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# Introduction

In RAN#94e, the Rel-18 WID of MIMO evolution for downlink and uplink is approved [1]. In the approved WID, extension of unified TCI framework is a part of the RAN1 objectives, and the detailed scope of this agenda item (Item 1A) includes the following highlighted objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1:**   1. … 2. Specify extension of Rel-17 Unified TCI framework for indication of multiple DL and UL TCI states focusing on multi-TRP use case, using Rel-17 unified TCI framework. 3. … 4. … 5. … 6. Study, and if needed, specify the following items to facilitate simultaneous multi-panel UL transmission for higher UL throughput/reliability, focusing on FR2 and multi-TRP, assuming up to 2 TRPs and up to 2 panels, targeting CPE/FWA/vehicle/industrial devices (if applicable)    * UL precoding indication for PUSCH, where no new codebook is introduced for multi-panel simultaneous transmission      + The total number of layers is up to four across all panels and total number of codewords is up to two across all panels, considering single DCI and multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation.    * UL beam indication for PUCCH/PUSCH, where unified TCI framework extension in objective 2 is assumed, considering single DCI and multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation      + For the case of multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation, only PUSCH+PUSCH, or PUCCH+PUCCH is transmitted across two panels in a same CC. 7. Study, and if justified, specify the following    * Two TAs for UL multi-DCI for multi-TRP operation    * Power control for UL single DCI for multi-TRP operation where unified TCI framework extension in objective 2 is assumed.   For the case of simultaneous UL transmission from multiple panels, the operation will only be limited to the objective 6 scenarios. |

Based on the contributions from companies [2]-[31], the followings are provided in this document:

* Summary of companies’ views on each of open issues raised by interested companies
* Observation and recommended proposal based on the summary of companies’ views

**Round 1 is intended to prepare the group for the 2nd check point on Wednesday May 18th.**

**Share your inputs before Tuesday May 17th 23:59 UTC, would be appreciated.**

# Issue 1 – Extension of Unified TCI Framework

Open issues on unified TCI framework extension and company views are summarized below.

Table 1 Summary for Issue 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **FL note/observation** |
| 1.3 | Max number of indicated joint TCI states (M1) for joint DL/UL TCI update  Max number of indicated DL TCI states (M2) for separate DL/UL TCI update  Max number of indicated UL TCI states (N2) for separate DL/UL TCI update | Atl1: M1 = 2, M2 = 2, N2 = 2   * Support: Samsung, Docomo, OPPO, Apple, Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia, ZTE, MTK, InterDigital, CATT, Spreadtrum, Sony, LGE, ITRI, TransHold, Fraunhofer, Fujitsu, Huawei, FGI, AT&T   Atl2: M1 > 2, M2 > 2, N2 > 2   * Support: Ericsson (up to 4 indicated joint, DL, and/or UL TCI states) | From moderator’s observation, {M1, M2, N2} = {2, 2, 2} is sufficient to support MTRP operation, which is the use case that should be focused on according to the WID. Another potential use case (separate control and data beams) has been proposed in one contribution, however, {M1, M2, N2} = {2, 2, 2} doesn't prevent that use case. {M1, M2, N2} = {2, 2, 2} is incapable only when both use cases work at the same time (i.e., MTRP + separate control and data beams per TRP-link), but whether such direction is still within the scope defined in the WID is doubtful. Since these max numbers could impact the later designs a lot, moderator suggests concluding them as early as possible. Given the majority view, Proposal 1.B is recommended.  How to configure/determine the exact number of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states can be further discussed |
| 1.4 | The multiple indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation (analogous to Rel-17 procedure) | Support: Ericsson, Samsung, Docomo, OPPO, ZTE, vivo, Apple, Qualcomm, MTK, InterDigital, CATT, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, Sony, Xiaomi, LGE, Lenovo, CMCC, TransHold, Fraunhofer, Fujitsu, Nokia (s-DCI mode), FGI, AT&T, Intel  Concern: | Given the majority view on this issue, Proposal 1.B is recommended accordingly.  Details of TCI state update and activation are discussed in the following sub-issues |
| 1.5 | Individual TCI update mode (joint or separate DL/UL TCI update) for each TRP, i.e., one TRP with joint DL/UL TCI update and another with separate DL/UL TCI update | Support: Nokia (m-DCI mode), Qualcomm, , CATT, Sony, Xiaomi, ITRI, FGI, Intel, InterDigital  Concern: Apple (no use case), ZTE, OPPO |  |
| 1.6 | TCI state update for S-DCI based MTRP | Use existing (single) TCI field in DCI to update all or subset of indicated TCI states:   * Support: Ericsson, Samsung (DCI w/ DLA), Docomo, OPPO (DCI w/ DLA), Apple, Qualcomm, Intel, ZTE, vivo, InterDigital, CATT, TransHold, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, Sony, CEWiT, MTK, Nokia, Fujitsu, LG, AT&T * Concern:   More than one TCI fields in DCI w/o DLA and each TCI field can update indicated TCIs respective to one of the TPRs:   * Support: Samsung, , FGI, LG * Concern: Apple (DCI overhead), Intel | Given the majority view on this issue, Proposal 1.C is recommended accordingly.  How to activate TCI states for indicated TCIs states can be discussed after the update scheme is sufficiently mature  If single TCI field in DCI is agreed, whether to increase the max number of codepoints/bits can be further discussed  If single TCI field in DCI is agreed, whether the switching between S-TRP and M-TRP is determined from the number of TCI states associated with the indicated codepoint can be further discussed |
| 1.7 | TCI state update for M-DCI based MTRP | Alt1: Use existing (single) TCI field in DCI associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to update the indicated TCI states respective to the *CORESETPoolIndex* value (i.e., no cross-TRP beam indication)   * Support: Samsung, Nokia, Docomo, Qualcomm, Intel, ZTE, vivo, MTK, Xiaomi. LGE, Fraunhofer, FGI, OPPO, Fujitsu, TransHold * Concern: Apple, Ericsson   Alt2: Use existing (single) TCI field DCI associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to update the indicated TCI states respective to both *CORESETPoolIndex* values (i.e., cross-TRP beam indication can be supported)   * Support: Apple, Xiaomi * Concern: Docomo (not good in non-ideal backhaul), Ericsson, InterDigital, Intel | Two alternativities for potential down-selection are provided by Proposal 1.D  How to activate TCI states for the indicated TCI states can be discussed after the update scheme is sufficiently mature |
| 1.8 | DCI format for updating the indicated TCI stares | Alt1: Reuse the same DCI formats as in Rel-17 (i.e., DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DLA), and no additional DCI format is introduced   * Support: ZTE, vivo, CATT, Apple, OPPO Docomo, Nokia, Ericsson, Fujitsu, LG * Concern:   Atl2: In addition to the DCI formats used in Rel-17, introduce DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 for updating at least the indicated UL TCI states:   * Support: Xiaomi, Intel, FGI, LG * Concern: Docomo, Ericsson, Spreadtrum |  |
| 1.9 | RRC-configured TCI state lists | Alt1: Reuse Rel-17 design (i.e., one TCI state list for joint/DL TCI states and one TCI state list for UL TCI states)   * Support: Ericsson, MTK, Docomo (if the max # of configured TCI states is not increased for MTRP), Nokia, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi, OPPO, Fujitsu, Intel * Concern: Apple (not good for TCI pool sharing for CCs with different sTRP/mTRP operation)   Atl2: TRP-specific TCI state list(s)   * Support: ZTE, Apple, vivo (if individual TCI update mode is allowed for each TRP), Docomo (if the max # of configured TCI states is increased for MTRP), FGI * Concern: Ericsson   Increase the max number of configured joint/DL/UL TCI states for MTRP operation   * Support: * Concern: |  |
| 1.10 | Introduction of TRP-ID associated with or included in each TCI state | Support: CMCC, Spreadtrum, ZTE (still case-by-case)  Concern: Ericsson, MTK, Apple, Docomo, Nokia, CATT, OPPO, LG, Intel |  |
| 1.11 | Applying/mapping the indicated TCI states to channel/signals for S-DCI based MTRP | To inform to the UE at least which one or two indicated TCI states (or which one or two TRPs) is mapped to the corresponding channel(s)/signal(s), an indicator is introduced:   * Per CORESET or per search space set: Ericsson, Xiaomi, ZTE, vivo, CATT, Nokia, MTK, Qualcomm, Samsung, Apple (CORESET), Docomo, FGI, OPPO (per CORESET), Fujitsu, LG, Intel (CORESET) * Per DCI with DL assignment for the scheduled/activated PDSCH: ZTE, vivo, MTK, Qualcomm, CATT, FGI, Fujitsu, LG * Per TDRA codepoint for scheduled/activated PDSCH/PUSCH: Apple * Per DCI with UL grant for the scheduled/activated PUSCH: vivo (reinterpret the SRS resource set indicator), Qualcomm, MTK, Xiaomi (reinterpret the SRS resource set indicator), Fujitsu, LG * Per dedicated PUCCH resource: Ericsson, ZTE, CATT (MAC-CE update), Nokia, MTK, Apple, Docomo, Xiaomi, LG * Per [P/SP] CSI-RS resource or resource set: Ericsson, ZTE, vivo, MTK, Apple (set), Docomo, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi, LG * Per [P/SP] SRS resource set: Ericsson, OPPO, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, MTK, Apple (set) , Docomo, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi, LG * Per DCI with CSI request for the triggered AP CSI-RS: vivo * Per DCI with SRS request for the triggered AP SRS: vivo * Per Type-1 CG configuration: Nokia, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi | For PDCCH, Proposal 1.E is recommended accordingly  For PDSCH, Proposal 1.F is recommended accordingly  If two indicated TCI states are mapped to a channel, how to map the indicated TCI states to each of repetition occasions (or CDM groups) of the channel can be further discussed. |
| 1.12 | Applying/mapping the indicated TCI states to channels/signals for M-DCI based MTRP | Unified schemes for both S-DCI and M-DCI to apply/map the indicated TCI states to channel(s)/signal(s)   * Support: Ericsson, Docomo * Concern: Nokia, Huawei   The indicated TCI state(s) respective to one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values applies to:   * PDCCH on the CORESET(s) configured/associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value (as in Rel-17): ZTE, Qualcomm, Nokia, vivo, Samsung, MTK, LGE, Xiaomi, Apple, Docomo, Fraunhofer, OPPO, Fujitsu, TransHold, Intel * PDSCH/PUSCH scheduled/activated by the DCI associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value: ZTE, Xiaomi, MTK, vivo, Qualcomm, Samsung, Apple, Fraunhofer, Fujitsu, TransHold, Intel * PUCCH with HARQ-ACK corresponding to the DCI associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value: Nokia, vivo, Qualcomm, Apple, Fraunhofer, TransHold * AP CSI-RS triggered by the DCI associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value: ZTE, Xiaomi, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, Qualcomm, Apple, OPPO * AP SRS triggered by the DCI associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value: ZTE, Xiaomi, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, Qualcomm, Apple   For channels/signals that don't have explicit/implicit association with a *CORESETPoolIndex* value:   * Introduce an indicator (reuse *CORESETPoolIndex* or a new one) to indicate which indicated TCI state(s) (or which TRP(s)) is associated with the corresponding channel/signal: Nokia, Apple, vivo, Fraunhofer, ZTE, MTK, Xiaomi, Docomo, FGI, LG | For PDCCH, Proposal 1.G is recommended accordingly  Whether an explicit association between indicated TCI state(s) and an *CORESETPoolIndex* value is needed may depend on the result of sub-issue 1.7, thus can be further studied |

