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). |
| Apple | Support Alt 1. |
| vivo | Support Alt 1. |
| Mod  | As suggested by Chaiman, this issu is being discussed over email. |

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.
 |
| Apple | Suggest removing failureDetectionResourcesToAddModList[1] and failureDetectionResourcesToAddModList2. The agreements did not say it is configured by RRC. |
| vivo | According to the following agreement, a new parameter should be introduced to configure the association between PUCCH-SR resource/SR configuration and BFD-RS set if TRP-speciifc BFR is configured.**Agreement**Support to configure an association between a BFD-RS set on SpCell and a PUCCH-SR resource / SR configuration for per TRP BFR.* FFS: Configure an association between a BFD-RS set on SCell and a PUCCH-SR resource / SR configuration for per TRP BFR

A UE capability signaling is introduced for indicating the support of this association. Above applies only for multi-DCI case.**Agreement**On the PUCCH-SR resource/SR configurations selection rule when SR is triggered and 2 PUCCH-SR resource/SR configurations are configured, the UE triggers the PUCCH-SR resource/SR configuration that is associated with failed BFD-RS set.Detailed design is drafted as following table. if two SR configuration ai allowed, the new parameter should be configured in SchedulingRequestIDForMTRPBFR, otherwise configured in SchedulingRequestResourceID-ForMTRPBFR.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RAN2 Parant IE | Parameter name in the spec |  | Description | Value  |  |  |
| SchedulingRequestIDForMTRPBFR OrSchedulingRequestResourceIDForMTRPBFR | AssociatedFailureDetection-ResourceList | new | Indication of the FailureDetectionResourceList associated with the PUCCH-SR/SR configuration | {0,1} | Per Cell Group or per BWP | UE-specific |

  |
| Mod | @Apple: as shown in my response to ZTE, according to previous agreement, is there any alternative of interpretation on “Explicit configuration” other than RRC configuration? |

## Inputs on version 01

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod | @vivo: your suggestion is captured in version 01. @all: for version 01, please provide your inputs in this table. |
| LGE | Regarding failureDetectionResourcesToAddModList[1] and failureDetectionResourcesToAddModList2, we share the view with moderator.Regarding added row by vivo, we are fine. |
|  |  |