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# Introduction

In RAN1#108-e, LS R3-216234 on TCI State Update for L1/L2-Centric Inter-Cell Mobility is received. Based on the preparation phase discussion, we have the following Mr Chair’s guidance.

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200861 Reply LS Reply on TCI State Update for L1L2-Centric Inter-Cell Mobility to RAN3 RAN3, ZTE**  **To be discussed as part of email discussion in [108-e-R17-MIMO-01] under agenda item 8.1.1.** |

On behalf of Eko (Samsung), this summary is drafted for trying to collect/summarize companies’ input and drawing reply LS to RAN3 based on companies’ input.

# Discussion

In the LS, RAN3 had provided corresponding questions as follows.

|  |
| --- |
| RAN3 thanks RAN1 and RAN4 for LS on on Clarification on TCI State Update for L1/L2-Centric Inter-Cell Mobility. RAN3 is aware that the term “non-serving cell” is not used in RAN1/2. However, from the RAN4 LS (R3-214702/R4-2115357), RAN3 understands that a non-serving cell is a neighbour cell with a different PCI from serving cell and that a UE can be scheduled data on both serving and non-serving cells. RAN3 would like to clarify that the understanding derived from the reply LS from RAN4 is correct also for RAN1. Meanwhile, RAN3 would use the term “a TRP associated with a PCI different from that of the serving cell” instead of “non-serving cell” in inter-cell beam management. It is also noted that RAN3 has two meetings left in Rel-17 and has no TU allocated for this feature.  RAN3 kindly asks RAN1 to take the above information into consideration and provide the clarification on the understanding of RAN4’s reply LS and terminology used in RAN3. |

In [2]-[9], several companies provide the draft reply LS(s), and it seems that all companies’ views are aligned in general. The only difference may be relevant to details on clarification description. Based on the companies’ input, the draft reply from the moderator is provided as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN1 confirms that a non-serving cell is a neighbour cell with a different PCI from serving cell and that a UE can be scheduled data on both serving and non-serving cells.   * In case of inter-cell beam management, a UE can’t receive data from two cells (TRPs) with different PCIs at the same time. * In case of inter-cell multi-TRP operation, a UE can receive data simultaneously from two cells (TRPs) with different PCIs.   Then, RAN1 agrees with RAN3 to use the terminology “a TRP associated with a PCI different from that of the serving cell” instead of “non-serving cell” in inter-cell beam management. |

Please provide company’s view in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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