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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 |

This summary includes the following:

* Observation and proposal
* Summary of current companies’ positions on each of the aspects within the category

## Summary of companies’ inputs

The listed issues are structured primarily to facilitate some progress on pending issues identified in the agreements especially in 103-e and 104-e (see Appendix A).

### Issue 1 (Rel.17 unified TCI framework – note: for intra-cell beam management)

Table 1 Summary: issue 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 1.1 | Additional source RS type for DL QCL Type-D reference for DL common UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs  Note: CSI-RS for tracking (TRS) and CSI-RS for BM have been agreed | SSB, with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS   * **Yes (12):** vivo, Lenovo/MoM, Samsung, NTT Docomo, ZTE, MTK, AT&T, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Convida, CATT * **No (11):** Huawei, HiSi, OPPO, Spreadtrum, APT/FGI, Intel, Nokia/NSB, Sony, Futurewei   SRS for BM, optionally with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS   * **Yes (14):** IDC, vivo, Lenovo/MoM, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, ZTE, Apple, Convida, Xiaomi, CATT, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm (UE capability) * **No (13):** Ericsson, Huawei, HiSi, OPPO, Intel, LGE, APT/FGI, Sony, Futurewei, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI   CSI-RS for CSI   * **Yes (8):** CMCC, Huawei, HiSi, ZTE, Sony, AT&T, NTT Docomo, Qualcomm (UE capability) * **No (7):** vivo, Spreadtrum, MTK, APT/FGI, Nokia/NSB |
| 1.2 | Additional source RS type for UL TX spatial filter  Note: SSB, SRS for BM, CSI-RS for tracking (TRS), and CSI-RS for BM have been agreed | Non-BM CSI-RS other than for tracking   * **Yes (5):** CMCC, ZTE, Sony, Huawei, HiSi, * **No (8):** vivo, Apple, MTK, Nokia/NSB, Qualcomm, Futurewei, Spreadtrum   Non-BM SRS   * **Yes (8):** CMCC, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Sony, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, HiSi, * **No (8):** Apple, MTK, APT/FGI, Qualcomm, Lenovo/MoM, Futurewei |
| 1.3 | Switching between joint and separate DL/UL TCI   * Alt1. A UE can be dynamically indicated with either joint DL/UL TCI or separate DL/UL TCI * Alt2A. A UE can be configured with either joint DL/UL TCI or separate DL/UL TCI via RRC signaling * Alt2B. A UE can be configured with either joint DL/UL TCI, separate DL/UL TCI, or both via RRC signaling * Alt3. A UE can be configured with either joint DL/UL TCI or separate DL/UL TCI via MAC CE signaling | **Alt1 (17)**: Lenovo/MoM, Nokia/NSB, Spreadtrum, CATT, APT/FGI, Xiaomi, Sony, AT&T, Apple, MTK, ZTE, Futurewei, Convida, Intel  **Alt2A (6)**: Ericsson, NTT Docomo, LGE, NEC, Huawei, HiSi  **Alt2B (2)**: vivo, ZTE  **Alt3 (11)**: CMCC, Samsung, NTT Docomo, Huawei, HiSi, CATT, Xiaomi, Intel, Qualcomm, NEC, Convida. |
| 1.4 | Whether Rel-17 DL and, if applicable, joint TCI also applies to the following signals.   * If not applicable, how to provide DL QCL information for those signals   Note: UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs have been agreed | CSI-RS resource for CSI:   * **Yes (21)**: Lenovo/MoM, Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, Spreadtrum, MTK, APT/FGI, Intel, Convida, AT&T, Samsung, Apple (at least for default AP-CSI-RS beam), Sony, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, Intel, CATT * **No (3)**: Huawei, HiSi, Futurewei (need further discussion), Qualcomm   Some CSI-RS resource(s) for BM (if so, which one(s), e.g. aperiodic, repetition ‘ON’)   * **Yes (15)**: Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, MTK, APT/FGI, Intel, AT&T, Samsung, Apple (at least for default AP-CSI-RS beam), Sony (at least for repetition ‘ON’), Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, Intel * **No (6)**: Huawei, HiSi, Futurewei (need further discussion, depending on whether the resource is repeated or not), Spreadtrum, vivo, Qualcomm   CSI-RS for tracking:   * **Yes (10)**: Lenovo/MoM, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, AT&T, Nokia/NSB, Sony, Qualcomm, CATT * **No (5)**: Huawei, HiSi, MTK, Futurewei, NTT Docomo |
| 1.5 | Whether Rel-17 UL and, if applicable, joint TCI also applies to the following signals.   * If not applicable, how to provide UL TX spatial reference information for those signals | Some SRS resources or resource sets for BM:   * **Yes (13)**: Lenovo/MoM, Ericsson, OPPO, MTK, Intel, APT/FGI, Nokia/NSB, Sony, Xiaomi, Convida * **No (5)**: Huawei, HiSi, Futurewei (need further discussion) , Spreadtrum (reuse R15 TCI framework), Qualcomm |
| 1.6 | Setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index): In addition to association with UL channel/RS,   * Alt1. The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is also associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * Alt2. The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is included with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * Alt3. The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is neither associated with nor included in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * Alt4. The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is determined as in Rel-16 without enhancement | **Alt1 (11)**: Lenovo, CMCC (PUCCH), Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo, Spreadtrum, CATT, ZTE, OPPO (PUSCH, PUCCH), Qualcomm, Futurewei  **Alt2 (6)**: IDC, Samsung, Intel (at least PUCCH), Apple, Qualcomm, LGE  **Alt3 (5)**: Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, CMCC (PUSCH – SRI, SRS – SRSResourceSet), Ericsson (for P0 and alpha), Sony,  **Alt4 (5)**: vivo, OPPO (SRS), MTK, Huawei, HiSi |
| 1.7 | Path-loss measurement (PL RS):   * Alt1. PL-RS can be included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.   + FFS: Whether it is always included or not. If not included, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL 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   + FFS: Exact association mechanism   + FFS: Whether it is always associated or not. If not associated, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * Alt3. The periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter can be used as PL-RS. In case the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter is not used as PL-RS, 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, or using default PL-RS)   + 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 as the source RS or a periodic QCL-Type-D/spatialRelationInfo source of the source RS in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state   + FFS: Whether UE can calculate path-loss based on DL periodic RS for path-loss calculation for UL RS in the UL TCI | **Alt1 (10)**: IDC, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Ericsson (if UL RS in TCI state), NTT Docomo, OPPO, Intel (at least PUCCH), Qualcomm, AT&T, LGE  **Alt2 (14)**: Lenovo/MoM, CMCC, NTT Docomo, Huawei, HiSi, Spreadtrum, CATT, ZTE, MTK, Futurewei, Sony, Nokia/NSB  **Alt3 (1)**: vivo  **Alt4 (3)**: Ericsson (if DL RS in TCI state), Samsung, Apple, |
| 1.8 | [Based on offline discussion, cf. Yuki, *reformulated for better clarity*] Carrier aggregation  For TCI state(s) shared across a set of CCs (that is associated with the same gNB beam):   * Alt1: CC-specific QCL-TypeD RS can be determined from the shared TCI state(s). The determined QCL-TypeD RSs for the set of CCs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS. * Alt2: A single QCL-TypeD RS is determined from the shared TCI state(s), and support enhanced QCL chain: support “i) only”, “ii) only”, or “both i) and ii)” from the following:   + i) the QCL type A TRS and, if any, QCL type D TRS, in the same/different CSI-RS resources   + ii) the QCL type A TRS and, if any, QCL type D SSB | **Alt1 (10)**: Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo, Intel, Apple, APT/FGI, CATT, Huawei, HiSi,  **Alt2 (8)**: vivo, Samsung, NTT Docomo, ZTE, MTK, Sony (“i only”), Qualcomm (both i and ii), Spreadtrum |
| 1.9 | For separate TCI, UL TCI state pool  Alt1: Shared pool with joint/DL TCI state  Alt2: Separate pool | **Alt1 (9)**: vivo, Samsung, Spreadtrum, ZTE, MTK, Xiaomi, Intel, Qualcomm, Convida,  **Alt2 (11)**: Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, CMCC, Ericsson, OPPO, Futurewei, Sony, Lenovo/MoM, Huawei, HiSi |
| 1.10 | TCI state pool for CA  Alt1: Separate, per CC  Alt2: Shared among all CCs  Note: This can be better formulated after #1.8 is finalized | **Alt1 (9):** Nokia/NSB, CATT, OPPO, Futurewei, Huawei, HiSi, LG, Ericsson  **Alt2 (11):** vivo, Samsung, Spreadtrum, ZTE, MTK, Xiaomi, Intel, Apple, Qualcomm, Sony, NTT Docomo |
| 1.11 | Maximum value of M (DL) and N (UL) along with the use case(s) | Max M:   * **1**: Samsung (depending on issue 3 outcome), NTT Docomo (1st priority), Spreadtrum, ZTE (high priority), MTK, Convida, OPPO, Apple (sTRP), Sony (sTRP), Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (sTRP), CATT (S-TRP) * **2**: Nokia/NSB (1st priority), Apple(mTRP), APT/FGI, Sony (mTRP), Lenovo/MoM(mTRP), Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (mTRP), CATT (M-TRP), AT&T * **>2 (specify)**: Vivo, Futurewei, Qualcomm, LGE, Nokia/NSB (2nd priority), AT&T   Max N:   * **1**: Samsung (depending on issue 3 outcome), NTT Docomo (1st priority), Spreadtrum, ZTE (high priority), MTK, Convida, OPPO, Apple (sTRP), Sony (sTRP), Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (sTRP), CATT (S-TRP) * **2**: Nokia/NSB (1st priority), Apple(mTRP), APT/FGI, Sony (mTRP), Lenovo/MoM(mTRP), Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (mTRP), CATT (M-TRP), AT&T * **>2 (specify)**: Vivo, Futurewei, Qualcomm, LGE, Nokia/NSB (2nd priority), AT&T   Clarify whether M>1 or N>1implies simultaneous reception with different DL QCL(s) or transmission with different UL spatial filter(s): Huawei, HiSi |
| 1.12 | TCI for non-UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs  Alt1: Extend (use) Rel-17 unified TCI  Alt2: Reuse Rel-15/16 TCI | **Alt1**: vivo, Samsung, Qualcomm, Futurewei, Huawei, HiSi, Ericsson  **Alt2**: Apple (modify Alt2 as “reuse Rel-15/16 QCL assumption”, since many cases are for idle mode UE and there is no TCI) |

**Proposed conclusion 1.1**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, at least for dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC, there is no consensus in supporting non-BM CSI-RS other than for tracking and non-BM SRS as source RS types for UL TX spatial filter reference

[**Proposed conclusion 1.1B**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, at least for DL UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs in a CC, there is no consensus in supporting SSB, CSI-RS for CSI, and/or SRS for BM as source RS types for DL QCL Type D

VS

**Proposal 1.1B**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, at least for DL UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs in a CC, support the following source RS types for DL QCL Type D as UE capabilities:

* SSB, with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS
* CSI-RS for CSI
* SRS for BM, optionally with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS ]

**Proposal 1.2**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss to down-select or combine from the following two alternatives for switching between joint and separate DL/UL TCI (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):

* Alt1. A UE can be dynamically indicated with either joint DL/UL TCI or separate DL/UL TCI among the activated TCI states
  + Details on dynamic indication are FFS
* Alt3. A UE can be configured with either joint DL/UL TCI or separate DL/UL TCI via MAC CE signaling
  + Details on how this is signaled in relation to TCI activation are FFS

FFS: The support for joint DL/UL TCI and/or separate DL/UL TCI in terms of UE capability

FFS: Functionality/mode corresponding to either joint DL/UL TCI, separate DL/UL TCI, or dynamically switching between joint and separate is enabled by RRC

**Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,

* DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals:
  + Aperiodic CSI-RS resources for CSI
    - FFS: Periodic and/or semi-persistent in addition to aperiodic
    - FFS: Supported settings, e.g. some vs all CSI-RS resources for CSI
  + [Some aperiodic CSI-RS resources for BM
    - FFS: Periodic and/or semi-persistent in addition to aperiodic
    - FFS: Supported settings, e.g. one CSI-RS resource set with repetition ‘ON’, or repetition of both ‘ON’ and ’OFF’]
  + FFS: Whether legacy TCI state should be applied to the DL signals not allowed for separate DL or joint TCI state.
  + FFS: Apply in resource set level or resource level
* UL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to some SRS resources or resource sets for BM
  + FFS: Whether legacy spatial relation state should be applied to the UL signals not allowed for separate UL or joint TCI state
  + FFS: Apply in resource set level or resource level

**Proposal 1.4**: On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework,

* For PUSCH, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) [is also associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state]
* For PUCCH, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is also associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* For SRS, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) [is also associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state]
* Note: It has been agreed that the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is associated with UL channel or UL RS (therefore the setting is channel- and signal-specific)

**Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss to down select or combine from the following two alternatives for PL-RS (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):

* Alt1. PL-RS can be 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
  + FFS: Exact association mechanism
* Depending on the final outcome, FFS on exact association mechanism and whether to support a unified mechanism for the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) and PL-RS, if PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state

The support of the above PL-RS (the outcome of the above down selection or combining) is a UE optional feature.

* If not supported, or if a UE is configured with neither PL-RS in UL/joint TCI state nor the association between PL-RS and UL/joint TCI state, the UE estimates path-loss based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter [or the PL-RS used for the UL RS] in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* FFS: maximum number of active PL-RS per band

