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Introduction

In RAN1#104-e meeting, an LS from RAN4 was received on TCI state indication at Direct SCell activation [1] and the following issue description is drawn from RAN4 while the solution to the issue is RAN1/RAN2 aspect:

* Current RRC command for direct SCell activation does not include TCI state activation information to UE. In current framework, network needs to send separate MAC CE to complete direct SCell activation procedure. Due to this both gNB and UE may not realise the full benefit of direction SCell activation feature using existing framework. The above mentioned issue applies to both FR1 and FR2.

Several related contributions on discussion and draft reply LS were submitted in this meeting [2]-[4]. As guided by the Chairman, this contribution provides a summary of the submitted contributions, discussion points and outcomes of email discussion during this meeting:

[104-e-NR-MRDC-CA-03] Email discussion/approval of a potential reply LS to [R1-2100013](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_104\Docs\R1-2100013.zip) until Jan-29 - James (MediaTek)

Discussion points (phase 1 until 27-Jan)

Based on the submitted inputs [2]-[4], it is mentioned in [2] that a default selection of TCI states according to current 38.213/38.214 spec is enough to tackle RAN4’s issue about direct SCell activation. A separate MAC-CE may not be necessary due the following text in 38.214 5.1.5:

* After a UE receives an initial higher layer configuration of TCI states and before reception of the activation command, the UE may assume that the DM-RS ports of PDSCH of a serving cell are quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block **determined in the initial access procedure**

or when only a single TCI state is configured.

In [3][4], they empathize with RAN4 that a separate MAC-CE is required to complete direct SCell activation procedure in current framework due to lack of TCI state activation information. In [3], it is elaborated that to further realise the full benefit of direction SCell activation, this would involve

* an RRC command update (RAN2 spec impact) or
* a default TCI state definition for direct SCell activation (RAN1 spec impact)

while [3][4] both prefer not to introduce further direct SCell optimization in RAN1 R16 spec due to the late stage in R16.

To moderator’s understanding, RAN1 should first clarify whether a separate MAC-CE is required to complete direct SCell activation procedure as RAN4 indicated. If it is required, RAN1 can further discuss whether a RAN1-based solution is necessary in R16. For the RAN2-based solution, it should be up to RAN2 to decide whether to develop a solution.

The following questions are devised in order to formulate potential answers to RAN4’s questions. Companies are encouraged to provide their inputs below.

Question 1 (Whether a separate MAC-CE is required to complete direct SCell activation procedure in current framework due to lack of TCI state activation information):

**Do you agree with RAN4 that a separate MAC-CE is required to complete direct SCell activation procedure in current framework?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| MTK | Yes | To our understanding, "TCI determined in the initial access procedure" mentioned in [2] only applies to PCell, not SCell. For “single TCI state configured” mentioned in [2], it is kind of a special case and not a general solution. Therefore, we agree with RAN4 that a separate MAC-CE is required to complete direct SCell activation procedure in current framework. |
| ZTE | Yes | Based on our understanding, considering one specific example, i.e., FR1 (PCell)+FR2 (SCell) CA, “TCI determined in the initial access procedure” may be more appropriate to be applies to PCell only.  From this perspective, a separate MAC-CE is required to complete direct SCell activation procedure. But of course, RAN2 may come up with some other solutions to handle this issue, e.g., introducing RRC IE to configure the TCI state. |
| Nokia, NSB | No | There are quite few cases when the TCI activation does not require a MAC CE   * By default, a serving cell's TCI state points to the SS/PBCH block (without any configuration) * If only a single TCI state is configured for PDCCH, that is always considered activated and no separate MAC CE activation is needed * For QCL type D, the PDSH TCI state in RRC\_CONNECTED is determined according to the CORESET with the smallest *controlResourceSetId* that is configured for active BWP of serving cell |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| vivo | No | Besides the case mentioned by Nokia. There is one additional case.  For a CORESET with index 0, the UE assumes that a DM-RS antenna port for PDCCH receptions in the CORESET is quasi co-located with  - the one or more DL RS configured by a TCI state, where the TCI state is indicated by a MAC CE activation command for the CORESET, if any, or  - a SS/PBCH block the UE identified during a most recent random access procedure not initiated by a PDCCH order that triggers a contention-free random access procedure, if no MAC CE activation command indicating a TCI state for the CORESET is received after the most recent random access procedure. |
| CATT | Yes | Additional MAC message is needed for the SCell TCI state in SCell activation. |
| FUTUREWEI | No | Though there can be enhancement, we do not see the need to have this in Rel-16. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | As mentioned by Nokia/vivo, in some cases, MAC-CE activation would not be needed. Given that there are cases that do not require MAC-CE, and MAC-CE can be sent if really needed, we don’t think further enhancement to Rel-16 is justified. |
| Intel | Yes |  |

Question 2 (RAN1-based solution in R16):