## Proposal 1.B: On unified TCI framework extension, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP [at least] for MTRP operation

* Note: The term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” refers to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply simultaneously to the channels/signals that share the “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” in a CC/BWP
* The indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
  + Up to 2 indicated joint TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update
  + Up to 2 indicated DL TCI states and up to 2 indicated UL TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update
  + Note: It does not imply that joint TCI state(s) and DL/UL TCI state(s) can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP, and whether up to 1 indicated joint TCI state and 1 indicated DL and/or UL TCI state(s) simultaneously in a CC/BWP is FFS
  + FFS: How to determine the exact number of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states that need to be maintained in a CC/BWP, e.g., based on the indicated TCI codepoint, TCI state activation, or RRC configuration
  + FFS: The maximum number of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states per TRP
  + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP
  + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP
  + FFS: How to map/apply one or two indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states to a target channel(s)/signal(s)

Support: Futurewei, QC, NEC, Lenovo, IDG, Samsung(?), Ericsson(?), Fraunhofer, OPPO, ZTE, Xiaomi(?), Transsion, Intel(?), ATT, CEWiT, TCL, LG, Spreadtrum, vivo(?), Fujitsu, Docomo

Concern: Nokia (at least for MTRP), CATT, Apple, Huawei (more than 2 may be needed for CJT)

## Proposal 1.C: On unified TCI framework extension for single-DCI based MTRP, the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) can indicate joint/DL/UL TCI states respective to all TRPs in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list

* FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI state ID(s) to a TCI field codepoint, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI state IDs that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits
* Note: This doesn't imply that support of one additional TCI field or a field associating the TCI field to the TRP(s) is precluded
* Note: The term TRP is used only for the purposes of discussions in RAN1 and whether/how to capture this is FFS

Support: Nokia, Futurewei, QC, NEC, Lenovo, IDG, Ericsson(?), Fraunhofer, OPPO, ZTE, Xiaomi, Transsion, ATT, CEWiT, TCL, LG, Spreadtrum, vivo, Fujitsu, Docomo, Samsung

Concern: CATT, Huawei

## Proposal 1.D: On unified TCI framework extension for multi-DCI based MTRP, consider the following alternatives for TCI state update:

* Alt1: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) respective to the same *CORESETPoolIndex* value
* Alt2: Use the existing TCI field in any DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to indicate all joint/DL/UL TCI states respective to both *CORESETPoolIndex* values
  + Study the association between joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value
* Alt3: Use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) respective to the same or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value.
  + Whether the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) applies to the channels/signals associated with the same *CORESETPoolIndex* value or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value is indicated by DCI

Support: Nokia, Futurewei, QC, NEC, IDG, CATT, Samsung, Fraunhofer, OPPO, ZTE, Xiaomi, Transsion, ATT, CEWiT, Fujitsu, Apple, Docomo

Concern: TCL, Ericsson

## Proposal 1.E-1: When more than one joint/DL TCI states are indicated in a CC/BWP for S-DCI based MTRP, consider at least the following alternatives to map/associate an indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH on the CC/BWP:

* Atl1: Use RRC configuration per CORESET to inform the UE which indicated joint/DL TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on the CORESET
* Alt2: Use RRC configuration per search space set to inform the UE which indicated joint/DL TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on the search space set
* Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on a CORESET
* Alt4: Use DCI to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on a CORESET
* Alt5: Based on a fixed mapping/association rule, e.g., the first indicated joint/DL TCI state always applies to PDCCH receptions

Study whether above alternatives are used for PDCCH-SFN as well

## Proposal 1.F: When more than one joint/DL TCI states are indicated in a CC/BWP for S-DCI based MTRP, consider at least the following alternatives to map/associate one or two indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDSCH on the CC/BWP:

* Atl1: Introduce a field (other than TCI field) in a scheduling DCI to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state(s) should apply to PDSCH scheduled/activated by scheduling DCI
* Alt2: Use the TDRA in a scheduling DCI to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state(s) should apply to PDSCH scheduled/activated by scheduling DCI
* Alt3: Use the existing TCI field to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state(s) should apply to PDSCH scheduled/activated by scheduling DCI
* Note: Other alternatives are not precluded

Study the mapping between the indicated joint/DL TCI states and PDSCH Tx occasions, non-overlapping FDRAs, and CDM groups if two indicated joint/DL TCI state are applied to PDSCH, and reusing the Rel-16 mapping rule is not precluded

## Proposal 1.G: When more than one joint/DL TCI states are indicated in a CC/BWP for M-DCI based MTRP, consider at least the following alternatives to map/associate an indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH on the CC/BWP

* Alt1: For a CORESET configured/associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values, the UE should apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state respective to the *CORESETPoolIndex* value to PDCCH receptions on the CORESET
  + Study whether an explicit association between an indicated joint/DL TCI state and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value is needed, or association can be determined implicitly
* Alt2: Use RRC configuration other than *CORESETPoolIndex* per CORESET to inform the UE which indicated joint/DL TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on the CORESET
* Alt3: Use RRC configuration other than *CORESETPoolIndex* per search space set to inform the UE which indicated joint/DL TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on the search space set