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| **ROUND 1** | |
| Mod V00 | If you have further inputs on **any of the above proposals**, please share.  For 1.1, 1.3, and 1.5, based on GTW discussion, please pay special attention on the yellow highlighted parts:   * For 1.1, given the pros and cons summarized in R1-2103830 ([34]) for SSB and SRS for BM, **would (any of the) companies opposing SSB and SRS change their mind?** * For 1.1, as correctly pointed out by Huawei, CSI-RS for CSI is supported as a source RS for DL QCL D in Rel-15/16 for PDSCH/PDCCH DMRS. There is some conflict between the cyan and the purple texts in the previous agreement. But given the main sentence, the natural interpretation would be to support CSI-RS for CSI as well (in addition to CSI-RS for BM and TRS). **Is there any strong reason not to support CSI-RS for CSI given the natural interpretation of the agreement?** * For 1.3 on **CSI-RS for CSI and BM**, would it be **acceptable to reword “at least for aperiodic CSI-RS...” and add FFS for periodic/semi-persistent**? **On CSI-RS for BM, could the proponents respond to vivo’s concern**? * For 1.5, please discuss how to refine the yellow text to make it agreeable (about the default mode).  |  | | --- | | **Agreement**:  On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, the supported source/target QCL relations in the current TS38.214 V16.4.0 is supported for QCL Type D.   * Note: This implies that the following source RS types for DL QCL (Type D, for DL RX spatial filter reference) information for DL UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs are supported:   + CSI-RS for beam management   + CSI-RS for tracking   FFS (to be decided by RAN1#104bis-e): If SSB, CSI-RS for CSI, and/or SRS for BM are also supported as source RS types  **{From Round 0 summary}**  SSB, with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS   * **Yes (12):** vivo, Lenovo/MoM, Samsung, NTT Docomo, ZTE, MTK, AT&T, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Convida, CATT * **No (11):** Huawei, HiSi, OPPO, Spreadtrum, APT/FGI, Intel, Nokia/NSB, Sony, Futurewei   SRS for BM, optionally with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS   * **Yes (13):** IDC, vivo, Lenovo/MoM, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, ZTE, Apple, Convida, Xiaomi, CATT, Spreadtrum * **No (13):** Ericsson, Huawei, HiSi, OPPO, Intel, LGE, APT/FGI, Sony, Futurewei, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI   CSI-RS for CSI as additional source RS type for DL QCL Type-D reference:   * **Yes (7):** CMCC, Huawei, HiSi, ZTE, Sony, AT&T, NTT Docomo * **No (7):** vivo, Spreadtrum, MTK, APT/FGI, Nokia/NSB | |
| Mod V02 | Revised P1.5 per a joint offline comment from Apple and Nokia (to resolve Nokia’s concern) |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 1.1   * For the highlighted part, suggest to remove the highlighted part at least for the SSB.   + For the SSB, the benefit is to simplify the QCL chain maintenance at least to our side. Wonder can we make SSB as UE capability to satisfy different flavors?   [Mod: We can try this compromise]   * + For the CSI-RS for CSI and SRS for BM, we are fine to support them with UE capability   [Mod: Table 1 is updated]  For Proposal 1.3   * For the highlighted part   + For the CSI-RS for CSI, we are also not clear the issue for applying unified TCI to P/SP CSI-RS. Slightly prefer no any restriction unless the issue is clarified   [Mod: Some comments from Ericsson and Huawei, in addition to ZTE, touch upon this issue ]   * + For the CSI-RS for BM, we may slightly prefer to not support it, because they may or may not have the same beam as PDCCH/PDSCH. So a simple rule could be not to apply unified TCI to CSI-RS for BM * For the non-highlighted part   + For the SRS for BM, we may also slightly prefer not to apply unified TCI to SRS for BM in general to simplify the rule   [Mod: Table 1 is updated]  For Proposal 1.4   * The PC parameters for PUSCH should also be associated with TCI state, since they are associated with SRI in R15   [Mod: Some companies such as vivo still prefer Alt3/4 for PUSCH and SRS. It’s in brackets for now.]  For Proposal 1.5   * We do not support the last Note, because UE can support more active UL beams than 4 PL RS in R15/16.   Note: UE supporting X active UL TCI state and joint TCI per band should support tracking at least X PL-RS per ban  [Mod: possible rewording: “To be able to track at least X PL-RSs per band, a UE must be capable of supporting X active TCI states and joint TCI states per band”. Is this acceptable?] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Conclusion 1.1: We propose to remove ‘CSI-RS for CSI’, and update previous agreement to clarify that CSI-RS for CSI can be used for QCL TypeD indication in R17. If there is concern, we would like to hear it.  [Mod: Please check proposal 1.1B]  Proposal 1.2: We propose adding ‘among activated ones’ at the end of Alt1, to avoid the understanding that DCI can point to arbitrary TCI state.  [Mod: done]  Propoal 1.3: After reviewing comments from companies, we are still concerned on this proposal. We would hope the proponents can answer our questions. In short, our understanding is the joint, DL, and UL TCI in R17 are mainly for data channels (or reference signals that are tightly related to data channels), and we failed to understand why they should be applied to reference signals for other purposes.   * There can be multiple configured CSI-RS resources for CSI, which one of them should follow the indicated DL or joint TCI? What happens to the TCI state indicated to this CSI-RS resource using R16 mechanism? * What is the meaning of ‘some’ here? Why joint/DL TCI should be applied to CSI-RS resource set configured with repetition ‘ON’, where the UE is expected to train its Rx beam? Why joint/UL TCI should be applied to SRS resources for BM, and which of them are ‘some’? * Some further thoughts: For P/SP CSI-RS, its TCI state is configured/activated by RRC/MAC-CE, and it is unclear why/how it should now follow the active TCI/QCL for PDCCH/PDSCH reception. For AP CSI-RS for CSI, when the scheduling offset is smaller than certain threshold, its QCL will follow PDCCH as in R16, with which there is no need to make a change. * Also, the questions asked by Ericsson are also valid to us: “To us it is central to first understand if R17 and legacy TCI states should be mixed. Does any company advocate that? If they are not mixed, how would the QCL assumptions for, e.g., periodic CSI-RS be derived?”   [Mod: Perhaps proponents can try to address Huawei’s questions please?  Note that 3) and 4) would be a non-issue if it is restricted for AP only]  Proposal 1.5: We are not sure about the default behavior of ‘path-loss measurement is based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state’. Is it correct understanding that the specification will select one of them?  [Mod: It was discussed whether “or the PL-RS used for the UL RS” can be removed or not. If so, this is a non-issue. If not, I believe your interpretation is correct and a clarification can be added] |
| vivo | **Proposal 1.1**  We are supportive of QC’s understanding.  **Proposal 1.5**  Two comments from our side:  The default PLRS behavior is the reason why Alt1 or Alt2 can be agreed. It should not be moved out of the description.  Indeed, as discussed during GTW, if UE does not support  [Mod: It is not moved out. It is captured only in the last part to avoid 3x repetition/replication and confusion. Please double check again.]  **Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss to down select or combine from the following two alternatives for PL-RS (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):   * Alt1. PL-RS can be included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.   + If not included, the default operation is that path-loss measurement is based on 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 associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state   + FFS: Exact association mechanism   + If not associated, the default operation is that path-loss measurement is based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state. * Depending on the final outcome, FFS on exact association mechanism and whether to support a unified mechanism for the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) and PL-RS, if PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state   The support of the above PL-RS (the outcome of the above down selection or combining) is a UE optional feature.   * If not supported, UE may additionally indicate support of the behavior that the default operation is that path-loss measurement is based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * For a UE supporting Rel-17 unified framework and not support of the default assumption, UE may fall back to Rel-15/Rel-16 operation. * Note: UE supporting X active UL TCI state and joint TCI per band should support tracking at least X PL-RS per ban   [Mod: If I understand correctly, the purpose of the default operation is that it is a conditional mandatory feature. Perhap the proponents of the default scheme can comment on vivo’s proposed changes?] |
| Mod V06 | Revised wording on proposal 1.2 (Huawei) and 1.3. For 1.3, from FL perspective, given the comments from ZTE, Huawei, and Ericsson, at this point it may be good to try to agree on aperiodic first and keep P/SP FFS.  Added proposal 1.1B: please see if the compromise proposed by Qualcomm is acceptable to all |
| DOCOMO | Proposal 1.1B is fine for us. We also think whether to include SSB is highly related to issue 1.8 (i.e. CA). To agree the original proposal 1.1 before agreeing issue 1.8 looks unsafer approach.  On proposal 1.5, the proposal only coveres the case UE does not support. However, we would like to keep option that gNB does not configure PL-RS or the association, same as Rel.16. Thus, we propose to update as below.  The support of the above PL-RS (the outcome of the above down selection or combining) is a UE optional feature.   * If not supported, or if UE is configured neither PL-RS in UL / joint TCI state nor the association between PL-RS and UL / joint TCI state, the default operation is that path-loss measurement is based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * [Note: UE supporting X active UL TCI states and joint TCI states per band should support tracking at least X PL-RS per band]   [Mod: Captured in a slightly different wording to account for OPPO’s comment] |
| OPPO | **Regarding Proposal 1.1 and 1.1B**: 1.1B is not acceptable to us because there is no technical benefit and justification to support SSB and SRS as QCL-TypeD, as we dicussed in offline before the meeting. Configuring SRS as QCL-typeD does not reduce the requirement on DL CSI-RS transmission. Instead, it would require transmission of SRS for BM, which is supposed to be unnecessary for a UE supporting beam correspondence. For a UE who can support using SRS for BM as QCL-TypeD is a UE with the capability of beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping. A UE with the capability of beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping fulfils the beam correspondence requirement without the uplink beam sweeping. That means the UE does not send SRS for uplink beam sweeping. But using SRS for BM as QCL-TypeD would enforece the UE to transmit uplink beam sweeping and that contradict with the definition of this UE capability. It does not reduce the overhead of CSI-RS transmission. For a SRS for BM, we still need to transmit one DL periodic RS as the path loss RS for that SRS. And, if we follow Apple’s suggestion, we would still need to configure one periodic DL RS as the spatial relation for that SRS resource. Given that, why do not we just configure the periodic DL RS as the QCL-TypeD RS. It does not reduce overhead of reference signal, but increase the overhead, In addition to the CSI-RS transmission, the UE would have to transmit SRS for BM, which is not needed for those UEs according to the current design. Regarding the SSB: we still need a TRS for TypeA. If the TRS is QCLed to different SSB, then misalignment problem would be caused and if the TRS is QCLed to that SSB, then why do we waste RRC overhead to configure SSB.  We really have spent too much effort and time on this. We suggest to agree the Proposal conclusion 1.1 and stop discussing this.  **Regarding Proposal 1.2:** we do not think we can combine those two alts. Suggest to remove the wording “combine”:  **Proposal 1.2**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss to down-select ~~or combine~~ from the following two alternatives for switching between joint and separate DL/UL TCI (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):  [Mod: Since a number of companies (Intel, MTK, Xiaomi, Convida, ...) would like to keep the possibility of combining open, I will keep “or combine”.  On the other hand, could the proponents of “or combine” please elaborate or give some examples of how such combining is done? It is not clear to me and perhaps some other companies. It is fine to keep but may be good to understand a bit better.]  **Regarding Proposal 1.4**: we do not support to associate {P0, alphas,..} with TCI state for SRS resource because the PC parameters are associated with one SRS resource set, not each individual SRS resource.  **Regarding Proposal 1.5**: We do not support the yellow highlighted part because If the UE does not support the new feature, then the UE shall follow legacy specification. The yellow highlighted part actually introduces a new Alt. So suggest to delete it. And on the note added: how many PL RS to be tracked shall be dicussed in UE capability. Furthermore, the number of PL RS shall not depend on the number of active UL TCI state. Suggest to remove the note.  **Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss to down select or combine from the following two alternatives for PL-RS (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):   * Alt1. PL-RS can be 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   + FFS: Exact association mechanism * If PL-RS is not included (in Alt1) or associated (in Alt2) in joint TCI state or UL TCI state, then the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter in the TCI state is used to estimate PL. * Depending on the final outcome, FFS on exact association mechanism and whether to support a unified mechanism for the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) and PL-RS, if PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state   ~~The support of the above PL-RS (the outcome of the above down selection or combining) is a UE optional feature.~~   * ~~If not supported, the default operation is that path-loss measurement is based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state~~ * ~~[Note: UE supporting X active UL TCI states and joint TCI states per band should support tracking at least X PL-RS per band]~~   [Mod: please check latest version which should address your concern] |
| Samsung | For conclusion 1.1/proposal 1.1B, we support having SSB and SRS as QCL Type-D source RS. SSB simplifies QCL chain as mentioned by Qualcomm. It also simplifies beam indication for inter-cell mobility. SRS reduces overhead for joint UL/DL beam indication. We are fine with the compromise proposed by Qualcomm (UE capabibility) for SSB and SRS BM.  We are fine with the second bullet of conclusion 1.1.  Proposal 1.2: Support  Proposal 1.3: Support  Proposal 1.4: We are not supportive of this proposal. We would like to see a unified design for all uplink channels and signals. This would save configuration overhead. It seems that there is some correlation between proposal 1.4 and proposal 1.5, the former is for the PC parameters, while the latter is for the PL RS, we would like to understand the rationale for agreeing to have the PC parameters associated (rather than included) with the TCI state in this proposal but discussing association vs inclusion in proposal 1.5.  Proposal 1.5: We are fine with the direction of this proposal. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1.1: We have concern on CSI-RS for CSI, if RAN1 agrees that joint/separate TCI can apply to CSI-RS for CSI in Proposal 1.3. First, it may cause QCL loop. Second, CSI-RS for CSI cannot be used as source RS for another CSI-RS for CSI. Thus, if CSI-RS for CSI is removed from Conclusion 1.1, we prefer to remove it from Proposal 1.3 as well. However, we do see the benefit to support CSI-RS for CSI in Proposal 1.3.  Proposal 1.3: Response to some comments from Huawei.   * An RRC parameter can be provided per resource/resource set to let UE know whether a configured CSI-RS resource follows the indicated joint/separate TCI or not. If not, we expect NW will provide the TCI state using R16 mechanism. We don't see this is an issue. * Regarding “some”, we think it means CSI-RS/SRS can optionally follow the indicated joint/separate TCI, which depends on NW configuration. * Regarding AP CSI-RS, we tend to agree that Rel-16 can configure UE to follow PDCCH beam by scheduling smaller than beamSwitchTime. Thus, we don't think AP-only restriction can address Huawei’s concern. * Regarding the “FFS: Whether legacy TCI state should be applied to the DL signals not allowed for separate DL or joint TCI state”, we think R16 mechanism is used by default if joint/separate TCI not applicable and whether to provide legacy TCI state can be up to NW implementation. However, we can further study whether NW can provide TCI state for the DL signals not applied with separate DL or joint TCI from the same TCI pool used for separate DL or joint TCI.   Proposal 1.5: The original concern from Apple is if UE supports Alt1/Alt2, NW may configure PL-RS with spatial QCL assumption not aligned with the TypeD source RS in the TCI state. Thus, for some chip-sets don't want to support Alt1/Alt2, they can use the default operation at least for unified TCI framework. However, this also implies the default operation would be a basic UE feature of Rel-17 unified TCI framework. We don't have strong preference on it. However, we prefer to make it more clear. For example:   * UE supports path-loss measurement based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state as a baseline capability for Rel-17 unified TCI framework   [Mod: Please check the latest version which should be clearer along the line of your suggestion]  Regarding the note, we prefer not to add it.  [Mod: Perhaps Nokia/Apple can explain the motivation of the notes] |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | We agree with Docomo’s comment and suggest that we update the yellow part as proposed by Docomo.  And one clarification on the comment made by Huawei: We are not sure about the default behavior of ‘path-loss measurement is based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state’. Is it correct understanding that the specification will select one of them?  A: The TCI state may contain a DL-RS or an UL-RS to indicate as a spatial source for an UL transmission. The behavior in the proposal enables the derivation of the pathloss from the DL or the UL RS in the TCI-state depending on which source RS is available. Hence, the UE may not have to choose one behavior or the other. Both of them may exist and be applied to different TCI states based on the source RS indicated for the UL transmission in the TCI state. |
| Lenovo, MoM | Proposal 1.1B: Support. We are OK to support SSB and SRS-BM as UE capability. For CSI-RS for CSI, we agree with Huawei that it is already agreed as part of previous agreements.  Proposal 1.2: We propose to postone this decision until the issue of 3.1 is settled. The benefit of dynamic or MAC-CE configured separate or joint DL/UL TCI state depends on what DCI format is used to signal the TCI states.  [Mod: We have agreed in RAN1#104-e to finalize this issue in RAN1#104-e. The group should strive for this ☺ proposal 1.2 is just to exclude Alt2A/2B and leave Alt1/3 for further discussion, hopefully this meeting]  Proposal 1.3: We do not see the need to distinguish aperiodic/semi-persistent/periodic CSI-RS, but a TCI may apply to only some, not all of the CSI-RS resources.  Proposal 1.5: Support vivo’s update. |
| Mod V13 | 1.1: Split DL and UL in 1.1 to 1.1A (UL which is stable) and 1.1B (two candidates).  Regarding CSI-RS for CSI in proposal 1.1B, given the above explanation, other than MTK, is there any other company having concern?  1.2: No change in text, but could the proponents of “or combine” elaborate with some examples or description on how to combine Alt1 and Alt3?  1.3: No change in text. Please check if the non-bracketed parts are agreeable.  Note that if the proponents of 1.3 cannot even converge to the agreeable settings (AP vs all etc), we will conclude that there is no consensus on supporting those 3 signals as target.  1.4: Basically despite majority support for Alt1, it’s quite puzzling that proposal 1.4 (Alt1) is not agreeable to several companies (Ericsson, Samsung, vivo, OPPO, Intel, ...). Given that we strive to close this issue in this meeting and that we have agreed on the following (that is, UL PC par setting is channel/signal specific):  *The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is at least associated with UL channel or UL RS*  If the group cannot converge on any of the 4 alternatives (or the TCI-state-specific setting proponents Alt1/2/4 cannot converge), no spec-based association/linkage with TCI state is agreed, i.e. Alt3 will be automatically the outcome:  *The setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is neither associated with nor included in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state*  1.5: Revised text. The added Note and “PL RS in UL RS” are in brackets for further discussion. Otherwise the text seems stable. Please check.  Regarding vivo’s addition, I’d like to see more companies’ inputs first. |
| LG | Proposal 1.1B: We still have a concern on supporting SRS for BM as DL QCL Type-D source considering that DL RS is still needed for pathloss estimation at least and UL RS cannot be a QCL reference RS by the definition of ‘QCL’. |
| Mod V15 | 1.5: The Note is replaced with FFS in V14 per offline inputs from Apple/Nokia/MTK. |
| Xiaomi | For Proposal 1.1B, we support SSB and SRS for BM as source RS types for DL QCL Type D.  For proposal 1.3, considering the comments from Huawei and MediaTek, could we update the main bullet into “DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals in some predefined condition(s) or by NW configuration”, which means DL or, if applicable, joint TCI is not always apply to aperiodic CSI-RS resource for CSI/BM. |
| ZTE | 1.1: We support 1.1A and the second 1.1.B, i.e., up to UE capability  1.2: Support.  1.3: Support. In technical, we identify two issues for periodic CSI-RS to be applied: #1 a possible odd QCL chain (source and target RSs are the same); #2, RS overhead for UE specific periodic CSI-RS (as usual, the periodic RS should cell-specific, but, if agreed to support dynamical TCI update, it means that we need to support UE-specific periodic RS).  1.4: We share the same views with Qualcomm: besides PUCCH, PUSCH should be supported also. If companies have concerns about ‘being associated with’, we suggest that we can have an additional note as follows:   * + Note: either ‘be included in’ or ‘be associated with (but not included in)’ are up to RAN2 decision.   1.5: We can support it in principle. If our understanding is correct, the last note may revert the previous agreement of up to 4 PL RS to be maintained.   * + [Note: UE supporting X active UL TCI states and joint TCI states per band should support tracking at least X PL-RS per band] |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 1.1: Support the proposal.  Proposal 1.1B: Support the proposal based on current situation. We don’t think the previous agreement implies CSI-RS for CSI has been supported. In our views, the previous agreement only means the QCL relations for the agreed source RS types are supported. For CSI-RS for CSI, we don’t see a necessity to support it, but we don’t have strong concern on this. Therefore, Qualcomm’s suggestion is fine.  Proposal 1.3: For CSI-RS for CSI, we think P/SP CSI-RS can also be supported. The benefit is that after the TCI state is updated, UE can measure/report CSI based on the new beam, without RRC/MAC CE re-configuration of TCI states for CSI-RS. We can try to support joint TCI being applied to at least one CSI-RS resource set, if possible.  For CSI-RS/SRS for BM, we still prefer not support. Since the unified TCI framework is to define a new beam indication method, we prefer not to change UE behavior on beam measurement/reporting, including the determination of Tx/Rx beam of measurement RS. Also, the benefit of supporting CSI-RS for BM is not clear to us.  Proposal 1.5: Support in principle. The restriction of up to 4 PL-RS should be maintained. |
| vivo | We are supportive of split discussion between conclusion 1.1 and conclusion 1.1B.  We are also fine with the following UE capability.  **Proposal 1.1B**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, at least for DL UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs in a CC, support the following source RS types for DL QCL Type D as UE capabilities:   * SSB, with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS * CSI-RS for CSI * SRS for BM, optionally with TRS as QCL Type-A source RS ]   For proposal 1.3, sorry for the late comment on the UL part, we would also like to make the SRS for BM FFS.  **Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,   * DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals:   + Aperiodic CSI-RS resources for CSI     - FFS: Periodic and/or semi-persistent in addition to aperiodic     - FFS: Supported settings, e.g. some vs all CSI-RS resources for CSI   + [Some aperiodic CSI-RS resources for BM     - FFS: Periodic and/or semi-persistent in addition to aperiodic     - FFS: Supported settings, e.g. one CSI-RS resource set with repetition ‘ON’, or repetition of both ‘ON’ and ’OFF’]   + FFS: Whether legacy TCI state should be applied to the DL signals not allowed for separate DL or joint TCI state.   + FFS: Apply in resource set level or resource level * [UL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to some SRS resources or resource sets for BM]   + FFS: Whether legacy spatial relation state should be applied to the UL signals not allowed for separate UL or joint TCI state   + FFS: Apply in resource set level or resource level   For proposal 1.4, our understanding is the framework is working well, which is Alt3.  For proposal 1.5, we would like to add the following. It is not necessary for UE to mandatorily support this newly defined PLRS determination framework.  **Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss to down select ~~or combine~~ from the following two alternatives for PL-RS (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):   * Alt1. PL-RS can be 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   + FFS: Exact association mechanism * Depending on the final outcome, FFS on exact association mechanism and whether to support a unified mechanism for the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) and PL-RS, if PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state   The support of the above PL-RS (the outcome of the above down selection or combining) is a UE optional feature.   * If not supported, or if a UE is configured with neither PL-RS in UL/joint TCI state nor the association between PL-RS and UL/joint TCI state, the UE estimates path-loss based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter [or the PL RS used for the UL RS] in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * [Note: UE supporting X active UL TCI states and joint TCI states per band should support tracking at least X PL-RS per band]   Above power control behavior for unified TCI framework is optionally supported by the UE. |
| CMCC | Proposal 1.1B: We think CSI-RS for CSI should be supported, not as a UE capability.  We should remember that CSI-RS for CSI is supported as a source RS for DL QCL Type-D in Rel-15/16 for PDSCH/PDCCH DMRS. We see no reason to restrict it in Rel-17. |
| Docomo | We are supportive of split discussion between conclusion 1.1 and conclusion 1.1B. We are fine with the UE capability.  Current proposal 1.5 looks good for us.  We are confusing vivo’s added text above. Proposal 1.5 says if not supported, default behavior to determine PL-RS is defined. But, why we need to add the above text (Above power control…)? It looks contradicting each other. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | 1.1: We don’t see any technical advantages for the support of SRS for BM as QCL type D for downlink reception. Support proposed conclusion 1.1B at least for SRS for BM.  1.5: We support the addition of the PL RS used for the UL RS in the default assumption.  The TCI state may indicate a DL-RS or an UL-RS as a spatial source for UL transmission. The behaviors in the proposal enable the derivation of the pathloss from the DL or the UL RS in the TCI-state depending on which source RS is available. Hence, the specification need not choose one behavior or the other – the choice of one behavior does not preclude the other. Both of them can exist and be applied based on the source RS indicated for the UL transmission in the TCI state. The bullet can be modified as follows for clarity:   * If not supported, or if a UE is configured with neither PL-RS in UL/joint TCI state nor the association between PL-RS and UL/joint TCI state, the UE estimates path-loss based on the periodic DL-RS provided as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL-RS used for the UL RS provided as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state   The word ‘used in UL/joint TCI state’ is changed to ‘provided in UL/joint TCI state’ due to repetition of the word ‘used’ in the case of the UL RS.  Moreover, this does not activate new PL RSs and merely uses existing PL RS thereby leaving the pathloss RS activation and tracking framework untouched. |
| Nokia | **Proposal 1.1 (1.1B)** we do not think it is necessary to close the door to these reference signals at this stage. Indeed, the support is split between companies, on the other hand we should focus crafting the framework of reference signal in general, that is what reference signals are supported. If the situation does not improve in the coming meetings, then these RSs would be supported. The discussion should not be prioritized in the future as such, but just taking act of the companies views on this issue! We do not see a reason why this topic has been a priority topic in the first telco on Monday! To a more technical level, regarding SSB as a source RS, our assumption is that we have a mixture of Rel15/Re116 and Rel17 DL/joint TCI states where Rel15/Rel16 TCI states can be used for instance to build QCL chain for the Rel17 DL/joint TCI state(s). Thus, we don’t see direct need to have SSB as QCL source RS in the Rel17 “common” TCI state.  **Proposal 1.2** we do hope that the joint and separate indication converge in a unified framework. We commented before that joint is a particular case of separate and perhaps it is one possibility to have a MAC CE construction where both variants are used. Dynamic indication of either joint DL/UL TCI or separate DL/UL TCI can be provided e.g. follow-ing Rel16 principles by defining a TCI codepoint that may have own entries for both DL and UL TCI. In each TCI codepoint there can be either DL TCI, UL TCI or both. MAC activation command would then be used to map up to L (e.g. 8) combinations of one or two TCI states to the codepoints and DCI based indication would select one of the activated codepoints. To support multiple indicated DL and UL TCI states, i.e. M > 1 and N > 1, the activation of the TCI state combinations could be per coresetPoolIndex and if configured there could be up to two coresetPoolIndices and thus also M and N could be up to 2.  **Proposal 1.3:** We see benefit to be able get CSI acquisition and enable UE RX beam training on the same beam as used for the PDCCH/PDSCH, i.e. based on Rel17 DL/joint TCI state, while also the UE may have other CSI-RS resources that could be based on Rel15/16 TCI states. |
| Sony | **Proposed conclusion 1.1B**  As mentioned online by HW and confirmed by FL at beginning of Round 1 discussion, RAN1 misunderstood the QCL rule in Rel.16 spec by excluding CSI-RS for CSI as source RS. It seems not late by now to fix it simply by removing CSI-RS for CSI  On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, at least for DL UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs in a CC, there is no consensus in supporting SSB, ~~CSI-RS for CSI,~~ and/or SRS for BM as source RS types for DL QCL Type D  We think the reasons for not supporting additional QCL source RS mentioned by OPPO are still valid. Even though UE capabilities are added in **Proposal 1.1B** as compromise, we are not supportive.  **Proposal 1.2**  As for combination of Alt.1 (TCI dynamically indicated) and Alt.3 (TCI configured by MAC CE), in our imagination, it feels like a bit strange and very rarely seen in Spec. So we are also interested to see the proponent(s) to illustrate some meaningful and educational combination.  **Proposal 1.3**  In principle, we are supportive. For the following two FFS, it might be not necessary. Since legacy TCI state or spatial relation in Rel.15/16 follows legacy rules, even in Rel.17, we see no strong reason to change it or have it impacted by the QCL rule we are now defining for UL or joint TCI state. If we insist to do so, legacy UE is inevitably impacted.  ~~FFS: Whether legacy TCI state should be applied to the DL signals not allowed for separate DL or joint TCI state.~~  ~~FFS: Whether legacy spatial relation state should be applied to the UL signals not allowed for separate UL or joint TCI state~~ |
| Apple | **Support Proposed conclusion 1.1B**  We think it is fine to preclude CSI-RS for CSI although it is supported in R15 for two reasons:   1. If CSI-RS for CSI is included in TCI, it cannot be target 2. We failed to see any use case/benefit to include CSI-RS for CSI in TCI |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 1.1B: Support. We are OK to support SSB and SRS-BM as UE capability.  Proposal 1.2: Support  Proposal 1.3: Support |
| CATT | Support the revised conclusion and proposals. |
| Ericsson | **Proposed conclusion 1.1:** support. Seems to just state the facts. **Proposed conclusion 1.1B:** support – although it is still in brackets. And it is an understatement – RAN1 is far from consensus. We could change our mind if there is any technical motivation is presented. **Proposal 1.1B:** do not support. For SSB and SRS, making these UE capabilities does not mean that the deployment scenario becomes more relevant.  As remarked by several companies, CSI-RS for CSI is already agreed as a source, since we agreed to support what Rel-16 supports. The subsequent note/agreements/FFSs do not change this.  **Proposal 1.2:** Do not support. This is somewhat premature: it would seem reasonably clear how the NW would signal a joint TCI state to the UE (one DCI codepoint corresponds to one joint TCI state, and if the codepoint is indicated, the UE would switch to that new joint TCI state). But we have not agreed on how separate DL/UL TCI would be signalled, so we don’t see how we can discuss switching between them. Suggest that we first agree on how to signal separate DL/UL TCI.  **Proposal 1.3:** We feel that there is still some confusion here. There are two interpretations of what unified TCI is:   * In one interpretation, unified TCI is the same as common beam: all signals that are applicable for unified TCI must use the same beam as PDCCH/PDSCH. With this interpretation, we agree that it is somewhat awkward to apply unified TCI to periodic CSI-RS. * In the other interpretation, unified TCI states are similar to R15/16 TCI states, which can be provided in many ways, via RRC/MAC CE/DCI. With this interpretation, unified TCI states can be provided to periodic CSI-RS via RRC.   Before this confusion is resolved, there seems to be little point in discussing if unified TCI can apply to any particular RS. Trying to provoke a decision will just lead to bigger confusion in future meetings.  The next level of details is to which RSs the PDCCH/PDSCH beam can be applied.  We noted that Nokia expressed the view that R17 and R15/16 TCI states can be mixed – we do not think that would be a good idea. But this is a fundamental question, which should be resolved  **Proposal 1.4:** We would be interested to understand the use case where it would be beneficial to include/associate, e.g., P0, with a TCI state. The fact that P0 is associated with SRI in R15 does not help. To us, this seems to be one case where the R15 flexibility is too large.  **Proposal 1.5:** We basically support. However, the text is quite long and complicated. Could we perhaps agree on the default case separately? Something like:  Proposal 1.5A:  On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, support that the UE estimates path-loss based on the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state  Proposal 1.5B:  On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss to down select or combine from the following two alternatives for PL-RS (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):   * Alt1. PL-RS can be 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   Note: including/associating a separate PL-RS in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state is an optional UE capability. |