**RAN4 LS mentioned that the solution to the issue is RAN1/RAN2 aspect. Do you agree that RAN1 should devise a solution for this issue in R16 if the issue is valid?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| MTK | Yes | It may be late in R16, but realizing the full benefit of direction SCell activation feature using existing framework is helpful for system performance enhancement. Companies can discuss proposals in this or next RAN1 meeting to finalize the solution. |
| ZTE | No | From our perspective, it is too late to introduce RAN1 solutions to address this issue. We noticed that companies submitted some layer-2 based solutions in RAN2, it may be better to leave this issue to RAN2 to avoid parallel discussion in RAN1 and RAN2. |
| Nokia | No | From our view, there are cases when the MAC-CE for activating the TCI state as part of SCell activation is not a mandatory pre-requisite, and don’t see the need to device a new solution for the problem that is not really there. |
| Qualcomm | No | RAN2 should define the solution, i.e., adding the TCI state in RRC signalling |
| vivo | No | Too late for Rel-16 enhancement. |
| CATT | No | No additional enhancement for Rel-16 |
| FUTUREWEI | No | We also think it is too late for Rel-16 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | As mentioned in our response to Question 1, MAC-CE activation is not always needed. And it is also too late to further optimize Rel-16, given that there are cases which do not require MAC-CE and MAC-CE can be sent if really needed. |
| Intel | No | We also think it is too late for Rel-16 |

Question 3 (RAN2-based solution):

**RAN4 LS mentioned that the solution to the issue is RAN1/RAN2 aspect. Do you agree that it should be up to RAN2 to decide whether a RAN2-based solution is required?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| MTK | Yes | It should be up to RAN2. |
| ZTE | Yes | This topic is led by RAN2, it is better to wait for RAN’s input first. If RAN2 resolves this issue, then no RAN1-based solution is needed. |
| Nokia | Yes | RAN2 can decide if they believe something is needed, but in our view it is important to inform RAN2 in addition to RAN4 of the somewhat misleading understanding conveyed in the RAN4 LS. A suggestion for this with the corresponding RAN1 spec references is in [R1-2100502](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100502.zip) |
| Qualcomm | Yes | RNA1 can agree that a solution is needed, and it is up to RAN2 to define the solution. |
| Vivo | Yes | It is up to RAN2. |
| CATT | Yes | It is up to RAN2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Yes | The details can be up to RAN2. However, we think it is too late for Rel-16. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Irrelevant | We don’t think RAN1 needs to discuss this. |
| Intel | Yes | It should be up to RAN2. |

Proposed reply LS answers / outcome (phase 2 until 29-Jan)

**1. Overall Description:**

RAN1 thanks RAN4 for the LS regarding TCI state indication at Direct SCell activation. RAN1 understands that in current framework, a TCI state activation is required in addition to the RRC activation command to complete the direct SCell activation procedure if more than one TCI states are configured. It is mentioned by RAN4 that the solution to the issue is RAN1/RAN2 aspect. However, from RAN1 perspective, no further enhancement for this issue is intended in Rel-16. Whether to develop a RAN2-based solution is up to RAN2.

**2. Actions:**

**To RAN4:**

RAN1 kindly asks RAN4 to take the above response into account for the corresponding future works.

**Question: Is the above proposed reply answer for RAN4 acceptable? If not, which part is not acceptable and any suggested modification?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Yes | We would suggest to have the following update.  However, from RAN1 perspective, no further RAN1-based enhancement for this issue is intended in Rel-16. Whether to develop a RAN2-based solution is up to RAN2. |
| Nokia | Not quite | 1. Even if there are several TCI states configured, the one associated with the monitored search space with the lowest *controlResourceSetId* can be used as default for intra-band CA.  RAN1 understands that in current framework, a TCI state activation is required for inter-band CA in addition to the RRC activation command to complete the direct SCell activation procedure if more than one TCI states are configured, while for intra-band CA a default CORESET of the PCell can be used as a default TCI reference for the activated SCell.  2. We are ok with or without the ZTE update. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | As pointed out by Nokia/vivo, in the reply it should be mentioned that in some cases MAC-CE activation would not be required. And, we suggest removing the last sentence ‘Whether to develop a RAN2-based solution is up to RAN2’, as RAN2 is the leading WG and RAN1 does not need to remind RAN2 what to do (which may unintentionally imply that RAN1 is recommending RAN2 to consider RAN2-based solution). |
| Intel | No | We agree with comments from Huawei. The LS could clarify that MAC-CE for TCI activation is not needed in certain cases. The last sentence is not needed. |
| FUTUREWEI | Ok in general | Our view is in-line with Intel and Huawei. Last sentence is not needed. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Agreed with ZTE on adding “RAN1-based” to the draft.  There is no need to point out the cases that MAC-CE activation would not be required given RAN1 is not suggesting any RAN1-based solution for the issue. It is RAN4’s expertise to identify cases that the TCI activation is needed and cases that the TCI activation is not needed. The last sentence of the draft should be kept to at least pass the neutral information that RAN1 does not provide any solution.  In addition, add additional actions to RAN2.  **To RAN2:**  RAN1 kindly asks RAN2 to take the above response into account for the corresponding future works. |
| LG | Yes in principle | We are fine with ZTE’s proposal on adding “RAN1-based”.  Regarding clarification on the cases where TCI state activation is required, we think it would be good to clarify the cases or at least adding an expression that the necessity is for “some cases” so that RAN2 or RAN4 can be more careful in their further discussion.  Regarding the last sentence, we don’t have a strong view on whether we keep it or remove it. |
| Vivo | No | Prefer the following update:  RAN1 thanks RAN4 for the LS regarding TCI state indication at Direct SCell activation. RAN1 understands that in current framework, a TCI state activation is required in some cases in addition to the RRC activation command to complete the direct SCell activation procedure if more than one TCI states are configured. It is mentioned by RAN4 that the solution to the issue is RAN1/RAN2 aspect. However, from RAN1 perspective, no further enhancement for this issue is intended in Rel-16. Whether to develop a RAN2-based solution is up to RAN2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We don’t understand how the statement of “Whether to develop a RAN2-based solution is up to RAN2” can “pass the neutral information that RAN1 does not provide any solution”. In our understanding, these two sentences are talking about two different and separate things. In short, we disagree with Qualcomm’s comment. |