Table 2 Additional inputs for Issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | 1. **Please check the updated Proposal 1.B. To avoid those concerns raised during GTW discussion, the proposal is revised to agree on the maximum numbers first.** 2. **Please share your view on Proposals 1.C, no change from the 1st round discussion** 3. **Please share your view on new Proposal 1.D and 1.E** |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1.B: Support  Proposal 1.C: Propose to add “at least”: [Mod] okay Proposal 1.C: On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to update all or subset of indicated TCI states in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs at least for single-DCI based MTRP Proposal 1.D: Do not support. We should avoid stating alternatives this early. Wait until further development of the sDCI solution has been performed – then we can compare solutions.  Proposal 1.E: Support with a slight edit: Proposal 1.E: When the UE is indicated with more than one DL/joint TCI states in a CC/BWP, support an indicator by RRC signaling to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to PDCCH receptions on the CC/BWP [Mod] Revised. Please check. |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 1.B:** Support.  **Proposal 1.C:** Support. We are also fine with Ericsson’s proposed modification.  **Proposal 1.D:** Support.  **Proposal 1.E:** We would like to have some clarifications on this proposal. First, to our understanding, this proposal is for S-DCI based MTRP as it is based on discussion on Issue 1.11. So we suggest adding “for single-DCI based MTRP” in the main bullet. Second, if existing RRC parameter(s) are reused as stated in the first FFS, depending on the scenario, it is possible that different parameter will be used for different scenario, instead of using just one single parameter. Therefore we would like to make the following modifications:  [Mod] Since there are still some companies prefer a unified scheme for S-DCI and M-DCI, thus whether this can be used for M-DCI still can be left for further studied Proposal 1.E: When the UE is provided with more than one indicated DL/joint TCI states in a CC/BWP for single-DCI based MTRP, support utilizing indicator(s) by RRC signaling to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to PDCCH receptions on the CC/BWP  * FFS: Detail design of the indicator(s), e.g., how to indicate, the indicator(s) are provided per CORESET or per search space set, whether to reuse the existing RRC parameter(s) or introduce a new one, etc. * FFS: Whether the same indicator(s) are used to inform the UE that two indicated DL/joint TCI states are applied for PDCCH-SFN |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1.B: support  Proposal 1.C: For the main bullet, we have two comments. First one, here only TCI update is mentioned, what about the first time indication? Second one, here mentioned all or subset, does it mean there is a reference set? Without the reference set, it is meaningless to talk about all or subset of indicated TCI states. According to the response from feature lead, the reference set will be decided by TCI mode. But from Proposal 1.B, we can see that TCI mode can be provided by the indicated TCI codepoint, TCI state activation, or RRC configuration. So if to keep “all or subset”, we suggest to define the reference set first. But from our point of view, the reference set can be defined if the TCI mode is provided by RRC configuration. While for the case of provided by the indicated TCI codepoint or TCI state activation, it is difficult to define it. So the simplest way is to remove “all or subset”.  [Mod] Revision to replace “update”, please check. And I add a note to clarify the term “indicated TCI states”.  Proposal 1.D: Alt 2 is not clear. We suggest to update it as below: Proposal 1.D: On unified TCI framework extension, support at least one of the following alternatives for multi-DCI based MTRP:  * Alt1: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to update the indicated TCI state(s) respective to the associated *CORESETPoolIndex* value   + FFS: Association between indicated TCI state(s) and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value, if Alt1 is supported * Alt2: Use the ~~same TCI state update for single-DCI based MTRP, i.e., use the~~ existing TCI field in ~~any~~ DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to update ~~all or subset of~~  the indicated TCI state(s) for any one or two of *CORESETPoolIndex* values.   [Mod] Alt3 is added accordingly  Proposal 1.E: first we share same view as Samsung that ‘S-DCI based M-TRP’ should be added. In addition, we prefer to use ‘which indicated DL/joint TCI state(s)’ since PDCCH repetition and PDCCH-SFN should also be considered. Thirdly, we are not sure RRC signaling is sufficient or not, whether an association between TCI state(s) and TRP is necessary. So we suggest to add a FFS that “an association between TCI state(s) and TRP”.  [Mod] How to support PDCCH-SFN by this proposal is captured in the 3rd FFS. On the association between TCI state(s) and TRP, it can be studied as a part of detail design of the indicator(s). |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 1.B:** Support. If other Rel.18 agenda (e.g. CJT) requires larger number of TRPs, we can discuss it later. The current description of “More than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” is very general, hence, we support to list the supported combination as in FL proposal.  **Proposal 1.C:** Support.  **Proposal 1.D:** Support. We support Alt.1. We think Alt.2 is not suitable for non-ideal backhaul that one DCI from one TRP indicates two TCI states for both TRPs.  **Proposal 1.D:** Support. We are ok with limiting the proposal to S-DCI. While we are also ok to cover both S-DCI and M-DCI, but in that case, “an indicator by RRC signaling” can be existing CORESETPoolIndex for M-DCI.  For SFN-CORESET, no indicator is needed in case of 2 indicated TCI states, but indication would be needed if more than 2 indicated TCI states are indicated. Hence, we support to study for SFN-CORESET. |
| Apple | Proposal 1.B: We suggest the following revision. In our view, this is for channels that share the indicated unified TCI state. The first 2 FFS seems to be unclear. We suggest removing them. Proposal 1.B: On unified TCI framework extension, for channels that share the indicated unified TCI state, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state IDs in a CC/BWP or in CCs in a CC list for MTRP operation  * The TCI states IDs can be indicated by MAC-CE or DCI format 1\_1/1\_2   + Up to 2 joint TCI state IDs can be indicated for joint DL/UL TCI update   + Up to 2 DL TCI state IDs can be indicated for separate DL/UL TCI update   + Up to 2 UL TCI state IDs can be indicated for separate DL/UL TCI update   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: How to map/apply one or two indicated TCI states to a target channel(s)/signal(s)   [Mod] This proposal is not intended to decide the number of TCI state IDs that can be indicated by a TCI state codepoint. Instead, it is intended for the number of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain at the same time and apply to the channels/signals that share the “unified TCI” in a CC/BWP. A note is added in the proposal to clarify the term “indicated TCI states”, which follows the concept in current spec for Rel-17 unified TCI framework.  Proposal 1.C: Support in principle. We suggest the following minor change. Proposal 1.C: On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to update all or subset of indicated TCI states in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list for single-DCI based MTRP  * FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI states that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits * Note: This doesn't imply that support of one additional TCI field or a field associating the TCI field to the TRP(s) is precluded   [Mod] Thanks. It is more clear.  Proposal 1.D: Suggest adding Alt3 to support cross-TRP beam indication. Proposal 1.D: On unified TCI framework extension, support at least one of the following alternatives for multi-DCI based MTRP:  * Alt1: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to update the indicated TCI state(s) respective to the associated *CORESETPoolIndex* value   + FFS: Association between indicated TCI state(s) and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value, if Alt1 is supported * Alt2: Use the same TCI state update for single-DCI based MTRP, i.e., use the existing TCI field in any DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to update all or subset of indicated TCI states * Alt3: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to update the indicated TCI state(s) respective to the associated *CORESETPoolIndex* value or the other *CORESETPoolIndex*   + Whether the indicated TCI state(s) are applied to the channels associated with the same *CORESETPoolIndex* or the other *CORESETPoolIndex* is indicated by DCI   [Mod] Added  Proposal 1.E: In our view, the beam indication should still be in CORESET level, otherwise it would create new mTRP schemes. We suggest the following revision. Proposal 1.E: When the UE is provided with more than one indicated DL/joint TCI states in a CC/BWP, if mTRP PDCCH repetition is enabled, support an indicator by RRC signaling for CORESET(s) that share the indicated DL/joint TCI states to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to the CORESET(s) on the CC/BWP  * FFS: Detail design of the indicator, e.g., how to indicate, the indicator is provided per CORESET or per search space set, whether to reuse the existing RRC parameter or introduce a new one, etc. * FFS: Whether the same indicator is used to inform the UE that two indicated DL/joint TCI states are applied for PDCCH-SFN * FFS: Whether the same indicator is used for both S-DCI and M-DCI based MTRP   [Mod] Some companies propose to use the same indicator to M-DCI, thus let’s keep it open now. On CORESET vs.. SS set, even I share similar view with you, but we can decide it later. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1.B: Support.  Proposal 1.C: Support.  Proposal 1.D: Support.  Proposal 1.E: Does the sentence “When the UE is provided with more than one indicated DL/joint TCI states in a CC/BWP” mean that the indicator is supported under the condition that the UE has been provided with more than one TCI state? If it is not the intention, we suggest to delete this sentence. Proposal 1.E: ~~When the UE is provided with more than one indicated DL/joint TCI states in a CC/BWP, s~~Support an indicator by RRC signaling to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to PDCCH receptions on the CC/BWP  * FFS: Detail design of the indicator, e.g., how to indicate, the indicator is provided per CORESET or per search space set, whether to reuse the existing RRC parameter or introduce a new one, etc. * FFS: Whether the same indicator is used to inform the UE that two indicated DL/joint TCI states are applied for PDCCH-SFN   FFS: Whether the same indicator is used for both S-DCI and M-DCI based MTRP  [Mod] Yes, the intension is what you mentioned. Precisely speaking, when more than one joint/DL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply to the channels/signals at the same time, the indicator is used to indicate which one is applied for PDCCH reception. |
| Mod V1 | 1. **Please check the updated Proposal 1.B. To avoid those concerns raised during GTW discussion, the proposal is revised to agree on the maximum numbers first. Meanwhile, a note is added in the proposal to clarify the term “indicated TCI states”, which follows the concept in current spec for Rel-17 unified TCI framework.** 2. **Please share your view on the updated Proposal 1.C 1.D and 1.E** |
| vivo | **Proposal 1.B:** We have following comment:   * We assume the first FFS is related to whether different TCI modes are allowed for two TRPs, i.e., indicate one joint TCI state for TRP1 and one DL and/or UL TCI state for TRP2, so “(s)” is not needed. What’s more, there is no need to discuss “the maximum number of the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states”, because we have the condition one indicated joint TCI state + one indicated DL/UL indicated state. * For the second FFS, is it intended to clarify our concern in the GTW? For example, a UE is firstly indicated two joint TCI states, and then the UE is indicated one joint TCI state. Does it mean the UE is switched to STRP transmission or still maintain MTRP with one updated joint TCI state and one kept joint TCI state? If this is to clarify our concern, we are OK with this FFS.  Proposed update of Proposal 1.B: On unified TCI framework extension, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation  * Note: The term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” refers to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply to the channels/signals that share the “unified TCI” in a CC/BWP * The indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation   + Up to 2 indicated joint TCI states can be provided in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update   + Up to 2 indicated DL TCI states can be provided in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update   + Up to 2 indicated UL TCI states can be provided in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update   + FFS: Whether one indicated joint TCI state~~(s)~~ can be provided together with one indicated DL TCI state~~(s)~~ and/or one indicated UL TCI state~~(s)~~ in a CC/BWP~~, and if applicable, the maximum number of the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in the CC/BWP~~   + FFS: How to provide the exact number of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states that need to be maintained in a CC/BWP, e.g., based on the indicated TCI codepoint, TCI state activation, or RRC configuration   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: How to map/apply one or two indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states to a target channel(s)/signal(s)   [Mod] Good suggestion, captured.  **Proposal 1.C:** Support  **Proposal 1.D:** A single solution for M-DCI based MTRP is highly desired, suggest remove “at least”. And we prefer Alt1. Proposed update of Proposal 1.D: On unified TCI framework extension, support ~~at least~~ one of the following alternatives for multi-DCI based MTRP:  * Alt1: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to update the indicated TCI state(s) respective to the associated *CORESETPoolIndex* value   + FFS: Association between indicated TCI state(s) and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value, if Alt1 is supported * Alt2: Use the same TCI state update for single-DCI based MTRP, i.e., use the existing TCI field in any DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to update all or subset of indicated TCI states   **Proposal 1.E:** We have following comments:   * Better to separate the S-DCI based MTRP and M-DCI based MTRP discussion because they may have different indications. * For S-DCI-based MTRP, there is no existing RRC parameter in our view and it should be removed. * We think indicator provided per CORESET is reasonable based on Rel-17 unified TCI framework. * For M-DCI-based MTRP, the existing RRC parameter is CORESETPoolIndex in our view and there is no support of PDCCH-SFN.  Proposed update of Proposal 1.E: When the UE is provided with more than one indicated DL/joint TCI states in a CC/BWP, support an indicator by RRC signaling to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to PDCCH receptions on the CC/BWP  * For S-DCI-based MTRP:   + FFS: Detail design of the indicator, e.g., how to indicate, the indicator is provided per CORESET ~~or per search space set, whether to reuse the existing RRC parameter or introduce a new one~~, etc.   + FFS: Whether the same indicator is used to inform the UE that two indicated DL/joint TCI states are applied for PDCCH-SFN * ~~FFS: Whether the same indicator is used for both S-DCI and M-DCI based MTRP~~ * For M-DCI-based MTRP:   + FFS: ~~Detail design of the indicator, e.g., how to indicate, the indicator is provided per CORESET or per search space set,~~ whether to reuse ~~the existing RRC parameter~~ CORESETPoolIndex or introduce a new one, etc. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.B**: For multi-TRP, we do not see use cases of having 2 joint TCI states or 2 DL TCI states or 2 UL TCI states per TRP. We therefore suggest the following edits for the potential TCI state modes. We are OK to further study whether joint and separate can be indicated together as stated in the first FFS.   * + Up to 2 indicated joint TCI states (up to 1 per TRP) can be provided in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update   + Up to 2 indicated DL TCI states (up to 1 per TRP) can be provided in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update   + Up to 2 indicated UL TCI states (up to 1 per TRP) can be provided in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update   [Mod] Since the association between TRP and TCI state is not clear, prefer not to add this limitation for now. For Proposal 1.C, we think with the following wording edit, the note in the last bullet can be removed.Proposal 1.C: On unified TCI framework extension, use at least the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to indicate a set of TCI state IDs for all or subset of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list at least for single-DCI based MTRP  * Note: The term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” refers to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply to the channels/signals that share the “unified TCI” in a CC/BWP * FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI state ID(s) to a TCI field codepoint, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI state IDs that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits  [Mod] This will change the meaning of this proposal. I think the original intension is that the existing TCI field should be able to indicate all joint/DL/UL TCI states For Proposal 1.D, support.For Proposal 1.E, we prefer FL’s previous version – ‘signalling’ is unclear.Proposal 1.E: At least for single-DCI based MTRP, if more than one indicated DL/joint TCI states in a CC/BWP, use RRC indicator(s) to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to PDCCH receptions on the CC/BWP  * FFS: Detail design of the indicator(s), e.g., how to indicate, the indicator(s) is provided per CORESET or per search space set, whether to reuse the existing RRC parameter(s) or introduce a new one, etc. * FFS: Whether the same indicator(s) is used to inform the UE that two indicated DL/joint TCI states are applied for PDCCH-SFN * FFS: Whether the same indicator(s) is used for M-DCI based MTRP |