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

Table 3 Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2.1 | Support CSI-RS associated with/configured for non-serving cell(s) as a measurement RS  Note: Supporting this implies the support of Rel-15 CSI-RSRP as beam metric/reporting | CSI-RS for mobility/RRM associated with NSC:   * **Yes (6)**: Huawei, HiSi, ZTE, CATT, Sony, LGE * **No (7)**: Samsung, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, MTK, Xiaomi, Qualcomm   CSI-RS for BM configured for NSC:   * **Yes (8)**: Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, APT/FGI, Futurewei, Huawei, HiSi * **No (4)**: Samsung, OPPO, MTK, Xiaomi,   CSI-RS for tracking (TRS) configured for NSC:   * **Yes (4)**: Nokia/NSB, IDC (add PCI in TRS), Futurewei * **No (5)**: OPPO, MTK, Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSi |
| 2.2 | Whether the measurement for SS-RSRP is limited within SMTC | **Yes (2)**: vivo (follow L3-RSRP), ZTE (first priority)  **No (4)**: CATT, MTK, Huawei, HiSi,  **Depends on RAN2/RAN4 response on whether inter-frequency is supported (1)**: Apple |
| 2.3 | Maximum value of K (beams associated at least with non-serving cell(s) reported in a single CSI reporting instance) | **1**:  **>1 (specify)**: Ericsson (up to 8, UE capability), Nokia/NSB (4), MTK (4), Intel (UE capability), Samsung (UE capability), APT/FGI (up to 8, UE capability), Sony, ZTE, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo (UE capability), CATT, Huawei, HiSi (up to 16, UE capability), Spreadtrum, LG |
| 2.4 | If max K>1, how to set the value of K  Alt1: RRC configured (based on UE capability)  Alt2: Dynamically selected by NW via MAC CE  Alt3: Dynamically selected by NW via DCI  Alt4: Dynamically selected by UE (indicated in CSI reporting) | **Alt1**: Apple, MTK, APT/FGI, ZTE, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo, CATT, Huawei, HiSi, Spreadtrum  **Alt2**:  **Alt3**:  **Alt4**: Samsung, Sony |
| 2.5 | Can beam reporting associated with non-serving cell(s) be mixed with that with serving-cell in one reporting instance? | **Yes (16)**: vivo, Ericsson, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, Spreadtrum, CATT, Intel, LGE, Apple, MTK, APT/FGI, Sony, ZTE (Up to config.), Futurewei, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, Huawei. HiSi (up to configuration)  **No (1)**: ASUSTeK |
| 2.6 | The maximum value of N1 (number of non-serving cell(s) RRC configured for measurement/reporting) | **1**: OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Spreadtrum  **>1 (specify)**: Samsung (UE capability), Sony, ZTE, Qualcomm (UE capability), NTT Docomo (at least 3 or more), CATT (UE capability), Xiaomi, Huawei. HiSi (UE capability) |
| 2.7 | The maximum value of N2 (number of non-serving cell(s) in a single CSI reporting instance comprising K beams) | **1**: OPPO, Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB  **≤ N1**: NTT Docomo, CATT (UE capability), Xiaomi (3), Samsung, Sony, ZTE, Qualcomm, Huawei. HiSi (UE capability) |
| 2.8 | Supported DL QCL Type-D and/or UL TX spatial reference source RS type(s) for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility by extending Rel-17 unified TCI framework to inter-cell indication | DL QCL Type-D:   * CSI-RS for BM configured for NSC: Sony, Nokia/NSB, ZTE, Lenovo/MoM, Futurewei * CSI-RS for tracking configured for NSC: NTT Docomo, Sony, Nokia/NSB, ZTE, Lenovo/MoM, Futurewei * CSI-RS for mobility associated with NSC: Sony, ZTE, LG * SSB associated with NSC as direct QCL source: Samsung, NTT Docomo, MTK, ZTE, Qualcomm, Lenovo/MoM, Xiaomi * SSB associated with NSC as indirect QCL source: Sony * SRS for BM configured for NSC: Nokia/NSB * Other: Apple (based on legacy QCL rule), APT/FGI (at least support legacy QCL rule), LG (based on *MeasObjectId*)   UL TX spatial reference:   * CSI-RS for BM configured for NSC: Sony, ZTE, Futurewei * CSI-RS for tracking configured for NSC: Sony, ZTE, Futurewei * CSI-RS for mobility associated with NSC: Sony, ZTE * SSB associated with NSC as direct QCL source: Samsung, NTT Docomo, MTK, Sony, ZTE, Qualcomm, Lenovo/MoM, Xiaomi * SSB associated with NSC as indirect QCL source: * SRS for BM configured for NSC: * Other: Apple (based on legacy rule), APT/FGI (at least support legacy QCL rule)   Clarify whether to support changing serving cell and whether to support CSI-RS based measurement before deciding source RS type(s) of DL QCL Type-D and/or UL TX spatial reference: Huawei, HiSi |
| 2.9 | Support for event-triggered (UE-initiated) inter-cell SS-RSRP reporting | **Yes (14)**: Huawei, HiSi, Qualcomm, Sony, Apple, Samsung, Xiaomi, ASUSTeK, IDC (inter-cell BFR), ZTE, Lenovo/MoM, Futurewei, CATT  **No (1)**: Ericsson |
| 2.10 | Timing assumption (e.g. time of arrival and time of the measurement) for measurement of non-serving cell measurement RS | TA/TAG of SC and configured NSC(s) shall be the **same**: Xiaomi  TA/TAG of SC and configured NSC(s) can be **different**: vivo (UE can report), Intel, Apple (with PDCCH ordered NSC PRACH, no TAG), Qualcomm, CATT (TA difference is configured), APT/FGI, Sony, ZTE, Futurewei, Huawei, HiSi, LG, Ericsson |

The following observation can be made:

* (2.3) There seems to be consensus in supporting Kmax>1 and that it is a UE capability. Some values such as 4 and 8 are proposed.
* (2.5) Strong majority on supporting beam reporting associated with non-serving cell(s) mixed with that with serving-cell in one reporting instance (to avoid using multiple reports which result in additional latency and mismatch in report qualities)
* (2.9) There seems to be consensus in supporting event-triggered/UE-initiated reporting
* (2.10) There seems to be consensus in supporting different TA/TAG of SC and configured NSC(s)

Based on the above observation, the following moderator proposals can be made:

**Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,

* On the value of K (defined in RAN1#104-e as the number of beam qualities associated at least with non-serving cell(s) can be reported in a single CSI reporting instance),
  + FFS whether the maximum value of K is a UE capability and
  + FFS: the supported maximum value of K, e.g. [4, 8, 16]
* For L1-RSRP measurement and at least aperiodic reporting, support MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation of a subset of higher-layer-configured (for measurement) non-serving cell SSBs
* In one reporting instance, depending on NW configuration, beam(s) associated with a non-serving cell can be mixed with that associated with serving-cell
  + FFS: How to report the K beams and corresponding qualities if the Tx power among the non-serving cell and with serving-cell is not the same
* In addition to NW-initiated measurement/reporting, event-based (UE-initiated) measurement/reporting without CSI request from the NW is supported
  + FFS: Definition of triggering event
  + Treated with lower priority
* [Timing assumption for DL measurement associated with the serving cell and non-serving cell(s) can be different
  + FFS: If timing assumption comprises TA, TAG, or both
  + FFS: Details of TA measurement and configuration, e.g. PDCCH ordered non-serving cell PRACH for TA measurement
  + FFS: Whether/how to account for panel-specific transmission]

Table 4 Additional inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| **ROUND 0** | |
| Apple | For measurement, we think the UE complexity and flexibility to support multiple-cell L1 measurement could be one issue. So we suggest we consider the following proposals:  ***Support MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation for a L1-RSRP measurement corresponding to a non-serving cell RS***  In addition, we suggest we discuss the TA assumption when UE starts to communicate with the non-serving cell, whether UE should assume TA=0 or maintain old TA or NW can provide a new TA after it triggers PDCCH ordered PRACH. |
| APT/FGI | We have provided our views above |
| Nokia/NSB | For issue 2.8, we may not need to define QCL source for UL TCI. RAN1 does not have any agreement whether UE can send UL channel/RS toward non-serving cell(s) |
| Sony | Add and modify our views. |
| ZTE | Our views are provided above. |
| Futurewei | Our views are added. |
| Mod V14 | Moderator proposals have been added |
| Apple2 | We suggest we remove TAG since UE is not required to communicate with both cells simultaneously, and add a FFS on PDCCH ordered non-serving cell PRACH for TA measurement.  **Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,   * On the value of K (defined in RAN1#104-e as the number of beam qualities associated at least with non-serving cell(s) can be reported in a single CSI reporting instance), the maximum value of K is a UE capability and does not exceed [4] * In one reporting instance, depending on NW configuration, beam reporting associated with non-serving cell(s) can be mixed with that associated with serving-cell * Event-based (UE-initiated) measurement/reporting is supported   + FFS: Definition of triggering event * TA~~/TAG~~ associated with the serving cell and non-serving cells can be the same or different   + FFS: PDCCH ordered non-serving cell PRACH for TA measurement |
| OPPO | Regarding Proposal 2.1: do not support different TA/TAG at least for the current moment. We need the LS replies to decide the applicable scenario before we can decide that. Furthermore, we prefer to limit the number of non-serving cell to be one and that cell shall be one of the cells that are reported in RRM measurement reporting.  **Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,   * On the value of K (defined in RAN1#104-e as the number of beam qualities associated at least with non-serving cell~~(s)~~ can be reported in a single CSI reporting instance), the maximum value of K is a UE capability and does not exceed [4] * In one reporting instance, depending on NW configuration, beam reporting associated with non-serving cell~~(s)~~ can be mixed with that associated with serving-cell * Event-based (UE-initiated) measurement/reporting is supported   + FFS: Definition of triggering event * ~~TA/TAG associated with the serving cell and non-serving cells can be the same or different~~ * The number of non-serving cell being measured is up to one and that non-serving cell shall be one of cells reported in L3 RRM measurement report.   [Mod: Since there are at least 7 companies who will disagree with the last proposed bullet, I will not include this in the proposal. Anyway this will be a separate topic not within the scope of this proposal. I will change cells to cell(s) in the TA bullet.] |
| MediaTek | We agree TAs among SC and configured NSC(s) can be different. However, we share the same view with Apple that UE doesn’t have maintain them simultaneously. |
| Mod V18 | Addressed inputs from Apple, OPPO, and MTK |
| Xiaomi | Added our views above.  We prefer to restrict same TA between serving cell and non-serving cell. |
| MediaTek | Regarding the second bullet, we would like to add one FFS to raise the issue if the Tx power among NSC(s) and with SC is not the same.   * FFS: How to report the K beams and corresponding qualities if the Tx power among the non-serving cell(s) and with serving-cell is not the same.   [Mod: Done]  Regarding the 3rd bullet, we would like to clarify whether UE-trigger reporting is an additional mechanism (in additional to CSI report configured/activated/triggered by NW). Or this implies Rel-17 only supports UE-trigger reporting.  [Mod: Yes it is understood as an additional mechanism similar to (P)BFR, not NW-triggered. Please check latest version] |
| ZTE | Regarding 2nd bullet, we suggest to remove ‘reporting’ for sake of presentation.   * In one reporting instance, depending on NW configuration, beam associated with non-serving cell(s) can be mixed with that associated with serving-cell   [Mod: Yes sir ☺]  Regarding 3rd bullet, we think the clarification about whether NW-initialized NSC beam reporting is supported or not is needed. From our perspective, the NW-initialized one should be supported as well.  [Mod: Agreed, please check revised version]  Regarding 4th bullet. Could any opponent clarify why TAG cannot be different since the different TA is tended to be agreed.  [Mod: Added FFS on TAG as a compromise] |
| Intel | We would not want to have specifics in the FFS of the last bullet since we have hardly discussed uplink. There we can have FFS on details. We also do not agree to removing TAG from the bullet.  [Mod: Added FFS on TAG as a compromise]   * TA or TAG configuration associated with the serving cell and non-serving cell(s) can be the same or different   + FFS: Details of TA measurement and configuration |
| Qualcomm | We are generally fine for Proposal 2.1. For the last bullet, we share the same view as ZTE and Intel that it is natural to support different TAGs for different Tas. Suggest to at least add TAG in the bullet.  [Mod: Added FFS on TAG as a compromise] |
| Apple | Response to ZTE, Intel and Qualcomm:  For inter-cell mobility, UE should not communicate with both cells simultaneously, so we should not consider different value of TA as different TAG.  [Mod: Added FFS on TAG as a compromise]  Regarding the suggestion from Intel to make it general, we have already agreed to study TA in the first R17 meeting, we should make some progress to list some specific study point. |
| Vivo | This is mainly for measurement and reporting. Thus would like to clarify as following.   * Timing assumption for DL measurement associated with the serving cell and non-serving cell(s) can be the same or different   [Mod: Good point]  We would also like to add the following bullet, as commented by Apple.   * Support MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation for a L1-RSRP measurement corresponding to a non-serving cell RS   [Mod: I can add in brackets and see if companies have concern]  For event based report, we are also interested in this, but a little bit concerned on treating directly without clear understanding on how the baseline measurement and reporting is working.   * Event-based (UE-initiated) measurement/reporting is supported   + FFS: Definition of triggering event   + Treated with lower priority.   [Mod: It is reasonable from FL perspective] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We added our views to some of the listed issues.  Proposal 2.1: We suggest adding 8 and 16 as candidate maximum number inside the brackets. |
| Mod V32 | Revised proposal to address inputs |
| Samsung | We are fine with this proposal. However, we for the newly added bullet on MAC CE activation/deactivation we would like to understand the rationale behind this. Isn’t RRC configuration sufficient? Maybe we can have FFS in front of this bullet.  [Mod: We can do so.] |
| ZTE | We share the same concerns as Samsung. Does it mean that we need to support semi-persistent CSI measurement/reporting for this case, regarding to ‘NW-triggered measurement/reporting’?  Besides, we are fine with other bullets.  [Mod: We can do so.] |
| Spreadtrum | For event-based (UE-initiated) measurement/reporting, more information is needed before agreeing on this new mechanism. For the newly added bullet on MAC CE activation/deactivation, we suggest it to be FFS.  [Mod: Since this is supported by majority, would it be possible for Spreadtrum to suggest some text changes (ither than FFS ☺) so that it is acceptable? I added “without CSI request from the NW” to clarify the absence of aperiodic trigger.] |
| MediaTek | Regarding “NW-triggered measurement/reporting” in the 4th bullet, could we change “NW-triggered” to “NW-initiated” since “NW-triggered” may imply only AP reporting triggered by DCI is supported.  [Mod: Done]  Regarding MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation for a L1-RSRP measurement, we prefer to have it since such measurement on non-serving cell may not be always needed. However, current spec already supports dynamic activation/deactivation for SP CSI-RS. Thus, this bullet is only needed for non-serving cell SSB.   * Support MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation for L1-RSRP measurement corresponding to a non-serving cell SSB   [Mod: Please see above comments on FFS] |
| LG | Our view is updated in the table.  On proposal 2.1: For the first bullet, we are not sure yet whether UE capabilty on the value of K is really necessary since the reporting mechanism is still unclrear. If it is a normal beam reporting, the maximum value of K can be fixed as 4 and no UE capability may need to be defined. We prefer to discuss UE capablity after stabilizing the repoting mechanism.  For the last bullet, we need to consider panel-specific transmission aspect as well. In Positioning, UE TEG (timing error group) has been defined so that each TEG needs to manage TA/TAG separately.  [Mod: Added FFS to address both] |
| Mod V43 | Revised proposal to address inputs |
| Apple | For the second bullet, we are ok to modify “measurement RS” into “SSB”, so we suggest we remove “FFS:” and go with what MTK suggested as follows. Since it has already been agreed as FFS, it is not reasonbale to FFS it again.   * Support MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation for L1-RSRP measurement corresponding to a non-serving cell SSB   [Mod: Removed FFS + added clarification on activation and “at least aperiodic”] |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.1.1: Suppport  Proposal 2.1.2. OK for FFS. Note that L1/2 measurements end up in the DU, so RRC reconfigurations cannot use them.  Proposal 2.1.3: Support  Proposal 2.1.4: Do not support, can be discussed later. Note that events/counters have so far always been handled by RAN2.  [Mod: Keeping this one for now since it is supported by strong majority. Yes, event/counter design is finalized in RAN2 as it tends to involve higher layer. But the decision for event-based is done in RAN1]  Proposal 2.1.5: The main bullet looks OK, but “same” seems to be superfluous. Also, TA/TAG has nothing to do with measurements as stated in the main bullet, those are related to UL transmission. Suggest to remove FFSs for clarity  [Mod: I tend to agree. Also, the first FFS is removed.] |
| Nokia/NSB | We are generally O.K. with FL proposal |
| Mod V49 | Revision to address inputs |
| **ROUND 1** | |
| Mod V00 | Any additional inputs on Proposal 2.1, please share |
| Qualcomm | We still prefer to add TAG in last bullet. For fast cell switching, different TAs/TAGs need to be maintained to our understanding. Can we make supporting different TAGs as UE capability to make progress? For UE not supporting this, they can update TA upon cell switching.  [Mod: Added back] |
| Mod V05 | Revised proposal per input |
| OPPO | We are not ok to support > 1 non-serving cells. The decision of inter-cell mobility is decided based on L3 measurement. The purpose of this new L1 measurement is to prepare the TCI state for target cell. Since the L3 already pick the target cell, we only need to measure SSB of the ONE target cell, instead of multiple cells. We prefer to claify that in the proposal.  We are not ok to support assuming different timing assumptions because the timing assumption critically depends on the applicable deployment scenarios. We just sent one LS to RAN2/RAN3/RAN4 to ask the questions on higher layer confirmation and depleoyment scenrioas. Before we can determine that, we are not ready to agree on the timing assumptions. So suggest to remove the last bullet.  **Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,   * On the value of K (defined in RAN1#104-e as the number of beam qualities associated at least with non-serving cell(s) can be reported in a single CSI reporting instance),   + FFS whether the maximum value of K is a UE capability and   + FFS: the supported maximum value of K, e.g. [4, 8, 16] * For L1-RSRP measurement and at least aperiodic reporting, support MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation of a subset ofhigher-layer-configured (for measurement) non-serving cell SSBs * In one reporting instance, depending on NW configuration, beam(s) associated with non-serving cell~~(s)~~ can be mixed with that associated with serving-cell   + FFS: How to report the K beams and corresponding qualities if the Tx power among the non-serving cell~~(s)~~ and with serving-cell is not the same * In addition to NW-initiated measurement/reporting, event-based (UE-initiated) measurement/reporting without CSI request from the NW is supported   + FFS: Definition of triggering event   + Treated with lower priority * The number of non-serving cell is up to one. FFS: more than one non-serving cells. * ~~Timing assumption for DL measurement associated with the serving cell and non-serving cell(s) can be different~~   + ~~FFS: If timing assumption comprises TA, TAG, or both~~   + ~~FFS: Details of TA measurement and configuration, e.g. PDCCH ordered non-serving cell PRACH for TA measurement~~   + ~~FFS: Whether/how to account for panel-specific transmission~~   [Mod: Incorporated some. The number of non-serving cells is still FFS but we can use singular ‘nonserving cell’ for now.] |
| Samsung | Support the current content and wording for proposal 2.1 |
| Mod V13 | No change in text |
| Mod V15 | Revised per OPPO’s inputs (brackets) |
| Xiaomi | We prefer to restrict same TA between serving cell and non-serving cell. |
| ZTE | Regarding L1-RSRP measurement, we are afraid that the candidate lists for higher-layer-configured (for measurement) non serving cell may be very large. Alternatively, we may consider to provide non-serving cell information directly in MAC-CE level. Therefore, we suggest to make this bullet more general:   * For L1-RSRP measurement and at least aperiodic reporting, support MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation of measurement for non-serving cell SSBs, e.g., additionally activated non-serving cell information for SSBs to be measured, or activated a subset of higher-layer-configured (for measurement) non-serving cell SSBs |
| vivo | Would like to update as following:  **Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,   * On the value of K (defined in RAN1#104-e as the number of beam qualities associated at least with non-serving cell(s) can be reported in a single CSI reporting instance),   + FFS whether the maximum value of K is a UE capability and   + FFS: the supported maximum value of K, e.g. [4, 8, 16] * For L1-RSRP measurement and at least aperiodic reporting, support MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation of a subset of non-serving cells for measurement on higher-layer-configured (for measurement) non-serving cell SSBs * In one reporting instance, depending on NW configuration, beam(s) associated with non-serving cell(s) can be mixed with that associated with serving-cell   + FFS: How to report the K beams and corresponding qualities if the Tx power among the non-serving cell(s) and with serving-cell is not the same * In addition to NW-initiated measurement/reporting, event-based (UE-initiated) measurement/reporting without CSI request from the NW is supported   + FFS: Definition of triggering event   + Treated with lower priority * Timing assumption for DL measurement associated with the serving cell and non-serving cell(s) can be different   + FFS: If timing assumption comprises TA, TAG, or both   + FFS: Details of TA measurement and configuration, e.g. PDCCH ordered non-serving cell PRACH for TA measurement   + FFS: Whether/how to account for panel-specific transmission |
| Docomo | We don’t agree if the beam reporting only supports “one” non-serving cell. If only one non-serving cell is supported, it means this feature is only applicable to switch from serving cell to another cell. The use case of L1/L2 inter cell mobility is quite limited.  As moderator commented, the number of non-serving cells is separate discussion. Thus, the description of this proposal2.1 should include both possibility of one or multiple non-serving cell(s).   * In one reporting instance, depending on NW configuration, beam(s) associated with a non-serving cell(s) can be mixed with that associated with serving-cell   + FFS: How to report the K beams and corresponding qualities if the Tx power among the non-serving cell(s) and with serving-cell is not the same |
| Nokia | Some comments in the order of their appearance in the proposal 2.1.  **Value of K**: OK.  **L1-RSRP, aperiodic reporting**: how about other forms of reporting in addition to aperiodic? All reporting forms should be considered, up to NW to configure. Periodic, S-P, Aperiodic.  **Mixing serving with non-serving cell reporting**: if we agree on the aperiodic reporting above, and then we mix the reporting of serving and non-serving cells, it seems we lock the operation fully to aperiodic mode for both serving and non-serving. Alternatively, one could allow legacy serving cell configured in any way and then just add the non-serving in aperiodic. This would be up to NW configuration. Hence we want to have more information at hand on such configuration possibilities before we agree on mixing the reporting of serving and non-serving cells.  **Event-based reporting**: we do not agree on this before we see the event as such! No blank check to whatever proposal might come here! Consider/discuss first the required events for L1/L2 centric mobility.  **Timing assumption:** We note some changes w.r.t what has been proposed in round 0. We echo similar views as OPPO above, not OK diving into the assumption of different timings between the cells. |
| Sony | Regarding the following bullet, we would like to ask whether SP CSI-RS from non-serving cell can be activated and deactivated by MAC CE in current spec or any agreement. If yes, then it’s fine to include SSB from NSC only. **If not, we would like to suggest to add CSI-RS from NSC back by replacing “SSBs” with “RS”.**   * For L1-RSRP measurement and at least aperiodic reporting, support MAC CE based dynamic activation/deactivation of a subset of higher-layer-configured (for measurement) non-serving cell SSBs   For the rest part of proposal 2.1, we are supportive. |
| Ericsson | Why is this one proposal? Why not split in several?  Overall, we are reluctant to spend time on advanced reporting schemes before we have agreed on beam indication. Note that L1 measurements end up in the DU, meaning that RRC reconfigurations cannot be based on L1 measurements.  Proposal 2.1.1: Support  Proposal 2.1.2: Do not support, too early  Proposal 2.1.3: We understand there is some controversy on the number of non-serving cells to report. However, writing “non-serving cell(s)” leaves the discussion open, while “a non-serving cell” points to one non-serving cell. We suggest reverting to “non-serving cell(s)”.  Proposal 2.1.4: Do not support. In the longer run, there could be benefits of event-driven reporting, but in the limited functionality we are discussing in R17, the benefits would be small. Note also that there are no event-driven mechanisms in RAN1 specs today, so this functionality is uncharted territory. |

