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## Introduction

In this summary, the term “item 1” refers to the first item in the Rel.17 NR FeMIMO WID, i.e. multi-beam enhancement:

|  |
| --- |
| * Enhancement on multi-beam operation, mainly targeting FR2 while also applicable to FR1:
	+ Identify and specify features to facilitate more efficient (lower latency and overhead) DL/UL beam management to support higher intra- and L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and/or a larger number of configured TCI states:
		1. Common beam for data and control transmission/reception for DL and UL, especially for intra-band CA
		2. Unified TCI framework for DL and UL beam indication
		3. Enhancement on signaling mechanisms for the above features to improve latency and efficiency with more usage of dynamic control signaling (as opposed to RRC)
	+ Identify and specify features to facilitate UL beam selection for UEs equipped with multiple panels, considering UL coverage loss mitigation due to MPE, based on UL beam indication with the unified TCI framework for UL fast panel selection
 |

## Summary and proposals

The summary and proposals are based on the content of the previous FL summaries R1-2101185 (preparation) and R1-2101856 (round 1).

### Issue 1 (Rel.17 unified TCI framework)

Table 1 Summary: issue 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **Moderator notes** |
| 1.6 | PL-RS in relation to UL TCI state and channels  | Alternatives:* **PL-RS included in UL TCI state:** IDC, Ericsson (optional for DL RS), Apple (only valid when SRS is configured for beam indication), vivo (in case of DL RS in TCI state), MTK (for no PL-RS configured, and DL CSI-RS or SSB), Intel, AT&T, OPPO (separate RS), Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (separate RS), Qualcomm, Lenovo/MoM, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, OPPO, Nokia/NSB (QCL-TypeD RS if periodic and no PL-RS configured /associated), LG
* **PL-RS associated with UL TCI state:** Futurewei, Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB, Huawei/HiSi, MTK, Sony, Qualcomm (separate field in the same DCI), CATT, NTT Docomo, ZTE, CMCC
* **PL-RS not associated with UL TCI state:** Ericsson (in case of UL RS in TCI state)
* **Use Rel-16 PL-RS framework:** vivo (for UL RS in TCI state)

MAC CE configures association between activated TCI states and PL-RS/PC: CATT, MTK(PL-RS only), Sony(only PL-RS) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework:* When a periodic DL-RS is used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, select one of the following alternatives by RAN1#104bis-e::
	+ Alt1: PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.
	+ Alt2: PL-RS is always included in in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* When a periodic DL RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter is not configured in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, select one of the following alternatives by RAN1#104bis-e:
	+ Alt1. PL-RS is always included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt2. PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt3. Reuse Rel.16 procedure with the same signaling structure (MAC CE+SRI field in UL-related DCI) to indicate PL-RS for UL transmission with minimum enhancement (e.g. pertaining to the use for PUCCH)
		- PL-RS is not additionally configured in or associated to UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ [Alt4. UE calculates path-loss based on periodic DL RS configured in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or configured as the QCL/spatialRelationInfo source of the RS in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state]
* FFS: Application time of PL-RS
* NOTE: As in Rel-16, a UE does not expect to simultaneously maintain more than four pathloss estimates per serving cell for all PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmissions
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Action: Interested companies are encouraged to provide their inputs on the proposal Goal: Finalize the proposal to be ready for endorsement |

Table 2 Inputs: issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Moderator | 1.1: Starting from the last version before it was removed from Wed checkpoint list (Dr. Bo’s version) |
| Apple | Since we modified the condition, we would like to modify Alt4 as follows:Alt4. UE calculates path-loss based on periodic DL RS configured in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or configured as the QCL/spatialRelationInfo source of the RS in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state |
| MediaTek | We don't have a strong preference on any of the alternatives. However, we have a concern if PL-RS is determined according to the source RSs in the TCI states directly or indirectly, the number of pathloss estimations that UE has to maintain at the same time will be increased by the number of active TCI states. Therefore, we would like to add the following note under this proposal.* NOTE: As in Rel-16, a UE does not expect to simultaneously maintain more than four pathloss estimates per serving cell for all PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmissions.
 |
| ZTE | Support, and we are also fine with Apple’s update. Regarding the note from MediaTek, it is not our preference (it should be discussed in Rel-17 UE capability session), but we can live with it. |
| vivo | For Alt3, based on yesterday’s exchange of views through email, we would like to update slightly as following. The potential enhancement could be make the *referenceSignal* field in *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo* is not optional.**Alt3. Reuse Rel.16 procedure (MAC CE+DCI based) to indicate PL-RS for UL transmission with minimum enhancement;** |
| OPPO | In the current proposal draft, it looks like Alt 4 is same to the first bullet. Alt4 also assumes PL-RS is not configured in the TCI state. We shall delete Alt4.* When a PL-RS is not explicitly associated or included in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, a periodic DL RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter ~~is~~ in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, ~~the periodic DL RS~~ is the PL-RS
* ~~When a periodic DL RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter is not configured in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state~~Otherwise, select one of the following alternatives by RAN1#104bis-e:
	+ Alt1. PL-RS is always included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt2. PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt3. Reuse Rel.16 procedure (MAC CE+DCI based) to indicate PL-RS for UL transmission without enhancement
	+ ~~Alt4. UE calculates path-loss based on periodic DL RS configured as the QCL/spatialRelationInfo source of the RS in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state~~
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support 1st bullet For 2nd bullet. The meaning of alt 3 or alt 4 is unclear. In case Alt 3, we can support MAC CE + DCI based indication/update of PL-RS either with Alt.1, Alt 2. So we suggest companies supporting Alt 3 to make it exclusive with Alt 1 or Alt 2.: * + Alt3. Reuse Rel.16 procedure with the same signaling structure (MAC CE+ SRI filed in DCI based) to indicate PL-RS for UL transmission without enhancement
		- PL-RS is not additionally configured in or associated to UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state