| CATT | **Proposal 1.B:** Support.  **Proposal 1.C:** Support. The first FFS seems to be redundant, since it is similar as the second FFS of Proposal 1.B. If the understanding is correct, we prefer to remove the first FFS.  [Mod] In the 1st round discussion, Samsung indicated that it is possible to increase the TCI codepoints but w/o increasing the bits. Thus, it is fine to keep it for further study.  **Proposal 1.D:** Support.    **Proposal 1.E:** Support. Whether the indicator is used for both S-DCI and M-DCI based MTRP depends on the outcome of Proposal 1.D. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 1.B:** Support.  **Proposal 1.C:** Support. It is more clear after the note for “indicated TCI” is added, thanks.  **Proposal 1.D:** Support. Cross-TRP beam indication should be discussed.  **Proposal 1.E:** Support in principle and we think that S-DCI and m-DCI based MTRP could be discussed separately. |
| LG | Proposal 1.B/C/D: Support  Proposal 1.E: Fine in principle. Regarding the first FFS, we suggest the following as an example for the design of the indication (red text) by: Proposal 1.E: At least for single-DCI based MTRP, if more than one indicated DL/joint TCI states in a CC/BWP, an indicator(s) can be signalled RRC to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to PDCCH receptions on the CC/BWP  * FFS: Detail design of the indicator(s), e.g., how to indicate, the indicator(s) is provided per CORESET or per search space set or per CORESET pool in case of M-DCI MTRP, whether to reuse the existing RRC parameter(s) or introduce a new one, etc.   [Mod] Let’s focus on S-DCI first |
| ZTE | Re Issue-5, our position is captured incorrectly. Now it is revised.  **Re Proposal 1B:** The current description for the following is confusing. It seems that all types of combination can be configured, like 2 joint + 2DL +2UL TCI states can be indicated together. It seems the following first FFS is to handle this ambiguities, but we are not 100% sure. Especially, what’s the meaning of ‘the maximum number of the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in the CC/BWP’. Then we have the following suggestion: Proposal 1.B: On unified TCI framework extension, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation  * Note: The term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” refers to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply to the channels/signals that share the “unified TCI” in a CC/BWP * The indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation   + - Up to 2 indicated joint TCI states can be provided in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update     - Up to 2 indicated DL TCI states can be provided in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update     - Up to 2 indicated UL TCI states can be provided in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update     - Note: it does not imply that joint TCI state(s) + DL/UL TCI state(s) can be provided simultaneously.   + FFS: Whether indicated joint TCI state(s) can be provided together with indicated DL TCI state(s) and/or indicated UL TCI state(s) in a CC/BWP, and if applicable   + FFS: How to provide the exact number of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states that need to be maintained in a CC/BWP, e.g., based on the indicated TCI codepoint, TCI state activation, or RRC configuration   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: How to map/apply one or two indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states to a target channel(s)/signal(s)   [Mod] Captured  **Re 1.C**, it looks good that we can consider CC-list TCI state update, which is useful. But, the reference CC/BWP seems not to be mentioned together. So, we have the following update. Proposal 1.C: On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to indicate a set of TCI state IDs for all or subset of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list at least for single-DCI based MTRP  * As in Rel-17, RRC-configured TCI state pool(s) can be absent in the PDSCH for each BWP/CC, and replaced with a reference to RRC-configured TCI state pool(s) in a reference BWP/CC. * Note: The term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” refers to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply to the channels/signals that share the “unified TCI” in a CC/BWP * FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI state ID(s) to a TCI field codepoint, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI state IDs that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits * Note: This doesn't imply that support of one additional TCI field or a field associating the TCI field to the TRP(s) is precluded   **Re 1.D**: Regarding Alt-2, the UE behavior is confusing for us. Since it has been declared that the framework is used in the MDCI scenario, why the scenario of SDCI is mentioned? This may cause problems to be discussed later. Therefore we would like to make the following modifications: Proposal 1.D: On unified TCI framework extension, support at least one of the following alternatives for multi-DCI based MTRP:  * Alt1: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate TCI state ID(s) for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) respective to the associated *CORESETPoolIndex* value   + FFS: Association between indicated TCI state(s) and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value, if Alt1 is supported * Alt2: Use the existing TCI field in any DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to indicate a set of TCI state IDs for all or subset of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states, where the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) can be associated with *CORESETPoolIndex* by MAC-CE or RRC signaling. * Alt3: Use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate TCI state ID(s) for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) respective to the same or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value.   + Whether the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) applies to the channels/signals associated with the same *CORESETPoolIndex* value or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value is indicated by DCI   [Mod] Captured. Regarding the association, we can further study  **Re 1.E**: We have two comments about this proposal. First, we prefer to use 'association' to replace 'indicator', because the description of indicator is too limited and may preclude some implicit mapping methods. Second, we think using RRC signaling to indicate the association relationship may be not enough, MAC-CE/DCI should be considered as well. In addition, use existing RRC parameter(e.g., CORESETPoolIndex) or introduce a new RRC parameter (e.g., TCI state pool ID) to indicate the association can be considered. BTW, we do not think, in this proposal, we also need to combine SDCI and MDCI together, which just makes the whole discussion complicated.  Therefore we would like to make the following modifications: BTW, we also support the LG suggestion of adding ‘per CORESET pool in case of M-DCI MTRP’.  [Mod] Let’s focus on S-DCI first now Proposal 1.E: At least for single-DCI based MTRP, if more than one indicated DL/joint TCI states in a CC/BWP, an assocation can inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to PDCCH receptions on the CC/BWP  * FFS: Detail design of the association, e.g., how to indicate, the association is provided per CORESET or per search space set, whether to reuse the existing RRC parameter(s) or introduce a new one, etc. * FFS: Whether the same association is used to inform the UE that two indicated DL/joint TCI states are applied for PDCCH-SFN   [Mod] Your proposal is captured as one alternative in the candidate list now |
| TCL | Proposal 1.B: Support  Proposal 1.C: Support  Proposal 1.D: Do not support Alt 2 and be open to discuss Alt 1 and 3. For multi-DCI based MTRP, CoresetPoolIndex can indicate TRP explicitly. Utilizing this parameter can make indication simper and more distinct.  Proposal 1.E: Do not support. We think RRC indication mechanism is redundant if we have MAC CE indication mechanism.  [Mod] A list of alternatives is provided for further study now. |
| CEWiT | **Proposal 1.B:** We support the updated proposal.  **Proposal 1.C:** We are fine to use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DLA to indicate/update all indicated TCI states.  Regarding the second FFS, from our understanding, we don’t see any need to increase the number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints. Hence, third FFS will not be needed which avoid the increasing DCI overhead.  **Proposal 1.D:** We agree with vivo’s view and support Alt1 i.e. for multi-DCI based MTRP,  use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate TCI state ID(s)  **Proposal 1.E:**   * A indicator should be provided per CORESET is reasonable based on Rel-17 unified TCI framework. * we think that M-DCI and S-DCI based MTRP could be discussed separately. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1.B**: we are fine with the direction to limit the maximum number of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states.  Our 1st comment is that since up to 2 joint/DL/UL TCI states are indicated for mTRP operation (up to 2 TRPs), there seems to no need to further restrict it on a per-TRP basis. In other words, if both unified TCI states are indicated to a single TRP, then there is no one TCI state left for the other TRP and it implies single-TRP operation.  Our 2nd comment is to synchronize ZTE’s view on 2 Joint TCI states + 2 DL TCI states + 2 UL TCI states which seems not excluded by this proposal. As this proposal talks about the maximum number of indicated unified TCI states, the added note on this part from ZTE looks good to us.  **Proposal 1.C**: we are in general okay.  One minor editorial comment is that since here “indicated” has the defined meaning in the note. We think it would be better to adjust the part of main bullet as  **use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to signal a set of TCI state IDs for all or subset of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states**  [Mod] OK  Though everyone participates in the discussion knows “a CC list” refers to the common beam operation for CA. But as new potential agreement in Rel.18 for mTRP, should we provide more description on what the CC list is.  [Mod] Yes, we will further check whether any impact to Rel-17 common beam operation for CA  **Proposal 1.D:** support.  Though it seems early to list alternatives, for M-DCI MTRP the solutions seem straightforward and doesn’t have to depend on the design of S-DCI MTRP. It can be beneficial to list all of the potential signaling schemes for discussion in next level.  **Proposal 1.E:** not support.  In the 1st Rel.18 meeting, to address the same issue (more than 1 indicated unified TCI states for S-DCI), there are a few of solutions, other than an indicator via RRC signaling which is not less flexible than MAC CE and/or DCI based solution. In addition, our thoughts on this issue can be to apply fixed rule to determine the beam, such as applying the 1st or 2nd of the indicated TCI states to the PDCCH. That’s simpler and with less effort for RRC signaling design.  Finally, before we make a decision for this issue, we hope all solutions can be presented to the group and discussed by the group.  [Mod] A list of alternatives is provided for further study now. |
| AT&T | Proposal 1.B: support (prefer the version from the moderator)  Proposal 1.C: support  Proposal 1.D: support with the wording from the moderator. It is good to keep all alternatives incl. alt.2 at this point |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Regarding Proposal 1.B:**   1. As discussed in the first GTW session, any agreement in 9.1.1.1 should not be at odds with objective 4 of the WID:  |  | | --- | | 1. Study, and if justified, specify enhancements of CSI acquisition for Coherent-JT targeting FR1 and up to 4 TRPs, assuming ideal backhaul and synchronization as well as the same number of antenna ports across TRPs, as follows:    * Rel-16/17 Type-II codebook refinement for CJT mTRP targeting FDD and its associated CSI reporting, taking into account throughput-overhead trade-off    * SRS enhancement to manage inter-TRP cross-SRS interference targeting TDD CJT via SRS capacity enhancement and/or interference randomization, with the constraints that 1) without consuming additional resources for SRS; 2) reuse existing SRS comb structure; 3) without new SRS root sequences    * Note: the maximum number of CSI-RS ports per resource remains the same as in Rel-17, i.e. 32 |   Having this in mind, some modification in Proposal 1.B seems necessary. In particular, up to 2 indicated joint/DL/UL DCI state would not be enough if coherent-JT for up to 4 TRPs is specified.   1. Given above discussion, in first FFS, we think that determining “the maximum number of the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in the CC/BWP” should not be restricted to the case that “indicated joint TCI state(s) can be provided together with indicated DL TCI state(s) and/or indicated UL TCI state(s) in a CC/BWP”. 2. The intention of the second FFS is unclear for us. Since “The indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI”, what exact problem this FFS is trying to address? The wording sounds like a UE capability discussion. At this point, we prefer it to be removed. We appreciate a clarification from our moderator and/or the proponents though.   We suggest the following Modified version: Proposal 1.B (modified): On unified TCI framework extension, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation  * Note: The term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” refers to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply to the channels/signals that share the “unified TCI” in a CC/BWP * The indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation   + ~~Up to 2 indicated joint TCI states can be provided in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update~~   + ~~Up to 2 indicated DL TCI states can be provided in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update~~   + ~~Up to 2 indicated UL TCI states can be provided in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update~~   + FFS: Whether indicated joint TCI state(s) can be provided together with indicated DL TCI state(s) and/or indicated UL TCI state(s) in a CC/BWP, ~~and if applicable, the maximum number of the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in the CC/BWP~~   + ~~FFS: How to provide the exact number of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states that need to be maintained in a CC/BWP, e.g., based on the indicated TCI codepoint, TCI state activation, or RRC configuration~~   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: How to map/apply one or ~~two~~ more indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states to a target channel(s)/signal(s)   [Mod] These numbers are proposed based on the feedback for sub-issue 1.3 in Table 1, which are preferred by majority companies. Moreover, based on agreed use case last week, in addition to legacy MTRP schemes, only STxMP will be further considered, but not CJT.  **Regarding Proposal 1.C:**  We prefer the original wording of the proposal 1.C in the first round. It seems that the additional note and “clarifications” made the proposal more ambiguous. The term “**indicate a set of TCI state IDs for all or subset of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states”** is a bit strange and confusing for us. Moreover, why DCI needs to indicate all indicated TCI states? This is unclear both from technical perspective and the English usage. Finally, regarding the “Note”, our understanding is that “indicated” TCI state is the one that UE applies and is provided to it using a DCI or directly using MAC-CE in case that only one unified TCI is activated. However, the Note mentions that indicated TCI state includes the TCI states that UE needs to “maintain” which, to our understanding, is not aligned with Rel-17 definitions.  [Mod] “Indicated joint/DL/UL state” is already used in Rel-17 spec for unified TCI framework. When UE is configured in separate DL/UL update mode, the UE needs to maintain a pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states. However, beam indication DCI instance may update only one of them. In Rel-18 extension, I would prefer to reuse the term and concept we have in Rel-17, i.e., UE needs to maintain multiple “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states”, but DCI may update a subset of them by one instance.  Regarding “all”, since only one TCI field in this proposal, it should be capable to update all the TCI states in a CC/BWP.  We suggest the following which is based on the original Proposal 1.C with slight changes: Proposal 1.C (modified): On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to indicate ~~indicate a set of TCI state IDs for all or subset~~ one or more ~~of~~ provided unified joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP or a set of CCs/BWPs in a CC list at least for single-DCI based MTRP  * ~~Note: The term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” refers to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply to the channels/signals that share the “unified TCI” in a CC/BWP~~ * FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI state ID(s) to a TCI field codepoint, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI state IDs that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints * FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits * Note: This doesn't imply that support of one additional TCI field or a field associating the TCI field to the TRP(s) is precluded |
| Lenovo | Proposal 1.B: We are generally OK with this proposal. Just want to confirm that when 2 indicated TCI states (joint or DL or UL) can be provided in a CC/BWP, these 2 TCIs are signaled with 2 DCIs with no more than 1 TCI in a DCI. We suggest to add the following bullet for clarification:   * There is at most one TCI indicated in a DCI.   [Mod] How to update by DCI is captured in the FFS  Proposal 1.C: Support in general. We prefer to keep the phrase “TCI states” instead of “TCI state IDs” in the text. This is more consistent with other proposals.  [Mod] Done  Proposal 1.D: We are open to discuss all possible alternatives at this time. However, it is highly desirable that a unified solution can be developed for all different deployment scenarios (ideal or non-ideal backhaul). We suggest to remove the word “at least” to focus on a single solution.  [Mod] Done  Proposal 1.E: It is not clear if the RRC signal applies to all PDCCH or applies to per CORESET or per CORESET type (A/B/C). We need to add the following:  FFS: the granularity it applies, all CORESET, per CORESET or CORESET type (A/B/C). |
| Intel | **Proposal 1.B:** The first FFS seems to suggest that only combinations of joint TCI with separate DL/UL TCI are to be studied. The combination of 2 DL + 2 UL TCI should also be a valid combination. Therefore we suggest rephrasing the FFS to the following:   |  | | --- | | FFS: Whether indicated joint TCI state(s) can be provided together with indicated DL TCI state(s) and/or indicated UL TCI state(s) in a CC/BWP, or whether indicated DL TCI state(s) can be provided together with indicated UL TCI state(s).  FFS: The maximum number of the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in the CC/BWP |   [Mod] I think the case 2 DL + 2 UL TCIs are valid. Now captured.  The last FFS only mentions one or two TCI states. This is applicable for joint TCI but separate DL/UL TCI, it may two or more indicated TCI states. This needs to be reflected in the FFS.   |  | | --- | | FFS: How to map/apply one or two indicated joint TCI states or two or more indicated DL/UL TCI states to a target channel(s)/signal(s) |   [Mod] I think one channel/signal can apply at most two TCI states for MTRP operation. Do you mean it is possible to apply more than two to a target channel/signal?  **Proposal 1.C:** It is not clear what is meant by “a set of TCI state IDs” in the main bullet. This wording seems quite vague.  [Mod] Revised  **Proposal 1.D:** For this proposal, we don’t think we need to limit to the listed alternatives in the first meeting. While the listed alternatives may be representative examples, it is too early to agree to support one of them. We can be with listing them for further study at this stage. We also don’t think cross TRP TCI indication for multi-DCI is needed. Suggest rewording the main bullet to study the alternatives and add a note that other alternatives are not precluded.  [Mod] Change from “down-selection” to “study”  **Proposal 1.E:** The current wording of the main bullet look weird. Consider revising:  At least for single-DCI based MTRP, if more than one ~~indicated~~ DL/joint TCI states are indicated in a CC/BWP, an indicator(s) can be signalled by RRC to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to PDCCH receptions on the CC/BWP |
| Mod V2 | 1. **Please check updated proposals 1.B, 1.C, 1.D** 2. **Proposal 1.E is replaced by Proposal 1.E-1 with a set of candidates for study** 3. **Please check new proposals 1.F and 1.G** |
| Transsion | Proposal 1.B: Support the updated proposal in general. For the 4th sub-bullet, “Up to 2 indicated DL TCI states and up to 2 indicated UL TCI states” may include the combination of 1 DL + 1 UL TCI. For the combination of 1 DL + 1 UL TCI, if the 1 DL TCI is applied to the channel of one TRP and 1 UL TCI is applied to the channel of the other TRP, is it a valid combination(i.e. 1 DL + 1 UL TCI)?  [Mod] Not precluded so far. The relationship between these TCI states and TRPs is not defined yet.  Proposal 1.C: Support.  Proposal 1.D: Support.  Proposal 1.E-1: For the Alt1 and Alt2, we suggest adding a note to clarify the detailed “RRC configuration”, e.g. the first TCI state.  [Mod] Can further discuss the next level detail  Proposal 1.F: For S-DCI based MTRP PDSCH, one PDCCH schedules two PDSCH Tx occasions from two TRPs. If a field in a scheduling DCI is used, how to inform the indicated DL/joint TCI state for the second PDSCH Tx occasion?  [Mod] The TCI state is indicated by TCI field to my understanding to this proposal.  Proposal 1.G: Support. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1.B: for the second note, if the motivation is to restrict the combination such as ‘2 joint + 2DL +2UL TCI states’, thus we prefer the following modification, else it will overlap with the first FFS.   * + Note: It does not imply that joint TCI state~~(~~s~~)~~ and DL/UL TCI state~~(~~s~~)~~ can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP   [Mod] Revised  Proposal 1.C: support  Proposal 1.D: support  Proposal 1.E-1: support in principle. But we prefer a unified design for the cases of one indicated joint/DL TCI state and more than one indicated joint/DL TCI state for S-DCI based MTRP, thus we suggest the following modification in the main bullet. Proposal 1.E-1: When ~~more than~~ at least one joint/DL TCI state~~s~~ are indicated in a CC/BWP for S-DCI based MTRP, consider the following alternatives to map/associate an indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH on a CORESET on the CC/BWP: [Mod] If there is only one indicated joint/DL TCI state, do we still need the mapping/associating method?  Proposal 1.F: we are confused why not to apply all indicated joint/DL TCI states directly like Rel-16 S-DCI based MTRP PDSCH receptions. And we suggest to add the following Alt 3.  Alt 3: reuse the Rel-16 S-DCI based MTRP mapping rule between two TCI states and PDSCH Tx occasions, non-overlapping FDRAs, and CDM groups for mapping between the indicated joint/DL TCI states and PDSCH Tx occasions, non-overlapping FDRAs, and CDM groups.  [Mod] The mapping rule if two TCI states are applied to PDSCH can be further discussed. However, I guess you prefer to follow the Rel-16 mechanism that maps one or two TCI states to PDSCH based on the indication from TCI field. If my understanding is correct, Alt-3 is added.  Proposal 1.G: same comment as for Proposal 1.E-1. |
| ZTE | Thank you so much for the FL’s efforts.  Proposal 1.B: To be honest, we fail to understand the meaning of ‘can be provided simultaneously’ as the following. In RRC level, it is a little bit confusing. It should be ‘Updated simultaneously? Or Applied simultaneously?’ It just for a DCI level, and we may just need to mention ‘in a single DCI or MAC-CE command’.   * + Up to 2 indicated joint TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update   + Up to 2 indicated DL TCI states and up to 2 indicated UL TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update   Proposal 1.C: Some clarification on ‘all joint/DL/UL TCI states’ are needed. If just related to indication behavior, ‘All’ should be removed.  [Mod] Compared with using two TCI fields, where each TCI field can only indicate TCI state(s) for one TRP, using only one TCI field should be able to indicate all TCI states for all TRPs. Wording is revised now.  Proposal 1.D: We are open to Alt1/2.  Proposal 1.E-1: Not support. As we mentioned before, there might be just a mapping/association in RRC level. As what we do for mDCI-mTRP, we may separately provide CORESET pool ID per CORESET and individually provide the TCI state to be associated with a CORESET pool ID. Then, we may consider mapping through the same CORESET pool ID. Based on above analysis, we have the following update:  [Mod] Your proposal can be one alterative. Please suggest. Proposal 1.E-1: When more than one joint/DL TCI states are indicated in a CC/BWP for S-DCI based MTRP, consider the following alternatives to map/associate an indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH on the CC/BWP:  * Atl1: Use RRC configuration ~~per CORESET~~ to inform the UE the mapping/association between ~~which~~ ~~indicated~~ a configured joint/DL TCI state ~~should apply to PDCCH receptions on~~ and the CORESET/CORESET-group * Alt2: Use RRC configuration per search space set to inform the UE which indicated joint/DL TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on the search space set * Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the UE the mapping/association between an activated joint/DL TCI state and the CORESET/CORESET-group ~~indicated DL/joint TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on a CORESET~~ * Alt4: Use DCI to inform the UE the mapping/association between the indicated joint/DL TCI state and the CORESET/CORESET-group ~~which indicated DL/joint TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on a CORESET~~ * Alt5: Based on a fixed mapping/association rule, e.g., the first indicated joint/DL TCI state always applies to PDCCH receptions   Study whether above alternatives are used for PDCCH-SFN as well  Proposal 1.F: Support  Proposal 1.G: It seems that proposal 1.G is relevant to 1.D. If so, we think that we need to handle this case one by one. Technically speaking, we do NOT identify the necessity of another RRC configuration other than CORESET pool ID in such case.  [Mod] Yes, CORESET pool ID is one alternative |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1.B:** we are supportive to the updated proposal.  **Proposal 1.D:** support.  **Proposal 1.E-1**: we are supportive. Thanks to FL for listing all potential solutions.  **Proposal 1.F**: we are fine to study/consider the solution on mapping/association between indicated TCI state(s) and PDSCH. When two indicated joint/DL TCI states are indicated, the following study (at bottom of Proposal 1.F) seems non-exclusive and may address the same issue as Alt.1 and Alt.2.  “Study the mapping between the indicated joint/DL TCI states and PDSCH Tx occasions, non-overlapping FDRAs, and CDM groups if two indicated joint/DL TCI state are applied to PDSCH”  Moreover, we are reluctant to introduce new DCI filed (Alt.1) for mapping of beam indication to PDSCH if this can be solved with simpler solutions. Let’s recall the legacy that in Rel.16 S-DCI multi-PDSCH, the 1st and 2nd TCI states can be associated with PDSCHs, via CDM group, etc. Similar approach can be adopted in Rel.18 too for unified TCI states, though the difference is that unified TCI state cannot be applicable before PDSCH reception. Hence, we think the above-mentioned “study…” can be fine at current stage, and we would not like to rush to design new DCI format which may require additional effort for UE to carry out blind detection.  [Mod] Thanks for the flexibility. We can analyze the pros and cons in the next meeting.  **Proposal 1.G:** we are in general fine.  By reading through Proposal 1.D, our impression is that both Proposal 1.D and Proposal 1.G are trying to solve the common issue for M-DCI mTRP, but in different aspects to touch the mapping or association. Proposal 1.D talks about the association between Joint/DL TCI and CORESETPoolIndex, whereas Proposal 1.G considers two more schemes association between indicated TCI state and RRC parameter other than CORESETPoolIndex (Alt.2) or search space set (Alt.3). Should we give either proposal higher priority to be discussed? If that’s the case, our choice would be to touch Proposal 1.G first.  [Mod] Tend to agree with you, there are correlated. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | **Proposals 1.B – 1.E-1:** Support  **Proposal 1.F:**  The reuse of Rel. 16 S-DCI based MTRP PDSCH TCI-state mapping is not included as mentioned by Xiaomi. So, support including Alt. 3 as proposed by Xiaomi.  [Mod] Added  Moreover, the study mentioned in the last line seems to explore further alternatives than the ones mentioned in the proposal. If that’s the case, the main bullet can state “consider at least the following alternatives”.  [Mod] OK  **Proposal 1.G:** Just a clarification. The subbullets in Alt. 1 seems to discuss other channels and signals while the main bullet is just for PDCCH. If the subbullets explore the broader scope of the index associated with the PDCCH in TCI-state update, aren’t they applicable at least to Alt. 2 as well? If yes, they could additionally be added to Alt. 2 or the subbullets can be added commonly to all the alternatives.  [Mod] Good point. They are moved as main bullets now. |