### Issue 3 (beam indication signaling medium)

Table 5 Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 3.1 | Support for DCI formats for Rel.17 unified TCI framework beam indication (TCI state update) beyond the agreed DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment   * 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 for scheduling a PDSCH reception, not indicating a SPS PDSCH release, or not indicating Scell dormancy), considering impacts on PDCCH coverage and scheduling mechanism   + FFS: Whether the UE can/shall assume the gNB configured application time is after ACK transmission * Alt2: Dedicated DCI format other than 1\_1/1\_2 without DL assignment, applicable for joint TCI as well as separate DL/UL TCI * Alt3: UL-related DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 with UL grant, applicable only for UL-only TCI of separate DL/UL TCI | **Alt0 (4)**: Fujitsu, Ericsson, Huawei, HiSi  **Alt1 (21)**: Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo, Verizon, KDDI, AT&T, Samsung (2nd preference), OPPO, Spreadtrum (only Alt1, and no other DCI formats such as Alt2 and Alt3), CATT, ZTE, MTK, APT/FGI, Intel, Apple, Qualcomm, Sony, Convida, NEC, Lenovo/MoM  **Alt2 (7)**: Samsung (1st preference), OPPO (DCI Format 1\_0), Intel, APT/FGI, Futurewei, CATT  **Alt3 (9)**: IDC, Lenovo/MoM, MTK, Xiaomi, Intel, Sony, LGE, NEC. |
| 3.2 | If Alt1/Alt2 is supported, DCI acknowledgment mechanism (including supported codebooks and timing relationship) | **Mechanism analogous to Rel-15/16 SPS PDSCH release** (both Rel-15/16 type-1 and type-2 codebooks): ZTE, MTK, APT/FGI, Apple, Samsung, Qualcomm, OPPO, NTT Docomo, CATT, Sony, Nokia/NSB, NEC  **HARQ timing analogous on Rel-15/16 definition** (ACK reported in PUCCH *k* slots after PDCCH reception where *k* is indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator DCI field, else RRC configured): Samsung, ZTE, MTK, APT/FGI, Apple, Qualcomm, OPPO, NTT Docomo, CATT, Sony, Nokia/NSB, NEC |
| 3.3 | If Alt1/Alt2 is supported, mechanism for identifying/differentiating the DCI format used for beam indication only | Combination of DCI fields with set values (differentiating from SPS PDSCH release):   * FDRA: Spreadtrum, MTK, Apple, ZTE, Qualcomm, Samsung, OPPO, APT/FGI, NTT Docomo * MCS: Spreadtrum(1’s), MTK (1’s), Apple, ZTE, Qualcomm, Samsung, OPPO, APT/FGI, Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo * RV: MTK (1’s), Apple, ZTE, Qualcomm, Samsung, OPPO, APT/FGI, Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo * NDI: Spreadtrum (0’s), MTK (0’s), Apple, ZTE, Qualcomm, Samsung, OPPO, APT/FGI, Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo * HPN: APT/FGI   RNTI:   * **CS-RNTI** (following SPS PDSCH release): Spreadtrum, MTK, ZTE, APT/FGI, Apple, Qualcomm, Samsung, NTT Docomo, OPPO, Nokia/NSB, NEC * **Other RNTI**: CATT, Futurewei |
| 3.4 | If Alt1/Alt2 is supported, which DCI fields are needed/used (in addition to TCI field(s))?  Note: As it is customary to do so, the remaining unused DCI fields and codepoints can be utilized for future use | DCI fields:   * Identifier for DCI formats: Samsung, ZTE, MTK, Sony, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo * Carrier indicator: ZTE, MTK, Samsung, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo * Bandwidth part indicator: ZTE, MTK, Samsung, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo * TDRA: ZTE, Samsung, MTK (used for type-1 codebook), Qualcomm, NTT Docomo * DAI (if configured): ZTE, Samsung, MTK, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo * TPC command for scheduled PUCCH: ZTE, Samsung, MTK, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo * PUCCH resource indicator: Samsung, ZTE, Samsung, MTK, Nokia/NSB, Sony, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator (if present): Samsung, ZTE, Samsung, MTK, Sony, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo |
| 3.5 | The use of TCI fields for beam indication  Note: This can be dependent on the DCI format | **Joint TCI**: ZTE, MTK, Apple, Qualcomm, OPPO, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, APT/FGI, NTT Docomo, CATT, NEC, Spreadtrum  **Either DL TCI or UL TCI for separate DL/UL TCI**: ZTE, MTK (depends on issue 1.3), Apple, Qualcomm, OPPO, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, APT/FGI, Sony, Futurewei, NTT Docomo, CATT, NEC  **Both DL TCI and UL TCI for separate DL/UL TCI**: Nokia/NSB, Samsung (only if DCI without DLA is supported), MTK (depends on issue 1.3), Sony, Qualcomm, Lenovo/MoM, NTT Docomo, CATT, NEC, Spreadtrum |
| 3.6 | Beam application time (BAT):   * Alt1: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the DCI with the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication * Alt2A: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication * Alt 2B: the first slot that is at least X ms or Y symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the acknowledgment of the joint or separate DL/UL beam indication, except that the (new) TCI state update can be applied to the PDSCH, if it exists, (scheduled by the beam indication DCI) and corresponding ACK transmission (provided that the time offset between the DCI and the scheduled PDSCH exceed the threshold, analogous to Rel.15/16) * Alt2C: Support both Alt1 and Alt2A, and introduce a UE capability that indicates the support of Alt1 or Alt2A * Alt3: the first slot that is at least X1 ms or Y1 symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the DCI with beam indication and X2 ms or Y2 symbols after the [first/last] symbol of the acknowledgment of the beam indication | **Alt1**: vivo, Ericsson, Samsung (DCI with DLA, 1st pref), Convida, MTK (1st preference), Xiaomi, Spreadtrum  **Alt2A**: IDC, Fujitsu, Lenovo/MoM, NTT Docomo, Huawei, HiSi, OPPO (Alt2A+ meet the UE capability which the minimum time between the DCI and the beam switch time), CATT, ZTE, APT/FGI, Intel, Apple, Qualcomm, Sony, Samsung (DCI without DLA)  **Alt2B**: Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo, Xiaomi, LGE, NEC, Samsung (DCI with DLA, 2nd pref)  **Alt2C**: MTK (2nd preference)  **Alt3**: OPPO, Spreadtrum |
| 3.7 | Support for group-based DCI in Rel.17 unified TCI framework | **Yes:** Intel, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo  **No:** IDC, Apple, Huawei, HiSi, Ericsson |
| 3.8 | Support for DCI ACK/NAK for DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment when used for beam indication | **Yes:** CATT, Apple, Samsung, NEC  **No:** |

The following observation can be made:

* (3.1-3.5) Strong majority in supporting DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 without DL assignment (a number of companies supporting other alternatives are also supportive of this) as described in the last meeting.
  + Main reasons mentioned: 1) Lower beam application latency due to more efficient ACK especially for PDSCH, 2) Better accommodate separate DL/UL TCI and, if agreed, M/N>1, 3) Reserved DCI fields can be used for future purposes (future proof)
  + In addition, a number of supporting companies provide more details for the components (e.g. how to differentiate beam indication from other usages, ACK mechanism following SPS PDSCH release, DCI fields)
  + The use of this format for signaling joint TCI, DL TCI (for separate DL/UL TCI), and UL TCI (for separate DL/UL TCI) seems clearly supported. Whether to signal both DL and UL TCIs for separate DL/UL TCI can be further discussed.

Based on the above observation, the following moderator proposals can be made:

**Proposal 3.1**: For beam indication with Rel-17 unified TCI, ...

For beam indication with Rel-17 unified TCI, support DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 without DL assignment:

* Use ACK/NACK mechanism analogous to that for SPS PDSCH release with both type-1 and type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook:
  + Upon a successful reception of the beam indication DCI, the UE reports an ACK
    - Note that upon a failed reception of the beam indication DCI, a NACK can be reported.
    - For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, a location for the ACK information in the HARQ-ACK codebook is determined based on a virtual PDSCH indicated by the TDRA field in the beam indication DCI, based on the time domain allocation list configured for PDSCH
    - For type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, a location for the ACK information in the HARQ-ACK codebook is determined according to the same rule for SPS release
  + The ACK is reported in a PUCCH *k* slots after the end of the PDCCH reception where *k* is indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI format, or provided *dl-DataToUL-ACK* or *dl-DataToUL-ACK-ForDCI-Format1-2-r16* if the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is not present in the DCI
* When used for beam indication:
  + CS-RNTI is used to scramble the CRC for the DCI
  + The values of the following DCI fields are set as follows:
    - RV = all ‘1’s
    - MCS = all ‘1’s
    - NDI = 0
    - Set to all ‘0’s for FDRA Type 0, or all ‘1’s for FDRA Type 1, or all ‘0’s for dynamicSwitch (same as in Table 10.2-4 of TS38.213)
    - FFS: Whether HPN is also used
* Use at least the existing TCI field (always present) to signal the following: 1) Joint DL/UL TCI state, 2) DL TCI state, and/or 3) UL TCI state
  + FFS: Whether both DL TCI and UL TCI states can be signaled in one instance of beam indication DCI
  + FFS: Relation with joint vs separate TCI (DL and/or UL) switching, including M/N>1 if supported
* In addition, use (at least) the following DCI fields:
  + Identifier for DCI formats
  + Carrier indicator
  + Bandwidth part indicator
  + TDRA
  + Downlink assignment index (if configured)
  + TPC command for scheduled PUCCH
  + PUCCH resource indicator
  + PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator (if present)
* The remaining unused DCI fields and codepoints are reserved

Table 6 Additional inputs: issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| **ROUND 0** | |
| MediaTek | Update views from MediaTek.  On issue 3.5, we think this can be discussed after issue 1.3 is concluded. |
| APT/FIG | Regarding 3.5, our views are missed and added back (i.e., set values for HPN field). |
| CMCC | Update our views on issue 3.1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Updated with Nokia’s view  For Issue 3.5, we may need to decide whether only one TCI state can be associated to each codeword of TCI field, or codeword of TCI field can be associated to both of separated DL/UL TCI state |
| Sony | Our more view added. |
| ZTE | Our views are provided above. |
| Futurewei | Our views are added and updated |
| Mod V14 | Moderator proposals have been added |
| Apple2 | As we have proposed in our contribution, for the highlighted part, we suggest the following:   * ***For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, a location for the ACK information in the HARQ-ACK codebook is determined based on a virtual PDSCH indicated by the TDRA field in the beam indication DCI, based on the time domain allocation list configured for PDSCH*** * ***For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, a location for the ACK information in the HARQ-ACK codebook is determined according to the same rule for SPS release***   [Mod: Thanks. This wording seems to capture the maximum reuse of the mechanism in SPS PDSCH release for Type-2. For Type-1, it is a simple extension based on what has been extensively discussed for SCell dormancy – according to contributions from several companies] |
| OPPO | Support Proposal 3.1 and suggest to rewording the last bullet with more precise wording as following:   * The remaining unused DCI fields and codepoints ~~can be utilized for future use~~ reserved.   [Mod: Agreed] |
| MediaTek | Share the same view with Apple. |
| Mod V18 | Addressed inputs from Apple, OPPO, and MTK |
| Xiaomi | Added our views above.  We cannot support proposal 3.1. As for the main reasons mentioned above, the first one is about the lower beam application latency, but we think the latency is same for DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with/without DL assignment in the case of PUCCH resource restriction. If long latency is introduced by PDSCH reception, separate PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK of beam indication and HARQ-ACK of PDSCH can be configured in the case of DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment. For the second one, it is better to be discussed after 1.3. For the third one, it can be discussed in future when future purpose is needed.  In addition, DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 without DL assignment will result in more blind decoding times. |
| NTT Docomo | Support proposal 3.1 |
| MediaTek | Regarding the 3rd bullet of this proposal, we feel TCI field cannot be always present, at least in FR1. Furthermore, unified TCI framework would be an optional feature. If UE doesn’t support this feature (e.g., Rel-15/16 UE), the field may not be configured. We can change the wording to avoid confusion:   * Use at least the existing TCI field (always present if joint/separate TCI is configured/enabled) to signal the following: 1) Joint DL/UL TCI state, 2) DL TCI state, and/or 3) UL TCI state |
| Convida Wireless | OK with proposal 3.1 |
| ZTE | Support proposal 3.1 |
| Qualcomm | We are fine for Proposal 3.1 |
| CATT | We’d suggest to add issue 3.8 to discuss the enhancement of acknowledgement of DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment, where ACK/NAK to the DCI (in addition to PDSCH) may be further needed.  [Mod: Added] |
| Apple | We share the same view with CATT. The ACK/NACK mechanism for DCI with data is not 100% clear. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We added our views to some of the listed issues.  We are still concerned and disagree with Proposal 3.1:  As PDSCH can be located within the same slot as PDCCH and there is always a need to wait for ACK transmission opportunity, the differences on beam indication latency using DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with and without data is insignificant.  A codepoint of TCI field in existing DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with data can be mapped with joint/separate DL/UL TCI, and can be used to support the case with M/N >1 (if clarified and supported).  Introducing DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 without data for dynamic beam indication is an additional optimization, which will not bring much performance gains (compared with the already agreed solution on using DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with data and MAC-CE), but will consume extra time/efforts that could be well allocated to other topics.  This is the fourth meeting that the same issue is brought up, trying to over-ride the compromise achieved in November meeting… |
| Mod V32 | Revised proposal to address inputs |
| AT&T | ok with proposal 3.1 |
| Samsung | Although we still prefer to introduce a new DCI format dedicated for beam indication (a cleaner design), we can support proposal 3.1 to respect majority view. This proposal also addresses the most problematic shortcomings of DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with DL assignment by adding a few improvements (analogous to known legacy spec features) over the already agreed DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2. |
| NEC | Our views added.  Support the proposal 3.1. And we think more DCI formats can be supported for beam indication, e.g. DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request.  [Mod: Thanks. Regarding the second comment, other formats can still be proposed by RAN1 procedure. If it receives large support, we can discuss. If not, please see my comment to Spreadtrum. We simply follow the regular RAN1 procedure.] |
| ZTE | Support the updated proposal 3.1. |
| Spreadtrum | Support proposal 3.1. And we agree with Huawei that we should avoid adding more DCI formats for the same function. Therefore, we suggest to add a sub-bullet: No additional DCI formats will be introduced for joint/separate TCI indication.  [Mod: Thanks. Regarding the second comment, I sympathize with your comment and it has been attempted in the last meeting. But a number of companies couldn’t accept this and informed me online/offline since it doesn’t seem normal from RAN1 procedure. Any company can still keep proposing a scheme until the WI is over. But if it doesn’t receive strong support, it will not be supported naturally.  Note that the group should not prolong the discussion on DCI issue.] |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 3.1 |
| LG | We have concern on proposal 3.1. Similarly with Huawei and Xiaomi, the agreed DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 seem sufficient in most cases. Motivation of dynamic beam switching is weak when there is no data to send. If we’d like to enhance DCI based beam indication further, UL DCI with data needs to be considered with higher priority than the case of having no data to send. |
| Mod V43 | No revision on proposal 3.1 |
| Ericsson | We have concerns about proposal 3.1. The claimed benefits in latency are non-existent, and we really don’t need a third method to do beam indication. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL proposal  As response to LG, even when no data is scheduled we may need to update the beam for PUCCH based periodic CSI reporting, as an example. |
| APT/FGI | We support the FL proposal. In addition, we do not believe it would result in more blind decoding times, as long as DCI format length can be taken good care. |
| Mod V49 | No revision on proposal 3.1 |
| **ROUND 1** | |
| Mod V00 | Any additional inputs on Proposal 3.1, please share |
| Qualcomm | We are fine for Proposal 3.1. To our understanding, the use case is to switch beam in absence of DL traffic. |
| Mod V05 | No revision on proposal 3.1 |
| Samsung | Support proposal 3.1 for reasons previously mentioned. |
| Lenovo/MoM | We are fine with proposal 3.1, but we think the following question is FFS: without scheduling PDSCH, TCI indication can be more flexible than when PDSCH is scheduled by the same DCI. What impact does this have on the TCI indication mechanism in DCI, including determining between separate and joint TCI state pool, and which channels the indicated TCI state applies to?  [Mod: This is a good point and a shorter version is added. The use for channels is related to M/N>1 and captured as such.] |
| Mod V13 | Added an FFS per Lenovo’s comment |
| Xiaomi | We share same understanding as Qualcomm that the use case of additional DCI format is to switch beam in absence of DL traffic, but in this case, the straight forward way is to enhance UL DCI format, i.e., Alt 3. We still slightly prefer Alt 3. With alt 1, it is necessary for UE to decode two DCIs before PUSCH transmission. |
| ZTE | Support Proposal 3.1 |
| Docomo | Support proposal 3.1. |
| Nokia | TCI field: do we need to see first what is the agreement in Proposal 1.2? Is it any advantage in having separate states for joint DL/UL and then for DL and UL? Why not having only states for DL and UL and when they are joint, same TCI index is used? It seems a bit of an overdesign the current approach! We suggest to remove the FFS from the “whether both DL TCI and UL TCI...”, if such signaling option is not possible, then we see some big drawbacks of the design. |
| Sony | In our understanding, this repurposed DCI could not only serve the case when DL traffic is absent, but also the case when UL traffic does not arrive. Hence when compared with DL DCI with DL assignment or UL DCI with UL allocation, it can be more flexible in updating TCI state(s).  Support the FL proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | Support the FL proposal, but also agree with Nokia. |
| CATT | Support proposal 3.1 |
| Ericsson | Do not support. The agreed mechanisms are good enough. |

