support 64 in FR2, but smaller value than Rel.15 in FR1), we will need to use Rel.15/16 TCI state for FR1 while we will use Rel.17 TCI state for FR2. If we remove “[in a band]” in Proposal 1.A.3, we suggest to clarify that “If UE supports Rel.17 TCI state, UE shall at least support UE capability for Rel.17 TCI state with the same value/number as what was supported in mandatory in Rel.15 TCI state”.  Issue1.4: We support to remove the 1st bracket (CA). In Rel.17, CC-common TCI pool is supported. If we only update QCL assumption of a CC, the beam miss alignment happens between CCs. We already have mechanism to derive QCL type A/D RS on other BWP/CC, we can reuse it.  We support to remove the 2nd bracket (CBRA-BFR). It is supported in Rel.16, and we should not preclude it.  Issue1.5: For the applicability (1st bracket + 1st FFS), we believe both joint TCI and separate TCI should be included.  For 2nd bracketed text (last PRACH), we don’t think the text for PRACH is needed. At least, for joint TCI, DL/UL TCI state is applied to both DL and UL. So, q\_new should be DL RS. For separate UL only TCI state, q\_new can be PRACH beam as in the existing spec. However, as Qualcomm mention it in online, we assume PRACH beam is the same as SSB beam, in most probable UE implementation, so we think it is fine to remove the text.  Proposal 1.E: Support.  Issue 1.7: We think the main issue is for a CORESET that associated with both CSS and USS.  For the second bullet of Alt1, for a CORESET associated with USS only, we think applying the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is sufficient.  For the first bullet of Alt2, if such a CORESET is associated with USS and CSS, we think it is not proper to apply always the indicated Rel-17 TCI state for inter-cell scenario.  We don’t prefer Alt.4.  Between the Alt.1-4, Alt3 looks more reasonable to us. |
| MediaTek | On 1.4, we prefer to remove the 1st brackets to make sure common beam update according to the new beam across CCs can be achieved. Note that for a set of CCs configured with common TCI activation and update, only one serving beam is used across the CCs at a time. If UE detects beam failure on the serving beam in any of these CCs, we don’t see this serving still can work on other CCs. Thus, it is reasonable to update the new beam for CCs with common beam update.  On 1.5, for CA part, the same view as in Issue 1.4.  For the 2nd bracketed text (last PRACH), we are fine to remove the brackets since the last PRACH transmission is used in Rel-15/16 SpCell BFR. It may be better to clarify the difference between Rel-15/16 SpCell BFR and Rel-16 Scell BFR in the proposal.  **Agreement**  On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, [at least 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 Rel-16 Scell BFR) or the last PRACH transmission (for Rel-15/16 SpCell BFR) 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.  For the applicability (1st bracket + 1st FFS), we prefer to apply this only for joint TCI mode. Note that for separate TCI mode, DL and UL serving beam can be different, but BFD only performed based on DL serving beam but not UL serving beam. Thus, when beam failure happens, UL serving doesn’t have to be updated accordingly.  On 1.7, we can decide which alternatives first, then the details.  Re commend from vivo, according to your proposal, for Rel-17 unified TCI, if a CORESET is associated with any USS set, it is not allowed to associate any CCS set with it? It is a quite big restriction and we don’t see why we need put such configuration restriction. Current wording in Alt2 does not violate the RAN1 agreement – for non-UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH, whether it share the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is configured by RRC. If NW still can configure a CORESET associated with only CSS set(s), and configured it NOT to share the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. |
| ZTE | Regarding 1.A.3, we think that the proposal should be refined for ‘pool’ only.  **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  [Mod: I checked, there is no pool for this. Or perhaps I am wrong?]  Regarding 1.4, 1.5, we provide our views in the above table. In general, we prefer to handle Rel-15/Rel-16 Pcell/Scell BFR firstly, and then we can review the CBRA Pcell-BFR. In our initial thoughts, it may be handled by Proposal 1.F together.  Regarding 1.6, not support.  Regarding 1.7, Alt2, and the following part may NOT be needed, after reviewing the whole bullets.   * + - [UE does not expect these CORESETs to be associated with CSS] |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.A.1**: Support  **Proposal 1.A.2**: Support  **Proposal 1.A.3**: Support  **Issue 1.4**: First bracket, as the TCI state ID is common across the configured CCs it would seem that the beam should be applied across CCs. However, the RS corresponding to the new in different CCs could be different. Therefore, we suggest to remove the bracket with the following update:  Or corresponding RS in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update  Second bracket is fine to remove. This could apply to CBRA BFR  **Issue 1.5**: 1st bracket: As beam failure detection is done on the DL RS, for UL the new beam only applies in case of joint TCI state. In case of separate TCI state, failure of DL beam doesn’t imply failure of UL beam.  For the second bracket, for UL, beam should follow the UL spatial filter of last PRACH transmission associated with the index q\_new. This is also aligned with Rel-15/16 design. Therefore, suggest to remove bracket and update as follows: “~~[~~one associated with ~~the index q~~~~new~~ ~~or~~ the UL spatial domain filter of the last PRACH transmission associated with the index qnew~~]~~”  Third bracket as the TCI state ID is common across the configured CCs it would seem that the beam should be applied across CCs based on the spatial filter of the last PRACH.  Fourth bracket is fine to remove. This could apply to CBRA BFR  **Proposal 1.E**: Support  **Issue 1.7**: Support Alt2 **without** sub-bullet. |
| CMCC | Issue 1.7: We have one question for Alt3.  For Alt3, whether UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state can be configured per search space set. If two search space sets associated to the same CORESET, one search space set is configured as to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI, the other is configured as not to apply, how should UE assume the TCI state of the CORESET? |
| Samsung | After some offline discussion, we suggest the following update for Alt2 of issue 1.7:   * Alt2: Per CORESET determination   + For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET other than CORESET#0 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 CORESET#0 or a CORESET other than CORESET#0 that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is determined ~~can be configured~~ per CORESET by RRC configuration   CORESET#0 has special handling as it doesn’t have a PDCCH-TCI-list. |
| MediaTek | On Issue 1.7, we are supportive of Samsung’s suggestion. It is proper to preclude CORESET#0 from the list that always shares the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. In one example, for inter-cell BM, NW will not (cannot) configure CORESET#0 to share the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. |
| Intel | Views updated in the table  **Proposal 1.A.3:** We don’t see why the sub-bullet should be added. The comment from Docomo is not very clear for us. We may understand including “in a band” with some assumption that the beam is same for a given band, but using the restriction on the supported number of configured TCI states is not clear. Additionally, it may be up to network configuration to even support different frameworks in different CCs within a band. Note that restriction of Rel-17 TCI within a band also means that in bands configured with Rel-17 TCI, mTRP will not work.  **Issue 1.7:** Support Alt-2. Ok with Samsung’s update. |
| NTT Docomo2 | Proposal 1.A.3: Re Intel’s comment. The sub-bullet is added just in case Rel.17 TCI state supports less number of RRC-configured TCI state than Rel.15 TCI state in UE feature (which we don’t hope). With the sub-bullet, if Rel.17 TCI state supports less number of RRC-configured TCI state than Rel.15 TCI state, proposal 1.A.3 is not applied.  But, on the other hand, we agree with Intel’s concern. In Rel.17, many features except 8.1.1 are enhanced based on Rel.15/16 TCI state/spatial-relation (e.g. M-TRP, etc.).  Based on Proposal 1.A.3, if unified TCI state is configured in any of CC, these features cannot be configured. In other word, if NW configures any of these features in any of CC, NW cannot configure Rel. 17 TCI state. We think this is too restrictive, and we need to consider this issue more. Otherwise, the applicability of unified TCI state becomes too limited. We’d like to postpone the decision of Proposal 1.A.3, because we think Proposal 1.A.3 is not urgent but it makes big limitation. |
| Mod V15 | **Updated Alt2 description per input from Samsung and MediaTek which also addresses the issue when a CORESET is associated with CS and a USS (which should not be ruled out as proposed by vivo).**  **Also added proposal 1.H back with revision.** |
