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# Sub-topic 1: Rel-16 RRC\_Connected Beam Correspondence applicability to Rel-18 RRC\_INACTIVE/IA Beam Correspondence

**Way forward/Agreements:**

* There is no UL beam sweep for IA BC requirements
* At least Msg1 will be tested.
* A new requirement is needed for Msg1 for all UEs regardless of Rel-16 BC IEs.
* If UEs support both IEs *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* and *beamCorrespondenceSSB-based-r16*, and performs IA with 4-step RACH then no new requirement is needed for Msg3
* Use PC3 as baseline for testing and requirements and handle specific values for other PC afterwards and based on the same method
* At least spherical coverage requirements will be tested for RRC\_Inactive Beam correspondence for Msg1
* Define a specific EIRP value at N% of the distribution of radiated power
* Discuss the value of N, e.g. N=[X]% for PC3

**Way forward/FFS:**

* FFS: Study the relevancy of adding min peak EIRP requirements in addition with spherical coverage requirements for BC Inactive (for each of the cases: Msg1/MsgA/RA-SDT/CG-SDT)
* FFS: values for the requirements (EIRP, X%, etc)
* FFS: Discuss whether BC requirements values will be the same for RA-SDT, CG-SDT and initial access (Msg1, MsgA, Msg 3), if yes should all be tested?
* FFS: Discuss whether Msg1 and Msg A should have the same requirements? If yes, should both be tested?
* FFS: BC side conditions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree, include justification |
| Qualcomm | We are not sure we need to redefine N % . We prefer to use the N specified for connected mode. Would proponents clarify why EIRP @ N must be studied again? (Do not agree to last 2 proposed agreements)  In the FFS list, why are we wanting to study the relevancy of min peak EIRP? (do not agree) |
| vivo | Before we figure out the baseline should be “rough” beam or “fine” beam and whether the beam refinement procedure is allowed during initial access, we can not agree the last 2 agreement above, and we prefer keep it open for further discussion. |
| Samsung | We agree with Qualcomm that the existing N% value of each power class should be reused, i.e. N=50% for PC3.  The same comment applys to the 2nd bullet of FFS list.  Besides beam correspondence test is at UE maximum output power in terms of testability, the beam correspondence requirements should also be specified at UE maximum output power. So we suggest to also capture this agreement in this WF for requiremen  t perspective. |
| OPPO | Regarding 4th bullet:  We don’t see there is agreement in 1st round that MSG3 will be specified, instead clear majority prefer only MSG1. Not clear why this MSG3 requirement are captured here as an agreement. Suggest to remove it.  And also not clear how to use “performs IA with 4-step RACH” as a precondition to determine whether MSG3 requirement is needed or not in conformance testing, this is not a beforehand information. |
| HW | Regarding 5th Agreement bullet:  In 1st round discussion, majority are interested in discussion on IDLE mode. Propose to change this bullet to :  “At least spherical coverage requirements will be tested for RRC\_IDLE Beam correspondence for Msg1”  Regarding last 2 Agreement bullets:  The exact spherical requirements would depend on discussion of ‘fine’ beam and ‘rough’ beam. Propose to keep these bullets FFS.  Regarding 1st FFS bullet:  Same as above. Propose to replace ‘Inactive’ by ‘IDLE’  Regarding 3rd FFS bullet:  As per Issue 2-2-3 in 1st round discussion, Msg 3 doesn’t need further study. |
| Sony | In general, considering this is the first meeting, it would be good enough if we could agree to take the EIRP spherical coverage of msg 1 as a starting point. Therefore, we are fine to remove the last two bullets in the agreement as suggested by QC.  We also support Samsung’s proposal on capturing the maximum output power.  In addition, we suggest to also add a point in the WF/FFS section that RAR need to be FFS:   * FFS whether RAR reception need to be also tested to verify the similarity between Tx and Rx beams. |
| CMCC | More detailed clarification is needed on the third bullet. The new requirement is spherical requirement? or new minimum peak EIRP or tolerance requirements? |
| ZTE | I would suggest to group the WF/agreements into two categories: core requirements and tests  Core requirements:   * There is no UL beam sweep for IA BC requirements * ~~At least Msg1 will be tested.~~ * A new requirement is needed for Msg1 for all UEs regardless of Rel-16 BC IEs. * If UEs support both IEs *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* and *beamCorrespondenceSSB-based-r16*, and performs IA with 4-step RACH then no new requirement is needed for Msg3 * ~~Use PC3 as baseline for testing and requirements and handle specific values for other PC afterwards and based on the same method~~ * ~~At least spherical coverage requirements will be tested for RRC\_Inactive Beam correspondence for Msg1~~ * Define a specific EIRP value at N% of the distribution of radiated power * Discuss the value of N, e.g. N=[X]% for PC3   Tests:   * At least Msg1 will be tested. * Use PC3 as baseline for testing and requirements and handle specific values for other PC afterwards and based on the same method * At least spherical coverage requirements will be tested for RRC\_Inactive Beam correspondence for Msg1   In addition, we also would like to know why percentage of each PC cannot be reused? |
| Xiaomi | Regarding 5th Agreement bullet  In another WF for BC testability, feasibility of testing UEs in Inactive mode is for further study, based on first round discussion, we have the similar view with HW, it should change Inactive mode to RRC\_IDLE. |
| Ericsson | Beam correspondence is a fundamental part of FR2. Testing this has been discussed since Rel-15. It has been argued that BC is implicitly verified by the spherical coverage test – the latter cannot be met without beam correspondence. Is this true for any spherical coverage requirement level for msg1? We note that UEs requiring beam sweeping in connected more are allowed a relaxed spherical coverage requirement.  We propose to amend the WF as follows   * “At least Msg1 will be tested. This does not precludc combination with other metrics like RAR performance in the test.” |
| Apple | Regarding the last 2 bullet in aggrievement part, we prefer to taking the existing BC requirements as the baseline. However, this is based on the assumption that the same codebook will be used for RRC\_CONNECTED, RRC\_INACTIVE and initial access. If different codebooks are used, we are open to revisit how to relax the existing BC requirements in this WI later.  Regarding the 4th bullet, it’s misleading. Does it mean new MSG3 requirement is needed for UE not supporting both IE?  Regarding the 6th bullet, we agree with Huawei revision. |