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| **Proposal 1.K**: 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**: This needs to be **concluded** in this meeting one way or another. Other than Apple and IDC, other companies are either supportive, fine, or neutral with this proposal. Can Apple and IDC compromise? |
| **Proposal 3.B**: On Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and DCI-based beam indication, the BAT is configured per-CC   * For CCs in the same CC list for common TCI state ID update, the UE assumes that the configured BATs for a given SCS are the same   **FL Note**: Picking up from the last GTW, the proposal seems agreeable and companies were trying to fine tune the wording of the sub-bullet |
| **Proposed conclusion 4.F**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, regarding acknowledgement mechanism of the reported correspondence from NW to UE, there is no consensus in supporting acknowledgement mechanism of the reported correspondence from NW to UE.   * Acknowledgement mechanism of the reported correspondence from NW to UE is not supported in Rel-17   **FL Note**: Discussed for at least 2 (if not 3) meetings, needs to be **concluded** in this meeting. Situation (further discussion doesn’t seem helpful)   * Alt-1: Being based on TCI state activation/update mechanism where the activated TCI state includes reported RS (SSBRI or CSI-RS) [and is additionally associated with the index of UE capability value set]; * Alt-2: A dedicated SS can be configured to send the ACK, which is like PCell-BFR. * Alt-3: A scheme based on the BFR response in SCell BFR * Alt-4: acknowledgement mechanism is not supported.   **Alt1**: MTK, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, ZTE, IDC, LG, Lenovo/MotM, NEC, CMCC (2nd)  **Alt2**: OPPO, CMCC, Intel, Apple  **Alt3**: OPPO, CMCC, Intel, Apple  **Alt4**: Ericsson, CATT, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSi, vivo, NEC, Qualcomm |
| **Proposal 4.G**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, update of the number of SRS ports according to UE reporting is performed via SRS resource set selection by DCI where each set has different number of ports   * ‘SRS resource set indicator’ in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 is used for set selection * TPMI/TRI mapping for varying number of SRS ports specified for fullpowerMode2 is reused   **FL Note**: Without ACK mechanism, this proposal becomes more important. A few companies commented that without having ACK mechanism, having nothing for this supported would hamper the overall panel selection operation.  **Alt1**: via UL BWP switching where each UL BWP has different number of SRS ports   * Nokia/NSB, vivo, Apple (2nd)   **Alt2**: via SRS resource set selection by DCI [where each set has different number of ports]   * Qualcomm, NTT Docomo, NEC, LG, Samsung, OPPO (only when no ACK mechanism), CMCC, IDC, ZTE, Lenovo/MotM, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSi   **Nothing supported:**   * Apple, Ericsson, MTK, CATT, Intel |
| **Proposal 4.H:** On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, for the agreed reporting of UE capability value set, introduce 'cri-RSRP-Capability[Set]Index', 'ssb-Index-RSRP-Capability[Set]Index', 'cri-SINR- Capability[Set]Index','ssb-Index-SINR-Capability[Set]Index' for *reportQuantity* in a CSI reporting setting.  **FL Note**: RRC impact. Other than dispute of “Set vs no Set”, no company raised any concern with this. So “Set” in bracketed per other agreements. It is understood that RRC nomenclature would be up to the editor (as always). |