### Issue 4 (MP-UE)

Table 7 Summary: issue 4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 4.1 | Additional specification support for enabling UE-initiated   * Panel activation (activating L out of P available UE panels at least for DL/UL measurement), and/or * Panel selection (activating 1 out of L activated UE panels for UL transmission)   Note: If a feature is supported, we will need to discuss whether this applies to activation, selection, or both | * **Not needed (2)**: Ericsson, OPPO * **Indicator/association for panel entity (16)**: IDC, vivo, Lenovo/MoM, ZTE, Qualcomm, Sony, MTK, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, APT/FGI, CMCC, NTT Docomo, Huawei, HiSi, LG * **Event of panel switch reporting (7)**: CATT, APT/FGI, CMCC, ZTE, Huawei, HiSi, LG * **Transmission process (3)**: Apple, MTK, ZTE |
| 4.2 | Additional specification support for NW-initiated panel selection (via Rel-17 TCI state update)  Note: the use of Rel-17 unified TCI and Rel-17 beam indication for panel selection has been agreed. “Additional” implies on top of this. | * **Not needed (11)**: vivo (implicit), Fraunhofer IIS/HHI (implicit), Ericsson, Xiaomi, OPPO, CATT, Sony, MTK, Nokia/NSB * **Indicator/association for panel entity (4)**: IDC, ZTE, Lenovo/MoM * **Handshake mechanism/panel alignment (4)**: Huawei, HiSi, Qualcomm, CMCC |
| 4.3 | For CSI/beam reporting, what indicates a panel entity (comprising one or more RS resources)? | * **CRI/SSBRI (2)**: LGE (per panel), Sony (2nd priority) * **Association with CSI-RS resource set index (transparent) (8)**: Lenovo/MoM, Samsung, CATT, APT/FGI, Nokia/NSB * **New panel ID (17)**: IDC, vivo, Lenovo/MoM, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, Spreadtrum, MTK (PEI), APT/FGI, CMCC, Sony (1st priority), ZTE (1st priority), Qualcomm, Huawei, HiSi, LG * **Transmission process index (4):** Apple, MTK, ZTE (2nd priority), [LG (open to discuss how to name panel ID from spec perspective] |
| 4.4 | For beam indication, what indicates a panel entity (comprising one or more RS resources)? | * **CRI/SSBRI/SRI (3)**: vivo, CMCC, Sony (2nd priority) * **CSI-RS resource set index/SRS resource set index (9)**: Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Samsung, Sony (1st priority), CATT, APT/FGI, Nokia/NSB * **New panel ID (6)**: IDC, LGE, APT/FGI, ZTE, Qualcomm |

The following observation can be made:

* (4.1, 4.3, 4.4) Strong majority supporting additional spec support for enabling UE-initiated panel activation/selection to indicate/refer to a panel entity. This is further delineated in 4.3 and 4.4 in terms of the options. For each of 4.3 and 4.4, two most supported options can be listed for further down selection.

Based on the above observation, the following moderator proposals can be made:

**Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection,

* For CSI/beam measurement/reporting, down select from the following candidates:
  + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index for CSI/beam reporting
    - The correspondence between a panel entity and a reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index is indicated to NW
    - FFS: Detailed design of the correspondence including the conveyed information
    - Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index and a panel entity is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16)
  + Opt1-2: A panel entity is referring to a new panel ID within CSI/beam reporting configuration or reports
    - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID including the information conveyed by the new panel ID
    - Note: The association between the new panel ID and the panel entity is determined by the UE
  + Opt1-3: No additional specification support
  + The duration in which the above panel entity reference is valid and the respective setting are FFS
* [For beam indication based on the Rel-17 unified TCI framework, down select from the following candidates:
  + Opt 2-1: Reference to CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index, or SRS resource index or resource set index within a TCI state
    - The resources with the same CSI-RS and/or SSB resource set index can only be measured by corresponding UE panel
  + Opt 2-2: Reference to a new panel ID within a TCI state
    - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID, and whether it is the same panel ID as that in Opt1-2
  + Opt 2-3: No additional specification support
  + The duration in which the above association is valid and the respective setting are FFS]

Table 8 Additional inputs: issue 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| **ROUND 0** | |
| CMCC | We have provided our views above |
| Nokia/NSB | Issue 4.1: Not clear what is the discussion point. Is this to decide whether UE oriented operation is supported or to find specification impact ‘if’ UE oriented operation is supported?  [Mod] UE-initiated panel selection/activation has been agreed in RAN1#103-e. But whether this requires additional spec impact or not has not been agreed. So the purpose of 4.1 is to conclude whether additional spec impact is needed.   * We support UE initiated UL panel activation, but prefer further discussion on UE oriented UL panel selection.   [Mod] Please see above. Both have been agreed, but the need for spec support is FFS   * We do not see necessity of specification to support UE oriented panel activation. But there should be a specification impact, if UE oriented panel selection is supported. |
| Sony | Add and modify our views. |
| ZTE | Besides, the state of UE panel should be reported, including DL only, and both DL and UL. |
| Mod V18 | Added FL proposal |
| Xiaomi | Updated our views above. |
| NTT Docomo | We suggest discussing CSI/beam reporting (issue 4.3) first. Panel information in CSI/beam reporting is important to align information between gNB and UE of which panel is used for CSI/beam meas./report, so that gNB can make proper configuration/indication of UL Tx in case different panels constitute different numbers of antenna ports/numbers of beams/etc.  Depending on the progress of panel information in CSI/beam reporting (issue 4.3), we can further discuss panel information in beam indication. If panel information is included in CSI/beam reporting,   * If L1 metrics of one panel can be reported for one CRI/SSBRI, CRI/SSBRI in TCI state can represent a panel. * If L1 metrics of multiple panels can be reported for one CRI/SSBRI, additional panel information may be needed in TCI state for beam indication.   [Mod: Thank you. Based on the comments so far it may be possible to proceed in the direction of proposal 4.1. But if not, we can proceed this way] |
| MediaTek | Regarding Opt1-1/Opt1-2, we think they are used differently within the CSI framework. For Opt1-1, to our understanding, CSI/beam measurement is performed in panel specific according to existing CSI-RS resource set index. However, no panel-related info has to be provided within CSI/beam reporting. For Opt1-2, CSI/beam measurement is performed without any restriction, and the panel-related info is provided within CSI/beam reporting according to UE panel activation/selection. In summary, we propose some changes for clarification.  Regarding Option1-2, we would like to further add one note to clarify that the association between the new panel ID and the panel entity is up to UE decision.  Regarding beam indication, we see not all companies supporting panel ID or transmission process index (14+3) for CSI/beam reporting also support panel ID for beam indication (7). Thus, we think no additional specification support could be one option for further study.  **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UL beam selection for MP-UE, support additional specification to facilitate indication/association of panel entity for enabling UE-initiated panel activation and selection. Down select from the following candidate schemes:   * For CSI/beam measurement/reporting:   + Opt1-1: A panel entity is associated with an existing CSI-RS resource set index within CSI/beam measurement   + Opt1-2: A panel entity is associated with a new panel ID within CSI/beam reporting     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID     - Note: The association between the new panel ID and the panel entity is fully up to UE implementation * For beam indication:   + Opt 2-1: Association between CSI-RS resource set index/SRS resource set index and TCI state   + Opt 2-2: Association between a new panel ID with TCI state     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID, and whether it is the same panel ID as that in Opt1-2   + Opt 2-3: No additional specification support   Some comments to Opt1-1. For CSI/beam measurement/reporting, it is more reasonable that the association between RS resource (i.e., gNB beam) and corresponding UE panel is done by UE according to measurement results and UE-initiated panel activation/selection. We fail to see how NW can group a set of RS resources (i.e., gNB beams) and enforce UE to measure them by a certain UE panel, and how this can facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection.  [Mod: Good points. Please check revised version] |
| Apple | We have concern for the term panel ID or panel entity ID. We should use a logical term like antenna port group ID or transmission process ID.  [Mod: ‘Panel entity’ is based on the previous agreement so it is better to progress from that term since it has been defined. Otherwise we would have to restart the discussion ☹]  We think the panel associated with a DL beam should not always be consistent. So we think more discussion could be needed for opt 1-1 and 1-2, e.g. whether this association is consistent or not, or we assume there should be an effective time window for a report.  [Mod: Please check revised version – I added the time issue]  In addition, we do not think NW should control UE panel. Thus, we do not support opt 2-1 or opt 2-2.  [Mod: Opt 2-3 is added] |
| ZTE | ‘CSI framework’ is a little bit confusing, regarding first/second sub-sub-bullet. We do not have strong preference on the title of this ID, but the usage or information corresponding to the ID should be clarified.  [Mod: Good point, please check latest version]  For instance, this ID corresponds to a maximum number of layers to be supported by the UE. |
| Qualcomm | We are generally fine for the proposal. Suggest to add a sub-bullet as below in red to clarify the meaning of Option 1-1, if that is the definition.   * For CSI/beam reporting:   + Opt1-1: Reference to existing CSI-RS resource set index within CSI framework     - The CSI-RS resource set is only measured by the corresponding panel   + Opt1-2: Reference to a new panel ID within CSI framework     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID   [Mod: Good point, done] |
| vivo | We are supportive of the direction.  Proposal 4.1: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UL beam selection for MP-UE, support additional specification to facilitate indication/association of panel entity for enabling UE-initiated panel activation and selection. Down select from the following candidate schemes:   * For CSI/beam reporting:   + Opt1-1: The panel entity is referring to existing CSI-RS resource set index within CSI framework     - The CSI-RS resource set is only measured by the corresponding panel   + Opt1-2: The panel entity is referring to a new panel ID within CSI framework     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID * For beam indication:   + Opt 2-1: Association between CSI-RS resource set index/SRS resource set index and TCI state   + Opt 2-2: Association between a new panel ID with TCI state     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID, and whether it is the same panel ID as that in Opt1-2   [Mod: This reads better, added] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We added our views to some of the listed issues.  Support Proposal 4.1 in principle. And we hope that after reporting, gNB can be assured about UE panel status, so that fast UL panel switching can be made possible… |
| Mod V32 | Revised proposal to address inputs |
| Samsung | Support Proposal 4.1, with a note (in red below) to clarify that the correspondence b/w a CSI-RS resource set and a physical panel is up to UE (i.e. UE doesn’t need to reveal it)  **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection,   * For CSI/beam measurement/reporting, down select from the following candidates:   + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to an existing CSI-RS resource set index within CSI/beam measurement     - The CSI-RS resource set is only measured by the corresponding panel       * Note: the correspondence b/w a CSI-RS resource set and a physical panel is up to UE. * ….   [Mod: OK] |
| NEC | Support proposal 4.1 |
| ZTE | Support the updated proposal 4.1 |
| OPPO | In the agreement of RAN1#104 meeting, we agreed that “For one RS resource, the corresponding panel entity may vary and is controlled by the UE”. In beam indication as defined rel17 unified TCI state, the gNB indicate a UL TCI through joint TCI state or a UL TCI state and the UL TCI is indicted through a DL RS or SRS. Combined with the agreement we made in RAN1#104 meeting, we do not need enhance beam indication for UL panel selection. The gNB just indicate one UL TCI and the UE would choose the proper UL panel/beam according the mapping which is controlled by the UE. Thus, we suggest to remove the beam indication part in the proposal.  Regarding the beam measurement/reporting part, Opt1-1 seems not correct technically. The mapping between panel entity and CSI-RS resource shall be controlled by UE as agreed in last meeting. Generally, the UE can determine the mapping between panel and CSI-RS according to the downlink beam measurement (assuming UE have beam correspondence). However, the wording Opt1-1 seems to suggest that the gNB control the mapping between the CSI-RS resource and UE panel/beam, which does not align with the agreement. Regarding Opt1-2: it intends to introduce a new panel ID. That has been discussed a lot in rel16 and we all know the outputs of the discussion. So, what is the case for listing it here again. Furthermore, from our perspective, another option is we do not need additional specification support for beam measurement and reporting. The reason is: the UE determines the on/off of a tx panel according many factors. If the UE decides to turn off one Tx panel due to some reasons, the UE won’t use it to conduct beam measurement and reporting. The assumption that the UE turns on all the panel to measure beam and then turn off some panel for transmission is not the real UE operation status. Thus, here is our suggestions on revising the proposal for further discussion:  Change #1: Update Opt 1-1 as follows:   * + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to an ~~existing~~ reported CSI-RS resource ~~set index~~ within CSI/beam measurement     - ~~The CSI-RS resource set is only measured by the corresponding panel~~   [Mod: Since one panel may comprise multiple CSI-RS resources as suggested by a number of companies, I will keep the (possibly) plural designation]  Change #2: add one more Option:   * + Opt1-3: No additional specification support.   [Mod: Added]  Change #3: delete the part of beam indication. as we explained, if we follow the rel17 unified TCI framework, there is no need for extra enhancement for beam indication:   * ~~For beam indication, down select from the following candidates:~~   + ~~Opt 2-1: Association between CSI-RS resource set index/SRS resource set index and TCI state~~   + ~~Opt 2-2: Association between a new panel ID with TCI state~~     - ~~FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID, and whether it is the same panel ID as that in Opt1-2~~   + ~~Opt 2-3: No additional specification support~~   + ~~The duration in which the above association is valid and the respective setting are FFS~~   [Mod: I agree we have the beam indication from Rel-17 unified framework per previous agreement. But even with this, to indicate panel selection for UL transmission purposes, some companies suggest that some association (e.g. configuration) would still be needed to make sure that the UL TCI state represents the correct panel entity. Besides we still have Opt2-3 (no additional support). So there is no need for deleting the entire bullet for now since some discussion is still needed. I’ll reword to address your concern on the term “set”.] |
| Spreadtrum | Support Proposal 4.1 in principle.  For Opt1-1, we are not clear whether this correspondence means CSI-RS resource set and a panel entity are associated before beam measurement or after beam reporting.  [Mod: This is a good point. In my understanding, this issue is a next level design detail. Some companies seem to suggest this can be dynamically set, but other may suggest higher-layer configuration. Your question is related to this aspect.] |
| MediaTek | Share similar view with OPPO. Opt 1-1 in current proposal seems to be conflicted with our previous agreement, thus we prefer to remove it. We are also okay to add change #2 suggested by OPPO as a compromise. We see whether new panel ID is needed will depend on how we design and use it in the end.  [Mod: Please check the latest version and my response to OPPO, if this clarifies my intention.] |
| LG | Added our view in the table.  We support Proposal 4.1 in principle. For Opt 1-1 and Opt 2-1, it needs to allow SSB resource set as well as CSI-RS resource set to our understanding.  [Mod: Added SSB]  Overall, the functionality of 1-1 vs 1-2 and 2-1 vs 2-2 are similar but considering many different issues related to panel (e.g. MPE, panel-switching/activation time gap, timing error group in Positioning, etc.) and forward-compatibility, we think that it will be more efficient to introduce a panel-specific ID. How to name that ID in specification can be discussed later, e.g. transmission process ID, etc. |
| vivo | Would like to clarify the following:   * + Opt1-2: A panel entity is referring to a new panel ID within CSI/beam reporting configuration or reports     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID     - Note: The association between the new panel ID and the panel entity is fully up to UE implementation   + The duration in which the above panel entity reference is valid and the respective setting are FFS   [Mod: Done] |
| Mod V43 | Revised proposal to address inputs. |
| Apple | In last agreement, panel entity is for discussion purpose. We suggest we make it consistent. We also add option 1-3.  **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection,   * For CSI/beam measurement/reporting, down select from the following candidates:   + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to reported CSI-RS resource and/or SSB index/indices for CSI/beam measurement     - Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS resource and/or SSB index/indices and a physical panel is fully up to UE implementation   + Opt1-2: A panel entity is referring to a new panel ID within CSI/beam reporting configuration or reports     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID     - Note: The association between the new panel ID and the panel entity is fully up to UE implementation   + Opt1-3: A panel entity is referring to a new transmission process ID within CSI/beam reporting configuration or reports     - Support UE to report at least maximum number of transmission processes and maximum number of SRS ports for each transmission process     - Support UE to report minimal switching delay for UL TCI states or joint UL/DL TCI states corresponding to different transmission processes       * FFS: whether this is reported by UE capability or dynamically by L1/L2 signaling     - Note: The association between the transmission process ID and the panel entity is fully up to UE implementation and can be changed   + The duration in which the above panel entity reference is valid and the respective setting are FFS   + Note: the term “panel entity” is only for discussion purpose * For beam indication based on the Rel-17 unified TCI framework, down select from the following candidates:   + Opt 2-1: Association between CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index/indicates or SRS resource index/indices and TCI state   + Opt 2-2: Association between a new panel ID with TCI state     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID, and whether it is the same panel ID as that in Opt1-2   + Opt 2-3: No additional specification support   + The duration in which the above association is valid and the respective setting are FFS |
| Ericsson | Opt1-1: is there any spec impact of this? A report is what it is, how can it refer to a panel?  [Mod: I reworded the wording “up to UE implementation” to “determined by the UE” since this can be misunderstood that there is no spec impact]  Opt2-1: Would that be an association between a different RS from the RS in the TCI state? If so, what would the RS inside the TCI state mean?  [Mod: Thanks for the catch. The reference to the RS index inside the TCI state will have to be replaced with a reference to the panel entity. Reworded.]  Opt1-2, opt 2-2: So far, no performance benefits have been demonstrated by having a panel ID, implicit indication has always been equally good. Even if it would be some benefit, that would require full NW control. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer to revert ‘set’ for CSI-RS resource reporting.  In our understanding, option 1 may mean that it is up to UE how to asscoated measurement RS reousce to UE panel. We are O.K. with that part, but at least we prefer gNB can know whether UE ‘keep using’ the same UL panel or not. If there is a restriction that UE should measure & report RSs within the same set via the same UE panel, then at least gNB can know when there could be a ‘possible switching’ of UE panels. We think this is the least information gNB may need.   * + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to reported CSI-RS resource index, CSI-RS reouce set and/or SSB index/indices for CSI/beam measurement     - Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS resource and/or SSB index/indices and a physical panel is fully up to UE implementation     - FFS: gNB assumes reported CSI-RS reousces within the same resource set is associated to same UE panel   [Mod: Done, the wording seems inclusive enough to OPPO’s comment as well] |
| Mod V49 | Revised to address inputs |
| **ROUND 1** | |
| Mod V00 | Any additional inputs on Proposal 4.1, please share |
| Qualcomm | To our understanding, Option 1-1 is current spec behavior. If so, we suggest to emphasize this as red text below, where panel is not selected by gNB to our understanding.   * + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index for CSI/beam measurement     - FFS: gNB assumes reported CSI-RS reousces within the same resource set is associated to same UE panel     - Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index and a physical panel is determined by the UE as in R15/16   For the Option 2-1, we suggest to add the following clarification if that is the definition. Otherwise, please clarify how does this DL resource set work.   * + Opt 2-1: Reference to CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index, or SRS resource index or resource set index within a TCI state     - The resources with the same CSI-RS and/or SSB resource set index can only be measured by corresponding UE panel   [Mod: Done] |
| Mod V05 | Revised proposal per input |
| OPPO | First of all, we insist to add Opt 1-3:   * + Opt1-3: No additional specification support.   Because from our understanding, the current beam measurement and reporting do be able to support UE panel selection. Agreeing “Without specification support” does not mean no progress. If the current spec is sufficient for one feature, why do we have to change the spec.  [Mod: Added]  Secondly: The current wording on Opt1-1 is not 100% correct. In beam report, there is no reported resource set index, The UE only reports CRI or SSBRI that refer to a reported CSI-RS or SSB. Suggest to remove the “set”   * + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index ~~or resource set index~~ for CSI/beam measurement   [Mod: Done]  Regarding the second bullet on beam indication. Here is our reply to Mod’s comments  [Mod: I agree we have the beam indication from Rel-17 unified framework per previous agreement. But even with this, to indicate panel selection for UL transmission purposes, some companies suggest that some association (e.g. configuration) would still be needed to make sure that the UL TCI state represents the correct panel entity. Besides we still have Opt2-3 (no additional support). So there is no need for deleting the entire bullet for now since some discussion is still needed. I’ll reword to address your concern on the term “set”.]  We have agreed the mapping between RS and panel enrity is controlled by the UE, not the gNB. When the gNB indicates one TCI state, the UE would derive the panel and Tx beam according the mapping association. Then why we need some association or configuration to make sure the UL TCI state represent the correct panel entity? If we do so, the gNB would control the panel, which is not what we agreed and which is also not aligned with practical implementation. The gNB can not control the UE panel. Given that, the second bullet of beam indication is not acceptable to us.  [Mod: I see the concern even if other companies may not agree with you ☺ This part is in brackets now] |
| Samsung | With the current wording of Opt1-1, what is the spec impact? Is this equivalent to no spec impact (similar to Opt 2-3?)  [Mod: Please see revised version] |
| MediaTek | On the proposal 4.1, we have the following comments:   1. Current Opt1-1 may confuse people since the reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index should be used in CSI/beam reporting, instead of CSI/beam measurement. Thus, we suggest to change “CSI/beam measurement” to “CSI/beam reporting” in Opt1-1. 2. Regarding resource set (index) added by Nokia in current Opt 1-1, we fail to see why UE has to report resource set index in CSI/beam reporting since only one resource set is measured by UE for a CSI/beam report instance. Further, regarding the FFS in Opt 1-1, we also have concern since it means UE is restricted to use a certain panel for measuring a resource set if gNB can assume it. Thus, we suggest to remove them from current Opt 1-1. 3. As mentioned in current Opt 1-1, since the correspondence between a RS resource and a panel entity is determined by the UE, a new ID can be used to indicate the correspondence to NW. Therefore, we suggest to add one sub-bullet in Opt1-1 and Opt 1-2 to clarify it. 4. We don't have a strong preference to call the new ID as “new panel ID” or “transmission process ID”. In fact, we see the most important thing is what is the information conveyed by this new ID, like what Apple proposed. Thus, we suggest to further study the new ID and clarify RAN1 has to further study the information conveyed by the new ID, but without going into the next level design at this stage. Hopefully, this could be okay to Apple. 5. We are okay to add Opt1-3: No additional specification support as a compromise. 6. Regarding current Opt 2-1, we have concern since it mandates UE to use a certain UE panel to perform transmission for the TCI state. We suggest to remove it from proposal.   In summary, we suggest the following changes for Proposal 4.1:  **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection,   * For CSI/beam measurement/reporting, down select from the following candidates:   + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to a reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or for CSI/beam reporting     - The correspondence between a panel entity and a reported CSI-RS resource and/or SSB index is indicated to NW though a new ID     - FFS: Detailed design of the new ID including the information conveyed by the new ID     - Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index and a panel entity is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16)   + Opt1-2: A panel entity is referring to a new panel ID within CSI/beam reporting configuration or reports     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID including the information conveyed by the new panel ID     - Note: The association between the new panel ID and the panel entity is determined by the UE   + The duration in which the above panel entity reference is valid and the respective setting are FFS * For beam indication based on the Rel-17 unified TCI framework, down select from the following candidates:   + Opt 2-2: Reference to a new panel ID within a TCI state     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID, and whether it is the same panel ID as that in Opt1-2   + Opt 2-3: No additional specification support   + The duration in which the above association is valid and the respective setting are FFS   [Mod: Added but removed new ID reference in 1-1 to avoid confusion, but the second bullet doesn’t seem agreeable to OPPO] |
| Lenovo/MoM | We want to have clarification if Opt 1-1 and 2-1 have spec impact or not.  [Mod: It seems MTK’s input clarifies this] |
| Mod V13 | Revised proposal based on inputs.  The second bullet on beam indication is in brackets. |
| LG | After reviewing other companies’ comments, we think that it will be better to clarify the specification impact of Opt1-1. In our view, a key part is that UE should maintain the same panel for receiving the CSI-RS resource reported as CRI and for transmitting UL signal when the CRI is indicated as spatial relation RS because current spec allows UE to switch panel in different time instances for a same source RS for DL/UL beam indication. We would like to propose revise Opt1-1 as follows. Additional subbullets from MediaTek is also fine to us but we are not sure whether ‘through a new ID’ is a common understanding of proponents of Opt1-1.  **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection,   * For CSI/beam measurement/reporting, down select from the following candidates:   + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index for CSI/beam measurement     - ~~FFS:~~ gNB assumes reported CSI-RS/SSB resources within the same resource set is associated to same UE panel when the CSI-RS/SSB resources are indicated as spatial relation RS for UL transmission     - Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index and a physical panel is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16) |
| Xiaomi | After revision, the difference between Option 1-1 and Option 1-2 is not very clear.  While for beam indication, we prefer Option 2-3 if Option 1-2 is supported. |
| ZTE | We do not have strong concerns, but Option 1-1 and Option 1-2 are very similar based on the updated version. And, if possible, we suggest to remove one of them, e.g., option 1-2, directly. |
| NTT Docomo | Support proposal 4.1. |
| Nokia | We do not see necessity of specification to support UE oriented panel activation. But there should be a specification impact, if UE oriented panel selection is supported.  UE reporting of the feasible links dynamically (i.e maximum achievable EIRP e.g. for UEs with panels of different capabilities or for potential MPE events) can help the gNB in enhancing beam management.  Opt 1-3: OK  Opt 2-3: OK |
| Sony | For updated Opt1-1, we see a panel entity is referring to CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index for CSI/beam reporting, but not any resource set that’s surely not reported by UE. Then should we also carry out the following change to get aligned?  Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index ~~or resource set index~~ and a physical panel entity is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16)  Generally, we are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We suggest the following revision.  **Proposal 4.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection,   * For CSI/beam measurement/reporting, down select from the following candidates:   + Opt1-1: A panel entity is referring to reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index in a beam reporting instance     - The correspondence between a panel entity and a reported CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index is indicated to NW     - FFS: Detailed design of the correspondence including the conveyed information     - Note: the correspondence between a CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index and a panel entity is determined by the UE (analogous to Rel-15/16)   + Opt1-2: A panel entity is referring to a new ID within CSI/beam reporting configuration or reports     - FFS: Detailed design of the new ID including the information conveyed by the new panel ID     - Note: The association between the new ID and the panel entity is determined by the UE   + Opt1-3: No additional specification support   + The duration in which the above panel entity reference is valid and the respective setting are FFS   + Note: “panel entity” is only used for discussion purpose * [For beam indication based on the Rel-17 unified TCI framework, down select from the following candidates:   + Opt 2-1: Reference to CSI-RS and/or SSB resource index or resource set index, or SRS resource index or resource set index within a TCI state     - The resources with the same CSI-RS and/or SSB resource set index can only be measured by corresponding UE panel   + Opt 2-2: Reference to a new panel ID within a TCI state     - FFS: Detailed design of the new panel ID, and whether it is the same panel ID as that in Opt1-2   + Opt 2-3: No additional specification support   + The duration in which the above association is valid and the respective setting are FFS] |
| CATT | Support the revised proposal. |
| Ericsson | We would be interested in the performance benefits of an explicit or implicit panel ID. Throughout the WI (and also during Rel-16), the panel ID has been discussed several times. In some simulations, the benefits of using different panels for UL and DL have been demonstrated, but the simulations can always rely on an implicit scheme, by pointing to another DL RS. The reason is that the gNB does not care which panel the UE uses, as long as the UL signal arrives from the predicted direction. (If the current specification prevents the UE to choose panel freely for a certain spatial relation/UL TCI, this should be addressed.) To be more precise: what is the benefit of option 2-2?  We noticed that the beam indication is now in brackets. It does not seem relevant to study measurements in isolation – these come in a package. Hence, as long as the beam indication is in brackets, we don’t think it’s relevant to compare opt1-1, opt1-2, opt1-3.  We would like to see some performance comparison of implicit and explicit panel ID – this could be a topic for the May meeting. |

