Companies are to share their inputs on the excel spreadsheet in

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1.2.3/RRC> herein.

## Inputs on version 00

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table

Issue #1: Regarding how to differentiate Rel-15/16 and Rel-17 group-based beam reporting procedure,

* Alt-1 (explicit): to introduce a RRC parameter groupBasedBeamReportingR17, e.g. *groupBasedBeamReportingR17*
  + (7) H3C, ZTE, InterDIgital, Nokia/NSB, NTT DOCOMO, OPPO, Samsung
* Alt-2 (implicit): to be based on the number of configured resource sets
  + (3) Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurewei, Lenovo/MotM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Alt-2. Similar to R16, there is no need to introduce a new RRC parameter. |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support Alt-2. It is unnecessary to have dedicated RRC parameter. There is no ambiguities without this RRC parameter when two CMR sets are configured. |
| H3C | Support Alt-1 |
| ZTE | Support Alt-1. We disagree with Huawei, but in fact, for Rel-16, we have new reporting quantities for Rel-16 SINR. Similarly, we need to have a RRC parameter for enabling this feature rather than being based on an implicit rule. |
| InterDigital | Support Alt-1 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Alt-1 |
| Futurewei | Support Alt-2. |
| Mod2 | The above inputs for issue#1 are copied from FL summary of mTRP MB(round 2).  Comments to other parameters can be listed below. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Alt-1. |
| OPPO | Alt1.  This proposal is essential to beam reporting option 2 and has impact on RRC. So we shall discuss it with high priority. |
| Samsung | Support Alt-1. |
| Mod3 | As shown above, inputs from OPPO and Samsung are copied from FL summary of mTRP MB(round 2). |

Comments on other issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| ZTE | Regarding rsrp-ThresholdSSBBFR1 (Row-5), we are fine with current description.  Regarding failureDetectionResourcesToAddModList[1] and failureDetectionResourcesToAddModList2 (Row-11/12), we still prefer to remove both of them considering that we still have not any agreements on supporting RRC parameter for explicit BFD configuration. At least they should be marked as unstable for now. |
| Mod | @ZTE: regarding the second comment from ZTE, we already have the following agreement in #106e. Based on this agreement, explicit configuration of BFD-RS set is supported.  **Agreement**  Support the following BFD-RS configurations in Rel.17 for UEs with one activated TCI state per CORESET:   * Explicit configuration of BFD-RS resources in BFD-RS set k, k = 0, 1 * FFS: CORESETs with more than 1 activated TCI state. |

## Inputs on version XX

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |