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# Introduction

This contribution is to capture the agreements for the email discussion for Rel-17 FeMIMO RRM in RAN4 #104-e meeting.

# Way-forward

## Inter-cell beam measurement

**Issue 2-1-1: Whether to consider additional known cell condition**

* Agreements
  + Don’t need to add an additional known cell condition with L1 measurement only

**Issue 2-1-2 Whether Inter-cell L1-RSRP requirements are applicable for inter cell mTRP**

* Option 1:
  + No clarification is needed. The existing inter cell L1-RSRP measurement defined in TS 38.133 is applicable for both inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP scenarios.
* Option 2:
  + For FR1, the existing inter cell L1-RSRP measurement defined in TS 38.133 is applicable for both inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP scenarios.
  + For FR2, the existing inter-cell L1-RSRP measurement requirements can be applied for TDM based inter-cell mTRP and inter-cell BM.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1. The measurement and scheduling restrictions already cover the cases where simultaneous measurements/ reception is not possible in FR2. Hence, no additional clarification is needed. |
| Intel | both Option 1 and option 2 are fine. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-2-1: UE reporting behaviour**

* Agreements
  + No clarification is needed on whether UE shall send L1 measurement report if the known condition is not met.

**Issue 2-3-1 General assumption for sharing factors**

* Agreements
  + RAN4 do not specify RRM requirements for the following cases:
    - SSBs of CDP are not overlapped with SMTC.
    - SSBs of CDP are fully overlapped with GAP

**Issue 2-3-2 Overlapping SSB definition**

* Option 1:
  + Based on SSB periodicity and offset alone with overlapping SSB window
* Option 2:
  + Have the same SSB index in addition to overlapping SSB window.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 2 would be more appropriate as UE cannot receive 2 SSBs if overlapping at symbol level. Fine to go with option 1 if that’s majority view.  We propose to capture the definition in spec to avoid any misunderstanding, since so far we only have SSB overlapping with SMTC or MG, but first time to define UE behaviour and requirements when we have SSB of serving cell overlapping with SSB from CDP. |
| Intel | Fine with option 2. If SSB index is the same, the symbol will overlap. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-3-3 Applicability of Sharing factors**

* Option 1:
  + Sharing factors are applicable when SSB from serving cell and cell with different PCI are overlapping with same SSB index, or are adjacent SSB index with no symbol gap.
* Option 2:
  + No matter whether SSB indexes are same between SSB of the serving cell SSB and SSB of the cell with different PCI, UE cannot perform L1 measurement for serving cell and the cell with different PCI at the same time.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1, if Option 2 is agreed on Issue 2-3-2. |
| Intel | Fine with option 1. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-3-4 Sharing factors design**

* Principles of Design:
  + The sharing factors PSC and PCDP for inter-cell BM are introduced without impacting the definition of existing sharing factor P, where P is defined for the sharing factor between L1-RSRP measurements and L3 measurements.
    - No impacts on the existing L3 measurements.
* Based on the remaining L1-RSRP measurement opportunities after punctured by L3 measurements, further study the sharing factor between SSB of SC and SSB of CDP.
  + Option 1:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Scenario | PSC | PCDP |
| 1 | T’SSB,SC = T’SSB,CDP | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | T’SSB,SC < T’SSB,CDP |  | 1 |
| 3 | T’SSB,CDP < T’SSB,SC | 1 |  |

* + Option 2:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Scenario** | **PSC** | **PCDP** |
| A | SC SSB occasions outside MG are fully overlapping with CDP SSB occasions outside MG | 2 | 2 |
| B | SC SSB occasions outside MG are partially overlapping with CDP SSB occasions outside MG | 2 | 1 |
| C | Scenario C: CDP SSB occasions outside MG are partially overlapping with SC SSB occasions outside MG. | 1 | 2 |