| Samsung | Proposal 1.B: We are fine to first define the allowable/maximum numbers of joint/DL/UL TCI states. As also pointed out by several companies, some combinations of different types of TCI states, if indicated, seem not valid for multi-TRP operation. We suggest to capture this aspect at least in FFS – fine to not having it in the main proposal for now. [Mod] Done Proposal 1.C: This proposal – including the corresponding FFSs and other bullet points – is for SDCI. We therefore suggest to remove “at least” from the main proposal, which is also consistent with other 1.X proposals (e.g., 1.D is for SDCI’s counterpart MDCI). We also understand from the FL’s explanation that 1.C is for the existing TCI field, and whether to increase the number of TCI states hypotheses should be the next step. [Mod] Yes, if 1.D captures the same mechanism as 1.C, it should be fine to remove “at least”. The first bullet under Alt1 in Proposal 1.D seems not needed. It is in the descriptions of Alt1 that the association between joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and a pool index value follows the association between the corresponding DCI and a pool index value (via the receiving CORESET).Proposal 1.D: On unified TCI framework extension for multi-DCI based MTRP, consider the following alternatives for TCI state update:  * Alt1: Use the existing TCI field in the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate the joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) respective to the same *CORESETPoolIndex* value * Alt2: Use the existing TCI field in any DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) to indicate all joint/DL/UL TCI states   + Study the association between joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value * Alt3: Use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 (with or without DL assignment) associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to indicate joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) respective to the same or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value.   + Whether the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) applies to the channels/signals associated with the same *CORESETPoolIndex* value or different *CORESETPoolIndex* value is indicated by DCI   [Mod] OK, I remove the sub-bullet if this is the common understanding. Proposal 1.E-1: Support.Proposal 1.F: Different from PDCCH reception, using indicator(s) to indicate one out of the M>1 indicated TCI states for PDSCH reception would also have implications on dynamic STRP/MTRP switching indication (similar to the SRS resource set indicator in uplink DCI). We are a bit hesitating to dive into detailed alternatives before we have a clearer understanding of how the proposal is related to dynamic STRP/MTRP switching for PDSCH reception. [Mod] In this proposal, alternatives are listed for mapping/associating one or two indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDSCH. To my understanding, if one is mapped, it is for STRP. If two, it is for MTPR. Then, depending on the signaling design, some alternatives should be able to achieve dynamic STRP/MTRP switching. Proposal 1.G: In general, we are fine to list/discuss alternatives, but we do not see the need of using RRC configuration other than pool index(es) for MDCI. We neither see concrete proposals related to Alt2 or Alt3 – maybe the proponents can elaborate. Otherwise, Alt2 or Alt3 are not needed. |
| Nokia | Proposal 1.B: We are in principle fine with the proposal but we think that multiple indicated TCI states (e.g. up to two indicated separate DL and UL) should also be supported and useful in sTRP case. Thus, we would like to add: Proposal 1.B: On unified TCI framework extension, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP at least for MTRP operation [Mod] However, multiple companies have concern to add “at least”. I add it with brackets now.  Proposal 1.C: Support.  Proposal 1.D: Ok with the proposal even though we don’t see need for Alt3.  Proposal 1.E-1: Fine with the proposal, and Alt5 seems sufficient as there are RRC configurations coming from legacy (e.g., For PDCCH repetition (search space set linking), the second indicated TCI state may applied to the linked CORESET. For SFN PDCCH (RRC configure these CORESETs), first and second indicated TCI states applied to those CORESETs.). Alt2 seems to be against the existing principle between TCI state and PDCCH reception (TCI state is provided for a CORESET).  Proposal 1.F: We think that also implicit determination should be considered as option. Thus, we propose to add   * Alt3: Other alternatives not precluded, e.g. implicit determination   [Mod] I put a note to clarify this. Proposal 1.G: Ok. We do not think Alt.3 is needed or align with the general principle of having TCI state per CORESET. |
| CATT | Proposal 1.B: As highlighted in the following bullets, both simultaneously and together are used for TCI state combinations. If the same meaning is assumed for FFS, we prefer to use the same wording, e.g. ‘together with’ is replaced by ‘simultaneously’. Proposal 1.B: On unified TCI framework extension, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation  * + Up to 2 indicated joint TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update   + Up to 2 indicated DL TCI states and up to 2 indicated UL TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update   + Note: It does not imply that joint TCI state(s) and DL/UL TCI state(s) can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP   + FFS: Whether up to 1 indicated joint TCI state can be provided together with up to 1 indicated DL TCI state and/or up to 1 indicated UL TCI state(s) in a CC/BWP   In addition, the main bullet is for MTRP operation. According to the above sub-bullets, there is still the case that only one indicated joint TCI state is provided. Does it mean this case is also for MTRP? If not, we prefer to delete ‘Up to’. Proposal 1.B: On unified TCI framework extension, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation  * + ~~Up to~~ 2 indicated joint TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update   + ~~Up to~~ 2 indicated DL TCI states and ~~up to~~ 2 indicated UL TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update   + Note: It does not imply that joint TCI state(s) and DL/UL TCI state(s) can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP   + FFS: Whether ~~up to~~ 1 indicated joint TCI state can be provided together with ~~up to~~ 1 indicated DL TCI state and/or ~~up to~~ 1 indicated UL TCI state(s) in a CC/BWP   [Mod] This proposal is intended to define the max numbers, thus removing “up to” will make this issue open. I think it should be clear that it is not possible to support MTRP with only one joint TCI states.  Proposal 1.C: The meaning of ‘all joint/DL/UL TCI states’ is ambiguous. We prefer to remove ‘all’ unless a further clarification.  [Mod] Please check the revised version.  Proposal 1.D: support  Proposal 1.E-1: In our opinion, for Alt1-Alt4, the mapping/association between TCI states and CORESET/search space still needs an indicator (referring to the first TCI or second TCI). We prefer to add a sub-bullet:   * + For Alt-1~Alt-4, an indicator(s) can be signalled to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should be applied to PDCCH receptions on the CC/BWP   [Mod] Since this is for study, let’s capture them in high level. Whether it is indicator(s) or parameter(s) can be further discussed.  Proposal 1.F: support.  Proposal 1.G: We share similar views as ZTE that proposal 1.G is related proposal 1.D. We prefer to discuss proposal 1.D first. |
| InterDigital | The latest updated versions of the FL proposals 1.B, C, D, E-1, F, G are okay. |
| Lenovo | Proposal 1.B: Support.  Proposal 1.C: Support.  Proposal 1.E-1: We prefer not have the word “at least”, given there are already 5 alternative solutions proposed. If some company has a new alternative solution, it is best to spell it out at this time.  [Mod] Since this is the first meeting, it should be fine to let company investigate protentional mechanisms.  Proposal 1.F: We have the same view as Samsung. It is better to resolve the issue of dynamic switching between sTRP and mTRP before going into the details.  [Mod] In this proposal, alternatives are listed for mapping/associating one or two indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDSCH. To my understanding, if one is mapped, it is for STRP. If two, it is for MTPR. Then, depending on the signaling design, some alternatives should be able to achieve dynamic STRP/MTRP switching.  Proposal 1.G: How are more than one joint/DL TCI states are indicated? Are they indicated by a single DCI or more than one DCIs? Our understanding for M-DCI based TRP is that each DCI contains one joint/DL DCI. The discussion shall be based on this assumption (for a single DCI). Please clarify the scenario. Thanks.  [Mod] Your question is addressed in Proposal 1.D. |
| QC | For 1.B, support  For 1.C, support  For 1.D, support Alt1, similar to R16  For 1.E-1, support Alt1, similar to R17 useUnifiedTCI flag  For 1.F, support Alt1. A new field is cleaner  For 1.G, support Alt1, similar to R16 |
| Futurewei2 | **Proposal 1.B:** We have one comment on the first note. Regarding the term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states”, our view is that this term is intended to refer to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply simultaneously (instead of over time) to the channels/signals that share the “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” in a CC/BWP. Therefore, we would like to suggest the following modifications to make it clear:  [Mod] Correct understanding! Done. Proposal 1.B: On unified TCI framework extension, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation  * Note: The term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” refers to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply simultaneously to the channels/signals that share the “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” in a CC/BWP * …   **Proposal 1.C:** Support.  **Proposal 1.D:** Support.  **Proposal 1.E-1:** Support.  **Proposal 1.F:** Support.  **Proposal 1.G:** We are in general ok with the proposal and we prefer Alt1. We share the same view as other companies that Proposals 1.G and 1.D are highly correlated and Proposal 1.D should be discussed and concluded first before discussing Proposal 1.G. |
| NEC | Proposal 1.C: support  Proposal 1.D: support  Proposal 1.E-1: support  Proposal 1.F: support  Proposal 1.G: support |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1.B: Support.  Proposal 1.C: For “can indicate joint/DL/UL TCI states respective to all TRPs”, it does not exclude that “can indicate joint/DL/UL TCI state respective to a single TRP”, is it a correct understanding?  [Mod] Correct  Proposal 1.D: Support.  Proposal 1.E-1: One question for clarification is as follows. As for the sentence “When more than one joint/DL TCI states are ***indicated*** in a CC/BWP for S-DCI based MTRP”, does it mean “***indicated***” by a DCI? Then during the application time of the more than one TCI states, the proposal further determines which TCI state apply to PDCCH for S-DCI based mTRP.  [Mod] It doesn't have to be the number indicated by one DCI indication instance. Like the first FFS in Proposal 1.B, we need to further discuss this issue.  Proposal 1.F: From our understanding, it seems that it is to support the following functionality.  - Firstly, two TCI states are indicated.  - Then, during the application time of the two TCI states, either one of the two TCI states or two TCI states can apply to PDSCH.  If it is the intention, maybe the functionality itself can be firstly agreed before agreeing on the detailed alternatives. Therefore, the following modification can be considered where the main sentence is revised and detailed alternatives are deleted. Proposal 1.F: When ~~more than one~~ two joint/DL TCI states are indicated in a CC/BWP for S-DCI based MTRP, ~~consider the following alternatives~~ it is supported to map/associate one or two indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDSCH on the CC/BWP. [Mod] Your understating is more like Alt3 in this proposal. However, from some companies’ point of view, UE may need to maintain two TCI states simultaneously regardless DCI indication instance, and the DCI indication is just used for updating the two maintained TCI states, instead of indicating which TCI state(s) should apply to the scheduled PDSCH.  Proposal 1.G: Although the two sub-bullets previously under Alt1 are moved outside of Alt1, they may not apply to Alt2 or Alt3. This is because Alt2 and Alt3 do not use *CORESETPoolIndex* but use some other RRC configuration instead. However, the two sub-bullets are still saying “associated with *CORESETPoolIndex*”, which may only apply to Alt1. Maybe the simplest way is to just delete them and focus only on PDCCH.  [Mod] Good suggestion. Proposal 1.G: When more than one joint/DL TCI states are indicated in a CC/BWP for M-DCI based MTRP, consider the following alternatives to map/associate an indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH on the CC/BWP  * Atl1: For a CORESET configured/associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values, the UE should apply the indicated joint/DL TCI state respective to the *CORESETPoolIndex* value to PDCCH receptions on the CORESET   + Study whether an explicit association between an indicated joint/DL TCI state and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value is needed, or association can be determined implicitly   + ~~Study whether the indicated joint/DL TCI state also applies to other channels/signals that are explicitly or implicitly associated with the~~ *~~CORESETPoolIndex~~* ~~value~~   + ~~Study how to map/associate an indicated joint/DL TCI state to channels/signals that don't have explicit/implicit association with any~~ *~~CORESETPoolIndex~~* ~~value~~ * Alt2: Use RRC configuration other than *CORESETPoolIndex* per CORESET to inform the UE which indicated joint/DL TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on the CORESET * Alt3: Use RRC configuration other than *CORESETPoolIndex* per search space set to inform the UE which indicated joint/DL TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on the search space set |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | **Proposal 1.B:**  As discussed in our earlier entry, we cannot agree with Proposal 1.B in this form. We disagree with our moderator that “based on agreed use case last week, in addition to legacy MTRP schemes, only STxMP will be further considered, but not CJT”. To our understanding, neither of the agreements last week preclude CJT. The agreement last week states:   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  On unified TCI framework extension, consider all the intra and inter-cell MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17   * Consider, if STxMP is supported, Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP |   We are not sure how about from the above agreement in could be inferred that CJT is not supported. Studying CJT with up to for 4 TRPs is part of the WID and we think it is more constructive to not to close the door on supporting Unified TCI state for 4 TRP CJT right in the first meeting of Rel-18. Having said that, we can accept Propsal 1.B with the following changes: Proposal 1.B (modified): On unified TCI framework extension, support more than one indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation  * Note: The term “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” refers to a set of joint/DL/UL TCI states that UE needs to maintain and apply to the channels/signals that share the “indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states” in a CC/BWP * The indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation   + ~~Up to 2 indicated joint TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for joint DL/UL TCI update~~   + ~~Up to 2 indicated DL TCI states and up to 2 indicated UL TCI states can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP for separate DL/UL TCI update~~   + ~~Note: It does not imply that joint TCI state(s) and DL/UL TCI state(s) can be provided simultaneously in a CC/BWP, and whether up to 1 indicated joint TCI state can be provided together with up to 1 indicated DL TCI state and/or up to 1 indicated UL TCI state(s) in a CC/BWP is FFS~~   + FFS: How to determine the exact number of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states that need to be maintained in a CC/BWP, e.g., based on the indicated TCI codepoint, TCI state activation, or RRC configuration   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP   + FFS: How to map/apply one or ~~two~~ more indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states to a target channel(s)/signal(s)   **Proposal 1.C:** OK.  **Proposal 1.D:** We prefer to have the removed subbullet back. If it is controversial, we can add the following subbulet under Alt2: Consider the possible association between joint/DL/UL TCI state(s) and a *CORESETPoolIndex* value.  **Proposal 1.E-1:**  We think that for different PDCCH transmission schemes (PDCCH-SFN, PDCCH repetition, single TRP PDCCH(in the case of dynamic S-TRP/M-TRP switch)), the mapping rule of TCI-state can be different. This needs to be captured in the proposal. We suggest the following changes: Proposal 1.E-1 (modified): When more than one joint/DL TCI states are indicated in a CC/BWP for S-DCI based MTRP, consider the following alternatives to map/associate an indicated joint/DL TCI state to PDCCH on the CC/BWP:  * Atl1: Use RRC configuration per CORESET to inform the UE which indicated joint/DL TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on the CORESET * Alt2: Use RRC configuration per search space set to inform the UE which indicated joint/DL TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on the search space set * Alt3: Use MAC-CE to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on a CORESET * Alt4: Use DCI to inform the UE which indicated DL/joint TCI state should apply to PDCCH receptions on a CORESET * Alt5: Based on a fixed mapping/association rule, e.g., the first indicated joint/DL TCI state always applies to PDCCH receptions   Study whether above alternatives are used for PDCCH-SFN, PDCCH repetition as well as STRP PDCCH (in case of dynamic STRP/MTRP switch)  Note: the solution for each of the above PDCCH schemes should be considered independently.  **Proposal 1.F:** OK.  **Proposal 1.G:** OK. |