In case Alt 4, 2nd bullet is for the case when periodic RS is not configured as QCL of UL TCI (or joint TCI). So it is unclear what Alt 4 means. Should it mean UE calculate PL based on aperiodic RS or UL RS? If so, we suggest to delete alt 4, since PL is kind of L3-RSRP.  |
| Futurewei | The first bullet indicates that a source RS, which is used for determining spatial TX filter, and which is a periodic DL RS in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI states, is used as the PL-RS if the PL-RS is not explicitly associated or included in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state. We have the same concerns on this bullet as we raised in the Round 1 email discussion: this bullet requires the UE to track a large number of DL RSs for pathloss measurement as the number of UL TCI states and/or joint TCI states in Rel. 17 unified TCI framework could be large. However, it will be difficult for UE to achieve that considering the fact that UE has limited capability on tracking multiple RSs for pathloss measurement. Furthermore, PL-RS needs to be measured irrespective to whether the beam is active or not so separation of TCI/QCL RS from PL-RS needs to be provided, and association is a good approach. Therefore we would like to modify Proposal 1.4 as follows:**Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework:* ~~When a periodic DL RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter is not configured in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state~~Select one of the following alternatives by RAN1#104bis-e:
	+ Alt1. PL-RS is always included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt2. PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt3. Reuse Rel.16 procedure (MAC CE+DCI based) to indicate PL-RS for UL transmission without enhancement
	+ Alt4. UE calculates path-loss based on periodic DL RS configured as the QCL/spatialRelationInfo source of the RS in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
 |
| Convida Wireless | Support FL proposal 1.4. Prefer Alt 2 or Alt 3. |
| Lenovo/MoM | Support the 1st bullet.For the 2nd bullet, the meaning of the first three Alternatives are clear. Alt 4 (even with Apple’s proposed text) appears to be the same as Alt 1. We think this proposal shall include only Alt 1-3. |
| Qualcomm | Added one more FFS**Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework:* When a PL-RS is not explicitly associated or included in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, a periodic DL RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter ~~is~~ in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, ~~the periodic DL RS~~ is the PL-RS
* ~~When a periodic DL RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter is not configured in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state~~Otherwise, select one of the following alternatives by RAN1#104bis-e:
	+ Alt1. PL-RS is always included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt2. PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt3. Reuse Rel.16 procedure (MAC CE+DCI based) to indicate PL-RS for UL transmission without enhancement
	+ Alt4. UE calculates path-loss based on periodic DL RS configured as the QCL/spatialRelationInfo source of the RS in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* FFS: Application time for PL RS
 |
| Ericsson | We support the intention of the proposal, but the formulation is somewhat strange. The proposal starts “When a PL RS is not explicitly associated….Otherwise…”The “otherwise” would have to mean that a PL RS IS explicitly associated” – of course, that explicitly associated PL RS would then be used. The previous formulation was better.We understand the concern from Futurewei. The FFS Qualcomm added points to that the UE would not immediately have to apply a newly activated PL RS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not sure whether the condition of ‘When a PL-RS is not explicitly associated or included in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state’ implies that the possibilities of ‘PL-RS is explicitly associated with the UL TCI state’ and ‘PL-RS is included in the UL TCI state’ are both supported, and suggest clarifying the intention. For now, we don’t see a need to support both options.We are wondering whether Alt-4 under the 2nd bullet may have some overlap with the 1st bullet and wish to clarify the difference. We are also wondering, for the case of joint DL/UL TCI (where the DL Rx and UL Tx beam at the UE are expected to be same/similar), whether there is strong motivation to additionally indicate a PL-RS that is different from the QCL-TypeD RS inside the TCI state, and wish to see some clarifications.  |
| Intel | The proposal needs to be formulated better; The first bullet corresponds to some of form of implicit configuration of PL-RS and the 2nd bullet is explicit? Rather than writing “otherwise”, it would be better to write implicit and explicit configuration respectively.For Alt. 3, based on email discussion, and assuming update from vivo, it is still unclear to us how this works for PUCCH and what is meant by “with minimum enhancement”. We prefer not to capture such vague terms in alternatives. Alt. 3 can only work for PUSCH and SRS which have MAC-CE based PL RS configuration in Rel-16. For PUCCH only option is to include the PL-RS explicitly (as in current *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo*) or associate with UL TCI (new enhancement). Therefore, we are ok with capturing Alt. 3 by adding that it’s only applicable to PUSCH/SRS. Another alternative is to mention that these alternatives are chosen separately for PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS as in the agreement for the UPLC parameter indication.Additionally, Alt. 4 looks similar to first bullet where PL-RS is not explicitly configured in TCI or associated with TCI. Therefore, first bullet should suffice to capture this case. On Qualcomm’s FFS, in Rel-16, application time for PL-RS was discussed and it was decided to be handled in RAN4. We prefer similar approach in Rel-17.  |
| Samsung | The first bullet assumes that a PL-RS could be explicitly associated or included in the UL or joint TCI which has not been agreed. We would like to return to the original formulation, and include different alternatives depending on the periodicity/direction of the source RS in the TCI state (including update from Apple):**Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework:* When a periodic DL-RS is used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, ~~the periodic DL RS is the PL-RS PL-RS is not explicitly associated or included in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, a periodic DL RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter is in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state, the periodic DL RS is the PL-RS~~
	+ Alt1: PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.
	+ Alt2: PL-RS can be included in in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state, if not included, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.

{Mod: Alt2 is confusing. It sounds like Alt1 plus something else. Why sometimes included and other times not? I changed this to “always included”.}* ~~When a periodic DL RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter is not configured in the UL or, if applicable, joint TCI state~~Otherwise, select one of the following alternatives by RAN1#104bis-e:
	+ Alt1. PL-RS is always included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt2. PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
	+ Alt3. Reuse Rel.16 procedure (MAC CE+DCI based) to indicate PL-RS for UL transmission without enhancement
	+ Alt4. UE calculates path-loss based on periodic DL RS configured in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or configured as the QCL/spatialRelationInfo source of the RS in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
 |
| APT | Related to the concern raised by e.g., MTK/Futurewei that the number of PL RS may be large if it is associated/derived from QCL-TypeD/SpatialRelation, we think it may not be an issue based on current agreement on unified TCI framework that a TCI needs to be activated by MAC-CE before dynamically used. In Rel-15/16, the number of activated TCI is limited, though a bit larger than the # of PL RS.Related to Alt3 and Alt4, we have similar concerns as raised by quite a few companies. While Alt-4 seems overlapping with Alt1, Alt3 itself is not clear enough to see if similar solution taken by Alt1/Alt2 is need or not as enhancement. If these alternatives are overlapping, it would be hard to down-select in next meeting. |
| Moderator | Revised 1.4 to address the following inputs: 1) The condition in the first bullet is unclear (seems to be resolved with Samsung’s suggestion.) 2) Concern (e.g. FW) that the 1st bullet can cause large # RS being tracked (2nd alternative should resolve this) 3) 2nd bullet: added clarification on Alt3 to resolve Intel’s comment (for PUCCH), 4) Put square brackets around Alt4 since several companies think this is similar to either 1st bullet Alt1 (which means it is not valid for the 2nd bullet) or Alt1 is 2nd bullet. |
| LG | Support the proposal and Alt4 seems quite similar with first bullet of the proposal. So it can be removed or modified as an alternative where FL makes it a square bracket. |
| Docomo | Could you add one more example of Rel.16 behavior below?* + Alt3. Reuse Rel.16 procedure with the same signaling structure (MAC CE+SRI field in UL-related DCI based) to indicate PL-RS for UL transmission without minimum enhancement (e.g. pertaining to the use for PUCCH, or using default PL-RS)
 |

### Issue 2 (L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility)

Table 3 Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2.2 | Type of beam metric for measurement and reporting:L1-RSRP or L3-RSRP | Alternatives**:*** **L1-RSRP (19):** vivo, MTK, Samsung, Qualcomm (L3 can reuse existing), Intel (intra-DU can re-use L1-RSRP), Xiaomi, Sony, NTT Docomo, ZTE, Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, Futurewei, Huawei/HiSi, IDC, APT, ASUS, CMCC
* **L3-RSRP (4):** OPPO, Lenovo/MoM, Xiaomi (L3-RSRP only for triggering beam measurement of non-serving cell)
* **Hybrid L1+L3-RSRP (2):** Apple, CATT (with SD filter L3-RSRP)
 |

Note that this issue is relevant not only for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, but also for inter-cell mTRP. Based on the above summary, the following proposals are made:

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 multi beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP:* Rel.15 L1-RSRP is used as reporting quantity for measurement and reporting of non-serving-cell(s)
	+ At least Rel.15 SS-RSRP calculated from SSB of non-serving cell(s) is supported
		- FFS: Whether the measurement for SS-RSRP is limited within SMTC
	+ Support Rel.15 CSI-RSRP if CSI-RS (for e.g. mobility and/or tracking) is supported as a measurement RS for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and/or inter-cell mTRP
		- FFS: Whether the support applies to CSI-RS with or without QCL source, or both
	+ FFS: time behavior of the reporting, i.e. periodic, semi-persistent, or aperiodic
* FFS: If other reporting quantities are supported, e.g. L3-RSRP, hybrid L1/L3-RSRP
* FFS: Dynamic activation/deactivation of non-serving cell(s) for beam measurement by MAC CE
* FFS: Timing assumption for measurement of non-serving cell RS measurement
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Action: Interested companies are encouraged to provide their inputs on the proposal Goal: Finalize the proposal to be ready for endorsement |