| OPPO | For Proposal 1.A.1, 1.A.2 and 1.A.3: we do not support. For the SRS not following the rel-17 DCI-indicated TCI states, the legacy mechanism of rel15/16 shall be applied. The proposal in 1.A.1/2/3 just introduce a 100% redundant function but introduce significant unnecessary specification effort. For instance, all the SRS related MAC Ces have to be re-designed because the current MAC Ces can not be re-used. And there is no benefit of reducing the pool because in rel15/16, there is no pool of spatial relation info for SRS. We would like to ask the company who proposed this proposal: please provide any technical justification for why we need introduce this 100% redundant function.  [Mod: Per supporting companies, it is not redundant as repeatedly said. Similar to DL. To avoid UE and NW having to deal with both Rel-15/16 TCI/spatial relation and Rel-17 unified TCI at the same time – which would over complicate implementation on both sides evidently.  Your concern has been resolved in 1.A.2 bullets.]  On 1.4: we prefer to remove the text in the first bracket. We are not supposed to change the design of BFR. The BFR is applied on each individual CC, not a set of CCs. The whole BFR operation is per CC: the beam failure detection is done per CC, and new beam is found per CC. The how can we switch the beam of non-related CC.  Re the text in second bracket: we are ok to remove the bracket.  On 1.5:   * 1st bracket: remove the text. This should not be limited to joint TCI only. * 2nd bracket: keep the text * 3rd bracket: remove the text. The BFR is only applied to each CC, not a set of CCs. Same reason as in 1.4 * 4th bracket: keep the text. CBRA shall be supported here.   On proposal 1.E: do not support. This has been discussed a few meetings. The issues of this proposal have been explained very well.  1.7: we support Alt2. That is aligned with the TCI state framework on PDCCH. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.A.1**: Support  **Proposal 1.A.2**: Support with the following changes: Remove bracket around note, and remove text of last bullet. We think that the last bullet doesn’t follow earlier agreements, where we have agreed that SRS should follow the Rel-17 PC parameters when following the Rel-17 TCI state:  **Agreement**  On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for SRS can also be associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.   * If not associated, the setting(s) of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for SRS per BWP is independent of the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI states * This is only applicable for SRS sets using Rel-17 TCI state to determine their spatial relation.   FFS: Whether more than one parameter sets can be configured, e.g. for different traffics  **Proposal 1.A.3**: OK  **Proposal 1.A.4, 1.A.5:** Same comments as before.  **Proposal 1.E:** Support  **Issue 1.7**: Support Alt2.  **Proposal 1.F**: Support |
| Lenovo/MotM | **Proposal 1.A.3:** We support the main bullet, but **w**e do not think the sub-bullet is needed. Does it mean if the UE cannot support N configured TCI states, some of the TCI states/spatial relation info are configured with R15/16 mechanism? It is limited by UE capability, no matter whether R17 or R15/16 TCI states/spatial relation is used or not.  **Issue 1.7**: Support Alt2 with sub-bullet.  **Proposal 1.F:** support. It makes sense to reuse R15/16 rule for initial access. |
| Apple | **Proposal 1.A.2:** In our view the last bullet is important. We do not support to change the PC from set level into resource level. UE cannot change Tx power so fast, i.e. in resource level. We would have strong concern if such behavior is changed.  [Mod: rephrased to avoid concern on violating previous agreement]  **Proposal 1.F:** The starting time is unclear in this proposal.  First, we do not think we need to change any behavior for initial access. This would cause some backward compatibility issue.  For RRC reconfiguration with sync, the whole procedure can be finished after RACH procedure instead of RRC reconfiguration.  We suggest the following change. In addition, maybe to discuss this proposal in CR phase would not be a bad choice.  **Proposal 1.F**: After ~~initial access or~~ Reconfiguration with sync, and if ~~after~~ a UE is reconfigured with ~~more than one~~ Rel-17 TCI states,  before the UE receives and applies a first instance of beam indication   * 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,  the QCL assumption for corresponding DM-RS/CSI-RS antenna port follows the Rel-15/16 rules for PDCCH DM-RS * 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, the UE transmits the UL signal/channel based on the Rel-15/16 rules for PUCCH |
| ZTE2 | **Proposal 1.4:** Regarding the addition suggestion, we have the following comments:   * Regarding the note of ‘q\_new only provides QCL-TypeD indication for CCs different from the failed CC’, it is a little bit confusing. In our views, by default, all CC especially including the failed CC in the set of configured CCs should be considered herein. * Regarding ‘corresponding RS’, does it means that we need to identify some another RS(s) but associated with the q\_new to update the QCL assumption in the set of CCs. Some clarification is needed. In our initial thoughts. Q\_new seems to be sufficient   **Proposal 1.5:** Regarding additional suggestions, in our views, ‘the index q\_new’ may be needed still for Scell-BFR where there is no PRACH transmission.  **Proposal 1.6:** So sorry that it seems some typo for our previous views. We indeed support this proposal, and in our views, it can be well handled by RRC parameter to indicate that unified TCI with CSI-RS for CSI as reference can NOT apply to CSI-RS.  **Proposal 1.7:** We are fine with the update for Alt-2 in general. In order not to debate whether the CORESET#0 can be associated with USS, the Samsung’s original version seems better. Or, based on the current one, we have the following minor suggestions:   * Alt2: Per CORESET determination   + For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET other than CORESET#0 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 CORESET#0, or on a CORESET that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is determined per CORESET by RRC     **Proposal 1.F**: We are fine in principle. Hopefully, the proposal can be stable soon, and we can further review it. Thanks again. |
| Qualcomm | For 1.2, suggest to add “if needed”. It may not need new design on top of R15/16 MAC-CE signaling to our understanding   * Note: If needed, It is up to RAN2 to design MAC-CE signaling for the Rel-17 mechanism(s) which reuse mechanisms similar to the Rel-15/16 spatial relation info update signaling/configuration design(s)   For 1.3, we prefer to at least put the following bullet in bracket. Why UE should support configuration with both R17 and legacy TCI if it only support 32 R17 TCIs?   * [The above is at least applicable for UE that supports no less than N configured unified TCI States per CC, where N is 64 for FR2 and N is maximum number of configured SSBs for FR1]   For 1.4   * For 1st bracket, suggest to add “failed CC(s)” to align R16 Scell BFR beam resetting behavior   + or failed CC(s) in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update * For 2nd bracket, fine to remove the bracket   For 1.5   * For 1st bracket, suggest to remove the text. It should be applicable to both joint and separate TCI * For 2nd bracket, suggest to only keep q\_new and remove PRACH. It is the Scell BFR behavior, i.e. q\_new is used for both DL and UL * For 3rd bracket, suggest to add “failed CC(s)” to align R16 Scell BFR beam resetting behavior   + or failed CC(s) in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update * For the 4th bracket, fine to remove the bracket   For 1.7, support Alt3, which is aligned with agreement. Btw, the red part is missing in Alt3.   * 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.   For 1.8, suggest to add the behavior when only a single R17 TCI state is configured, i.e. all channels follow the single R17 TCI. This is similar to the legacy rule. Otherwise, the scenarios are incomplete. Also, for 1st bullet, the corresponding scenario should be more than one R17 DL or joint TCIs. For 2nd bullet, the corresponding scenarios should be more than one R17 UL or joint TCIs. We think the scnearios can be complete based on the following highlighted classifications.  **Proposal 1.F-1**: After ~~initial access or reconfiguration with sync, after~~ a UE is configured with more than one DL or joint Rel-17 TCI state~~s~~, the following rules pertaining to QCL and UL spatial filter assumptions are used until the UE receives a first instance of DL beam indication          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, ~~For any DL signal/channel that is a valid target signal/channel of  Rel-17 TCI~~, the UE assumes that the corresponding DM-RS/CSI-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] ~~and clause 10.1 of TS 38.213.~~  **Proposal 1.F-2**: After ~~initial access or reconfiguration with sync, after~~ a UE is configured with a single DL or joint Rel-17 TCI state, the following rules pertaining to QCL and UL spatial filter assumptions are used ~~until the UE receives a first instance of beam indication~~          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, ~~For any DL signal/channel that is a valid target signal/channel of  Rel-17 TCI~~, the UE assumes that the corresponding DM-RS/CSI-RS antenna port ~~associated~~ ~~with the DL signal/channel reception~~is quasi co-located with the one or more DL RS configured by the TCI state.  **Proposal 1.F-3**: After ~~initial access or reconfiguration with sync, after~~ a UE is configured with more than one UL or joint Rel-17 TCI state~~s~~, the following rules pertaining to QCL and UL spatial filter assumptions are used until the UE receives a first instance of UL beam indication          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, ~~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 of TS 38.213  **Proposal 1.F-4**: After ~~initial access or reconfiguration with sync, after~~ a UE is configured with a single UL or joint Rel-17 TCI state, the following rules pertaining to QCL and UL spatial filter assumptions are used ~~until the UE receives a first instance of beam indication~~  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, ~~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 determined with the spatial relation RS configured by the TCI state |
| NTT Docomo | **Proposal 1.A.3**: Re Lenovo, yes it is the intention. Please note that “N is 64 for FR2 and N is maximum number of configured SSBs for FR1” is already supported as mandatory value in Re.15. If UE reports less number of Rel.17 TCI state than Rel.15 mandatory value, gNB will need to use Rel.15/16 TCI state to maintain existing Rel.15/16 network.  If there is concern on the sub ballet, we don’t support the proposal 1.A.3 and we suggest to postpone the desition. From our perspective, at least Proposal 1.A.3 should be limited per band.  **Issue 1.4: Re ZTE,** the current text of Proposal 1.F does not cover the case of CBRA BFR. Also, the reason why PUCCH spatial relation after CBRA-BFR is specified in sect. 6 of 38.213 is, from gNB perspective, gNB cannot differentiate the purpose of CBRA, but when Rel.16 CBRA-BFR contains BFR-MAC CE on Msg.3/A, gNB can understand the purpose of CBRA is for BFR. So, we believe we should include Rel.16 CBRA BFR.  Regarding to “Add Note: q\_new only provides QCL-TypeD indication for CCs different from the failed CC” by Apple, we think BFR can be used in FR1, and we don’t need to mention “QCL-Type D”, because usually “QCL-Type D” is not configured in FR1. |
| Xiaomi | For 1.4, we prefer to remove two brackets. For the first one, it is because common TCI state ID across a set of configured CCs are supported in Rel-17, TCI state should be updated among CCs at the same time. For the second one, it was supported in Rel-16 and it should be included.  For 1.5, we prefer to include the scenario of separate DL/UL TCI. In addition, according to existing spec, UL spatial filter can be same as qnew or the last PARCH transmission, thus we also prefer to remove this bracket.  For issue 1.7, we prefer Alt 2 since the TCI state is configured per CORESET in existing spec. |
| MediaTek | On Proposal 1.F, if we check current 213 spec for PDCCH-DMRS, there are two corresponding paragraphs, one for CORESET#0, another one for CORESET other than CORESET#0. According to current wording of Proposal 1.F, it is unclear which one is followed?  The same problem for PUCCH. In fact, current spec doesn’t define the default beam for the dedicated PUCCH resources after initial access and reconfig with sync, the following spec is adopted for PUCCH transmission before dedicated PUCCH resources are configured.  *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.*  This is why we suggest to directly clarify the behavior in the proposal, instead of using the wording “Rel-15/16 rules”. |
| Sony | On **Proposal 1.A.3,** though there are a good number of supporters, we would like to have following comments/questions.   * Is there any possibility that (as of now) Rel.17 unified TCI state cannot cover all the functions provided by Rel.15/16 TCI state or spatial relation information? The sub-bullet added by DCM reflects the spirit of carefully considering this restriction for DL. Then what about the UL? * The complexity of applying both legacy TCI/spatial relation not only exists in UE side, but also NW side (e.g. RRC configuration and MAC CE). Hence, we have a good reason to believe NW would not increase the storage complexity unless necessary. We would like to mention the use case of inter-band CA where for instance the Pcell in FR1 uses legacy TCI/spatial relation, and the Scell(s) in FR2 uses Rel.17 TCI states. This can also be extended to NR-NR DC, in which MCG and SCG does not apply the same TCI/spatial relation. * In previous discussion, we saw companies discussing UE capability on unified TCI state, which could be per UE or per band. If per band is agreed, then UE may report such supporting in one band, but not on another band. For the band not supporting Rel.17 TCI states, legacy scheme should be applied. * So we can live with the modification by adding “within a band” in the main bullet. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1.F:** Why would there be “a prior Rel-17 TCI state configuration” after initial access or handover? Please clarify. |
| CATT | Proposal 1.A.2: we support to remove the last bullet. This is not aligned with the former agreement as given by Samsung, i.e. SRS should follow the Rel-17 PC parameters.  Proposal 1.A.3: we support the main bullet. From our opinion, the target of this proposal aims to reduce the redundancy of beam indication. Whenever configured the unified TCI states (no matter the number of TCI states), Rel-15/Rel-16 TCI/SpatialRelationInfo is not necessary. Therefore, we prefer to remove the sub-bullet.  Proposal 1.F: Support. |
| Vivo | **Proposal 1.A.2**: Agree with Samsung. We prefer to remove the bracket around the note and remove the last bullet to follow the agreement “the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for SRS can also be associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.”  For 1.4, confused about the intention regarding “Or corresponding RS in a set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID activation and update”. More clarification is needed.  For 1.7, Alt2 seems to preclude the CORESET#0 associated with USS set. We are fine with ZTE’s suggestion.   * Alt2: Per CORESET determination   + For any PDCCH reception on a CORESET other than CORESET#0 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 CORESET#0, or on a CORESET that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is determined per CORESET by RRC |
| Mod V31 | **Minor revision on proposals**  **Re proposal 1.F, companies who opine that “after initial access or reconfiguration with sync” is needed, please respond to Huawei’s question.** |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | 1.A.2: The last sub-bullet can be removed. We also prefer to remove the brackets from the note in the third sub-bullet.  1.A.3: Supporting both Rel. 17 TCI and Rel. 15/16 TCI/spatial relation info in a CC seems redundant.  1.7: Fine with the latest version of Alt-2. |
| MediaTek | For 1.A.2, we believe we need the 4th sub-bullet instead of 3rd sub-bullet to address concern on per-resource PC setting from some companies.  For 1.A.3, @Sony, regarding UE capability, we think if this proposal is agreed by RAN1, the support of Rel-17 unified TCI will be reported per UE.  For 1.7, the last version looks good.  For 1.F, we think the sentence “After a UE is configured with [more than one] Rel-17 TCI states, before the UE receives and applies a first instance of beam indication” already implies the following default behavior is applied for a UE that is firstly configured/reconfigured with Rel-17 TCI states but which one shall be used is not yet indicated/applied. Thus, initial access and reconfig may not need to be mentioned in the proposal.  Regarding [more than one], we are supportive to remove the brackets. Meanwhile, we prefer to clarify the beam indication is the one for Rel-17. In summary, we prefer the following for the main bullet:  **Proposal 1.F**: After ~~[[initial access or] Reconfiguration with sync, and after]~~ a UE is configured with ~~[~~more than one~~]~~ Rel-17 TCI states, before the UE receives and applies a first instance of Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication  Regarding the 2nd sub-bullet, we prefer to remove “the Rel-15/16 rules for PUCCH” and keep “using the same spatial domain transmission filter as for a PUSCH transmission scheduled by a RAR UL grant as described in clause 8.3.”. As we explained above, current spec doesn't define the default beam for the dedicated PUCCH resources after initial access and reconfig with sync. However, we also fine with for the following wording:   * 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, the UE transmits the UL signal/channel using the same spatial domain transmission filter based on the Rel-15/16 rules for PUCCH transmission when a UE doesn't have dedicated PUCCH resource configuration.  *9.2.1 PUCCH Resource Sets* *If a UE does not have dedicated PUCCH resource configuration, provided by PUCCH-ResourceSet in PUCCH-Config, a PUCCH resource set is provided by pucch-ResourceCommon through an index to a row of Table 9.2.1-1 for transmission of HARQ-ACK information on PUCCH in an initial UL BWP of PRBs.*  *...*  *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.* |
| OPPO | We have concern on Proposal 1.A.1 and 1.A.2:   * Questions on them: (1) If they are supported, does a rel-17 UE still need to support/implement any feature related with the SRS spatial relation info? If so, why do we introduce totally redundant functionality? (2) If they are supported, does we need to change the MAC CE or introduce new MAC CE? If so, why do we introduce a totally useless and redundant function at the cost of significant specification effort.   On Proposal 1.A.3: The SRS resource that do not share the rel-17 indicated TCI state shall be excluded from the proposal.  On 1.4: remove the text in the 1st bracket. The reason is the BFR operation is per CC, not per CC group. The beam failure could happen due to the interference issue. So switching the beam of all CCs due to beam failure detected in one CC is not correct technically. For the 2nd bracket: we are ok to keep the text.  On 1.5:   * 1st bracket: we suggest to remove the text. Why is the proposal limited to joint TCI state only? * 2nd bracket: the PRACH transmission shall be kept here to align with the BFR design. We should not change the current design of BFR. In PCell BFR, the beam of PUCCH is switched the one used by the latest PRACH * 3rd bracket: we suggest to remove the text for the same reason stated for 1.4. * 4th bracket: keep the text.   On 1.E: do not supported. This has been discussed quite a few times in both email and GTW. |
| Qualcomm | For 1.A.3, we have concern on the bullet as mentioned before. Suggest to remove.  For 1.F, we have concern on the bracket around “more than one”. We don’t think the rule should be applied to the scenario where there is a single TCI configured.  [Mod: I fully agree. I added a Note to address the single configured TCI state (in that case there is no “empty” period and the TCI state applies directly – I also removed QC from Concern) |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 1.A.1**: Support.  **Proposal 1.A.2**: Support.  **Proposal 1.A.3**: Support.  **Issue 1.4**: Ok to remove both brackets.  **Issue 1.5**: On the applicability (1st bracket + 1st FFS), we share the same view as MediaTek and Samsung that this proposal should only apply to joint DL/UL TCI. For separate DL/UL TCI, DL beam failure does not necessarily mean UL beam failure. We are ok to remove the other two brackets for CA and CBRA, respectively.  **Proposal 1.E**: Support.  **Issue 1.7:** We are ok with Alt2. |
| Mod V40 | **Small revision on proposals** |
| Intel | **Proposal 1.A.3:**  Not ok with the bullet. It should be removed. We think it should be per CC, otherwise applicability of mTRP etc becomes limited due to this, as commented before. However, for progress we can accept “in a band” as per Docomo’s original preference.  **Proposal 1.F:** We have a question for clarification for single configured TCI case: is there any default assumption necessary up to the MAC-CE activation (~3ms) after which the configured TCI state is applied? Single active TCI is also not applied instantaneously right? |
| Lenovo/MotM | **Proposal 1.A.3:** We support to remove the bullet. |
| ZTE3 | **Issue 1.4/1.5:** As a basic assumption for this agreement, the UE is performing the unified TCI framework. If so, we should assume that all CCs in the set of configured CCs with common TCI state ID fail. In order to avoid the unnecessary measured for each of CC in the set, we do not need to preform Cell-specific BFR per CC in such case. So, we prefer to remove the ‘[failed CCs]’.  Then, regarding ‘Rel-16 CBRA’, we still prefer to handle it a little bit later, considering that the DL update after RACH may be relevant to 1.8.  **Issue 1.8:** What is the the Rel-15/16 rules for PDCCH DM-RS (other than CORESET#0) and the Rel-15/16 rules for PUCCH transmission? If still unstable, we think that it can be considered in maintenance session.  [Mod: Please scroll up and check MediaTek’s previous comment] |
| MediaTek | For Issue 1.7, we may need to clarify whether they are used for intra-cell case or inter-cell case.  For Alt2, we think current wording can be used only for intra-cell beam indication. Thus, we prefer the following:   * Alt2: Per CORESET determination   + For intra-cell beam indication, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET other than CORESET#0 that is associated with at least USS set(s) and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.   + For intra-cell beam indication, for any PDCCH reception on CORESET#0 or a CORESET (other than CORESET#0) that is not associated with any USS set and the respective PDSCH reception, whether or not UE to apply the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is determined per CORESET by RRC   For inter-cell beam indication, since RAN1 already agreed that the indicated Rel-17 TCI state cannot apply to any non-UE-dedicated channel/signal. Following the agreement, we suggest the following to reflect the corresponding RAN1 agreement:   * Alt2: Per CORESET determination   + For inter-cell beam indication, for any PDCCH reception on a CORESET other than CORESET#0 that is not associated with any CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.   + For inter-cell beam indication, for any PDCCH reception on CORESET#0 or a CORESET that is associated with any CSS set and the respective PDSCH reception, UE always not applies the indicated Rel-17 TCI state.   [Mod: This is possible also.] |
| Mod V47 | **No update except recommendation for 1.A.3 (the bullet seems to have raised many concerns, suggest to include “in a band” instead to address Docomo’s concern)**  **MOVING 1.4 AND .5 TO EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2** |
| LG | On 1.A.3: Sympathize concern from DOCOMO, Intel, OPPO and Sony this may disable other features in other CCs. We fine to revise the main sentence by FL, i.e. 'in any CC in a same band' or prefer to modify ‘in any CC’ to ‘in a same CC’.  On 1.4/1.5: Regarding whether to reset beams per CC or per CC group, we think that this depends on the decision whether same TCI state is applied with a common TCI state pool within the CC group or with a separated TCI state pool per CC. Since the decision is up to RAN2, we prefer to leave this part as FFS and handle this issue in CR phase (i.e. after stabilizing related RAN2 spec).  On 1.F: To us, the issue is still unclear which timeline we would like to address and what is the legacy behavior. To our understanding, TCI/QCL assumption after RRC configuration of TCI states until MAC-CE/DCI indication is unspecified in legacy. If we follow the same principle, this needs to be unspecified as well. Overall, we think that this issue is not urgent to finalize this feature and it can be discussed in CR phase. |
| Mod V49 | **Added proposal for issue 1.7** |
| NTT Docomo | **On 1.A.3:** After checking, at least the following Rel.17 scopes uses Rel.15/16 TCI states   * Multi-TRP (in MIMO) * Above 52GHz: multi-PDSCH / multi-PUSCH (one DCI schedules multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs in different slot, and their beam indication is defined based on Rel.15/16 TCI state/spatial relation) * Positioning: SRS for positioning uses Rel.15/16 spatial relation   Also, some Rel.16 features (e.g. positioning, IAB, etc. ) would use Rel.15/16 TCI state/spatial relation. It is unfortunate if we cannot use Rel.17 TCI state when gNB configures at least one of these features in one CC. Hence, our preference is to restrict Proposal 1.A.3 per CC, as Intel suggested. However, we can accept “in any CC in a band”, as compromise. Then, we are fine to remove the bullet.  Regarding to defining UE capability of Rel.17 TCI state per UE, suggested by MediaTek, we think it is not feasible. We assume different band has different difficulty of supporting Rel.17 TCI state (including the number of configured/activated TCI state). UE would report its capability of supporting Rel.17 TCI state per band.  **Proposal of issue 1.7:** Support. We think it is good to clarify the behavior for inter cell beam indication. |

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

Table 3 Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2.1 | **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 [and BFD-RS].  **FL Note**: This proposal facilitates the support of “inter-cell BFR”. Given companies’ views, this proposal is not agreeable and can be considered for unified TCI extension work in Rel-18. No conclusion is needed since there is no FFS on this matter. | **Proposal 2.C.2:**   * **Support/fine**: Samsung, Intel, NEC, NTT Docomo, Futurewei, QC, CATT, Apple, [Nokia/NSB], Lenovo/MotM, Xiaomi, AT&T * **Concern:** MTK, Ericsson, vivo, Sony, CMCC, ZTE (Rel-18), OPPO (ok with Scell) |
| 2.2 | **Proposed conclusion 2.E:** On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, in Rel-17, there is no consensus that the agreed L1-RSRP measurement/reporting also includes group-based beam report for inter-cell mTRP  **Agreement**  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 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 ehaviour design is up to RAN2 * FFS (to be concluded in RAN1#107-e): Whether the above L1-RSRP measurement/reporting also includes group-based beam report for inter-cell mTRP   **FL Note:** On the red FFS text   * ‘Yes’ implies that group-based beam reporting is supported in the agreed L1-RSRP reporting for Rel-17 inter-cell mTRP * ‘No’ implies that group-based beam reporting is not supported in the agreed L1-RSRP reporting for Rel-17 inter-cell mTRP   **Views on red FFS text:**   * **Yes:** Apple, NEC, ZTE, CMCC, OPPO, Huawei, HiSi, Qualcomm, CATT * **No:** MTK, Samsung, NTT Docomo, Sony | |
| 2.3 | **Proposed conclusion 2.D**: On Rel-17 enhancements for inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP, in Rel-17, on 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, there is no consensus on if/how it impacts RAN1 specification   * Prepare an LS to RAN4 informing such conclusion and recommending RAN4 to investigate the issue * Note: Discussion in UE feature agenda on this issue is not ruled out   **FL Note: This is the current situation.** Need conclusion due to FFS:UE measurement behaviour when SSBs associated with different PCIs overlap, including whether this is up to UE capability  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:** Apple  **Alt3:** Sony  **Alt4:** Samsung, Intel, CATT, CMCC, NTT Docomo, ZTE, Lenovo/MotM, AT&T | |

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** | |
| vivo | @Samsung, Intel, CATT, CMCC,  There is the following UE measurement behaviour defined in RAN1 specification. If there is SSB overlap, how would UE perform the corresponding measurement? Is UE required to measure the most recent overlapped SSBs simultaneously?  “If the higher layer parameter timeRestrictionForChannelMeasurements in CSI-ReportConfig is set to “Configured”, the UE shall derive the channel measurements for computing L1-RSRP reported in uplink slot n based on only the most recent, no later than the CSI reference resource, occasion of SS/PBCH or NZP CSI-RS (defined in [4, TS 38.211]) associated with the CSI resource setting.” | |
| Apple | Our view is provided | |
| Mod V04 | **No revision.**  **For issue 2.3, proponents of Alt4, please address vivo’s questions as a technical courtesy** | |
| NTT Docomo | Proposal 2.C.2: Support.  Issue 2.2: We think it is beneficial from technical perspective. However, some additional spec. impact is needed to support group-based beam reporting in inter-cell.  Issue 2.3: Support Alt.4. We have concern on Alt.3. Usually, SSB time-domain position of different cell is overlapped. So, Alt.3 makes impossible to measure L1-RSRP on non-serving cell SSB in most of cases. | |
| MediaTek | On the red FFS text in Issue 2.2, RAN1 never discusses about this and has no agreement on this. We need another agreement to confirm this new feature, and other details need to be provided in that agreement, instead of just one sub-bullet under this agreement to conclude this new feature. On the other hand, we don’t think proper to do this at this final stage. | |
| ZTE | For 2.1, we share the same views with DOCOMO. But, if time is limited, we are fine to consider it together with UE-initialized L1-mobility in Rel-18.  For 2.2, if not supporting group based reporting, how to identify two different TCI states for simultaneous reception. It is a basic feature for inter-cell mTRP.  For 2.3, it is RAN4 issue, and we can wait for RAN4 inputs, if any. Regarding timeRestrictionForChannelMeasurements, it is by default that the most recent ‘available’ measurement is used. We experience the similar situation for CSI measurement while the corresponding CSI-RS for CSI is not measured, e.g., within scheduling restriction window specified by RAN4, if my memory is correct. | |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.C.2**: Support  **Issue 2.2**: Benefit of red FFS not clear. Besides, detailed group based beam reporting format for MTRP including differential RSRP reporting format, SSBRI/CRI ordering in a group, assumptions of simultaneous reception and etc. has been discussed in 8.1.2.3, and are different from the inter-cell beam reporting here. Therefore, we suggest to remove.  **Issue 2.3**: No RAN1 spec impact. RAN4 to investigate first. | |
| CMCC | For 2.1： we think to support “inter-cell BFR”, besides the candidate beam RS, enhancement of BFD-RS, beam update after BFRR should also be discussed. We don’t think it is proper to discuss this new issue at this final stage.  For 2.2: Support.  For 2.3: We think it is RAN4 issue. | |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 2.C.2**: needs agreement on BFD-RS with different PCI as well. | |
| Intel | **Issue 2.3:** We think this is purely a RAN4 issue. For the restriction mentioned by vivo, if that is a problem (which is not clear), we can assume that it is applicable for intra-cell case and leave inter-cell case to RAN4. | |
| Mod V16 | **Added proposal 2.D for issue 2.3** | |
| OPPO | 2.C.2: We are fine with Scell, but have concern on Pcell. The BFR of Pcell is based on CFRA where new beam RS is associated with RACH. How/whether to associate NSC SSB with RACH need more study. So we are only fine with Scell now.  2.2: group-based beam reporting is not useful for inter-cell beam management but would be useful for inter-cell mTRP. So we are fine with the FFS part.  2.D: suggest to include it as UE optional capability | |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.C.2**: Support, but remove “and BFD-RS”. We have already agreed that the SSB is not a direct QCL source for the DL channels. The direct QCL source of DL channels (i.e. CSI-RS for BM or TRS) should be used as BFD-RS (same as the intra-cell case).  **Issue 2.2**: Don’t support the FFS for reasons mentioned in our previous comment.  **Proposed conclusion 2.D**: Support | |
| Lenovo/MotM | 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 we are not sure of using these SSBs as BFD-RS. Whether to use SSB as BFD-RS shall be discussed separately. We propose to remove the content in the bracket.  Issue 2.3: We support Alt4. It shall be left as UE implantation. |
| Apple | **Issue 2.3:** Regarding this issue, we need to consider the worst case where SSBs from 8 cells are fully overlapped.The measurement restriction definition would be very critical for UE to finish the measurement for such SSBs. Another alternative might be. This might be a simple solution to fix this issue. But the best one we think should be Alt2.   * **Alt 5: UE shall not expect measurement restriction be enabled if any SSBs for L1-RSRP measurement are overlapped** |
| vivo | **Issue 2.3**  Based on companies’ input, we would like to either inform RAN4 about RAN1’s querrying through LS or we can have a conclusion as Apple suggested (with some rewording below).   * **Alt 5: UE shall not expect higher layer parameter timeRestrictionForChannelMeasurements in CSI-ReportConfig set to “Configured” if any SSBs for L1-RSRP measurement are overlapped in Rel-17. Inform RAN4 about above conclusion.** |
| ZTE2 | **Regarding 2.2,** it seems some misunderstanding on the FFS part which is to enable ‘group based reporting’ for inter-cell mTRP rather than inter-cell beam management, although we do not know why we need to handle this issue in this agenda. |
| Qualcomm | For 2.2, we prefer the FFS can be supported. Otherwise, simultaneous Rx in inter-cell mTRP may not be supported. To SS, the topic is related to inter-cell mTRP measurement/report. So we think it should be treated here. 8.1.2.3 may not treat any inter-cell related items. This clarification was never treated in 8.1.2.3 from day 1. In addition, the agreed part only says non-serving SSB can be configured for L1-RSRP measurement, which is common for both non-group based and group based beam report. Anyway, we are fine to draw a conclusion in this agenda, either support or not support. No consensus also means no support to our understanding.  For 2.3, suggest to add Alt5 as below. We support either Alt3 or Alt5  Alt5: Whether UE can measure overlapped SSBs or not is up to UE capability. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.C.2, we are fine to support it but it may need more time to discuss the detail including RA procedure to non-serving cell for SpCell BFR. |
| MediaTek | For 2.C.2, if CBD-RS can be an SSB with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell, does it mean UE can transmit PRACH to non-serving cell? It will violate the updated scope of Rel-17 feMIMO. Meanwhile, if BFD-RS cannot be associated with any non-serving cell RS, how to handle the case if beam failure happens on the non-serving link. Thus, we prefer to postpone this to Rel-18, as mentioned by ZTE.  For Issue 2.2, one question for clarification. Is “group-based beam report for inter-cell mTRP” a new framework we need to discuss in AI 8.1.1? Or it will reuse the framework introduced in AI 8.1.2.3. If it is the later one, we don’t see the need to introduce two CMR resource sets for measurement since UE already can differentiate SSBs from different TRPs according to the associated PCIDs. In summary, we don’t think we have sufficient time to conclude on this.  For 2.D: Support |
| Sony | On proposal 2.C.2, we would like to share following observations.   * In last week, we just concluded that event-driven reporting is not supported in Rel.17. In essence, we think BFR procedure is also event-driven, i.e. beam failure events, and report based (either PRACH or MAC CE for BFRQ) solution. * The recovery mechanism of inter-cell BFR procedure may change UE’s serving cell, if UE is recovered to a NSC. It seems more details to be further discussed. * Finally, it seems nearly impossible to nail down all the details of inter-cell BFR within the last meeting.   In general, the inter-cell BFR seems beneficial, but perhaps it can be specified and completed in next release.  On issue 2.2, the FFS text. In our understanding, it should be discussed in AI 8.1.2.3 where the group-based beam reporting based on L1-RSRP (Option 2) for multi-TRP has been supported. To save time, we don’t think it’s necessary to discuss it in AI 8.1.1.  On conclusion 2.D, we are fine with FL’s observation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Issue 2.2:** Yes |
| CATT | For issue 2.2, group based reporting is necessary for inter-cell mTRP to support simultaneous reception. As the agreement is related to both inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP, the reporting scheme should be applied to both scenarios. Therefore, we are fine with the FFS part.  For issue 2.3, we agree to inform RAN4 about this issue through LS. |
| Mod V31 | **Revised conclusion 2.D (added LS), added conclusion 2.E** |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.C.2: Not support  Proposed conclusion 2.E: Support  Proposed conclusion 2.D: Support |
| OPPO | For 2.C.2: we are only ok with SCell BFR.  For 2.E: ok  For 2.D: If there is no consensus, does that mean it is up to UE implementation? If so, we would like to clarify it clearly in the conclusion.  Another option is to define it as UE capability. |
| AT&T | Added our views in the table.  Conclusion 2.E: support due to lack of time and this being last meeting. We sympathize with the importance of group based beam reporting for inter-cell multi-TRP, but the details are hard to agree in one meeting. |