# Issue 2 – UL Power Control for UL MTRP

Open issues on UL PC for UL MTRP and company views are summarized below.

Table 3 Summary for Issue 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **Moderator notes/observation** |
| 2.1 | Discussion on Issue 2 should start after simultaneous UL transmission schemes are determined in AI 9.1.4.1 | Support: Samsung, ZTE, Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon, Intel  Concern: Nokia, LG | From moderator perspective, sub-issue 2.2 still can be discussed first, at least for Rel-17 UL MTRP |
| 2.2 | Reuse Rel-17 TCI-specific UL PC parameter setting (including PLRS, and per-PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS P0, alpha, CL index) to support per panel/TRP power control | Support: Ericsson, Docomo, OPPO, vivo, Futurewei, Xiaomi, Lenovo, MTK, LGE, Fujitsu, CATT, Apple, Nokia, NEC, TransHold, Intel  Concern: | Given the majority view on this issue, Proposal 2.A is recommended at least for Rel-17 UL MTRP.  How to handle the case if the indicated joint or UL TCI states for S-DCI based UL MTRP are not associated with power control settings can be further discussed |
| 2.4 | Tx power limitation for simultaneous UL transmission | Study per-panel power limit   * Support: Nokia, OPPO, Docomo, Huawei, ZTE, Qualcomm (per-TRP), vivo (LS to RAN4), CATT, Spreadtrum, LGE, Lenovo, CMCC, Apple, NEC, TransHold * Concern:   Study total power limit shared by two panels   * Support: Huawei, CATT, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Apple, Intel, NEC, OPPO, ZTE, LG, TransHold * Concern: |  |
| 2.5 | Send LS to RAN4 to check the feasibility for above two cases | Support: vivo, Apple, Lenovo, QC, CMCC, Xiaomi, DOCOMO, Futurewei, Ericsson, Fujitsu  Concern: |  |

## Proposal 2.B: On UE power limitation for STxMP, send LS to RAN4 to check the followings:

* Whether if feasible to assume power limitation per-panel for simultaneous UL transmission across multiple UE panels
* Whether if feasible to assume a total power limitation that is shared by multiple UE panels used for simultaneous UL transmission
* If both assumptions are feasible, whether both assumptions can be applied to a same UE, and what is the relationship between the per-panel power limitation and total power limitation if both are applied?

FFS: Detail of exact LS if agreed

Table 4 Additional inputs for Issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your inputs on sub-issue 2.5 and Proposal 2.B** |
| Samsung | The reason to send LS is not clear, since many companies share view that both scenario could be studied in RAN1. Unless strong concerns are found in either scenario, we may not need to send LS to RAN4.  But we would respect majority views. |
| Ericsson | OK. |
| Futurewei | Fine with FL proposal. |
| Apple | Support FL proposal.  As explained in the 1st round, the per-panel power control option (i.e., the 1st sub-bullet) is feasible on condition that RAN4 plans to define a new panel-specific maximum transmission power, which is NOT available in current RAN4 FR2 spec. |
| Xiaomi | Support proposal 2.B. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with FL proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Support proposal 2.B.  Just one suggestion on a minor editorial issue: Proposal 2.B: Send LS to RAN4 to check the feasibility of the followings:  * Power limitation per-panel for simultaneous UL transmission across multiple UE panels * A total power limitation that is shared by multiple UE panels used for simultaneous UL transmission   [Mod] Thanks |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| LG | Fine in general with the proposal. There’s a small typo in the first bullet (i.e. across multiple UE panels).  In our view, it is also possible to have both assumption, i.e. per-panel power limit + per UE power limit for a UE, so we suggest to include that question in the LS as well.  [Mod] We can further discuss when draft the LS, if agreed |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal in general. But we think further clarification is needed.   * + - For the first sub-bullet, it means Pc,max,1(for panel 1) and Pc,max,2(for panel 2) can be configured respectively, but whether the sum of Pc,max,1 and Pc,max,2 can be equal to or larger than per CC Pc,max (legacy definition) is not clear.     - For the second sub-bullet, regarding the shared total power limitation, whether Pc,max,1 = Pc,max,2 = Pc,max(legacy) or Pc,max1 + Pc,max2 = Pc,max(legacy) is not clear to us.   Hence we suggest to modify the proposal to be: Proposal 2.B: Send LS to RAN4 to check the feasibility of the followings:  * Power limitation per-panel for simultaneous UL transmission across multiple UE panes * A total power limitation that is shared by multiple UE panels used for simultaneous UL transmission * If both may be specified, whether the sum of power limitation per-panel can be larger than the total power limitation, or should be always the same.   [Mod] We can further discuss when draft the LS, if agreed |
| OPPO | Support the FL proposal and we think the exact LS can be carefully drafted if agreed. |
| AT&T | Share the view with Samsung that RAN1 can study both scenarios, but ok to send the LS. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | To our understanding, so far in RAN4, all Tx requirements are defined with the assumption for one panel. Even when two panels could be switched for different beams, there will be only one panel in operation at a time. Further, to our knowledge, no simultaneous multi-panel transmission has been discussed in RAN4 so far.  In a related discussion in 9.1.4.1, some of the colleagues from other companies refer to the recent agreed requirements for inter-band CA for IBM to infer that each panel in STxMP scheme can transmit with the maximum power of 23dBm; effectively allowing the UE to transmit with the maximum of 26 dBm and violating the maximum TRP (total radiated power) restriction that is set by PC2-PC5 UEs.  We should note that although for inter-band CA for IBM, there is an agreement in RAN4 that max TRP is a per band limitation, and, hence, a UE operating in inter-band CA, can transmit larger power than max TRP, still all the following conditions hold:   * + - 1. inter-band CA for IBM is a single-panel case. Both bands use the same panel at a time. The max TRP is the limitation for each band, and, hence, the power for the panel could be larger than the max TRP (which, in this case, is set for one band).       2. The requirement framework is only applicable to PC1 and PC5 UEs, only applicable to inter-band UL CA with IBM, and further, for PC1 is limited to only n260+n261 and for PC5 is limited to only n257+n259.   Further, since it is the first meeting for Rel-18 RAN1 discussion, and RAN4 has never discussed multi-panel requirement, it might be too early to send an LS to RAN4. However, we would not object sending an LS. The wording of the LS needs to be careful and specific though. For instance, the following could be used as a starting point:   |  | | --- | | For a PC2-PC5 UE (with TRP 23dBm) that is equipped with two panels, is it allowed to simultaneously transmit with 23 dBm from both panels in the following cases?  1) In the single carrier scenario;  2) In the case of intra-band CA where the two panels transmit in disjoint set of CCs;  3) In the case of intra-band CA where the two panels transmit in at least partially overlapping set of CCs;  4) In the case of inter-band CA where the two panels transmit in non-overlapping bands;  5) In the case of inter-band CA where the two panels transmit in all bands of the inter-band CA; | |
| Lenovo | Support. |
| Intel | We can check feasibility with RAN4 based on their current understanding but it should not mean that if there is no current support from RAN4, RAN1 cannot study or specify either option. We think both options should be studied in RAN1. |
| Mod V1 | **Please check updated Proposal 2.B** |
| Transsion | Support the updated proposal. We think both options should be studied in RAN1. |
| Xiaomi | Support the updated proposal. |
| ZTE | Support. Then, we think that the following can be captured in the LS as a question. Thank you.   * If both may be specified, whether the sum of power limitation per-panel can be larger than the total power limitation, or should be always the same. |
| OPPO | Support the updated Proposal 2.B. |
| Samsung | O.K. |
| Nokia | We are fine with the updated Proposal 2.B. |
| CATT | Support the updated Proposal 2.B. We think both options can be studied in RAN1. |
| Lenovo | Fine with Proposal 2.B. |
| QC | Support Proposal 2.B |
| NEC | Proposal 2.B |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Mod V2 | **Add one more question to RAN4 per request from ZTE and LG** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | As discussed in our earlier entry, all Tx requirements are defined with the assumption for one panel so far in RAN4. Even when two panels could be switched for different beams, there will be only one panel in operation at a time. Further, to our knowledge, no simultaneous multi-panel transmission has been discussed in RAN4 so far. Since it is the first meeting for Rel-18 RAN1 discussion, and RAN4 has never discussed multi-panel requirement, it might be too early to send an LS to RAN4. However, we would not object sending an LS but the wording needs to be clearer. In particular, it should be clarified that the two panel do not necessarily transmit across multiple bands or on different bands, that is, a primary application is a single carrier scenario. We suggest the following changes: Proposal 2.B (modified): Proposal 2.B: On UE power limitation for STxMP, send LS to RAN4 to check the followings:  * Whether if feasible to assume power limitation per-panel for simultaneous UL transmission across multiple UE panels * Whether if feasible to assume a total power limitation that is shared by multiple UE panels used for simultaneous UL transmission * If both assumptions are feasible, whether both assumptions can be applied to a same UE, and what is the relationship between the per-panel power limitation and total power limitation if both are applied?   Note: Scenarios of concern include at least single carrier scenario. |