Table 4 Inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal in general, but we worry about the case that gNB may configure many CSI-reportConfig with many DL resources for L1-RSRP measurement for a number of neighbor cells. Some measurement may not be that necessary. With that, we would like to suggest we study the dynamic activation/deactivation of CSI-reportConfig based on MAC CE. Hopefully, this can clarify the motivation. With that, we suggest the following FFS.* **FFS: Dynamic activation/deactivation for CSI-reportConfig for non-serving cell beam measurement by MAC CE**

Without this dynamic activation/deactivation, I think gNB can only use RRC to reconfigure CSI-reportConfig for some neighbor cells, since currently all resources in CSI-reportConfig should be counted as “active” in UE capability, and gNB cannot preconfigure all resources from all neighbor cells by RRC. |
| MediaTek | This proposal is essential. According to current RAN4 requirement (TS 38.133), there should be at least one L1-RSRP measurement reporting for a target TCI state within a period before UE performs DL reception with a TCI state, where the RS for L1-RSRP measurement is the RS in the target TCI state or QCLed to the target TCI state. In order to allow a TCI state associated with non-serving-cell RS(s) to be used for DL reception and UL transmission, the same requirement should be reused, which means at least L1-RSRP measurement reporting has to be introduced for non-serving-cell RS.Re Apple, a CSI report setting can be either activated/deactivated by MAC-CE if it is SP reporting, or dynamically triggered by DCI if it AP reporting. According to this proposal, this feature will be a part of CSI framework, then the functionality (activation or triggering) will be naturally supported. We believe we are not going to re-design CSI framework for this feature, right? |
| ZTE | We can support this proposal with minor modification and a FFS bullet for clarifying the time behavior of this reporting as MediaTek mentioned:On Rel.17 multi beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP:* Rel.15 L1-RSRP is used as reporting quantity for measurement and reporting of non-serving-cell(s)
	+ At least Rel.15 SS-RSRP calculated from SSB of non-serving cell(s) is supported
	+ FFS: The support of Rel.15 CSI-RSRP depending on whether CSI-RS (for e.g. mobility, RRM and/or tracking) is supported as a measurement RS for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and/or inter-cell mTRP
	+ FFS: time behavior of the reporting, e.g., periodic, semi-persistent, or aperiodic
* FFS: If other reporting quantities are supported, e.g. L3-RSRP, hybrid L1/L3-RSRP
 |
| vivo | For the SS-RSRP measurement, we would like to clarify whether the measurement restriction of legacy non-serving cell SSB is still applied.* **FFS: Whether the measurement for SS-RSRP is limited within SMTC;**

For the timing assumption for measurement of the non-serving cell RS, we would also like to study the following aspects:* **FFS: timing assumption for measurement of non-serving cell RS measurement;**

As Apple commented, since the number of non-serving cell RS would be large we would like to study the following but with more general wording:* **FFS: Dynamic activation/deactivation of the cell for non-serving cell beam measurement by MAC CE;**
 |
| OPPO | We suggest to limit the number of non-serving cell included in L1-RSRP measurement to be 1. For multi-TRP, we only support up to 2 TRPs, which means at most one non-serving cell. For inter-cell mobility, the L1-RSRP measurement is only used for TCI state, so including only the target cell is sufficient. {Mod: In the previous soon-to-be-agreement (proposal 2.2 in round 1), K is still FFS and many companies would like to support K>1. This will be discussed in the next meeting.}**Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 multi beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP:* Rel.15 L1-RSRP is used as reporting quantity for measurement and reporting of non-serving-cell(s)
	+ At least Rel.15 SS-RSRP calculated from SSB of non-serving cell~~(s)~~ is supported
	+ The number of non-serving cell is no more than 1.
	+ FFS: The support of Rel.15 CSI-RSRP depending on whether CSI-RS (for e.g. RRM and/or tracking) is supported as a measurement RS for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and/or inter-cell mTRP

FFS: If other reporting quantities are supported, e.g. L3-RSRP, hybrid L1/L3-RSRP |
| Sony | We would like to support this proposal just with a minor update. Same as ZTE did, under the first FFS bullet, we think at the moment it is not harmful to add “mobility” i.e. CSI-RS for mobility for further study.  |
| Futurewei | We agree FL’s proposal in principle. We also support CSI-RSRP based L1-RSRP for non-serving cell and suggest modifying the FFS bullet as follows:* + Support Rel.15 CSI-RSRP if CSI-RS (for e.g. RRM and/or tracking) is supported as a measurement RS for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and/or inter-cell mTRP

{Mod: Thanks for the catch, agreed} |
| Convida Wireless | Support the FL proposal 2.1. |
| Lenovo/MoM | We OK with this proposal in general. However we do not agree with OPPO’s proposal to limit the number of non-serving cell RSRP measurement to 1. This is different from m-TRP. Before gNB decides the UE can be served by a non-serving cell, it needs to know the UE is in the coverage area of which non-serving cells and their signal strength. Before it can make a down selection and decide on a non-serving cell, it needs information regarding multiple non-serving cells.Regarding the FFS on other reporting quantities like L3-RSRP or hybrid L1/L3-RSRP, we think we shall consult RAN2 by sending a LS asking for their opinion. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to add “with or without QCL source” in the FFS. We have concern on CSI-RS from non-serving cell without QCL source**Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 multi beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP:* Rel.15 L1-RSRP is used as reporting quantity for measurement and reporting of non-serving-cell(s)
	+ At least Rel.15 SS-RSRP calculated from SSB of non-serving cell(s) is supported
	+ FFS: The support of Rel.15 CSI-RSRP depending on whether CSI-RS with or without QCL source (for e.g. RRM and/or tracking) is supported as a measurement RS for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and/or inter-cell mTRP

FFS: If other reporting quantities are supported, e.g. L3-RSRP, hybrid L1/L3-RSRP |
| Ericsson | Support. We would not be OK to limit the number of non-serving cells to 1 – the NW would not know which non-serving cell is the best (that’s the motivation of doing the measurement). The UE complexity can be controlled by limiting the number of beams to report.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The first bullet of the proposal is fine, so is the first sub-bullet to support SS-RSRP for non-serving SSBs. We think that second sub-bullet should support the use of CSI-RSRP for CSI-RS for mobility, since the main bullet is about measurement and reporting from non-serving RSs and RRM-CSI-RS fit that purpose by design. Using a non-serving TRS for measurement and reporting for the purpose of L1/L2-mobility seems a little far-fetched. Hence, we suggest revising the second sub-bullet as follows:* **Support Rel-15 CSI-RSRP calculated from RRM-CSI-RS of non-serving cell(s)**
	+ **FFS: Whether to support Rel-15 CSI-RSRP calculated from TRS of non-serving cell(s)**

{Mod: Whether to support an additional measurement RS other than SSB is still pending. The wording from Futurewei largely addresses your comment but with condition. The additional source RS issue will be discussed in later rounds next week.}While the proposal addresses an essential feature for L1/L2-mobility, we think that it is equally important that we provide further context for such L1-RSRP measurements. Non-serving RSs will always out-number serving RSs, so to assist the UE: we suggest that the NW provides the UE with beam-based mobility events, targeting specific beams of interest. This would allow the UE to inform the NW when a relevant mobility event took place and would make L1/L2-mobility implementation smoother. Hence, we suggest adding the following bullet:* **Support semi-static configuration of beam-based mobility events involving serving and non-serving RSs (e.g. SSB, RRM-CSI-RS)**

{Mod: Thanks, I will note this for future discussion point (please feel free to bring this up). I believe this is a very relevant issue. This is currently not in the scope of the FL proposal.} |
| Intel | The main bullet mentions L1-RSRP and sub-bullet mentions SS-RSRP. It would be better to mention L1-RSRP calculated from SSB of non-serving cell. For 2nd sub-bullet, what is the relationship of RRM/tracking (CSI-RS for mobility) with L1-RSRP? The examples should be removed. {Mod: The term SS-RSRP is, I believe, from TS38.215. The term L1-RSRP is used for BM discussion. Which is why I use both.}On the first FFS mentioned by vivo, SS-RSRP in SMTC is used for non-L1 measurements. Why is this relevant for L1-RSRP?  |
| Samsung | Support proposal |
| APT | We support the proposal. We have concern on limiting the number of non-serving cell to 1, since it is for selecting a TRP from a few candidate TRPs. |
| Moderator | Addressed most of the inputs that can be accommodated. Re restricting to only 1 non-serving cell, this is perhaps a topic for next meeting since the previous soon-to-be-agreement (proposal 2.2 in round 1) has an FFS on K. |
| LG | Support the proposal. May need to further clarify how to report this quantity later, e.g. via including in existing L1-RSRP report, UE initiated report, etc. |
| OPPO2 | To moderator: In the previous soon-to-be-agreement (proposal 2.2 in round 1), The K is the number of beams, Not the number of cells. We are not suggesting the limit number of beams to be one. Instead, we are talking about the number non-serving cell.For either inter-cell MTRP or inter-cell mobility, we do not see motivation for why we need to support more than one non-serving cell. |

### Issue 3 (beam indication signaling medium)

Table 5 Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **Moderator notes** |
| 3.1 | Beam application time definition:Alt1: Measured from DCI receptionAlt2: Measured from ACK transmission | **Alt1 (DCI) (7):** Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, Ericsson, CATT, MTK, NEC, Samsung**Alt2 (ACK) (17):** IDC, Lenovo/MoM, Fujitsu, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Apple, Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, vivo, Intel, Sony, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo, APT **Alt1 and Alt 2:** OPPO (Since Alt1 considers the requirement of UE and Alt2 considers the requirement of gNB side), LG |
| 3.4 | Support for additional DCI formats for Rel.17 unified TCI framework beam indication (TCI state update) | DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 without DL assignment:* **Yes (18)**: OPPO, Fujitsu, Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB, CATT, vivo (at least for UL-only TCI), MTK, Qualcomm, Samsung, Apple (ACK/NACK mechanism is needed), vivo, Lenovo/MoM, Convida, NTT Docomo, ZTE (ACK/NACK is needed), NEC (ACK/NACK needed)
* **No (4)**: Ericsson, Huawei/HiSi, LG

DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 with UL grant:* **Yes (10)**: IDC, Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi (at least for UL-only TCI), ZTE (at least for UL-only TCI), MTK, LGE, Intel, Sony (Study), Qualcomm
* **No (12)**: OPPO, CMCC, Ericsson, Huawei/HiSi, Convida, Apple, vivo, Spreadtrum, CATT, NTT Docomo, NEC

Dedicated DCI format for beam indication, with dedicated ACK based on SPS PDSCH release:* **Yes (15)**: Futurewei, ZTE, CATT, Intel, Sony, NTT Docomo(keep the same DCI payload as existing DCI format), OPPO (based on format 1\_0 without DL assignment), Samsung, Nokia/NSB (based on format 0\_1/0\_2 without UL grant), Qualcomm, Lenovo/MoM, APT (based on SPS or CG release DCI), NEC
* **No (8)**: Ericsson, MTK, Convida, Apple, vivo, Huawei/HiSi, LG

**Support extending existing DCI formats for UL-only TCI**: APT |

Additional DCI

From Table 5, the reuse of DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 with UL grant is unlikely agreeable (10 support vs 12 oppose). The remaining alternatives should be down selected.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3.1**: On the Rel.17 DCI-based beam indication, in RAN1#104bis-e, down-select one of the following alternatives regarding the support of DCI format(s) for beam indication in addition to the agreed DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment (in RAN1#103-e): * Alt0: No additional DCI format is supported
* Alt1: DCI formats 1\_1 and 1\_2 without DL assignment, applicable for joint TCI as well as separate DL/UL TCI
	+ Support DCI acknowledgment mechanism, e.g. based on SPS PDSCH release, based on triggered SRS, based on DCI indicating SCell dormancy
	+ FFS: How to identify DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication only, not scheduling a PDSCH reception, indicating a SPS PDSCH release or indicating SCell dormancy
* Alt2: Dedicated DCI format other than 1\_1/1\_2 without DL assignment, applicable for joint TCI as well as separate DL/UL TCI
	+ Support DCI acknowledgment mechanism based on SPS PDSCH release
	+ FFS: If the format is based on an existing DCI format, how to identify the DCI format used for beam indication only
 |

Beam Application Time (BAT)

|  |
| --- |
| Previous agreement (RAN1#103-e):On Rel.17 DCI-based beam indication: * Regarding application time of the beam indication: if beam indication is received, down-select from the following:
	+ Alt1: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the DCI with the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication
	+ Alt2: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication
	+ FFS: whether any existing timing defined for DCI based TCI/spatial relation update can be used for X/Y
* FFS: When to apply the minimum indication delay (e.g., when the newly indicated beam is different with the previously indicated beam)
 |

The main arguments for Alt1 (assuming the agreed DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment):

* It tends to result in lower beam application latency than Alt2
* Unlike Alt2, for the agreed DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment, it allows the updated TCI state (signaled in the DCI) to be used for the DL assignment (PDSCH reception) associated with the beam indication DCI provided that the offset between the DCI and the PDSCH resources used for the DL assignment is larger than the threshold. This is not possible in Alt2 since the updated TCI state can be active only after the ACK transmission (hence after the DL assignment).

The main arguments for Alt2 (assuming the agreed DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment):

* Unlike Alt1 where potential misalignment between gNB and UE assumptions on the TCI state can occur if the DCI is not successfully decoded, Alt2 ensures that the gNB and the UE are aligned (since the gNB can assume that the TCI state update is successfully received after receiving the ACK from the UE).

Assessment: It is argued that since PDCCH error rate is around 1%, the probability of TCI state assumption misalignment associated with Alt1 is 1% (non-negligible), thus Alt2 is preferred.

* However, this reasoning ignores that the misalignment only occurs between the DCI reception and ACK transmission –typically a significantly smaller fraction of the overall UE data traffic even if the UE receives DL assignment in every slot.
* Furthermore, this misalignment (only in a relatively small time period) only occurs for other PDCCH transmission (than the beam indication DCI) and other PDSCH/PUSCH transmissions (not associated with the DL assignment). It does not apply to the DL assignment associated with the beam indication DCI. Nor does it apply to PUCCH resource used for the ACK.
* Furthermore, it is argued that since BAT is configured by the gNB (given the UE capability), the gNB can configure the BAT depending on factors, e.g. UE data traffic, resource allocations, such that the chosen value avoids or minimizes the misalignment while still ensuring lower beam application latency compared to Alt2. Obviously a sufficiently large BAT for Alt1 can replicate the effect of Alt2, but the converse doesn’t always hold.