### Issue 5 (MPE mitigation)

Table 9 Summary: issue 5

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 5.1 | Whether to support at least one the following:   * {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)} + {A}, where A is either Opt1A, Opt1B, Opt1C, or Opt1D:   + Option 1A: Virtual PHR or a modified version associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI   + Option 1B: {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication}   + Option 1C: {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication} + virtual PHR or a modified version associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured)   + Option 1D: No additional reporting quantity * {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication} + {A}, where A is either Opt2A, Opt2B, Opt2A+ Opt2B, or Option 2C   + Option 2A: L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured)   + Option 2B: Virtual PHR or a modified version associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured)   + Option 2C: No additional reporting quantity | Rel-16 P-MPR based:   * **Option 1A (6)**: Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo, OPPO, Lenovo/MoM * **Option 1B (2)**: Sony, Intel * **Option 1C (3)**: ZTE, Apple, Qualcomm * **Option 1D (6)**: vivo, Spreadtrum, MTK, Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSi   SSBRI/CRI-based:   * **Option 2A (8)**: CMCC, Ericsson (*UL-RSRP = L1-RSRP – PDL + PUL*), Samsung (modified RSRP), NTT Docomo, CATT (scaled RSRP), MTK, Sony, LGE * **Option 2B (4)**: CATT, ZTE, Convida, Qualcomm * **Option 2A+2B** (in one report) (3): Nokia/NSB, Apple * **Option 2C (2)**: Spreadtrum, Xiaomi * **Other option**(s): IDC (TCI state group indication + gNB confirmation) |
| 5.2 | If Opt1A/B/C/D in 5.1 is supported:   * Alt1. Beam-level reporting * Alt2. Panel-level reporting | **Alt1 (5)**: Nokia/NSB, MTK (associated with active TCI states), Qualcomm, Sony  **Alt2 (10)**: vivo, Lenovo/MoM, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MoM, NTT Docomo, Huawei, HiSi |
| 5.3 | If Opt2A/B/C in 5.1 is supported:   * Alt1 (beam-level): Reporting of at least SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) to indicate gNB beam(s) that is feasible for UL transmission * Alt2 (panel-level): Reporting of at least an indicator associated with a UE ‘panel’ that is feasible for UL transmission | **Alt1 (9)**: IDC, Nokia/NSB, MTK, Sony, ZTE (1st priority), Qualcomm, NTT Docomo, CATT  **Alt2 (6)**: Lenovo/MoM, Xiaomi, Samsung, LGE, MTK |
| 5.4 | Reporting mechanism | **UE-initiated (event-triggered) without NW triggering via CSI request (8):** Sony, Qualcomm, Samsung, Nokia/NSB (BFR like), ZTE, Huawei, HiSi  **NW triggering via CSI request (just as the regular A-CSI) (3):** Spreadtrum, MTK, Ericsson |

The following observation can be made:

* (5.1) The two most supported options are Opt1A and Opt2A. To further progress, more detailed technical discussion can be focused on those two options while not precluding the option of not enhancing
  + On gNB confirmation scheme (from, e.g. IDC), it seems to apply to both schemes, and can be left as FFS
* (5.4) There seems to be consensus on UE-initiated (event-triggered) reporting mechanism for MPE mitigation

Based on the above observation, the following proposal can be made:

**Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss to down-select at least one or combine from the following options:

* Opt 1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)} + Virtual PHR or a modified version
  + The modified version may be associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI, or associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured) from candidate pool, if reported.
  + FFS: how to determine the virtual PHR or the modified version.
* Opt 1D. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)}
* Opt 2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication} + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured)
  + FFS: How panel-level L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] is reported if L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] is associated with panel
  + FFS: Whether/how to account for MPE effect in L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] report, e.g. by using scaled L1-RSRP [L1-SINR]
  + FFS: Whether/how to enhance existing beam reporting format to support Option 2A
  + FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs are reported in the same reporting instance, whether to allow mixture between the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)) intended for MPE mitigation and for DL beam reporting
  + Note: If Opt2A is selected and there is no consensus on a modified L1-RSRP definition, at least the Rel-15 L1-RSRP definition is reused

FFS: If gNB confirmation of MPE-based UE reporting is supported

FFS: If differential report is supported when multiple UL beams are reported in the same report

**[Proposal 5.2**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, the supported UE reporting scheme is UE-initiated (event-triggered, without CSI request)

* FFS: Support for NW-initiated reporting with CSI request
* FFS: Definition of triggering event]

Table 10 Additional inputs: issue 5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| **ROUND 0** | |
| Sony | Add more views. |
| ZTE | In our views, the issue 5.4 reporting mechanism should be discussed firstly for facilitating the final down-selection from the alternatives in Issue 5.1. |
| Mod V18 | Added FL proposal 5.1 |
| Xiaomi | Added our views above. |
| NTT Docomo | For 5.4, for option1, we support to reuse reporting mechanism of R16 PMPR report, i.e., event triggered; for option2, we support to reuse reporting mechanism of CSI/beam reporting, i.e., configured/triggered by NW  [Mod: Added proposal 5.2. Would Docomo-san be fine with event-triggered for Opt2x as well?] |
| MediaTek | Okay to this proposal. It is a down-selection from previous agreements for future down-selection. Regarding Opt2A, there are some FFSs in the previous agreement, and we prefer to add them back to this proposal.   * Opt 2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication} + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured)   + FFS: How panel-level L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] is reported if L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] is associated with panel   + FFS: Whether/how to account for MPE effect in L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] report, e.g. by using scaled L1-RSRP [L1-SINR]   + FFS: Whether/how to enhance existing beam reporting format to support Option 2A   [Mod: Done]  Regarding reporting mechanism, we think this may depend on which option(s) is adopted. For Opt 1A/1D, we think UE-initiated report is natural. For Opt 2A/2D, it is more similar to existing beam reporting at least in our view. |
| Apple | We support the proposal in principle, but we suggest we consider to combine some options. In our understating, option 1A and 2A can be combined so that gNB can calculate the UL Rx power. We suggest we add “or combine” in the main-bullet.   * **Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, in RAN1#104b-e, discuss and down select or combine from the following options:   + Opt 1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)} + Virtual PHR or a modified version associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI   + Opt 1D. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)}   + Opt 2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication} + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured)   + Opt 2C. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication}   + FFS: If gNB confirmation of MPE-based UE reporting is supported   [Mod: Good point] |
| ZTE | We can NOT support this proposal before technical discussion. To be honest, we do not see a clear majority views among those candidates.  [Mod: From the table, 1A, 1D, and 2A seem to be the most supported ones. I removed 2C to be consistent. Please check the latest version and hopefully it is ok to ZTE ☺ Or please suggest some revision]  In our views, the issue 5.4 reporting mechanism should be discussed firstly for facilitating the final down-selection from the alternatives in Issue 5.1. Can we agree that UE-initialized reporting should be supported for MPE mitigation?  [Mod: Added proposal 5.2 (good point)] |
| Intel | We think this proposal needs further discussion. In our view the baseline should be Option 1B. If going with Apple’s suggestion, 1B should also be included in the discussion. |
| Qualcomm | Suggest to add “at least one” in the Proposal 5.1, since the event triggered P-MPR report can be used when the UL beam for regular report fails. In other words, P-MPR report and regular report can coexist for different use cases to our understanding. Also, Suggest to add another FFS at the end.   * **Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, in RAN1#104b-e, discuss and down select at least one from the following options: * Opt 1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)} + Virtual PHR or a modified version associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI * Opt 1D. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)} * Opt 2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication} + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured) * Opt 2C. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication}   FFS: If gNB confirmation of MPE-based UE reporting is supported  FFS: If differential report is supported when multiple UL beams are reported in the same report.  [Mod: Done] |
| Mod V32 | Revised proposal 5.1 to address inputs  Added proposal 5.2 |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal except that we suggest to add an FFS for the case when multiple beams are reported in the same report. In our view, all beams don’t need to be UL beams (i.e. dedicated for UL). Some of them can be for UL, and the rest can be normal (i.e. for DL and UL like in Rel. 15.16).  FFS: When multiple beams are reported in the same report, then whether some of them can be dedicated for UL beams (e.g. for MPE mitigation), and the rest can be normal (e.g. for both DL and UL as in Rel. 15/16 beam report)  [Mod: Added but with some rewording since the wording is unclear. I assume the intention is to have a mixture between the new report and legacy report – also the term “normal” is confusing] |
| ZTE | We support proposal 5.2.  Regarding proposal 5.1, to be honest, we still fail to understand the full picture of how to make sure the MPE related reporting is useful.   * For Opt 1A, the activated UL TCI state may be quite limited, and candidate RS should be selected from a general beam pools (e.g., up to 64 SSB); * For Opt 1D, we still fail to identify the candidate beam or panels. What is the Rel-17 enhancement? * For Opt 2A, the spec impact/complexity should be well evaluated, and we do not have a clear event-driven UE behavior that can be inherited from Rel-15/16.   Regarding the updated proposal, does it means that ‘combine’ means SSBRI/CRI may be reported along with PHR, also as Intel mentioned? If so, for progress, we suggest to revise Opt-1 a little bit for solving our concerns.   * Opt 1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)} + Virtual PHR or a modified version.   + The modified version may be associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI, or associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured) from candidate pool, if reported.   + FFS: how to determine the virtual PHR or the modified version.   [Mod: Thank you. I appreciate the open-mindedness and constructiveness for progress. Included] |
| Spreadtrum | Support Proposal 5.1 in principle. For Opt 2A, since there are many modified versions of L1-RSRP, we suggest to add a note that if there’s no consensus on the definition of L1-RSRP, no additional report quantity is supported.  **Proposal 5.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss to down-select at least one or combine from the following options:   * Opt 1A. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)} + Virtual PHR or a modified version associated with each activated UL TCI or, if applicable, joint TCI * Opt 1D. {Rel.16 P-MPR based (beam/panel-level)} * Opt 2A. {SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication} + L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] or a modified version that accounts for MPE effect associated with each of the reported SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) and/or panel indication (if configured)   + FFS: How panel-level L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] is reported if L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] is associated with panel   + FFS: Whether/how to account for MPE effect in L1-RSRP [L1-SINR] report, e.g. by using scaled L1-RSRP [L1-SINR]   + FFS: Whether/how to enhance existing beam reporting format to support Option 2A   + Note: If there’s no consensus on the definition of L1-RSRP, no additional report quantity is supported   FFS: If gNB confirmation of MPE-based UE reporting is supported  FFS: If differential report is supported when multiple UL beams are reported in the same report  [Mod: Done. This is true by default so there is no harm in including it.]  Support Proposal 5.2. |
| MediaTek | On Proposal 5.1, we support the FFS added by Samsung. In fact, we believe the issue raised by Samsung is a part of the following FFS.   * + FFS: Whether/how to enhance existing beam reporting format to support Option 2A   [Mod: Please check latest version since I reworded the Samsung FFS (it seems unclear to me)]  On Proposal 5.2, we cannot support it. We don't see UE-initiated report is a good choice at least for Opt 2A. As we mentioned above, Opt 2A can be done by enhancing legacy beam reporting, which is NW-initiated measurement/report (either periodic configure or dynamic activate/trigger).  [Mod: Please check my response to Spreadtrum and see if there is a way to modify the proposal to be agreeable – since proposal 5.2 seems to have some good majority] |
| vivo | In response to ZTE, for Option1D, the enhancement is to report the P-MPR per panel rather than per CC. |
| Mod V43 | Revised proposal based on inputs |
| MediaTek | Proposal 5.1: On the FFS added by Samsung, we think the intension is discussing whether the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) indicating “gNB beam(s) that is feasible for UL transmission” (as we agreed in RAN1#104e) can be mixed with the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) indicating gNB beam(s) as in Rel-15/16 beam reporting. Thus, we suggest the following change for the FFS. Since panel indication is not supported in DL beam reporting, it is not mentioned in this FFS.   * + FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs are reported in the same reporting instance, whether to allow mixture between the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)) intended for MPE mitigation and for DL beam reporting   Propsoal 5.2: If we check the FFS item in Option 2A, whether/how to enhance existing beam reporting format to support Option 2A is still under discussion. In fact, we are not in favor of both alternitives in Issue 5.4 at least Option 2A. This is because if Option 2Acan be supported by enhancing existing beam reporting format, then it is natual that NW-initiated measurement/report is supported.  **Proposal 5.2**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, at least for Opt 1A and 1D, if supported, the supported UE reporting scheme is UE-initiated (event-triggered)   * This implies that NW triggering (via, e.g. CSI request) is not utilized * FFS: For Opt 2A, if supported, the UE reporting scheme will depend on whether it can be supported by enhancing existing beam reporting format * FFS: Definition of triggering event |
| Ericsson | Proposal 5.1: Support to discuss. Opt 1A states “Rel-16 P-MPR based” – to us this means we reuse the event, and that the report is MAC CE-based. If we introduce new events, we would not reuse the R16 report  Proposal 5.2: Do not support. For Opt 2A, it would seem quite strange to support (only) event-based, since beam management is not based on event-driven reports. For 1A/1D, the event is already specified by RAN4, and the associated reporting is performed over MAC CE. We can discuss to add measurements to that. |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 5.1:  For the clarificaiton, we want to delete the last note. Even when L1-RSRP is not agreed, we may have new reporting entity for MPE reporting: SSBRI or panel ID  [Mod: Agreed, the note is now limited to ‘modified L1-RSRP’ alone] |
| Mod V59 | Revised proposal 5.1.  Proposal 5.2 may need a bit more discussion |
| **ROUND 1** | |
| Mod V00 | Any additional inputs on Proposal 5.1 and 5.2, please share |
| Qualcomm | We suggest to remove the following note. Using R15 RSRP cannot tell which UL beam suffering or not suffering MPE. This option does not work to our understanding.   * + Note: If Opt2A is selected and there is no consensus on a modified L1-RSRP definition, the Rel-15 L1-RSRP definition is reused   [Mod: Kept the note but added “at least” to address your concern]  For Proposal 5.2, we think both UE initiated and NW initiated reporting have use cases. The former is for when UL reporting beam fails. The latter is for regular check for any better UL beam.  [Mod: Addressed] |
| Mod V05 | Revised proposals per input |
| OPPO | We do not support NW-initiated method in Proposal 5.2. As defined in RAN4 spec of rel16, the UE determines the P-MPR based on a couple of factors, including the load of uplink traffic. When some condition is met, the UE reports the P-MPR related information to the system. Therefore, the reporting can only be UE-initiated, as specified in rel16. The NW-initiated method only cause resource waste.  We can only accept the original proposal 5.2 |
| Samsung | Re NW-initiated approach, we don’t think this is a majority view, so we prefer to either remove it, or make it FFS.  [Mod: Done] |
| MediaTek | Proposal 5.1: On the FFS added by Samsung, we think the intension is discussing whether the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) indicating “gNB beam(s) that is feasible for UL transmission” (as we agreed in RAN1#104e) can be mixed with the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s) indicating gNB beam(s) as in Rel-15/16 beam reporting, instead of “beam quality”. Thus, we suggest the following change for the FFS. Since panel indication is not supported in DL beam reporting, it does not have to be mentioned in this FFS.   * + FFS: When multiple SSBRIs/CRIs are reported in the same reporting instance, whether to allow mixture between the SSBRI(s)/CRI(s)) intended for MPE mitigation and for DL beam reporting   Proposal 5.2: We see it will depend on which option(s) in Proposal 5.1 is adopted and can be discussed separately. |
| Mod V13 | Revised proposal 5.1 per inputs |
| LG | Proposal 5.2: Support |
| Mod V15 | Revised proposal 5.2 (missed Samsung’s input) |
| Xiaomi | For proposal 5.1, we prefer Option 1D. If the new panel ID in Option 1-2 of proposal 4.1 is supported, Rel. 16 P-MPR based (panel level) is sufficient.  For proposal 5.2, support the revision that move NW-initiated into FFS. |
| NTT Docomo | Support proposal 5.1.  For proposal 5.2, in our understanding whether UE initiated or NW-initiated reporting is supported is related to the options in proposal 5.1. In our understanding, UE initiated reporting is straightforward for option1A/1D, but option2A is based on L1 beam reporting framework, thus, NW triggering is straightforward for option2A.  We suggest following revision of proposal 5.2.  [Proposal 5.2: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate MPE mitigation, for option1A and 1D (if supported), the supported UE reporting scheme is UE-initiated (event-triggered, without CSI request)   * FFS: Support for NW-initiated reporting with CSI request * FFS: Definition of triggering event for option1A and 1D (is supported)] |
| Nokia | We support:  Opt 1A  Opt 2A  The following note would not work in our understanding: Using R15 RSRP cannot tell which UL beam suffering or not suffering MPE.  \* Note: If Opt2A is selected and there is no consensus on a modified L1-RSRP definition, the Rel-15 L1-RSRP definition is reused  We suggest the following update:  \* If Opt2A is selected and there is no consensus on a modified L1-RSRP definition, Virtual PHR may be added.  This reflects Opt 2A+2B in the RAN1#104-e agreement.  Proposal 5.2: Both UE initiated and NW initiated reporting have use cases. The operation (new reporting) should be network controlled and also network should be able to request report because it would be used for UL beam selection similarly to current L1-RSRP is used for DL and UL beam selection in Rel15 and Rel16. Thus, we are not fine to make network initiated reporting as FFS. |
| Convida Wireless | Support proposal 5.1, with a preference for Option 1A.  For proposal 5.2, share the view of NTT Docomo. |
| CATT | Support the proposals. |
| Ericsson | We are essentially OK with P5.1. Then there still seems to be some confusion about how beam management would work in the presence of an MPE event. Some proposals seem to indicate that the UE would indicate once that a panel is blocked, but after that, nothing more would happen, and the NW would be limited to using Rel-16 reports for the subsequent beam management. We do not think that is enough: there must also be some sort of NW-controlled reporting so that beam management can be operated during a longer time. Opt1A has to be complened by another scheme.  As we see it, opt1A would be used to inform the NW that there is a problem, but the Rel-16 report may be good enough. Once the NW knows this, it would request the reports in opt2A. These reports will take the MPE into account. Please let me know if we have misunderstood this.  With this mindset, it is possible to only specify opt2A – we can live without opt1A, but not without opt2A. |

### Issue 6 (advanced beam refinement/tracking)

Table 11 Summary: issue 6

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views on specific candidate schemes** |
| 6.1 | Group 1: Beam management with reduced DL signaling to reduce latency | **UE-initiated beam reporting/refinement/selection/activation**:   * UE reports beam/beam-group quality or performs P3 based on measurement after/upon beam indication: Samsung, OPPO (from pre-configured TCI-state-associated resource set), Nokia/NSB (P3) * UE selects beam based on measurement only: OPPO (report selection for alignment), Ericsson (report beam quality, UE assumes gNB follows), Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB (with gNB confirmation) * UE selects beam from DCI-based beam-group indication based on measurement: Futurewei (ACK to NW) * UE reports activated beam-group based on measurement: MTK (ACK from NW)   **Semi-static/pre-programmed (RRC) NW-configured beam selection (without beam indication and measurement/reporting)**: NTT Docomo (for HST), Sony (based on predictive trajectory), Qualcomm  **SSB grouping across CCs** (reduce beam training time for CA)**:** Ericsson, Apple  **Aperiodic beam measurement/reporting based on multiple resource sets for facilitating P2+P3/P1**: ZTE |
| 6.2 | Group 2: Reducing activation delay of TCI states and PL-RSs (including other WGs, e.g. RAN4)  Note: A number of companies argued that most of the schemes in this category can be handled exclusively in RAN4 | **Reducing latency of MAC CE based activation/update**:   * TCI state activation or F/T/beam tracking (limited by SSB periodicity): SSB pool tracking (ZTE), A-TRS or AP-CSI-RS triggering via MAC CE/DCI (vivo, Apple), pre-stored QCL properties to avoid measurement (Ericsson, NTT Docomo, Sony, ZTE) * PL-RS (simultaneous/multiple): vivo, Qualcomm (reducing application time), ZTE * SCell TCI state activation: direct (Qualcomm)   **Replacing RRC-based update with MAC CE (or DCI) based update (from NW to UE):**   * Associated NZP CSI-RS info for SRS (NCB based)**:** Lenovo/MoM * QCL relation between SSBs and CSI-RSs: Intel (e.g. to aid hierarchical beam acquisition), vivo, ZTE, Apple   **One-shot timing update**: Ericsson (e.g. upon TCI state update) |

**Proposal 6.1**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate advanced beam refinement/tracking, perform study (for the purpose of down-selection and/or combining) and, if needed, specify the following candidate schemes from Group 1:

* Opt 1-1A: Beam measurement/reporting/refinement/selection triggered by beam indication (without CSI request)
* Opt 1-1B: UE-initiated beam selection/activation based on beam measurement (without beam indication)
* Opt 1-2: Semi-static NW-configured beam selection (without beam indication and measurement/reporting)
* Opt 1-3: SSB grouping across CCs to reduce beam training for CA
* Opt 1-4: Aperiodic beam measurement/reporting based on multiple resource sets for reducing beam measurement latency
* Note: Aim for at most one solution for Group 1 in Rel-17 to address issue 6

**Proposal 6.2**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate advanced beam refinement/tracking, perform study (for the purpose of down-selection and/or combining) and, if needed, specify the following candidate schemes from Group 2:

* Opt 2-1A: Latency reduction for MAC CE based TCI state activation or F/T beam tracking
* Opt 2-1B: Latency reduction for MAC CE based PL-RS activation
* Opt 2-2: Direct SCell TCI state activation
* Opt 2-3: Replacing RRC-based with MAC CE (or DCI) based for DL QCL or UL information update
* Opt 2-4: One-shot timing update for TCI state update
* Note: Aim for at most one solution for Group 2 in Rel-17 to address issue 6
* Note: At least for Opt 2-1A/B, 2-2, and 2-4, RAN2 and RAN4 will at least have to be involved (some may be exclusively RAN2 and/or RAN4 work)

Table 12 Additional inputs: issue 6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| **ROUND 0** | |
| Sony | Add more preference. |
| ZTE | One more alternative for group-1 is added: Aperiodic beam measurement/reporting based on multiple resource sets for facilitating P2+P3/P1. Furthermore, we can consider additional UE report to aid P2/P3 related measurement/report configuration (triggering request, and the number of candidate RS(s)). |
| Futurewei | We share the same view that most of the schemes in Group 2 can be handled exclusively in RAN4. |
| NTT Docomo | In Group2, to reduce the TCI state activation delay, RAN4 spec. should be updated. So, we’d like to send LS to inform the issue and potential solution to RAN4. |
| Mod V33 | Revised Table 12 based on further reading of each company’s Tdoc |
| **ROUND 1** | |
| Mod V00 | Please share your inputs on proposals 6.1 and 6.2 |
| Qualcomm | We are fine for both Proposal 6.1 and 6.2, but prefer to prioritize 6.1, since 6.2 can be and should be addressed by RAN4 to our understanding.  [Mod: Note added –prioritization can be done when down selection starts.] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Overall, we are a bit concerned on the workload of study, and we suggest the group to be more cautious. At the very least, we suggest adding the note agreed in previous meeting to both proposals above “Aim for at most one solution for each of the group in Rel-17 to address issue 6”.  [Mod: Done]  Proposal 6.1: The proposals are quite related to various aspcts of (UE-initiated) beam measurement/reporting/indication that are being discussed in Issue 1~5 and we suggest postponing the discussions after the first five issues become stable. We also failed to understand why Option 1-1A is marked ‘UE-initiated’ if it is triggered by beam indication. And in our understanding, Opt 1-4 belongs to Group 2 of the categoriziation in R1-2101185, and has been down-scoped by previous discussions.  [Mod: UE-initiated is removed from 1-1A.  Re removing Opt 1-4, I’d like to check if other companies have the same view. In my understanding, ZTE proposal is targeted to reduce latency since without multiple sets, the procedure would have to last for >1 slots. So it is a valud scheme under Group 1. I do understand your point that this could be misconstrued as the old Group 2. So I reworded it.]  Proposal 6.2: All these proposals are heavily related to other WGs. We are ok to discuss candidate solutions in RAN1, but prefer to consult RAN2/RAN4 before formal decisions (e.g., Opt 2-1A, 2-1B, and 2-4 need to check with RAN4, while Option 2-2 needs to check with RAN2).  [Mod: Note added] |
| Mod V05 | Revised proposals per input |
| Samsung | We are fine with the direction of the two proposals. For proposal 6.1, we suggest modfing Alt1-1A to:   * Beam measurement RS and/or beam reporting/refinement/selection triggered by beam indication (without CSI request)   Rationale for change:   * Beam reporting is triggered by beam indication, not necessary UE-initiated. * Beam measurement RS can also be triggered by beam indication. This applies to CSI-RS as well as SRS.   [Mod: Added “measurement” which should be sufficient] |
| Lenovo/MoM | For proposal 6.2, we think both RAN4 (radio performance) and RAN1 (improved signaling design) can work on it. A LS can be sent to RAN4 later. |
| Mod V13 | Revised text per inputs |
| LG | Our view is updated in the table and we are fine for the proposal 6.1 and 6.2 in principle. |
| ZTE | We support FL proposal.  To answer the question from Huawei, we do not think that Option 1-4 is relevant to Group-2. Herein, we prefer to reduce the latency of beam measurement, and also using one or more slots may be next step. |
| vivo | We have the following proposal for reduced signaling and reduced latency, which we believe is also within Group 1. Hope this can also be included.  • Support simultaneous beam update by a MAC CE for PUCCH resource/PUCCH resource group for all the BWPs in the indicated CCs. |
| Ericsson | Support.  We realize that some parts are out of RAN1’s control, and that the only thing RAN1 can is to send an LS. It could be so that RAN1 could complete that LS rather soon. |