| Qualcomm | For 2.2, to MTK, perhaps we can put R17 group-based beam report in FFS. So at least R15/16 mechanism can be used, e.g. without two separate CMR sets introduced in R17. To Sony, we are fine if the chairman decides to treat in 8.1.2.3. But this was never treated in 8.1.2.3 for a long time, and we think it is more feasible to discuss in 8.1.1 which at least treats inter-cell related measurement given only a few days left.  **Proposal**: Non-serving SSB can be configured for group-based beam measurement/reporting for R17 inter-cell mTRP at least based on R15/16 group-based beam report framework   * FFS: whether it can be applied to R17 group-based beam report   [Mod: Sorry, we have a few days left and the views from other companies don’t see to converge on this]  For 2.3, suggest to continue to discuss in UE capability to facilitate the progress. I think RAN1 can decide related capability.  **Proposed conclusion 2.D**: 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, there is no consensus on additional RAN1 specification impact   * Prepare an LS to RAN4 informing such conclusion * Whether UE can measure overlapped SSBs or not can be discussed in UE capability session |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 2.C.2**: Support.  **Proposed conclusion 2.E**: We are supportive to include group-based beam report for inter-cell mTRP.  **Proposed conclusion 2.D**: Support. |
| Mod V40 | **Added note on proposal 2.E** |
| vivo | **Since companies comment seems to be asking RAN4 to study the issue, can we just prepare the LS to state the issue?**  **Directly saying no consensus might be hasty.**  **[Mod: This is reasonable. Modified the proposal]** |
| Lenovo/MotM | Proposal 2.E: given the time left for R17, we agree to postpone the issue of group-based beam report for inter-cell mTRP to R18.  Issue 2.3: We support Proposal 2.D. This can be left to UE, and there is no UE capability issue here. |
| Mod V50 | **Revised proposal 2.D per vivo’s request.**  **MOVING 2.D and 2.E to EMAIL ENDORSEMENT 2 THREAD** |

### Issue 3 (signaling medium)

Table 5 Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 3.1 | Agreement  On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, regarding application time of the beam indication, the UE is configured with at least one beam application time (BAT) [per BWP per CC]   * Note: It was agreed that the BAT associated with the carrier(s) (hence BWP(s)/CC(s)) on which the beam indication applies is determined on the carrier with the smallest SCS among the carrier(s) (hence BWP(s)/CC(s)) applying the beam indication * TBD (RAN1#107-e): whether a second configured BAT is also supported, e.g. for MPUE or inter-cell BM, [per BWP per CC] * TBD (RAN1#107-e): Whether or not the UE may assume that BWPs configured with same SCS [in a same CC group] share a same value of BAT * [A UE may assume that BWP(s)/CC(s) configured with same SCS [in a same list of CCs following a same TCI-stateID] share a same value of BAT] | One BAT per BWP per CC, no constraint:   * **Support/fine**: ZTE, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Intel * **Concern**:   One BAT per BWP per CC, BWPs with same CSC (in a same CC group) share a same BAT (yellow):   * **Support/fine**: Samsung, Sony, OPPO, Apple, MTK, NTT Docomo, Xiaomi, vivo, Intel, Lenovo/MotM * **Concern**: |

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** |
| OPPO | The beam application time (Y symbols) is only a function of SCS. So it is ok to configure the value of Y per CC group, instead of per BWP per CC.  If Y is configured per BWP per CC, then we have to make sure the Y values of different BWP/CC with same SCS to be same. Otherwise, the UE procedure to determine TCI state application time would be problematic. Configuring Y per BWP/per CC only increase the overhead, which is generally not desired. |
| Samsung | **Issue 3.1**: UE can be configured with BAT per BWP per CC.  For BWPs/CCs in the same list of cells following the same tci-StateID, the UE may assume configured BAT for the same SCS. We suggest the following update:  • ~~TBD (RAN1#107-e): Whether or not the~~ A UE may assume that BWP(s)/CC(s) configured with same SCS ~~[~~in a same list of CCs following a same TCI-stateID ~~group]~~ share a same value of BAT |
| Apple | We think a clean way is to configure this BAT per serving cell group instead of per BWP.  To configure it per BWP would cause some new problem. The first one is which value should be selected. Although we have agreements on the reference SCS, we still need to select the value. If we consider cross-CC scheduling, there could be more problems on this BAT value selection.. |
| ZTE2 | As in our initial intention, we prefer to have a simple solution without additional constraint. |
| Qualcomm | For “[per BWP per CC]”, we prefer to remove the text for simplicity, but can also live with keeping it, as long as the note is clear on which BAT to choose  For “a second BAT”, we prefer one BAT is enough  For “same BAT for same SCS”, this constraint may not be needed, as long as UE capability is satisfied. |
| NTT Docomo | We are fine with either per CC or per BWP per CC. If per BWP is agreed, the yellow restriction, or how to select one value from value configured in multiple BWP should be discussed.  For the yellow text, another way would be to allow to configure different value in different CC and to select the longest value across different CCs within the same SCS. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with either per CC or per CC group. If it is configured Per CC, we support the yellow part that “UE may assume that BWPs configured with same SCS [in a same CC group] share a same value of BAT”. Otherwise, there will be some ambiguity at UE side. |
| MediaTek | We have concern on configuring the BAT per cell group. First, cell group for common beam operation is not always configured. We still need to configure the BAT for a BWP if respective CC is not in any cell ehav. Second, the smallest SCS among a cell group can be changed according to BWP switching. Then, why only one BAT can be configured for a cell group.  We are supportive of Samsung’s proposed direction. We still prefer to configure BAT per BWP per CC, but put some restrictions to avoid the ambiguity indicated by OPPO.  *On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, the beam indication time (BAT) is configured per BWP per CC*   * *The UE may assume that BWPs/CCs configured with same SCS share a same value of BAT* |
| Sony | We added our view in Table 5. The revision from MTK seems good to us.  We think the general principle here to configure BAT based on UE capability without introducing additional ambiguity. When we made previous agreement, RAN1 believed that the Y symbols are determined based on the smallest SCS. It seems nature to configure the BAT on a per SCS basis, in this case, we are fine with the per BWP per CC configuration.  To avoid any ambiguity on BAT, the same SCS should be configured with same BAT.  As for per cell-group BAT configuration, the multiple CCs may include multiple BWPs which involves multiple SCS. Then single value for multiple SCS seems not a reasonable choice. Multiple BAT values might be introduced which may somehow complicate the BAT determination at UE.  As for the 2nd BAT values for unsettled use cases, we feel it might be pre-mature. In addition, we think one value would be simply good. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Turquoise part:** Support two additional BAT(s), one for inter-cell BM, and one for MPUE. In this way, gNB will not be forced to configure a large BAT to accommodate all possible cases reported by UE capability. |
| Vivo | We are fine with the restriction of last bullet, i.e. the BWPs configured with same SCS share a same value of BAT. |
| Mod V31 | **Revision by replacing the FFS with the proposed text from Samsung/MTK** |
| MediaTek | Regarding the last bullet, we prefer to remove the CC list part since the previous RAN1 agreement (i.e., the BAT is determined based on the smallest SCS) can perfectly avoid the possible ambiguous cases if the BWPs with the same SCS share the same SCS. Meanwhile, the BWP/CC should be multiple.  [Mod: It was added to accommodate Ericsson’s concern just in case the same SCS is used across bands]   * [A UE may assume that BWPs/CCs configured with same SCS share a same value of BAT] |
| OPPO | The BAT in Y symbols is only a function of SCS. With different SCS, the value of Y is different. So configuring it per BWP per CC seems not necessary. It only increases the RRC configuration overhead and we also need to define that restriction on the configuration to avoid problematic case.   * Option 1: configure Y per SCS. * Option 2: configure Y per cell group   [Mod: I agree but some companies pointed out “cell group” and “CC group” are of different notions and there is no entity called “CC group” in RAN1 spec]   * Option 3: configure Y per BWP per CC + define the restriction that BWP/CC with same SCS shall be provided with same value of Y.   Apparently, Option 1 or 2 are much simpler than Option 3. |
| Mod V40 | **No revision, only added brackets around CC list inside the bracket** |
| Intel | Views updated in the table |
| InterDigital | We share the same view with Huawei to support additional BAT(s) for inter-cell BM and for MPUE. For example, UE applies the additional BAT, when Rel-17 TCI is indicated which is associated with a PCI different from the serving cell PCI. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Given all the BWPs share the same SCS, the BAT shall be the same for all the BWPs in the CC. We added our support to the table. |
| ZTE3 | If being per BWP per CC, we prefer not have any additional rules of ‘A UE may assume that BWP(s)/CC(s) configured with same SCS [in a same list of CCs following a same TCI-stateID] share a same value of BAT’, which can be handled by gNB implementation. If not, it is a clear error case (two or more different BATs can be applied for one TCI update). |
| Mod V50 | **No revision** |