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 3.2: On Rel.17 DCI-based beam indication,  |

|  |
| --- |
| Action: Interested companies are encouraged to provide their inputs on: * Proposal 3.1 on DCI format
* Beam application time (BAT): after summarizing the arguments from both sides, companies are encouraged to respond and decide between Alt1 vs Alt2

Goal: * Proposal 3.1: Finalize the proposal for endorsement
* BAT: Arrive at a proposal to down select Alt1 vs Alt2
 |

Table 6 Inputs: issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Apple | Support Alt1 in proposal 3.1. When gNB has no downlink data for transmission, Alt1 can be helpful to avoid dummy data transmission. Dummy data transmission would waste both gNB and UE power.  |
| MediaTek | Support Proposal 3.1. On BAT, we prefer Alt1. We believe FL already captures the arguments why the reliability of Alt1 is not a problem, and the benefit of Alt1 is clear.  |
| ZTE | Proposal 3.1: Alt1 is supported. Besides wasting resources as Apple mentioned, BLER for PDSCH is about 10%, and consequently rate of transmission failure is at least 10 times over successful PDCCH decoding. If we just try to list candidate for down-selection next meeting, we think that the following “FFS” in Alt1 can be removed. * Alt1: DCI formats 1\_1 and 1\_2 without DL assignment, applicable for joint TCI as well as separate DL/UL TCI
	+ support DCI acknowledgment mechanism, e.g. based on SPS PDSCH release, based on triggered SRS
	+ FFS: How to identify DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication only, not scheduling a PDSCH reception, indicating a SPS PDSCH release or indicating SCell dormancy

 Regarding BAT, we support Alt.2. Maybe, this discussion should be postponed until we make the final down-selection for candidates in Proposal 3.1. |
| vivo | Support Alt1 in proposal 3.1Support Alt2 in proposal 3.2. |
| OPPO | Either Alt 1 or Alt 2 in proposal 3 is ok to me. For Alt1: the benefit is we can remove the dependency of beam indication on PDSCH transmission.For Alt2: a dedicated DCI can reduce the overhead of beam indication and also improve the reliability of DCI-based beam indication. |
| Sony | For proposal 3.1, support Alt.2.Reusing the existing DCI format 1\_1 or 1\_2 without DL assignment may not be flexible enough to conduct all necessary information related to TCI state(s) to be applied. So for the newly defined function in Rel.17, it seems proper to design a dedicated DCI format for it.  For BAT, support Alt.2. It may sound a little conservative that beam updating based on DCI should be 100% aligned at both NW and UE side. Consider a case (perhaps a corner case) that the DCI carrying new TCI targets for PDCCH itself, if the 1% PDCCH decoding failure happens, there could be beam misalignment for PDCCH, which may results in undesirable BFR.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 3.1: Support Alt 1Proposal 3.2: Support Alt 2. But we are O.K. for further discussion on applying new beam to scheduled/granted PDSCH/PUSCH which is already supported feature in Rel-15/16. We have most concerns on ‘differentiating’ beams between TCI indication DCI and acknowledging N/Ack PUCCH.  |
| Futurewei | Support Alt2 in Proposal 3.1. The existing DCI format 1\_1 or 1\_2 without DL assignment lacks the capability to provide information for beam indication for single channel (e.g. PDSCH only, single CORESET) or a subset of channels. |
| Convida Wireless | Support the FL proposal 3.1. Prefer Alt 1. |
| Lenovo/MoM | Proposal 3.1: We agree this shall be decided in RAN1#104bis-e meeting, but we think Alt1 and Alt2 shall not be exclusive. For Alt 1 we agree with Apple’s argument on not wasting UL power. For Alt 2 we think it has the benefit for signaling many UEs simultaneously for reduced delay. Companies should bring back arguments supporting for or against each alternatives for RAN1 to decide in the next meeting. Proposal 3.2: we support Alt 2 to ensure the ACK is received by the gNB before the new beam is activated.  |
| Qualcomm | Added one more example**Proposal 3.1**: On the Rel.17 DCI-based beam indication, in RAN1#104bis-e, down-select one of the following alternatives regarding the support of DCI format(s) for beam indication in addition to the agreed DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment (in RAN1#103-e): * Alt0: No additional DCI format is supported
* Alt1: DCI formats 1\_1 and 1\_2 without DL assignment, applicable for joint TCI as well as separate DL/UL TCI
	+ FFS: support DCI acknowledgment mechanism, e.g. based on SPS PDSCH release, based on triggered SRS, based on DCI indicating SCell dormancy
	+ FFS: How to identify DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 used for beam indication only, not scheduling a PDSCH reception, indicating a SPS PDSCH release or indicating SCell dormancy
* Alt2: Dedicated DCI format other than 1\_1/1\_2 without DL assignment, applicable for joint TCI as well as separate DL/UL TCI
	+ Support DCI acknowledgment mechanism based on SPS PDSCH release

FFS: If the format is based on an existing DCI format, how to identify the DCI format used for beam indication onlyFor potential proposal 3.2, the reliability of Alt.1 may be ensured by configuring the application time after the acknowledgement, so both sides will switch the beam only after the acknowledgement is Txed/Rxed. We are fine for either modified Alt.1 or Alt.2 below. * + Alt1: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the DCI with the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication
		- The gNB configured application time should be after the acknowledgement.
	+ Alt2: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication
 |
| Ericsson  | Support proposal 3.1. Just as was predicted in previous meeting, DCI design takes a long time, and this discussion needs to be finalized.For BAT: we agree with Qualcomm that with Alt1, the gNB can still configure the application time to be after the ACK – this is up to NW configuration. We think that is the reasonable configuration, but in the future, things may change, and we do not want to stop other NW vendors to perform more aggressive configurations. Therefore, we prefer Alt1, but we would be OK with Alt2 as well.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 3.1: Support Alt-0. Object Alt-1/2. Proposal 3.2: Support Alt-2. Alt-1 is unnecessarily complicated in terms of timeline planning and beamforming behavior determination, i.e., needs to consider UE capability and gNB configuration, and compare time offsets between DCI and PDSCH and ACK and the effective application time (with which the receiving beam for PDSCH and Tx beam for ACK can only be determined after decoding the DCI). Alt-2 can also help avoiding the complicated misalignment handling and PDCCH/PUCCH/PUSCH grouping mentioned in the assessment part.  |
| Intel | Proposal 3.1: We support Alt. 1 since it can also enable UL-only beam indication without DL grant when formats 1\_x is used. It is not reasonable to couple UL-only beam update e.g., for HetNet or MPE scenario, with a DL PDSCH transmission. We are also open to Alt. 2 since it can increase flexibility of beam indication. We would like to note that we have still not resolved FFS points from RAN1#103e about applicability of the indicate DL/UL or joint TCI to a subset of channels/RS or to individual channels RSs. Selecting Alt. 0/1 without scope for Alt. 2 would preclude any such option. Proposal 3.2: Support Alt. 2 We think some of this discussion is also dependent on the outcome of Proposal 3.1. For example, if DCI for beam indication-only (DL grant free) is supported and we also support HARQ feedback for this beam indication DCI, it makes little sense to change the beam before the feedback is transmitted. Notwithstanding the arguments on the benefits of the applicability of indicated beam to scheduled PDSCH in Rel-16, the unified TCI framework has a wider scope than legacy TCI indication. Here the updated beam can be used for control channel reception and for ACK/NACK transmission as well. It might not make sense to apply the beam before acknowledgement of such beam indication is transmitted. If UE misses DCI, then misalignment can occur. We also wonder what the point is, of agreeing on a HARQ feedback for the beam indication DCI if beam is changed before transmission of the ACK?  |
| Samsung | Support proposal 3.1. We are fine with Alt1 and Alt2, but slightly prefer Alt2.For the beam application time (BAT), we prefer Alt1. As explained by the FL, BAT configured by gNB can be configured large enough with Alt1 so as to mimic the Alt2 timing. However, Alt2 can’t mimic Alt1. In some scenarios, the application of the DCI-indicated TCI state to the PDSCH associated with the DCI can be improve reception quality of the PDSCH, if there is no other simultaneous downlink/uplink traffic there is no beam misalignment risk. |
| APT | Support Proposal 3.1. The first FFS in Alt 1 can be removed from our perspective.Related to BAT, support Alt-2. |
| Moderator | Proposal 3.1 should be stable. On BAT, some companies seem to be repeating their previous arguments in previous round rather than interacting with the arguments from the opponents (or the above summary ☺). I tend to agree with, e.g. ZTE and Intel, that the benefit of Alt1 over Alt2 depends on whether an additional DCI format is supported or not. So this can be discussed and decided together in the next meeting. At the same time, some online conversation is needed. I feel some points didn’t come across. For those who haven’t read the above summary, please do so, and interact (debate) with the points raised by Alt1 proponents.  |
| LG | On Proposal 3.1, we support Alt0 and we still think that the existing DCI formats (0\_1/0\_2) should be taken into account on the same table. We can separate three cases.Case1: when there is DL-SCH to send to UECase2: when there is UL-SCH to be transmitted from UECase3: when there is no DL-SCH and no UL-SCHFor Case1, the agreed method is sufficient. For Case2, we think that it is straight-forward to use the UL DCI in which UL TCI field exists, i.e. DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2. For Case 3, we are not sure why beam switching should be done so quickly since there is no data to send/receive, so it is not of high priority scenario to our understanding. Case 3 can be handled by implementation using the methods defined for Case1/Case2 or via MAC-CE based beam indication since there is no PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. On BAT, our main concern on Alt2 is that if there is a TCI field in DCI, why this TCI indication cannot be applied to the scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH by the DCI? This function is already well supported in Rel-15/16 and should be supported in Rel-17 as well. If Alt2 is a way to go, PDSCH should be an exception. We don’t quite understand some companies’ argument that BAT should be aligned for different channels. UE cannot receive PDSCH and PDCCH at the same time anyway, and UE cannot transmit PUCCH/PUSCH while receiving PDCCH/PDSCH in TDD, where we believe that we are discussing on FR2 TDD system. |

### Issue 4 (MP-UE)

Table 7 Summary: issue 4

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **Moderator notes** |
| 4.3 | Support for NW-initiated UL panel selection and activation | NW-initiated UL panel selection (of one) and activation (of ≥1)* **Yes**: IDC, Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, LGE, NTT Docomo,CMCC
* **No**: OPPO, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, CATT, MTK, Intel, Sony, Xiaomi, Qualcomm (NW can initiate selection within active panels but not activation), Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB

NW-to-MPUE signaling of panel selection/activation:* **Yes**: NTT Docomo, Lenovo/MoM, Xiaomi, APT, IDC (panel ID in TCI state), Samsung (in case of MPE), CATT, APT, vivo, Qualcomm (NW can signal which active panel to use but not activation), Spreadtrum (select among active panels), Nokia/NSB, Huawei/HiSi (with UE confirmation/rejection), LG, CMCC
* **No**: OPPO
 |

In RAN1#103-e, the support for UE-initiated UL panel selection/activation was agreed, with FFS on whether NW-initiated panel selection/activation is also supported. This FFS needs to be resolved early.

Based on the above summary, the following proposals are made:

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancement for facilitating fast uplink panel selection, support NW-to-MPUE signalling to facilitate UE panel selection and activation:* For UE panel selection, Rel.17 DCI-based TCI state update (beam indication) is used
* For UE panel activation and selection, Rel.17 MAC-CE-based TCI state activation is used
* FFS: If additional specification support in TCI state definition to associate with UE panel is needed or not, and if so, the exact scheme
* FFS: If additional specification support to let gNB aware which UE panel is used is needed or not, and if so, the exact scheme
* FFS: if additional specification support is needed for UE-initiated panel activation and NW-initiated panel activation to work together

{Nokia’s formulation}**Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancement for facilitating fast uplink panel selection, not support additional dynamic NW-to-MPUE signalling of UE panel selection ~~and~~ or activation:* For UE panel selection, gNB utilize Rel.17 DCI-based TCI state update (beam indication) ~~is used~~
* FFS: gNB may request to activate more UE panels utilizing signals for Rel.17 TCI configuration/activation.  ~~For UE panel activation, Rel.17 MAC-CE-based TCI state activation is used~~
* FFS: If additional specification support in TCI state definition to accommodate UE panel is needed or not, and if so, the exact scheme
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Action: Interested companies are encouraged to provide their inputs on proposal 4.1 Goal: Finalize the proposal to be ready for endorsement |

Table 8 Inputs: issue 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Moderator | 4.1: This proposal is to ensure that there is beam indication support. The FFS addresses additional TCI state definition for panel. This also depends on what panel entails. Agreeing to this proposal doesn’t imply that we agree on a new TCI state signaling scheme. Similar to the previous agreement on UE-initiated panel selection/activation. |
| Apple | We think gNB can provide the beam indication, but panel selection/activation should still be based on UE. UE may still change the panel due to rotation/power saving and so on. Therefore we suggest revisions as follows:**Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancement for facilitating fast uplink panel selection, support NW-to-MPUE signalling to facilitate UE panel selection and activation:* For UE panel selection, Rel.17 DCI-based TCI state update (beam indication) is used
* For UE panel activation, Rel.17 MAC-CE-based TCI state activation is used

FFS: If additional specification support in TCI state definition to accommodate UE panel is needed or not, and if so, the exact schemeFFS: If additional specification support to let gNB aware which panel is used is needed or not, and if so, the exact scheme |
| MediaTek | We don't support NW-initiated UE panel activation since there are a lot of UE implementation-related factors (especially UE power consumption) should be considered when decides UE panel activation. Thus, UE panel activation should be left to UE decision.We also don't see the benefit from NW-initiated UL panel selection. For example, it is natural that UE can initiate UL beam/panel selection to avoid the MPE issue since MPE issue shall be detected by UE itself. If UE detects MPE event on current serving UL panel, UE can attempt to determine other UL panel with good link quality and without suffering from the MPE issue, if any, based on, e.g., estimated UL receive power by taking MPE effect and link quality into account. Regarding the proposal, in our view, Rel.17 TCI state activation/indication is used to confirm the panel activation/selection initiated by UE. Thus, we cannot support this proposal. |
| ZTE | We support it in principle. Since the panel activation/deactivation is up to UE, the corresponding panel state (e.g., active) corresponding to DL RS should be reported. Apple’s new bullet seems to be a good move-forward solution. We can support it with minor update:FFS: If additional specification support to let gNB aware spatial filter(s) (e.g., CRI/SSBRI) corresponding to which panel is used is needed or not, and if so, the exact schemeRegarding comments from MediaTek, if our understanding is correct, this proposal is not to support NW-initialized UL panel selection, but instead to clarify how the system can work in this UE-initialized framework.  |
| vivo | Prefer the following update**Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancement for facilitating fast uplink panel selection, support NW-to-MPUE signalling of UE panel selection and activation:* For UE panel selection, Rel.17 DCI-based TCI state update (beam indication) is used
* For UE panel activation, Rel.17 MAC-CE-based TCI state activation is used

FFS: If additional specification support in TCI state definition to associate with UE panel is needed or not, and if so, the exact scheme |
| OPPO | Do not support Proposal 4.1We do not support NW-initiated UE panel selection/activation.In the procedure of multi-beam operation, the gNB indicates DL TCI and/or UL TCI to the UE for downlink reception or uplink transmission. How to map a DL TCI or UL TCI to UE panel or beam is up to UE implementation. Just as MTK mentioned, there are a lot of UE implementation-related hardware factors. We do not think that there is benefit and it is feasible to do that.Furthermore, from the perspective of UE, we do not see the use case for a UE to expose the information of particular hardware/panel implementation to the system.  |
| Sony | We tend to trust the from NW-to-MPUE signaling is to facilitate panel activation and selection at UE. But given the agreed MPUE-to-NW signaling (UE controls its panels by nature) and potential MPE event (only detected by UE), there seems a risk as mentioned by MTK that the panel or beam indicated/activated by NW would results in MPE. By far, no mechanism to avoid this is discussed yet, so we would be reluctant to accept the proposal at the moment. Hopefully this issue can be further discussed.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Prefer further discussion. UE panel selection: UE panel selection should be based on UL beam management, and additional indication/mechanism would not be needed in perspective of beam management.UE panel activation: We still wonder whether gNB based UE panel activation can work, since gNB cannot have any reported measurement via certain UE panel until UE ‘activate’ that panel. But we can be open to allow gNB’s ‘request’ to activate more UE panel. Please see our modified proposal as: **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancement for facilitating fast uplink panel selection, not support additional dynamic NW-to-MPUE signalling of UE panel selection ~~and~~ or activation:* For UE panel selection, gNB utilize Rel.17 DCI-based TCI state update (beam indication) ~~is used~~
* FFS: gNB may request to activate more UE panels utilizing signals for Rel.17 TCI configuration/activation.  ~~For UE panel activation, Rel.17 MAC-CE-based TCI state activation is used~~

FFS: If additional specification support in TCI state definition to accommodate UE panel is needed or not, and if so, the exact scheme |
| Convida Wireless | Support the FL proposal 4.1.  |
| Lenovo/MoM | We think NW-initiated panel selection shall be supported because gNB can already signal the UE which UL TCI (UL beam) to use, and a panel is a group of antenna ports with their respective TX beams. The real issue is how to make NW-initiated and UE-initiated panel activation work together. We propose to add an additional FFS to this proposal:FFS: if additional specification support is needed for UE-initiated panel activation and NW-initiated panel activation to work together.  |
| Qualcomm | We do not support NW to decide UE panel activation from day 1. Suggest to remove that part and add FFS for UE decided panel activation. **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancement for facilitating fast uplink panel selection, support NW-to-MPUE signalling of UE panel selection ~~and activation~~:* For UE panel selection, Rel.17 DCI-based TCI state update (beam indication) is used
* ~~For UE panel activation, Rel.17 MAC-CE-based TCI state activation is used~~

FFS: If additional specification support in TCI state definition to accommodate UE panel is needed or not, and if so, the exact schemeFFS: UE decided panel activation and corresponding signaling to gNB |
| Ericsson | Support Proposal 4.1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share similar view and support the revision from Apple. In addition, we suggest adding ‘and selection’ to the 2nd sub-bullet (when only one TCI state is activated, the associated UE panel is selected – to be aligned with previous agreement). Proposal 4.1: On Rel.17 enhancement for facilitating fast uplink panel selection, support NW-to-MPUE signalling to facilitate UE panel selection and activation:* For UE panel selection, Rel.17 DCI-based TCI state update (beam indication) is used
* For UE panel activation and selection, Rel.17 MAC-CE-based TCI state activation is used

FFS: If additional specification support in TCI state definition to accommodate UE panel is needed or not, and if so, the exact schemeFFS: If additional specification support to let gNB aware which panel is used is needed or not, and if so, the exact scheme |
| Intel | We don’t support the proposal pending further clarification of the framework for UE initiated panel selection/activation. The panel selection and activation are decided by the UE. The reporting should be to support UE initiated panel selection/activation. If UE reports SSBRI/CRI from a particular panel, it is the UEs responsibility to keep the panel active. From the network perspective, there is no need to know which panel is active at the UE side. Based on SSBRI/CRI report from the UE, Rel.17 TCI state activation/indication can be used for panel activation/selection initiated by UE. The current proposal does not convey this understanding.  |
| Moderator | It seems proposal 4.1 needs more discussion. I also put Nokia’s version on for further synthesis. |
| LG | Support the proposal. As analyzed in our Tdoc, this is essential functionality for the agreed use cases for panels in the last meeting, especially for UL interference management and for dynamic UL TRP switching. To complete this functionality, reporting of UE panel information to gNB is also needed, e.g. for associating each TRP or TRP beam to each UE panel. |

### Issue 5 (MPE mitigation)

Table 9 Summary: issue 5

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **Moderator notes** |
| 5.3 | Any additional reporting content: * Alt0: no additional reporting content
* Alt1: Additional reporting content
 | **Alt0**: Ericsson, Intel, Xiaomi, MTK, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MoM, Huawei/HiSi, APT **Alt1**:* CRI/SSBRI + L1-RSRP/L1-SINR + P-MPR: OPPO, MediaTek, Nokia/NSB, IDC
* CRI/SSBRI + L1-RSRP/L1-SINR + virtual PHR: Nokia/NSB, Apple, Convida, CMCC
* CRI/SSBRI + L1-RSRP/L1-SINR + panel ID: LG, CMCC
* CRI/SSBRI + virtual PHR: ZTE, Convida
* CRI/SSBRI + UL RSRP + panel ID: Qualcomm
* CRI/SSBRI + new/additional param. (indicating MPE): CMCC
* P-MPR + panel-ID: vivo, Sony (panel-specific), IDC
* P-MPR + alternative panel or UL TX beam: Nokia/NSB
* ID of preferred/non-preferred panel: LGE
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Previous agreements**:[RAN1#103-e]On UE reporting for MPE mitigation for Rel-17, investigate and, if needed, specify the following:* …
* Any additional reporting content: down-select from the following in RAN1#104-e
	+ Alt0: no additional reporting content
	+ Alt1: Additional reporting content is included (for example P-MPR + L1-RSRP, virtual PHR + L1-RSRP, L1-RSRP/SINR with and without MPE effect, virtual PHR, P-MPR or virtual PHR + CRI/SSBRI, estimated max UL RSRP)
		- Note: Other options are not precluded
		- FFS: Whether the above reporting is triggered by UE or configured by NW

[RAN1#104-e]On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, * On further enhancing the P-MPR report in Rel.16 (already agreed RAN4 framework, including triggering), down select between beam-level and panel-select reporting
* On SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or indication of panel selection, focus study on the following:
	+ Reporting of at least SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) to indicate gNB beam(s) that is feasible for UL transmission: additional reporting quantities are FFS
	+ Reporting of at least an indicator associated with a UE ‘panel’ that is feasible for UL transmission: additional reporting quantities are FFS
* Note: Just as agreed in RAN1#103-e, the purpose is to assess whether specification is needed or not
 |

It was agreed that we have to down-select the alternatives for additional reporting content in this meeting. From the summary, L1-RSRP/SINR and virtual PHR are the quantities supported by more companies.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, perform study and, if needed, specify the following reporting quantities in addition to the Rel.16-based P-MPR and/or SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication: * L1-RSRP/SINR associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication (if configured)
* Virtual PHR associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication (if configured) or for each activated UL TCI

Note: Performing study and, if needed, specifying Rel.16 based P-MPR and SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication was already agreed |

|  |
| --- |
| Action: Interested companies are encouraged to provide their inputs on proposal 4.1 Goal: Finalize the proposal to be ready for endorsement |

Table 10 Inputs: issue 5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Moderator | 5.1: We need to start narrowing down options for study on additional quantities. From the summary, this could be a good starting point |
| Apple | Support proposal 5.1 |
| MediaTek | We support L1-RSRP/SINR associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication. If UE selects a set of proper gNB beams to avoid MPE issue, if any, then, at least L1-RSRP/SINR associated with the selected beams can be provided to NW for later decision of which beam is used for UL transmission.We don't see clear benefit from other report quantities if MPE issue is already handled by UE. |
| ZTE | Support with following modification. In general, virtual PHR calculation should also be based on with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication. **Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, perform study and, if needed, specify the following reporting quantities in addition to the Rel.16-based P-MPR and/or SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication: * L1-RSRP/SINR associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication (if configured)
* Virtual PHR associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication (if configured)

Note: Performing study and, if needed, specifying Rel.16 based P-MPR and SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication was already agreed |
| vivo | Not support. Would like to focus the study on the following already agreed one:Performing study and, if needed, specifying Rel.16 based P-MPR and SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication was already agreed |
| OPPO | Compared with reporting P-MPR information in beam reporting of CRI/SSBRI, we prefer to support P-MPR and/or virtual PHR for each activated UL TCI state.We propose to update the proposal as follows:**Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, perform study and, if needed, specify the following reporting quantities in addition to the Rel.16-based P-MPR and/or SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication: * L1-RSRP/SINR associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication (if configured)
* Virtual PHR for each activated UL TCI state
 |
| Sony | Support the proposal from FL. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support in principle.We are O.K. with ZTE’s modification. Question to OPPO: How gNB understand for which of activated UL TCI state UE measured virtual PHR? Should UE report virtual PHR of all activated UL TCI? |
| Convida Wireless | Support the FL proposal 5.1. |
| Lenovo/MoM | Support ZTE’s modification. |
| Qualcomm | Suggest to associate virtual PHR also with beam/panel. Otherwise, no difference from R16. **Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, perform study and, if needed, specify the following reporting quantities in addition to the Rel.16-based P-MPR and/or SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication: * L1-RSRP/SINR/Virtual PHR associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)/panel indication (if configured)
 |
| Ericsson | Do not support. L1-RSRP/SINR is already specified, so it is not an additional reporting quantity. {Mod:} Read Moderator comment below}This is unclear. The RSRP report (for SSBRI) would look like this:SSBRI1 RSRP1SSBRI2 RSRP2SSBRI3 RSRP3SSBRI4 RSRP4In our understanding, an additional reporting quantity would mean that we define a report that looks like this:SSBRI1 x1SSBRI2 x2SSBRI3 x3SSBRI4 x4Where x is not RSRP or SINR. {Mod: Yes. And also substitute SSBRI with P-MPR} But this is not yet agreed – there are proposals that the beam report would contain multiple measurement quantities per SSBRI. Can we agree that the beam report only contains one measurement per SSBRI, and that the UE reports the 1,2 or 4 highest values for that quantity?{Mod: Read the Moderator comment below}If the reporting is per panel, the problem is similar, but even more complicated, since the NW uses the UL TCI to control the spatial properties of the UL transmission. If the reporting is per panel, how would the NW associate the measurement with the UL TCI? We have some sympathy for Oppo’s suggestion to report MPR per UL TCI, but the UE should also be able to report for TCI states that are not activated – the network would typically require a report before activating any TCI state.However, it feels difficult to agree on a reporting quantity before we agree on the scheduling mechanism. Here Proposal 4.1 is a good start. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. Reading the agreement again, we don’t think it has been agreed to support ‘SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or indication of panel selection’, as it says to ‘focus study’... And it makes more sense to ‘down select between beam-level and panel-select reporting’ for ‘further enhancing the P-MPR report’.{Mod: Check previous agreement and summary. We just agreed to down select this layer since the support for both are equal. The group cannot proceed further at this point.} |
| Intel | It appears that all companies are ok to at least support SSBRI/CRI reporting. Therefore, we can at least agree that SSBRI/CRI is reported with the P-MPR report. Additionally, we can further study if L1-RSRP/SINR/Virtual PHR associated with these SSBRI/CRI, as well as the association of such SSBRI/CRI to a panel is also reported.  |
| APT | We support the proposal in general. We think there should be a means for gNW to request panel activation, or at least a means to request a panel status report from UE. This is needed at least for measurement resource configuration. |
| Moderator | It seems several companies may misunderstand what the proposal is. It is a proporsal to “perform study and, if needed, specify”. For SSBRI/CRI, we have NOT agreed to SUPPORT yet. But we HAVE AGREED TO STUDY. Since we have to down select, if there is no chance for this proposal (TO STUDY) to be agreed, I will conclude that additional reporting is EXCLUDED for study in this meeting. At this point there are too many options. |
| LG | Support the proposal. |
| NTT Docomo | We would like to clarify our understanding whether the reporting of SSBRI/CRI is included in Rel-16 PMPR report, or the reporting of SSBRI/CRI is a separate report from Rel-16 PMPR report e.g. based on L1 beam reporting framework. If they are separate report, the study of additional quantities may need to be discussed separately. |

### Issue 6 (beam refinement/tracking)

After round-1 discussion was concluded, below is proposal 6.1 revised based on companies’ inputs (a sub-bullet on the second bullet was added to address inquiries).

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 6.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements based on the unified TCI framework, perform study and, if needed, specify the following:* Beam management with reduced DL signaling (e.g. beam update based on reporting, beam measurement and report triggered by beam indication, multi-SSB indication, semi-static beam transition configuration, UE-initiated beam measurement/update/activation)
	+ Candidate schemes will be down selected or, if possible, combined
* Reducing activation delay of TCI states and PL-RSs (including other WGs, e.g. RAN4)
	+ For instance, via storing QCL properties of a subset of source RSs for a time period
	+ On RAN4-related matters, assessment/study phase can be done in RAN1. If RAN4-based enhancements are found necessary, a LS to RAN4 will be sent (to prepare RAN4 work)

Note: Given its dependence on the maturity of other issues (1 to 5), when to start the work and how much work is done on issue 6 should depend on the progress on the other issues. |

**Support**: Futurewei (clarify 2nd bullet), MTK, Samsung, OPPO, Apple, Intel, NTT Docomo, Qualcomm (clarify 2nd bullet), Ericsson, IDC, Spreadtrum (after other issues progress enough), Xiaomi, Nokia/NSB (clarify 2nd bullet), Convida (after other issues progress enough), Lenovo/MoM

**Not support**: ZTE, Huawei/HiSi, vivo

|  |
| --- |
| Action: Interested companies are encouraged to share inputs on refining the text for endorsementGoal: Finalize the proposal to be ready for endorsement |

Table 11 Inputs: issue 6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Apple | Support proposal 6.1.  |
| MediaTek | With the note under the proposal, we can support this proposal. |
| ZTE | We feel a little bit comfortable for proposal 6.1 with the additional note. Regarding second bullet, we think that the previous example in last meeting can be added back for clarification as follows:* Reducing activation delay of TCI states (including other WGs, e.g. RAN4)
	+ For instance, via storing QCL properties of a subset of source RSs for a time period
	+ On RAN4-related matters, assessment/study phase can be done in RAN1. If RAN4-based enhancements are found necessary, a LS to RAN4 will be sent (to prepare RAN4 work)
 |
| vivo | Do not support. Concerned on too many examples to study. |
| Sony | The solutions for reducing overhead of DL beam management are quite open, and we see no obvious problem to further study it. Support proposal from FL in principle.  |
| Nokia/NSB | O.K. in principle |
| Futurewei | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | OK |
| Lenovo/MoM | Support proposal 6.1 |
| Qualcomm | Added one more aspect for UE initiated beam measurement. Also added reducing activation delay of PL RS for study, which is as important as TCI state. For the 2nd bullet, please add RAN4 issue description or related doc # for aligned understanding. **Proposal 6.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements based on the unified TCI framework, perform study and, if needed, specify the following:* Beam management with reduced DL signaling (e.g. beam update based on reporting, beam measurement and report triggered by beam indication, multi-SSB indication, semi-static beam transition configuration, UE-initiated beam measurement/update/activation)
	+ Candidate schemes will be down selected or, if possible, combined
* Reducing activation delay of TCI states and PL RSs (including other WGs, e.g. RAN4)
	+ On RAN4-related matters, assessment/study phase can be done in RAN1. If RAN4-based enhancements are found necessary, a LS to RAN4 will be sent (to prepare RAN4 work)
	+ Add RAN4 issue description or related doc/LS #
 |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are concerned on the workload of this agenda item and do not support to open wide door to so many new directions (5 different solutions mixed in one bullet).  |
| Intel | Support the proposal since we think this is one of the only items which can actually improve the latency of beam management.  |
| Samsung | Support proposal 6.1 as work will start after the first five issues reach a reasonable level of maturity |