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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 ‘a TRP associated with the same PCI as the serving cell’ and ‘a TRP associated with a PCI different from that of the serving cell’~~. RAN1 agrees with RAN3 using ~~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** |
| vivo | Editorial as below:And ~~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.[Mod]: Thank you. Let’s try Ericsson’s version. |
| Ericsson | Propose to shorten the reply: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 using ~~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.[Mod]: Okay. The intention of the sub-bullets is just to clarify the details of data reception. Looks good to remove it from reply LS perspective. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree with draft reply above. From UE perspective, UE receives data from serving cell only, and does not receive data from non-serving cell. As the UE cannot be scheduled on non-serving cells, the draft reply above is inappropriate. For both inter-cell beam management and inter-cell multi-TRP operation, from UE perspective, the data is always transmitted from the serving cell, while an SSB with PCI different from the serving cell is merely used as QCL assistance. [Mod]: Good point. Please review my update based on your comments, and let’s use the preferred terminologies. |
| Samsung | We support the moderator’s reply. Regarding, the comment from vivo, it might be better to say:“~~Then~~ Hence, 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.”We are also fine with the update from Ericsson.[Mod]: Thank you. Let’s try Ericsson’s version. |
| Apple | We support Ericsson’s revision.[Mod]: Thank you. Let’s try Ericsson’s version. |
| Mod\_v06 | Thanks for input. Please review the update before the table.* Update #1: per vivo, Ericsson, Samsung and Apple’s comments, polish and shorten the reply;
* Update #2: per Huawei’s comments, let’s use the preferred terminologies (receiving data from non-serving cell may be controversial).
 |
| LG | Fine with the latest version in general. We prefer to keep the two bullets for better clarity or modify the wording something like: ‘and a UE can be scheduled data on either/both ‘a TRP associated with the same PCI as the serving cell’ and ‘a TRP associated with a PCI different from that of the serving cell’ to explain both ICBM and inter-cell mTRP operations. Another possibility is to further simplify the answer, i.e. removing ‘~~and a UE can be scheduled data on both ‘a TRP associated with the same PCI as the serving cell’ and ‘a TRP associated with a PCI different from that of the serving cell~~’. [Mod]: Thank you. Based on the current situation, let’s go with your last suggestion. Short but sufficient. |
| CMCC | Support the lastest version. Agree with LG’s refinement: ‘and a UE can be scheduled data on either/both ‘a TRP associated with the same PCI as the serving cell’ and ‘a TRP associated with a PCI different from that of the serving cell’.[Mod]: Thank you. Let’s go with LG’s last suggestion. |
| OPPO | We are supportive to the revision provided in above table in Mod\_v06. Since RAN3 refers the case of ICBM only according to the LS, we are hesitated to provide additional information on inter-cell mTRP.[Mod]: Okay, thank you. |
| DOCOMO | Support the latest version, and also fine with LG/CMCC’s refinement.[Mod]: Okay, thank you. |
| Lenovo | We can support the latest version. But we share the similar view with OPPO that we may only need to reply to the ICBM case.[Mod]: Okay, thank you. |
| CATT | Support LG/CMCC’s refinement.[Mod]: Okay, thank you. |
| Spreadtrum | The terminologies used by RAN4 and RAN1 are slightly different, maybe we should first confirm that the two terminologies are the same.We also agree with OPPO and Lenovo that no need to mention inter-cell mTRP case.Therefore, we propose the following modification,RAN1 confirms that ‘a non-serving cell’ is ‘a neighbour cell with a different PCI from serving cell’ which is the same as ‘a TRP associated with a PCI different from that of the serving cell’, and that a UE can be scheduled data on either ‘a TRP associated with the same PCI as the serving cell’ and ~~non-serving cells~~ ‘a TRP associated with a PCI different from that of the serving cell’. [Mod]: Let’s try another direction as LG suggested. And, considering the last sentence we had, it seems that duplicated description may not be needed. Thank you. |
| Mod\_v14 | Thanks for input. Please review the update before the table.* Although all companies are on the same page about UE behaviour for data reception in inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP operation, there are two different preferences on providing clarification for inter-cell beam management only or both, when replying to RAN3 LS.
* Based on that, it seems that we can directly go with LG’s last suggestion of further simplifying the answer.
 |
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