* + Other options are not precluded.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We don’t agree that we need to define PSC and PCDP and keep the existing ‘P’. We need to come up with overall sharing factors by accounting for the available measurement occasions after factoring out the overlapping measurement occasions with SMTC and/or MG. We propose the following as proposed in round 1:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **#** | **Scenario** | **P for Serving cell** | **P for cell with different PCI** | | 1 | TSSB,SC = TSSB,CDP < TSMTC or MGRP |  |  | | 2 | TSSB,SC < TSSB,CDP < TSMTC or MGRP  All occasions of SSB of SC collide with CDP, MG and/or SMTC |  |  | | 3 | TSSB,CDP < TSSB,SC ≤ TSMTC or MGRP  All occasions of SSB of SC collide with CDP, MG and/or SMTC |  |  | | 4 | TSSB,SC < TSSB,CDP < TSMTC or MGRP  Not all occasions of SSB of SC collide with CDP, MG and/or SMTC |  |  | | 5 | TSSB,CDP < TSSB,SC ≤ TSMTC or MGRP  Not all occasions of SSB of CDP collide with SC, MG and/or SMTC |  |  | | SSBSC1 is the number of SSB occasions of serving cell which are colliding with CDP but not colliding with MG or SMTC within time max(MGRP, SMTC)  SSBCDP1 is number of SSB occasions of CDP which are colliding with SC but not colliding with MG or SMTC within max(MGRP,SMTC)  SSBSC2 is the number of SSB occasions of serving cell which are not colliding with CDP, MG or SMTC within time max(MGRP, SMTC)  SSBCDP2 is number of SSB occasions of CDP which are not colliding with SC, MG or SMTC within max(MGRP,SMTC) | | | | |  | | | |   In case SSB of serving cell and cell with diff PCI don’t overlap, then legacy sharing factors are applicable. |
| Intel | In general, we support the design principle that sharing factors PSC and PCDP for inter-cell BM are introduced without impacting the definition of existing sharing factor P.  The reason is that it’s possible that there is only L1 and L3 measurement for one cell, then legacy sharing factor P can be re-used. When there are measurements from two cells, scaling factor can be further scaled due to collision between the two cells.  Therefore, we think it’s better to consider two step scaling method. In the first step, only consider the Collison between L1 and L3 for each cell respectively, which is defined in legacy. In the second step, further solve the collision between two cells. The final scaling factor will be the multiply of the two step scaling factors.  Option 1 and option 2 are similar. For the scenario description, option 1 using equation and option 2 using wording. Option 1 list the calculation equation for PSC and PCDP. Option 2 calculate the result of PSC and PCDP and find it converge to 2.  We are fine to further discuss. The main principle is to design a method which is relatively simple and have limited impact to legacy requirement. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-3-5 Number of non-serving TRPs to be measured for FR1**

* *Tentative Agreements*
  + Number of other PCI UE can measure for L1-RSRP on FR1 is same as RAN1 capability and i.e., it can be more than 1 and up to 7.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | Support the tentative agreement |
| Intel | Agree with tentative agreement |

**Issue 2-4-1 Scheduling restriction for dynamic TDD**

* Option 1:
  + Introduce scheduling restriction for dynamic TDD when L1-RSRP measurement on cell with different PCI overlaps with serving cell UL slots.
* Option 1a:
  + Introduce scheduling restriction for dynamic TDD when L1-RSRP measurement on non-serving cell overlaps with serving cell UL slots. In addition, one OFDM symbol before and after SSB should also be considered because of TA.
* Option 2:
  + Do not introduce scheduling restriction for dynamic TDD when L1-RSRP measurement on cell with different PCI overlaps with serving cell UL slots.
* Option 3:
  + For the scheduling restriction due to L1-RSRP measurement on cell with different PCI, RAN 4 has agreed that the timing offset between serving cell and cell with different PCI should be less than CP, thus no need to introduce additional 1 slot scheduling restriction even considering dynamic TDD.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We support option 1. We are not sure if 1 symbol is needed for inter-cell BM as we don’t have dual TA and single UL timing is assumed.  Is option 3 same as option 1, but only restricted to the SSB symbols? |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-4-2 Update capability *simultaneousRxDataSSB-DiffNumerology***

* Option 1:
  + Introduce scheduling restriction for dynamic TDD when L1-RSRP measurement on cell with different PCI overlaps with serving cell UL slots.
    - Update the capability signaling simultaneousRxDataSSB-DiffNumerology as below:

|  |
| --- |
| ***simultaneousRxDataSSB-DiffNumerology***  Indicates whether the UE supports concurrent intra-frequency measurement on serving cell or neighbouring cell and PDCCH or PDSCH reception from the serving cell or an additional serving cell with a different numerology as defined in clause 8 and 9 of TS 38.133 [5]. |

* Option 2:
  + No need for option 1.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 2. |
| Intel | Prefer option 2. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-4-3 Whether to define scheduling restriction for non-serving cell**

* Option 1:
  + Introduce scheduling restriction on non-serving cell when UE performs L1-SINR measurement, BFD, CBD, RLM on serving cell.
* Option 2:
  + Option 1 is not needed.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | This scheduling restriction already exists and applies if UE is receiving PDCCH/PDSCH from cell with diff PCI since the scheduling restriction doesn’t specify receiving PDSCH/PDCCH from serving cell alone. |
| Intel | Prefer option 2. It seems that the legacy scheduling restriction can still apply. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-5-1: Applicability of ICBM feature**

* Option 1:
  + The ICBM feature shall be applicable to SCell. (ZTE, Intel, MTK)
  + For intra-band ICBM using common TCI configurations, different reference CCs in the same CC list between the serving cell and a cell with different PCI is not supported in R17.(ZTE,Intel)
  + For intra-band ICBM using common TCI configurations, requirements are defined for the case when SSB measurements for a cell with different PCI are only performed in the cell that has the same SSB frequency as the reference CC.
  + R17 ICBM feature is applicable to FR1 HST and FR2 HST. If RAN4 identifies any issue in applying HST related enhancements to ICBM related RRM requirements, RAN4 solve them in the R17 maintenance phase. (ZTE, CMCC)
  + R17 ICBM feature is applicable to the scenarios when UE is configured with R17 enhanced gaps. If RAN4 identifies any issue in applying R17 enhanced gaps to ICBM related RRM requirements, RAN4 solve them in the R17 maintenance phase.
* Option 2:
  + Not in favor of extending ICBM requirements for concurrent R17 WIs

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | We support option1. As for the comments on concurrent R17 WIs, at least Rel-16 FR1 HST need to be supported. |
| Apple | Option 2, since more dedicated discussion is needed. |
| Intel | Fine with first two bullets. |

**Issue 2-6-1a: Scenario clarification in the LS [R1-2205640]: SSB and PDCCH/PDSCH are overlapped on the same RE**

* *Tentative Agreements*
  + SSB from cell with different PCI is overlapped with PDSCH/PDCCH from serving cell on the same RE

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | No strong view. According to the wording of LS, it seems for the same PCI. But if companies have common understanding that it is for the case that SSB from cell with different PCI is overlapped with PDSCH/PDCCH from serving cell on the same RE, we are also fine. |
| Apple | Fine with tentative agreement. |
| Intel | Agree with tentative agreement. |

**Issue 2-6-2: Whether any clarification or update is needed in RAN4 spec when SSB and PDCCH/PDSCH are overlapped on the same RE**

* Option 1:
  + No.
* Option 2:
  + Clarify that performance degradation is expected when overlapping happen in RAN4 spec.
* Option 3:
  + Clarify that there is no UE requirement when overlapping happen in RAN4 spec.
* Option 4:
  + Define scheduling restriction to avoid overlap between SSB and data on the same RE in RAN4 spec.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1 |
| Intel | Prefer option 2, 3 or 4. Some performance degradation is expected, it’s better to clarify. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-6-3: detail wording for reply LS**

* Option 1:
  + No. Just inform RAN1 about the current status in RAN4.
* Option 2:
  + Mention that performance degradation is expected in the LS.
* Option 3:
  + Mention that there is no requirement in the LS.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1, 2 |
| Intel | Prefer option 2. |
|  |  |

## TRP specific link recovery

**Issue 3-1-1 Wording update and clarification for TRP specific link recovery**

* Agreements
  + For TRP specific link recovery, it is suggested to use the wording “a serving cell” instead of “a serving cell and cell with different PCI”, where the serving cell can be either configured with additionalPCIList or not.
  + For TRP specific link recovery, it is suggested to clarify that the SSBs in set and can be indicated to be associated with an additional PCI.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Further check in the CR. |
|  |  |

**Issue 3-1-2 Measurement restrictions**

* *Tentative agreements*
  + For TRP specific BFD/CBD measurements in FR2, it is suggested that there is no measurement restrictions between BFD/CBD RS resources from different sets.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Not clear what this means. Different sets are associated with different TRPs, we have scaling factor if they overlap in FR2. |
| Intel | Agree with tentative agreement. Measurement restriction is used to define requirement when collision happen between measurement. for overlapped case, scaling factor is already defined. Therefore, there is no need to define measurement restriction. |
|  |  |

**Issue 3-1-3 Prioritization for beam failure recovery procedure**

* *Tentative agreements*
  + RAN4 not to introduce prioritization for beam failure recovery procedure when beam failure recovery happens simultaneously on both BFD-RS resource sets.

Collect companies’ view in 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Fine with tentative agreement. |
|  |  |