## Appendix A: Collection of Inputs from Round 0

### Issue 1 (advanced beam refinement/tracking)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| **ROUND 0** | |
| Apple | Our view is provided |
| APT/FGI | We have added and updated our views above. |
| Nokia/NSB | Our view is added.  Issue 1.1: we assume Rel-15/16 like TCI state will be configured between SSB and TRS. And as agreement, Rel-17 type of TCI can be configured with TRS as QCL source. So as a result, direct association between SSB and Rel-17 TCI would not be necessary  Issue 1.9: we don’t see a big difference on physical layer operation between alt 1 and alt 2. |
| Sony | Input our additional views and modify some. |
| ZTE | Our views are provided. Issue 1.12 is unclear to us, and some clarification on motivation seems to be needed. |
| Futurewei | Our additional views are added.  Issue 1.8: We support “A single QCL-TypeD RS is determined from the common TCI state(s)”, however, we would like to have some clarifications on i) and ii).  Issue 1.11: The categories of “2” and “>2” should be grouped together as a single category, e.g., “>1”.  [Mod] Will do so in the next round |
| Mod V14 | Moderator proposals have been added |
| Apple2 | For proposal 1.3, we would like to add a note to clarify that the intention is to to create standalone aperiodic TRS.  **Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,   * DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals:   + CSI-RS resources for CSI   + Some CSI-RS resources for BM, if so, which ones (e.g. aperiodic, repetition ‘ON’)   + CSI-RS for tracking   + Note: aperiodic TRS should be QCLed with a periodic TRS with regard to QCL-TypeA and QCL-TypeD when applicable * UL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to some SRS resources or resource sets for BM   [Mod: the TRS bullet is removed for now per MTK’s concern]  We have concern for proposal 1.5 that additional PL-RS would lead to beam mismatch. So if we want to go with proposal 1.5, we suggest we add a sub-bullet as follows.  **Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss and select between the following two alternatives for path-loss measurement (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):   * Alt1. PL-RS can be included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.   + FFS: Whether it is always included or not. If not included, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL 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   + FFS: Exact association mechanism   + FFS: Whether it is always associated or not. If not associated, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * If the downlink spatial filter based on indication of QCL-TypeD of PL-RS is not the same as the uplink spatial filter based on indication of unified TCI, it is up to UE whether to derive pathloss based on PL-RS or DL RS provided in the unified TCI |
| OPPO | Proposal 1.1: support. But not sure we need this proposal.  [Mod: It is now a conclusion]  Proposal 1.2: We think we need to first clarify that supporting joint or separate TCI is UE capability. From our perspective, no matter which Alt of switching scheme is adopted, supporting joint or separate TCI is always UE capability. So the UE capability shall be placed in main bullet, instead of only in Alt1. Suggest to update Proposal 1.2 as follows:  **Proposal 1.2**: Supporting joint DL/UL TCI and/or separate DL/UL TCI is UE capability and On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss and select between the following two alternatives for switching between joint and separate DL/UL TCI (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):   * Alt1. A UE can be dynamically indicated with either joint DL/UL TCI or separate DL/UL TCI   + Details on dynamic indication are FFS   + ~~FFS: UE capability for the support of joint DL/UL TCI and/or separate DL/UL TCI~~ * Alt3. A UE can be configured with either joint DL/UL TCI or separate DL/UL TCI via MAC CE signaling   + Details on how this is signaled in relation to TCI activation are FFS   [Mod: Some companies may disagree with this, but let’s see if it is acceptable now. Added]  Proposal 1.3: support in principle. For CSI-RS resource for BM, we would like to make it clear that one CSI-RS resource set with repetition = “On” is included. Suggest to update Proposal 1.3 as follows  **Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,   * DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals:   + CSI-RS resources for CSI   + Some CSI-RS resources for BM, including one CSI-RS resource set with repetition “ON ” ~~if so, which ones (e.g. aperiodic, repetition ‘ON’)~~   + CSI-RS for tracking * UL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to some SRS resources or resource sets for BM   Proposal 1.4: we are not ok to associate the (P0, alpha, closed loop index) with TCI state **for SRS**. Such association shall only be applied to PUSCH and PUCCH. Suggest to update Proposal 1.4 as follows:  **Proposal 1.4**: On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is also associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state for PUSCH and PUCCH.   * Note: It has been agreed that the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is associated with UL channel or UL RS   Proposal 1.5: support. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 1.2**: We think Alt1 and Alt3 are not mutually exclusive since whether DCI can dynamically indicate joint or separate DL/UL TCI could depend on how MAC-CE maps the TCI states to the TCI codepoints. Even Alt1 is supported, MAC-CE still can configure joint TCI only (or separate TCI only). This is similar to Rel-16 S-DCI MTRP, if no TCI codepoint is associated with two TCI states, UE will be scheduled by single TRP only.  [Mod: I tend to agree. Let’s discuss further]  **Proposal 1.3:** We have concern on applying joint/separate TCI to TRS. In Rel-15/16, DL QCL information is semi-statically provided to TRS, which means UE doesn't have to dynamically change UE beam when performs tracking on TRS. However, if joint/separate TCI applying to TRS is allowed, it would be challenging from UE implementation perspective since joint/separate TCI can be updated by DCI signaling.  [Mod: Removed for now] |
| Mod V18 | Addressed comments from Apple, OPPO, and MTK |
| Xiaomi | Added our views above.  Proposal 1.1, support  For Proposal 1.2, we share same view as MTK  Proposal 1.3, support |
| NTT Docomo | Issue 1.6: We believe it is more important to define default PL-RS assumption if PL-RS is not configured. Then, selection between Alt.1 and Alt.2 is not a big problem. Thus, we propose to update as following:  **Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss and select between the following two alternatives for path-loss measurement (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):   * Alt1. PL-RS can be included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.   + ~~FFS: Whether it is always included or not.~~ If not included, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL 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   + FFS: Exact association mechanism   + ~~FFS: Whether it is always associated or not.~~ If not associated, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state   [Mod: Agreed, included]  For Proposal 1.3, if unified TCI is applied to TRS, we have concern on it. Since QCL source RS of unified TCI would be TRS, we don’t understand how it works. (We see TRS is already deleted, but we’d like to have comment) |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 1.2: OK with the proposal and share the view of MediaTek.  [Mod: changed ‘select’ to down select or combine]  Proposal 1.3: Support. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Updated our views in the table.  Conclusion 1.1: Support  Proposal 1.4: Support  Proposal 1.5: Agree in principle. Clarification is required in the bullet added by Apple: does it mean that the QCL-typeD RS of the PL RS and the RS used for spatial relation for an UL transmission must be the same for the UE to apply them? What would be the case if the PL RS is a DL RS and the spatial relation is an UL RS? |
| Apple | Response to Fraunhofer: usually gNB should not provide a standalone UL RS for beam indication. It should provide a DL RS for beam indication for the UL RS for further UE beam tracking. The gNB should try its best to make sure the beam is aligned – the two DL RS: PL-RS and DL RS for direct or indirect beam indication should not lead to beam mismatch. |
| ZTE | Regarding Conclusion 1.1: It is not our preference, but we can live with this conclusion for progress.  Regarding Proposal 1.2, we still think that Alt2A/2B is needed for backward compatibility. Meanwhile, we sympathize with MTK that those alternatives are relevant to different levels, and instead of down-selection, we need to discuss: 1) whether/how to achieve the dynamic indication for joint and separate TCI state; 2) how to support backward compatibility of old gNB/UE.  [Mod: The current narrowing down to Alt1 and Alt3 is based on majority views. Regarding backward compatibility, since this is only for Rel-17 unified TCI, there is no switching with Rel-15/16 – so it doesn’t seem to be an issue.]  Regarding Proposal 1.3, the CSI-RS for BM and CSI should be aperiodic, and we need to consider both CSI-RS for BM with repetition = on/off, rather than repetition =‘on’ only.  [Mod: This can be kept FFS for now - added]  Regarding Proposal 1.4, we support it. It seems that the same mechanism can apply to SRS also. Or, do we miss anything?  [Mod: Please check OPPO’s comment – not OK for SRS]  Regarding Proposal 1.5, NTT DOCOMO’s suggestion seems to be a good way-forward solution. If so, we wonder that the last bullet from Apple can be removed in such case?  [Mod: Replaced by Apple’s last comment] |
| Intel | Updated our views in the table.  **Proposal 1.2:** As discussed in our paper, we do not these two alternatives are mutually exclusive. We are mixing TCI applicability and indication. A MAC-CE can configure what is the type of TCI state i.e., DL/UL/joint for each TCI codepoint. The DCI based indication can then point to any of the 8 codepoints and still satisfy Alt.1 Therefore we prefer to have both alternatives and no down-selection is necessary. For purpose of MAC-CE configuration, the Rel-16 MAC-CE used for mTRP can be re-used and the reserve bits in the MAC-CE can be used for configuring the applicability of the TCI states  [Mod: Revised to include possibility for down-selection or combining – will finalize this meeting]  **Proposal 1.4:** By saying that for PUCCH, the power control parameters are “associated” with the TCI state, we are now introducing new behavior different from spatial relation info framework for PUCCH. For PUSCH and SRS, we are ok but we do not see the need for new behavior for PUCCH. In Rel-16, the PL-RS and power control parameters for PUCCH are include IN the spatialRelationInfo and such behavior should be maintained unless compelling arguments can be provided otherwise  [Mod: I am not sure what your suggestion is. saCould you please suggest an alternative text? Or is it simply that we remove PUCCH?]  **Proposal 1.5:** Similar comment for PUCCH. The PL-RS is currently included in the pucch-spatialRelationInfo. For SRS and PUSCH, MAC-CE is available for configuration, therefore, we believe Alt.1 should be considered for PUCCH and may not be necessary for SRS/PUSCH. Additionally, for bullet added by Apple, while I see the intention, it’s still not clear to us what happens when there is a beam mismatch. If the UE autonomously selects the PL-RS, how does that guarantee same understanding with gNB? |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 1.2, we are fine for it.  For Proposal 1.3, suggest to add the following two FFSs  **Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,   * DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals:   + CSI-RS resources for CSI   + Some CSI-RS resources for BM, including one CSI-RS resource set with repetition ‘ON’   + FFS: Whether legacy TCI state should be applied to the DL signals not allowed for separate DL or joint TCI state. * UL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to some SRS resources or resource sets for BM   + FFS: Whether legacy spatial relation state should be applied to the UL signals not allowed for separate UL or joint TCI state.   For Proposal 1.4, we are fine for it. For SRS, it would be per SRS set as in R15/16.  For Proposal 1.5, suggest to modify the last note as below or leave it as FFS, since if PL RS is indicated, UE shall use it even if its Rx beam is different from UL Tx beam. To our understanding, this is the R15/16 behavior.   * If the downlink spatial filter based on indication of QCL Type-D of PL-RS is not the same as the UL spatial filter based on indication of Rel-17 unified TCI, it is up to the UE whether to derive path-loss based on PL-RS ~~or DL RS provided in the unified TCI~~   [Mod: Please check latest comment from Apple] |
| Apple | Proposal 1.5:  Response to ZTE, Intel and Qualcomm:If the group has concern for the last bullet, we suggest we go with Docomo’s suggestion to define the default PL-RS and add a new bullet as follows:   * Support of PL-RS associated with or in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state is an optional feature |
| vivo | For Conclusion 1.1: This is related to CA discussion. When an RS is shared across CCs, our preference is to use SSB as the source. It is also one of the options listed there.  [Mod: I tend to agree with you. CA issue has been mentioned as one advantage of having SSB as Type-D source RS. But still many companies have issues with it. So this conclusion simply captures the outcome, i.e. no consensus to add more source RS types.]  For Proposal 1.2, we are basically fine.  For Proposal 1.3, we would like to update as following:  **Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,   * DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals:   + CSI-RS resources for CSI   + FFS: Some CSI-RS resources for BM, including one CSI-RS resource set with repetition ‘ON’ * UL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to some SRS resources or resource sets for BM   [Mod: The setting is left FFS for now, but majority of companies support the signals]  For proposal 1.4, we would like to further study. Since this would mean different channels sharing the same P0/alpha configuration.  [Mod: Please check the latest version – separated for different channels. Note that it has been agreed that the setting of those parameters is channel- and signal-specific. So different channels do not share the same configuration]  For proposal 1.5, we are supportive of what DCM and Apple added.  **Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e, further discuss and select between the following two alternatives for path-loss measurement (note: the text below is based on the agreed description in RAN1#104-e):   * Alt1. PL-RS can be included 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 or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL 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   + FFS: Exact association mechanism   + If not associated, PL-RS is the periodic DL-RS used as a source RS for determining spatial TX filter or the PL RS used for the UL RS in UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * If the downlink spatial filter based on indication of QCL Type-D of PL-RS is not the same as the UL spatial filter based on indication of Rel-17 unified TCI, it is up to the UE whether to derive path-loss based on PL-RS or DL RS provided in the unified TCI   [Mod: Agreed, please check the latest version] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We added our views to some of the listed issues.  Proposal 1.1: The target channel/signal should be listed in the proposal to avoid overkill. On the 1st sub-bullet, we would like to point out that the previous agreement is self-conflicting on whether CSI-RS for CSI can be used for TypeD QCL indication for PDCCH/PDSCH (main bullets says yes, while the note says no), and we suggest clarifying the understanding on this.  [Mod: Target channels (per previous agreement re Rel-17 unified TCI are added)  **Agreement**  On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, the supported source/target QCL relations in the current TS38.214 V16.4.0 is supported for QCL Type D.   * Note: This implies that the following source RS types for DL QCL (Type D, for DL RX spatial filter reference) information for DL UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs are supported:   + CSI-RS for beam management   + CSI-RS for tracking * FFS (to be decided by RAN1#104bis-e): If SSB, CSI-RS for CSI, and/or SRS for BM are also supported as source RS types   Excerpt from TS38.214 V16.4.0  For the DM-RS of PDCCH, the UE shall expect that a *TCI-State* indicates one of the following quasi co-location type(s):  - 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with the same CSI-RS resource, or  - 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with a CSI-RS resource in an *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition*, or  - 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured without higher layer parameter trs-Info and without higher layer parameter *repetition* and,when applicable, 'typeD' with the same CSI-RS resource.  For the DM-RS of PDSCH, the UE shall expect that a *TCI-State* indicates one of the following quasi co-location type(s):  - 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with the same CSI-RS resource*,* or  - 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with a CSI-RS resource in an *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition*,or  - typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured without higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and without higher layer parameter *repetition* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with the same CSI-RS resource.  Proposal 1.2: We got a question on whether the so-called dynamic indication is among the MAC-CE activated TCI states or not, and if yes, we suggest making this clear in Alt-1.  [Mod: The proponents can perhaps clarify. But I think this is a part of the discussion which will take place after this proposal is agreed – observe that the proposal includes the need for further discussion and decision in this meeting]  Proposal 1.3: We are still concerned on this proposal. Our understanding is the joint, DL, and UL TCI in R17 are mainly for data channels (or reference signals that are tightly related to data channels), and we failed to understand why they should be applied to reference signals for other purposes.  There can be multiple configured CSI-RS resources for CSI, which one of them should follow the indicated DL or joint TCI? What happens to the TCI state indicated to this CSI-RS resource using R16 mechanism?  What is the meaning of ‘some’ here? Why joint/DL TCI should be applied to CSI-RS resource set configured with repetition ‘ON’, where the UE is expected to train its Rx beam? Why joint/UL TCI should be applied to SRS resources for BM, and which of them are ‘some’?  Some further thoughts: For P/SP CSI-RS, its TCI state is configured/activated by RRC/MAC-CE, and it is unclear why/how it should now follow the active PDCCH/PDSCH reception. For AP CSI-RS for CSI, when the scheduling offset is smaller than certain threshold, its QCL will follow PDCCH as in R16, with which there is no need to make a change.  [Mod: Please check latest version]  Proposal 1.4: It would be better if there can be some description or example on how such association is to be conveyed to UE.  [Mod: This level of details is perhaps more relevant for RAN2. Association means some linkage with, but not included in the TCI. How this is done is up to RAN2]  Proposal 1.5: On the last bullet, instead of saying ‘up to UE’, we would suggest picking one out of the two different indicated RS resource(s).  [Mod: “Up to UE” is not there anymore] |
| Mod V32 | Revised proposals to address comments |
| AT&T | Added more views to more items above.  For proposal 1.2, share same view as Intel as these are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and the downselectjon should be a possibility.  For proposals 1.3-1.5 we are ok in principle. |
| Samsung | Thank you for the proposals.  For conclusion 1.1: Conclusion 1.1 is not our preference, we see a benefit in supporting SSB and SRS for BM as source RS types for DL QCL Type D. But we understand that the number of proponents and opponents are almost the same and an offline discussion has been done.  Proposal 1.2: Regarding the statement about UE capability, this should be FFS:  FFS: The support for joint DL/UL TCI and/or separate DL/UL TCI is subject to UE capability.  We have not discussed whether all UEs should support joint or separate TCI states or if this is based on UE capability more discussion is needed.  For this proposal, we prefer Alt3.  [Mod: Yes, this can be discussed toward the end. Also the issue whether the two should be separate (sub) UE capabilities or not]  Proposal 1.3: We would like to understand the “FFS” in the sub-bullets of CSI-RS for CSI and CSI-RS for BM. This implies that the Rel-17 TCI state would not apply to all CSI-RS for CSI or all CSI-RS for BM pending the outcome of that FFS.  [Mod: Yes, that’s the intention of the FFS]  Proposal 1.4: We are not supportive of this proposal. We would like to see a unified design for all uplink channels and signals. This would save configuration overhead. It seems that there is some correlation between proposal 1.4 and proposal 1.5, the former is for the PC parameters, while the latter is for the PL RS, we would like to understand the rationale for agreeing to have the PC parameters associated (rather than included) with the TCI state in this proposal but discussing association vs inclusion in proposal 1.5.  [Mod: From Table 1, it seems that not all companies see the need for a ‘unified design’ for UL PC (for different channels) and PL RS. Given this situation, from FL perspective the best way to proceed for UL PC is to discuss PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS separately. Regardless, the FFS added by MTK may address your concern.  Regarding Alt1 vs Alt2, perhaps some proponents of Alt1 can respond to Samsung’s question? ]  Proposal 1.5: While our preference is Alt4 from RAN1#104-e, we will accept the view of the majority and discuss down selection between Alt1 and Alt2. However, the last bullet seems to be confusing what is the meaning of having this proposal as optional:   * UE doesn’t support PL-RS measurements? This is not possible. * PL-RS is based on Rel-16 behavior, this would complicate the design especially from a network perspective, if the network has only Rel-17 UEs, it would be required to support the legacy PL-RS behavior as well as one of the two alternatives listed in this proposal. In this case, wouldn’t it be better to just keep the legacy PL-RS behavior for all UEs.   [Mod: Apple clarify this bullet, but I believe this bullet is in favor of Alt4 which Samsung prefers ☺ Meaning within he Alt1/2 based solution, Alt4-like solution is a defatilt/fallback scheme when the PLRS inside/associated with UL TCI is not configured. I added some clarification] |
| ZTE | Regarding Conclusion 1.1: We can live with updated conclusion. After reviewing the views from other companies and existing QCL chain for CSI-RS for CSI, we are wondering whether we can have a second chance for supporting CSI-RS for CSI. Maybe, opponents can clarify why this CSI-RS for CSI should be precluded as QCL source RS in technical, considering that it has been supported in Rel-15/16.  [Mod: The conclusion states that there is no consensus at this meeting: the number of opponents is close to the number of supporters. Implicitly, this means that the topic will not be revisited (or will be at the bottom of priority list) unless the situation changes significantly, e.g. suddenly most companies are fine/supportive]  Regarding Proposal 1.2: Thanks so much for the Moderator’s efforts. We are fine to further discuss the two majority-supported alternatives first of all. But, after reviewing these two alternatives, there may be serious backward compatibility issues herein.   * Specifically, for Alt1, how/whether the UE can realize that this DCI fields further contains the separate DL/UL TCI, rather than Rel15/16 DCI format; * For Alt3, how/whether the Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for PDSCH corresponding to DCI format 1-1/2 or the newly introduced MAC-CE can be used from UE perspective. * Also, joint DL/UL TCI and/or sepetate DL/UL TCI may be up to UE capability.   Therefore, we suggest to add the following FFS in the proposal-1.2  FFS: Functionality/mode corresponding to either joint DL/UL TCI, separate DL/UL TCI, or dynamically switching between joint and separate is enabled by RRC  [Mod: Thanks, I think this is a very good compromise.]  Regarding Proposal 1.3: From gNB vendors, the periodic/semi-persistent CSI-RS may be the source of joint TCI state, and it would be very wired that QCL assumption corresponding to the periodic/semi-persistent DL RS is updated by dynamic signaling or that the QCL chain becomes a closed loop. Therefore, if we try to move forward this proposal, we suggest to restrict that the CSI-RS for CSI cand CSI-RS for BM is aperiodic only as first step, rather than a general description that implies all types of time-domain behavior are supported.  **Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,   * DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals with aperiodic only:   + CSI-RS resources for CSI     - FFS: Supported settings, e.g. ~~aperiodic-only,~~ some vs all CSI-RS resources for CSI   + Some CSI-RS resources for BM     - FFS: Supported settings, e.g. one CSI-RS resource set with repetition ‘ON’, or repetition of both ‘ON’ and ’OFF’~~, aperiodic-only~~   + FFS: Whether legacy TCI state should be applied to the DL signals not allowed for separate DL or joint TCI state. * UL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to some SRS resources or resource sets for BM   + FFS: Whether legacy spatial relation state should be applied to the UL signals not allowed for separate UL or joint TCI state   [Mod: The argument is sound. Added. But let’s see what other companies say.]  Regarding Proposal 1.4/1.5: We support both of them.  If some companies has concerns about association or inclusion, how about we describe this two alternative using a general way, like ‘included or associated with’ , and then we can have a note that this final decision is up to RAN2 signaling design. If so, the two alternatives in proposal 1.5 can be merged, and the following note can be added for both proposal 1.4/1.5.   * + Note: either ‘be included in’ or ‘be associated with (but not included in)’ are up to RAN2 decision.   [Mod: I will keep this in mind. We may need this depending on the outcome of further discussion in this meeting.] |
| Spreadtrum | Conclusion 1.1: Support.  Proposal 1.2: Support. In our views, the switching between joint TCI and separate TCI is mainly for UL TCI state update, which is similar as UL TCI state indication in either joint or separate TCI scheme. Therefore, DCI based switching should be applicable.  Proposal 1.4: Support.  Proposal 1.5: Support. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1.3: In precious meeting, RAN1 agreed that joint/separate TCI can optionally apply to SRS for CSI in “resource set” level. For CSI-RS for CSI, joint/separate TCI should apply in “resource set” level as well. For CSI-RS/SRS for BM, since the use case would be gNB or UE beam refinement for an indicated TCI state, we don't see the need to support it in “resource” level. Note that if “resource” level is supported, UE has to support the beam measurements on a set of RSs based on legacy TCI/spatial relation and Rel-17 joint/separate TCI at the same time, where Rel-17 joint/separate TCI may be dynamically updated by DCI.  [Mod: From your comment, I gather that MTK is fine with proposal 1.3. The above is just a comment on the FFS part (next level details). If I misunderstand, please comment.]  Proposal 1.4: Regarding the association mechanism, we think it has to be discussed later, similar to Alt2 in  [Mod: Please see my response to Samsung]  Proposal 1.5. Furthermore, we see if Alt2 is supported, the association mechanism should be unified for PC parameters and PL-RS. Therefore, we would like to add an FFS bullet under this proposal:   * FFS: Exact association mechanism and whether to support a unified mechanism for the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) and PL-RS, if PL-RS can be associated with (but not included in) UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.   [Mod: Added]  Proposal 1.5: Regarding the last bullet in this proposal, we are curious whether it is needed since any Rel-17 feature shall be optional anyway. However, we are fine with it if it can address concern from companies. |
| LG | Our view is updated in the table.  Conclusion 1.1: Support  Proposal 1.2; We still think that the switching between joint TCI and UL TCI would not happen so frequently, so our first preference is RRC based switching. Considering many companies’ support on dynamic switching, we can compromise to accept MAC-CE based switching but not DCI, which is obviously an over-design. We can directly agree on MAC-CE based switching as a compromise between the two parties (DCI vs RRC).  [Mod: Thanks. This will be done as a next step for sure and it has to be finalized in this meeting.]  Proposal 1.3: OK  Proposal 1.4 and 1.5: Direction is good as direct or indirect linkage is necessary from technical perspective. While the association of the PC parameters with TCI state (Alt2) is not much different compared to Alt1 from the functionality point of view, it may cause lots of variants on how to provide the association as many companies mentioned. Also, as shown in the current version of proposal, the way of association is unclear and it can be different for each channel/signal, e.g. PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS. Hence, the PC parameter included in TCI state seems still simpler and straight-forward by taking PL RS in Proposal 1.5 into account together.  [Mod: Please check my comments to Samsung and vivo below] |
| vivo | For 1.1, we still have concerns. It would be bizarre to have different design for single CC case and multiple CC case.  [Mod: I understand your concern. Please check my comment to ZTE. This doesn’t mean companies cannot bring this back in the future meeting. But the situation will have to change significantly.]  **Conclusion 1.1**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in RAN1#104b-e:   * ~~At least for DL UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs in a CC, there is no consensus in supporting SSB, CSI-RS for CSI, and/or SRS for BM as source RS types for DL QCL Type D~~ * At least for dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH and all of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC, there is no consensus in supporting non-BM CSI-RS other than for tracking and non-BM SRS as source RS types for UL TX spatial filter reference   For Proposal 1.3, concerned on CSI-RS for BM. CSI-RS for BM is used for beam refinement. Do not think it is appropriate to update the RS with indicated beams.  **Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,   * DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals:   + CSI-RS resources for CSI     - FFS: Supported settings, e.g. aperiodic-only, some vs all CSI-RS resources for CSI   + ~~Some CSI-RS resources for BM~~     - ~~FFS: Supported settings, e.g. one CSI-RS resource set with repetition ‘ON’, or repetition of both ‘ON’ and ’OFF’, aperiodic-only~~   + FFS: Whether legacy TCI state should be applied to the DL signals not allowed for separate DL or joint TCI state. * UL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to some SRS resources or resource sets for BM   + FFS: Whether legacy spatial relation state should be applied to the UL signals not allowed for separate UL or joint TCI state   [Mod: CSI-RS for BM is in brackets now. But is it possible to add restriction to address your concern? The main purpose brought up by some companies is for P3. Perhaps if repetition ’ON’ constrain is added?]  For proposal 1.4, PUSCH and SRS should have similar mechanism for power control. Would like also FFS PUSCH part.  **Proposal 1.4**: On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework,   * [For PUSCH, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is also associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state] * For PUCCH, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is also associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state * [For SRS, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) ...] * Note: It has been agreed that the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is associated with UL channel or UL RS (therefore the setting is channel- and signal-specific)   [Mod: We can add brackets and discuss further] |
| Mod V43 | Revised proposals based on inputs |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1.3: Yes, we support is proposal. Sorry we didn't clearly indicate our concern in previous comment. Our internsion is, if pssoible, could we clarify the level of applicability in this proposal? The joint/separate applies to RS in resource set level or resource level? Is it possible and any use case to apply joint/separate TCI and legacy TCI/spatial relation for the RS resources in the same resource set? We could add an FFS to clarify this issue later. For example:  **Proposal 1.3**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,   * DL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to the following signals:   + Aperiodic CSI-RS resources for CSI     - FFS: Supported settings, e.g. aperiodic-only, some vs all CSI-RS resources for CSI   + [Some aperiodic CSI-RS resources for BM     - FFS: Supported settings, e.g. one CSI-RS resource set with repetition ‘ON’, or repetition of both ‘ON’ and ’OFF’, aperiodic-only]   + FFS: Whether legacy TCI state should be applied to the DL signals not allowed for separate DL or joint TCI state.   + FFS: Apply in resource set level or resource level * UL or, if applicable, joint TCI can also apply to some SRS resources or resource sets for BM   + FFS: Whether legacy spatial relation state should be applied to the UL signals not allowed for separate UL or joint TCI state   + FFS: Apply in resource set level or resource level |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1.2: Do not support. Since joint DL/UL TCI is a special case of separate DL/UL TCI state, Alt 1 is inherently supported. The question should be if something more should be supported. Also, there are more things that need to be clarified first, for example based on Nokia’s contribution.  [Mod: That Alt1 s inherently supported is not a common understanding among companies (no agreement can be used to make such inference – if so, it wouldn’t be listed as an alternative). This implies that it needs to be discussed as such understanding (from Ericsson) is one possibility at best. Agreeing on proposal 1.2 is simply a first step to focus on dynamic switching and choose (down select or combine) from Alt1/3.]  Proposal 1.3: Basically support. To us it is central to first understand if R17 and legacy TCI states should be mixed. Does any company advocate that? If they are not mixed, how would the QCL assumptions for, e.g., periodic CSI-RS be derived?  [Mod: Yes, this is a next level issue to be discussed.]  Proposal 1.4: Do not support. No technical motivation. Leads to unnecessary overhead.  [Mod: The proponents of Alt1/2 can argue for their case durinh the GTW ☺]  Proposal 1.5: Support to discuss. |
| Nokia/NSB | Proposal 1.2:  We do not support to discuss UE capability at this moment.  [Mod: I tend to agree and this is FFS for now]  Proposal 1.3:  We don’t see a reason to restrict the application of Rel-17 TCI only to aperiodic CSI-RS. As response to ZTE’s comment, we consider application of QCL-D to CSI-RS for CSI acquisition while we don’t have any agreement that CSI-RS for CSI can be configured as QCL-D source of TCI state. No confliction we found. In addition, we want to clarify that in Rel-15, for SRS resource, another SRS reouce can be configured as reference of spatial relation info.  [Mod: It seems we need to keep AP restriction FFS for now]  Proposa 1.4: We support FL’s proposal & we are O.K. with SRS part |
| APT/FGI | We are supportive of Conclusion 1.1 and Proposal 1.2. |
| Mod V49 | Slight revision to address inputs |
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