### 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   + [For any two different value sets, at least one capability value needs to be different]   + FFS (RAN1#107-e): 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 * 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 behaviour(s) * [Support SRS resource set with usage ‘codebook’ with different number of SRS ports for different SRS resources]   **FL Note:** First see if we can resolve the 3 initial issues. If not, there is no point to discuss the FFSs since there is not enough consensus to proceed with this feature | **1st bracketed text (repeated values):**   * **Remove brackets:** ZTE, Intel, NTT Docomo, Samsung, Ericsson, Qualcomm, AT&T, IDC * **Remove text:** Apple, NEC, CMCC, Sony, CATT, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Lenovo/MotM   **2nd bracketed text (the need for application time for ‘correspondence’):**   * **Remove brackets:** NTT Docomo, ZTE (should be replaced by ‘from the time instance of ACK’), Samsung, Intel (agree with ZTE), Qualcomm * **Remove text:** LG, NEC, MTK, Sony * **No use case for 2nd bullet if the 3rd bullet in agreement of 106 meeting is not included:** OPPO   **3rd bracketed text (SRS resource set characteristic):**   * **Remove brackets:** LG (w/ revision), NTT Docomo, Samsung, Sony, AT&T, Ericsson, MTK, IDC * **Remove text:** Apple, Intel, Lenovo/MotM, * **Replace the current wording with the wording in agreement of 106 meeting:** OPPO, ZTE, Qualcomm, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, IDC |

Table 8 Additional inputs: issue 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Check and update your view in Table 7** 2. **Share more inputs here if needed** |
| LG | Our views are provided in the table.  1st: This depends on whether to support additional UE capability value. We prefer to include the max number of SRS resources in the set for BM SRS and NCB/CB PUSCH. In this case, identical entries seem inevitable, e.g. for 3 panel, (2-port, 2 resources) + (2-port, 4 resources) + (4-port, 4 resources). So we may leave the text in square-brackets until UE capa value(s) are fixed or revise the wording to ‘~~No two value sets can have identical entries~~For any two different value sets, at least one capability value needs to be different.’ To leave the possibility for using multiple UE capa values in a set.  2nd: To our understanding, UE simply reports the best panel according to current panel activation status and it does not matter whether NW received the beam report or not. If NW didn’t receive it, NW would trigger beam/panel report again. In this regard, we think that defining timeline for NW assumption and ACK seem not critical part, which could also be discussed in CR phase.  3rd: If we don’t have this bullet, there is no fast panel selection at all since the first/second bullet is just additional information to NW and how to support fast panel selection is missed. From our perspective, signaling detail such as per-SRS-resource vs per-SRS-resource-set does not really matter as long as different PC is allowed for each panel. It is not reasonable to bring up a new alt such as BWP switching based solution at this last meeting. Please note that that approach has not been our agreed alternative and we don’t have time to figure out whether/how it works for panel switching within this last meeting. Regarding some concerns, we provided technical answers to Intel/Apple/Oppo in previous round, core parts are summarized below again:   1. **Concern that it is not realistic to assume multiple panels are activated at the same time**  * It has been Rel-15/16 assumption that multiple panels can be activated at the same time. Without such assumption, how we support Rel-16 mTRP DL with multi-beam simultaneous reception in FR2? * In the RAN4 LS(R1-2104169), it is stated ‘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’. Thus, it is obvious that RAN4 assume that multiple panels can be activated.  1. **Concern that this mandates UE to activate multiple panels and NW-initiated panel activation/selection.**  * To our understanding, the second bullet can address this concern. If UE activates only one panel, UE can report same UE capa value set ID across all CRI/SSBRI. According to this information, NW will not indicate SRI for inactive panel(s). If we need some guarantee, we can add a sub-bullet, e.g., ‘UE expects that the indicated SRI corresponds to at least one of the UE capability value set index(es), included in the most recent beam reporting.’  1. **Concern that switching DL capability would also be needed together**  * This enhancement is for UL only by WID and it is typical that DL max rank and UL max rank are different, which means that max DL rank can be same when panel is switched (e.g. from 2T4R panel to 4T4R panel). We may consider DL enhancement in later releases, if needed. |
| Apple | We provided our view for some brackets.  For the second bracket, hopefully there can be some clarification. We do not quite understand the intention.  For the third bracket, there seems to be no time to finish that.  Besides, we think the ACK for the beam report is important, or we need to consider this is another type of report instead of a beam report.  @LG, we double checked with our RAN4 team, the highlight sentence means current beam switching requirement does not consider cross panel beam switching, as panel is transparent. The key words are “panel agnostic way”. |
| Mod V04 | **Revised 1st bracketed text per LG’s comment. Removed 2nd bracketed text (I tend to agree with LG)** |
| s | **1st bracketed text (repeated values):** we don’t have strong view on this one. Slightly prefer to remove brackets, the reason is with report of two panels with different capability, NW can configure UL Tx corresponding to the panel-specific capability. While although UE may have two panels with identical entries, it seems less useful to report two identical entries. But we can also accept the other way (remove text), if it helps to make progress.  **2nd bracketed text (the need for application time for ‘correspondence’):** prefer to remove bracket. We think it is reasonable that the correspondence is active when reporting. Although we understand companies views about ACK from NW, we think we may not have enough time for it.  **3rd bracketed text (SRS resource set characteristic):** prefer to remove bracket. We think it is reasonable to support SRS resources with different number of ports to facilitate panel switching. By the way, we also support the original proposal (support multiple SRS resource sets…) |
| ZTE | 1st bracket text: We share the same views with LG, and the identical entries occur as usual.  2nd bracket text: We support in principle. But, it should be based on ‘gNB acknowledge message’, right?  3rd bracket text: We suggest to remove it, and to reuse the legacy description as Samsung mentioned above. |
| Samsung | Re the 1st bracket, we are fine either way for progress. The 2nd and the 3rd text within brackets should be kept. |
| CMCC | As we commented in the GTW, we have agreed that the UL Tx panel(s) can be a same set or subset of DL Rx panel(s).  **Agreement (@RAN1#103)**  In Rel-17 enhancement on MP-UE to facilitate fast UL panel selection and MPE mitigation, UL Tx panel(s) are assumed to be a same set or subset of DL Rx panel(s)  To our understanding, the reported index of UE capability value sets in the beam reporting instance means the CSI-RS/SSB is measured by the corresponding panel. If the UL Tx panel(s) is the subset of DL Rx panels, how can UE inform the UL Tx panels to NW? |
| Intel | Added our views in the table.  For the third bullet, we think it should be removed. As we commented before, current BWP framework can be used to make this feature work. Since, previously, we had agreed to modifications, we do not think we are bound by that agreement to only support the options listed. We have brought up BWP based switching in RAN1-106bis-e and not in this last meeting and we think at this late stage, this is the best way forward.  With respect to specific technical concerns, we have some follow-up to respective companies:  @LG: Thanks for the further discussion, but our understanding of RAN4’s discussion is that they consider “panel-agnostic” switching which does not mean that there is no delay for switching between the multiple active panels. In our comments, we did not imply that we ONLY support single active panel. We simply think that current BWP framework can achieve the same goal. In terms of so-called FAST panel switching, it is ultimately up to RAN4 to define the switching delay. For example, there might be similar delay as BWP switching for switching between different active panels. It may depend on whether baseband hardware is shared, and reconfiguration is required for the panel switching. In our understanding, using BWP switching framework is a more future-proof solution in that it can support both DL and UL with MIMO layer adaptation for panel switching. For us it’s not clear why only SRI based solution needs to be used.  Additionally, for the ACK, as we explained before, it is necessary since we are talking about asymmetric panels and if the gNB misses the UCI and the same TCI state is active (i.e., new UE panel faces the same direction as old panel) then PUSCH may not be received since the MIMO layer adaption will not work especially if UE is switching from say a 4Tx panel to a 2Tx panel. |
| Mod V16 | **For the 3 main issues (before even trying to address the three FFSs) companies’ views are too divergent** |