# Issue 3 – Beam reporting and beam failure recovery

Open issues on beam reporting and BFR enhancements and company views are summarized below.

Table 5 Summary for Issue 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **Moderator notes/observation** |
| 3.1 | Enhance/extend group-based reporting to support simultaneous UL transmission | Support: Qualcomm, Samsung, vivo, MTK, Nokia, Xiaomi, ZTE, Huawei  Concern: Apple, Ericsson, OPPO | This issue can be discussed once any Rel-18 MTRP scheme for simultaneous UL transmission is agreed |
| 3.2 | Enhance/extend Rel-17 UE capability index reporting to support simultaneous UL transmission | Support: Samsung, Nokia, CATT, LGE, MTK, AT&T, QC, Apple, Docomo, Lenovo, Xiaomi, OPPO, ZTE, Huawei  Concern: Ericsson | This issue can be discussed once any Rel-18 MTRP scheme for simultaneous UL transmission is agreed |
| 3.3 | Enhancement to TRP-specific BFR under unified TCI framework | Support: InterDigital, vivo, Samsung, Apple, Qualcomm, Docomo, Nokia, NEC, Lenovo, Xiaomi, ZTE, Spreadtrum, TransHold, Huawei  Concern: Ericsson |  |

## Proposal 3.A: Study and, if needed, specify the following:

* Enhancement to group-based reporting (including Rel-17 enhanced group-based reporting) to support STxMP, if STxMP is supported
* Enhancement to Rel-17 UE capability index reporting to support STxMP, if STxMP is supported
* Enhancement to TRP-specific BFR under unified TCI framework

Table 6 Additional inputs for Issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please check and update your views in Table 5** |
| QC | We are also fine for 3.2 with table updated |
| Apple | For beam report, in our view, current group based beam report cannot be reused, as it cannot provide enough information for simultaneous transmission. |
| Samsung | We don’t see strong association between supported STxMP tx schemes and beam management for STxMP.  But O.K. to focus on other issues first before we tread this one. |
| Docomo | Added our views in the table. |
| Nokia | Added our views in the table. |
| NEC | We support to study issue#3.3. |
| Ericsson | We are OK to study 3.1 and 3.2 in AI 9.1.4.1. (In our view, 3.1 is needed, 3.2 is not needed). 3.3 is out of scope of the WI. |
| Lenovo | Added our views in the table. |
| vivo | Current description of 3.1 and 3.2 is not clear. Details should be provided for us to make decision. Additionally, we wonder whether 3.1 and 3.2 are exclusive? For example, can extending Rel-17 UE capability correspondence reporting work in group-based beam reporting?  We suggest further study on this issue. |
| Futurewei | Our view is that these issues should be treated with lower priority than those listed under Issues 1 and 2. |
| CATT | We think how to facilitate gNB to know the association of panels and beams should be studied. 3.2 can be studied as a start point. |
| Xiaomi | Added our view in the table, same view with Vivo that 3.1 and 3.2 are two approaches to solve this issue. The use of the index of UE capability value set can be a starting point to facilitate the simultaneous multi-panel transmission. We think this issue is important for STxMP, and we are fine to either discuss here or in AI 9.1.4.1. |
| OPPO | Add our concern on Issue 3.1 that group-based reporting is based on DL operation in which UE may apply single Rx beam for receiving two DL beams. As for STxMP, such group-based reporting cannot be simply feasible for UL transmission.  On Issue 3.2, we think it’s time to remove the artificial constraint on UE capability value set reporting. But we are fine to hold a while until there are progresses on STxMP in other AI. |
| ZTE | Please review our position in the above table. Generally speaking, we tend to agree with Samsung. We can first focus on the discussion of issue 1 and 2, and then consider issue 3 after they are stable. |
| QC | Among all 3 issues, we suggest to prioritize issue 3.1, which is needed for simultaneous UL beam Tx.   * To Apple/OPPO, agree the current group-based report cannot be reused. Our understanding is that the issue 3.1 is to investigate how to make it work * To E///, we think the beam reporting issue should be treated in 9.1.1.1, since 9.1.4.1 is mostly for non-beam related issues, e.g. precoder as in the WID |
| Fujitsu | In our view, beam reporting should at least be able to distinguish STxMP scheme and panel selection/TDM-based scheme. In that sense, we are also open to the beam reporting 3.1 and 3.2. |
| Spreadtrum | We support 3.3 with table updated. Same view as vivo, we think the scheme in issue 3.1 and 3.2 could be described in detail before we have further discussion. |
| CMCC | At this stage, both 3.1 and 3.2 can be viewed as potential way to facilitate simultaneous UL transmission. For issue 3.3, we support to study it in this AI. |
| Transsion | Added our views in the table. |
| Samsung | We support 3.3 BFR enhancements. We think it is within the scope. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **3.1:** Support.  **3.2:** Just to clarify, does the “UE capability correspondence reporting” refers to the capability value based reporting? If so, then we can support it.  [Mod] Yes. Wording is revised to avoid confusion.  **3.3:** Ok to support. |
| Intel | **3.1** can be studied. Others are of lower priority and should be discussed after STxMP schemes are discussed in 9.1.4.1. Ideally 3.2 should be discussed in 9.1.4.1. |
| Mod V1 | Revised wording for sub-issues 3.1 and 3.2 to avoid confusion |
| Samsung | As response to Ericsson, for further clarification,  TRP specific BFR enhancement in Rel-18 should focus on the possible issues raised by extending unified TCI framework to cover MTRP. So the procedure(s) of BFR not related to beam indication/update under MTRP unified TCI framework would be excluded in the discussion.  In addition, please be noted that with unified TCI, most beam management or related operations should be associated with TCI state, and operation per TCI state should be the baseline (and potential BFR enhancements can be progressed along with the progress of issue 1 beam indication/update). While in current design, without modification, BFR would be the only exception.  I hope this explanation can verity why TRP specific BFR can be discussed within the scope. |
| CATT | As captured in the above table, we support 3.2. |
| LG | For STxMP, we firstly need to remove artificial constraints of UE capability value, i.e. it is only applicable to MPUE having different number of ports across panels. Otherwise, gNB has no information on preferred UL beams for each panel which is fundamental information for STxMP BM. Thus, we suggest to prioritize 3.2. |
| Mod V1 | Please check new proposal 3.A |
| Transsion | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support Proposal 3.A. |
| ZTE | Support the FL proposal. |
| OPPO | We can live with studying these issues. Some editorial modification is listed in the following bullets for consideration.   * Enhancement to group-based reporting (including Rel-17 enhanced group-based reporting) to support STxMP, if supported * Enhancement to Rel-17 UE capability value [set] index reporting to support STxMP, if supported |
| Samsung | Support Proposal 3.A. |
| Nokia | Support the proposal. |
| CATT | Support new proposal 3.A. |
| InterDigital | Support Proposal 3.A. |
| Lenovo | Support Proposal 3.A. |
| QC | Support FL’s proposal 3.A |
| Mod V2 | Please check updated proposal 3.A |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | The proposal is too detailed and we don’t see any reason to support it at this stage. STxMP is planned to be evaluated and companies are just trying to finalize EVM. If it turns out that STxMP should be supported based on the evaluations campaign, we can then move forward with to study/specify these details. Spending online/offline time resources during the meetings on these detail issues when STxMP is not even supported yet seems unwarranted. |

# Other potential issues

Table 7 Inputs for other potential issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your view if there is any open issue that need to be addressed with high priority but is not captured above** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Appendix A: Agreements before/in RAN1#109-e

**Agreement**

On unified TCI framework extension, consider all the intra and inter-cell MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17

* Consider, if STxMP is supported, Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP

**Agreement**

On unified TCI framework extension, if an indicated joint or UL TCI state applies to a PUSCH /PUCCH transmission occasion at least for S-DCI based PUSCH/PUCCH repetition with TDM and the indicated joint or UL TCI state is associated with an UL PC parameter setting for PUSCH /PUCCH (including P0, alpha for PUSCH , and closed loop index) and a PL-RS, the UE should apply the UL PC parameter setting and the PL-RS for the PUSCH /PUCCH transmission occasion.

* FFS: How to extend to other Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP, if supported
* FFS: UL PC enhancement for CB and non-CB SRS in above case

FFS: The applied UL PC parameter setting if one or both indicated joint or UL TCI state(s) is not associated with an UL PC parameter setting (including P0, alpha for PUSCH, and closed loop index) for PUCCH/PUSCH
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