Proposed reply LS answers version 2 / outcome (phase 2 until 29-Jan)

**1. Overall Description:**

RAN1 thanks RAN4 for the LS regarding TCI state indication at Direct SCell activation. RAN1 understands that in current framework, a TCI state activation is required in some cases (e.g. inter-band CA) in addition to the RRC activation command to complete the direct SCell activation procedure if more than one TCI states are configured. It is mentioned by RAN4 that the solution to the issue is RAN1/RAN2 aspect. However, from RAN1 perspective, no further RAN1-based enhancement for this issue is intended in Rel-16. ~~Whether to develop a RAN2-based solution is up to RAN2.~~

**2. Actions:**

**To RAN4:**

RAN1 kindly asks RAN4 to take the above response into account for the corresponding future works.

**Question: Is the above proposed reply answer for RAN4 acceptable? If not, which part is not acceptable and any suggested modification?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes | Original LS from RAN4 was to RAN1 and RAN2, so we think the response should be to RAN2 and RAN4  **2. Actions:**  **To RAN2 and RAN4:**  RAN1 kindly asks RAN2 and RAN4 to take the above response into account for the corresponding future works. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Agreed with Nokia that RAN2 should be included in the actions. We also suggested this in our first round feedback. |
| LG | Yes | Fine with the version 2 text, with the update in the action part by Nokia. |

Summary of contribution inputs

In [2], it quotes the following spec in 38.214 5.1.5:

If *tci-PresentInDCI* is set to "enabled" for the CORESET scheduling the PDSCH, and the time offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is equal to or greater than *timeDurationForQCL* if applicable, after a UE receives an initial higher layer configuration of TCI states and before reception of the activation command, the UE may assume that the DM-RS ports of PDSCH of a serving cell are quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block determined in the initial access procedure with respect to 'QCL-TypeA', and when applicable, also with respect to'QCL-TypeD'.

and draws the following observation

**Observation 1:** Before TCI state activation, UE assumes that the TCI state of PDSCH is towards SSB at least for the PCell.

Along with some other observations about default beam association for PDCCH/PDSCH in 38.213/38.214, the following proposal is proposed in [2] to inform RAN4 in the reply LS:

**Proposal 1:** Indicate to RAN4 the default selection of TCI states according [TS38.214](https://www.3gpp.org/DynaReport/38214.htm) and [TS38.213](https://www.3gpp.org/DynaReport/38213.htm) as follows:

* By default, a serving cell's TCI state points to the SS/PBCH block (without any configuration)
* If only a single TCI state is configured for PDCCH, that is always considered activated and no separate MAC CE activation is needed

For QCL type D, the PDSH TCI state in RRC\_CONNECTED is determined according to the CORESET with the smallest *controlResourceSetId* that is configured for active BWP of serving

In [3], three solutions are mentioned for TCI state activation for direct SCell activation:

1. To additionally indicate one TCI state that is to be activated inside the RRC command for direct SCell activation.
2. To define that a default TCI state (e.g., lowest or highest ID) among those included in the RRC command for direct SCell activation is to be activated.
3. (Implementation-based) Network to send regular MAC-CE to activate one TCI state, after sending RRC command for direct SCell activation.

and it is proposed in [3] that **RAN1 reply RAN4, cc RAN2 that RAN1 would not consider further optimizations on TCI state indication for direct SCell activation in R16**.

In [4], it is mentioned that:

* RAN1 understands that in current framework, network must send separate MAC CE commands in addition to the RRC activation command to complete the direct SCell activation procedure.

and the corresponding suggested action is:

* From RAN1 perspective, considering that Rel-16 has already been frozen, **no further enhancement is required to accelerate the SCell activation procedure in Rel-16. Any potential enhancements can be considered in Rel-17 WI of further MR-DC enhancements.**
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