| OPPO | The current proposal has critical issues:  On the 3rd bullet: the scheme of UE-initiated panel selection does not work with the current 3rd bullet where only one SRS resource set is configured or with the 3rd bullet being removed.   * If the 3rd bullet is removed: how can the “UE-initiated panel selection” is supported? If it is by UE implementation, then the 2nd bullet of beam reporting shall be removed too since the mapping between CRI/SSBRI and UE panel is UE implementation, it is needed to report such mapping to the gNB. With 3rd bullet being removed, how does the gNB apply the reported information. * If the 3rd bullet is kept with the current wording of just one SRS resource set: the “UE-initiated panel selection” is still not supported by the spec, i.e., it is just supported by UE implementation. The SRS resource set with different SRS resources with different ports is supported in rel16 already. * We suggest to go back to the 3rd bullet in original agreement made in August meeting and clarify that the UE indicates on SRS resource set to the gNB that is used for PUSCH transmission.   On the 2nd bullet: if “multiple SRS resource set**s**” are not supported, then the beam reporting in 2nd bullet does not make any sense. The UE-initiated panel selection can be conducted totally by UE implementation, then why does the UE reports the mapping between CRI/SSBRI and the panel to the system? There is no use case for such reporting. Furthermore, 2nd bullet make a wrong assumption that all the UE panels are activated at the same time, which we shall not assume.  So far, we are only ok with the 1st bullet in the current proposal.  The agreement made in 106 meeting (08/2011) is copied here:  **Agreement**  On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE –initiated panel activation and selection, down select **or modify**from the following two schemes in RAN1#106bis-e:   * Scheme 1:   + A panel entity corresponds to a reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index in a beam reporting instance (i.e. Opt1-1 per RAN1#104-bis-e agreement)     - The correspondence between a panel entity and a reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index is informed to NW       * FFS : Detailed design of how to inform the correspondence to NW     - Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index and a panel entity is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16)   + Support UE reporting of maximum number of SRS ports and coherence type for each panel entity as a UE capability   + Support multiple c odebook –based SRS resource sets with different maximum number of SRS ports     - The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to one SRS resource set, where the SRS resource set should be aligned with the UE capability for the panel entity * Scheme 2:   + Support UE reporting one of the following (to be down selected in RAN1#106bis-e):     - Opt1. A list of supported UL ranks (number of UL transmission layers)     - Opt2. A list of supported number of SRS antenna ports     - Opt3. A list of coherence types (as in Rel-15) indicating a subset of ports   + The NW configures an association between an ~~rank~~ index and rank/number of SRS antenna ports/coherence type   + Include at least one of the index, the maximum UL rank or SRS antenna ports or coherence type corresponding to a reported SSBRI/CRI in a beam reporting instance     - FFS : timeline to apply above result in the beam report instance   + Support multiple codebook-based SRS resource sets with different number of SRS antenna ports     - The indicated SRI is based on the SRS resources corresponding to one SRS resource set, where the SRS resource set should be aligned with the UE reported info corresponding to the index |
| Lenovo/MotM | Proposal 4.A: We think it shall be limited to single TRP operation. The second bullet cannot be applied to group based beam reporting.  For the third bullet, we support it, but we think it is unrelated to the main bullet. It shall be a separate proposal. |
| ZTE2 | Update our views as in the above table. |
| Qualcomm | Suggest to remove the bracket around at least to aligned with the FFS, which implies other types can be discussed  For 1st bracket, suggest to remove the bracket  For 2nd bracket, suggest to remove the bracket  For 3rd bracket, we prefer to replace with #106 wording. Because the number of panels sharing the same port number can be easily defined as SRS resource number per resource set, which can be another type of UE capability value in the value set. In addition, if there is only one SRS resource set, the SRS resource number can be large to consider various types of panels with different port #, but the SRI field in DCI is only up to 2 bits to our understanding. So we prefer multiple sets. |
| Sony | Added our view in Table 7 and sorry for making it even more divergent.  For the 1st bracket, suggest removing the whole constraint.  Currently, we only have one value (i.e. SRS port number) in the UE capability value set. It seems not stable to include any other UE capability parameter, e.g. max SRS UL ports or coherent type.  In addition, allowing UE to report identical panel settings can provide more concrete information on UL panels to NW. It somehow will facilitate UL scheduling decision on which UL panel to transmit.  Moreover, if UE is not allowed to report identical values in two value sets, we worried that there could be case that may confuse NW in beam reporting. For instance,  {DL RS#1, panel value set#1} and {DL RS#1, panel value set#1} where the panel value set#1 may correspond to two different UL panels. UE knows it, but NW doesn’t.  For the 2nd bracket, suggest removing the whole constraint.  Like many other UCI, we don’t think it is necessary to define the beam report application time. As LGE mentioned, if the beam report cannot be correctly decoded, then NW may trigger other means to obtain such report, e.g. aperiodic beam reporting.  For the 3rd bracket, suggest removing the bracket.  We tend to think this is very essential part of the MP-UE feature. Without it, the correspondence between DL RS and UE capability value set cannot be fully unitized. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support in general – flexible on bracketed parts. |
| CATT | 1st:  We don’t have strong view on this, and slightly prefer to delete the text. According to our understanding, the original intention of the text in the bracket is the consideration that if two UE panels have the same capability value set and when UE reported the same value sets, gNB can’t distinguish the UE panels by the reporting. In our view, such problem can be avoided by the enhanced beam reporting in the 2nd bullet.  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 4pairs, with 7-bit absolute and 4-bit differential) in the beam reporting UCI  2nd: In Rel-15/16 beam reporting, there is not a definition for NW ACK. If NW didn’t receive the beam reporting from UE, NW will trigger beam/panel reporting again. From this point, we didn’t see the necessity of defining a timeline for NW assumption and ACK here.  3rd: It depends on the solution after gNB receives the enhanced beam reporting in the 2nd bullet. One option is that after gNB receives beam reporting information from the 2nd bullet, gNB chooses one panel and configures one SRS resource set to UE. Then gNB will use SRI to indicate the later uplink transmission panel/beam, in this case, the bracket should be deleted. Another option is that gNB configures multiple SRS resource sets to UE, UE maps the SRS resource sets with its activated panels. gNB use SRI to indicate UE the later uplink transmission panel/beam. The text should be modified to support multiple SRS resource set configuration. |
| Mod V31 | **Revised summary of companies views** |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | For the first bracketed text, we prefer that it is removed. Agree with Qualcomm and OPPO to revert to RAN1#106 wording for the third bracketed text. |
| Samsung | 1st bullet: updated our view  3rd bullet: should be kept, fine with either the current wording or the multiple set version (from Aug meeting agreement), since can work in our view |
| MediaTek | Regarding the 3rd bullet, we are not sure why it reverts Aug meeting agreement, where the agreement mentions the following schemes can be modified.  The agreement made in 106 meeting (08/2011) is copied here:  **Agreement**  On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE –initiated panel activation and selection, down select **or modify**from the following two schemes in RAN1#106bis-e: |
| OPPO | @MTK: 3rd bullet of “Support multiple c odebook –based SRS resource sets” is the common part of two schemes listed the agreement made in 106 meeting. But the current 3rd bullet is totally different from that. “Configuring multiple SRS resource sets” vs “one SRS resource set” are two totally different schemes. If such “modification” is allowed, then we do not see why we made that agreement in 106 meeting, which we took a significant effort to achieve. Such a modification is kind of revering the Aug meeting agreement in our view. Please note: the “multiple SRS resource sets” is only one common part of those two Schemes listed in August meeting agreement.  The current proposal **with** or **without** the current 3rd are in totally different direction in comparison with the schemes listed in the Aug agreement. It is the last meeting; we should not change the whole framework or direction of the discussion. |
| Mod V40 | **No revision. Despite the current state, it may be helpful to move a part of the discussion to email.** |
| InterDigital | Our views are updated in the table. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Our views are updated in the table. |
| Mod V47 | **Moving this discussion to email reflector** |
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