**3GPP TSG RAN WG1 #109-e R1-220XXXX**

**e-Meeting, May 9th – 20th, 2022**

**Agenda item:** 8.1.1

**Source:** Moderator (ZTE)

**Title:** Moderator Summary #2 for Maintenance on Rel-17 Multi-Beam

**Document for:** Discussion and Decision

## Introduction

The following email thread is assigned for email discussion on maintenance of Rel-17 Multi-Beam, please provide your comments in corresponding sections below

[109-e-R17-MIMO-02] Maintenance on beam management (description of issues in R1-2205130) – Bo (ZTE)

* Issues 1-1, 1-2, 1-7, 1-14, 1-15, 1-20, 1-30, 2-2, 2-3, 2-7, 3-1, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-7, 3-10, 4-2 by May 18
* Editorial Issues: 1-5, 1-6, 1-11, 1-13, 1-19, 1-31, 2-4, 2-5, 2-8, 3-8, 3-11, 4-1 by May 11

## Summary of High priority (H) issues

### Issue 1 (Rel.17 unified TCI framework)

Table 1 Summary: issue 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 1-1 | **TP 1-1**: To endorse the following text proposal for TS 38.213:**6 Link recovery procedures**<Unchanged part omitted>If a UE is provided *TCI-State\_r17* indicating a unified TCI state for the PCell or the PSCell [6, TS 38.214], after ~~X~~28 symbols from a last symbol of a first PDCCH reception in a search space set provided by *recoverySearchSpaceId* where the UE detects a DCI format with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI, the UE- if *AdditionalPCIInfo* is not provided, monitors PDCCH in all CORESETs, and receives PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS in a resource from a CSI-RS resource set with same indicated TCI state as for the PDCCH and PDSCH, using the same antenna port quasi co-location parameters as the ones associated with the corresponding index $q\_{new}$, if any- transmits PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS that uses a same spatial domain filter with same indicated TCI state as for the PUCCH and the PUSCH, using a same spatial domain filter as for the last PRACH transmission. A power parameter is determined with:- the RS index $q\_{d}=q\_{new}$ for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission- the values of $P\_{O\\_UE\\_PUSCH,b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, $α\_{b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, and the PUSCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the lowest value of *ul-powercontrolId-r17* configured for the PCell or the PSCell - the values of $P\_{O\\_PUCCH,b,f,c}\left(q\_{u}\right)$ and the PUCCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUCCH-Set* associated with the lowest value of *ul-powercontrolId-r17* configured for the PCell or the PSCell - the values of $P\_{O\\_SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, $α\_{SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, and SRS power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* associated with the lowest value of *ul-powercontrolId-r17* configured for the PCell or the PSCell <Unchanged part omitted>If a UE is provided *TCI-State\_r17* indicating a unified TCI state for the PCell or the PSCell and the UE provides BFR MAC CE in Msg3 or MsgA of contention based random access procedure, after ~~X~~28 symbols from the last symbol of the PDCCH reception that determines the completion of the contention based random access procedure as described in [11, TS 38.321], the UE- if *AdditionalPCIInfo* is not provided, monitors PDCCH in all CORESETs, and receives PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS resource in a CSI-RS resource set with same indicated TCI state as for the PDCCH and PDSCH using the same antenna port quasi co-location parameters as the ones associated with the corresponding index $q\_{new}$, if any- transmits PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS that uses a same spatial domain filter with same indicated TCI state as for the PUCCH and PUSCH, using a same spatial domain filter as for the last PRACH transmission. A power parameter is determined with:- the RS index $q\_{d}=q\_{new}$ for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission- the values of $P\_{O\\_UE\\_PUSCH,b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, $α\_{b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, and the PUSCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the lowest value of *ul-powercontrolId-r17* configured for the PCell or the PSCell - the values of $P\_{O\\_PUCCH,b,f,c}\left(q\_{u}\right)$ and the PUCCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUCCH-Set* associated with the lowest value of *ul-powercontrolId-r17* configured for the PCell or the PSCell - the values of $P\_{O\\_SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, $α\_{SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, and SRS power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* associated with the lowest value of *ul-powercontrolId-r17* configured for the PCell or the PSCell <Unchanged part omitted>If a UE is provided *TCI-State\_r17* indicating a unified TCI state, after ~~X~~28 symbols from a last symbol of a PDCCH reception with a DCI format scheduling a PUSCH transmission with a same HARQ process number as for the transmission of the first PUSCH and having a toggled NDI field value, the UE- monitors PDCCH in all CORESETs, and receives PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS in a resource from a CSI-RS resource set using the same antenna port quasi co-location parameters as the ones associated with the corresponding index $q\_{new}$, if any- transmits PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS that uses a same spatial domain filter with same indicated TCI state as for the PUCCH and PUSCH, using a same spatial domain filter as the one corresponding to $q\_{new}$, if any. A power parameter is determined with:- the RS index $q\_{d}=q\_{new}$ for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission- the values of $P\_{O\\_UE\\_PUSCH,b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, $α\_{b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, and the PUSCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the lowest value of *ul-powercontrolId-r17* configured for the corresponding SCell - the values of $P\_{O\\_PUCCH,b,f,c}\left(q\_{u}\right)$ and the PUCCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUCCH-Set* associated with the lowest value of *ul-powercontrolId-r17* configured for the corresponding SCell - the values of $P\_{O\\_SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, $α\_{SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, and SRS power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* associated with the lowest value of *ul-powercontrolId-r17* configured for the corresponding SCell <Unchanged part omitted>**FL Note**: Rel-15/16 UL power control setting may not be configured in unified TCI framework in Rel-17, and consequently we may need to identify the default setting in the pool of RRC UL power control setting for unified TCI. The following as proposed by some proponents is unclear, according to my best knowledge.…, where a power determined as described in clause 7.1.1, 7.2.1 and 7.3.1 with $q\_{u}=0$, $q\_{s}=0$, $q\_{d}=q\_{new}$, and $l=0$So, let’s try TP2 in R1-2203257 firstly with some modification. The other issue, e.g., updating closed loop value, can be discussed in the second round. | **Support/fine**: QC, Apple, ZTE, vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon,CATT, Nokia, Docomo, Lenovo**Not support:** ~~SS, Ericsson~~ |
| 1-2 | **Alt-2: Section 7 Uplink Power control in TS 38.213**In the remaining of this clause, if a UE is provided *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* and for an indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* as described in [6, TS 38.214] - in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, the RS index $q\_{d}$ for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission is provided by *PL-RS* associated with or included in the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* except for SRS transmission that is not provided *useIndicatedTCIState*- in clause 7.1.1, if *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* is provided, the values of $P\_{O\\_UE\\_PUSCH,b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, $α\_{b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, and the PUSCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*- in clause 7.2.1, if *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUCCHSet* is provided, the values of $P\_{O\\_PUCCH,b,f,c}\left(q\_{u}\right)$ and the PUCCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUCCH-Set* associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*- in clause 7.3.1, if *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* is provided, - if *useIndicatedTCIState* is provided for a SRS resource set, the values of $P\_{O\\_SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, $α\_{SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, and SRS power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIState*- else, if *useIndicatedTCIState* is not provided for a SRS resource set and for a first SRS resource from the SRS resource set, the values of $P\_{O\\_SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, $α\_{SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, and SRS power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* associated with *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set and a RS index $q\_{d}$ for obtaining a pathloss estimate for the SRS transmission is provided by PL-RS associated with or included in the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set- in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, if the *TCI-State\_r17* configurations is absent in a BWP of the CC, the UE can apply the RS index $q\_{d}$, $P\_{O\\_UE\\_PUSCH,b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, $α\_{b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, the PUSCH power control adjustment state $l$, $P\_{O\\_PUCCH,b,f,c}\left(q\_{u}\right)$, the PUCCH power control adjustment state $l$, $P\_{O\\_SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, $α\_{SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, and SRS power control adjustment state $l$ included in the indicated *TCI-StateID\_r17* from a reference BWP of a reference CC.**FL Note**: Besides, the cross-CC PL-RS indication by ‘pathlossReferenceLinking’ as mentioned in TP1 in R1-2203257 can be discussed in the second round. | **~~Alt-1~~**~~: vivo~~**Alt-2: Apple, ZTE,** Huawei/HiSilicon, LG, CATT, Nokia, Docomo, QC (2nd)**~~Alt-3: QC (1~~~~st~~~~)~~****Not support:** ~~SS,~~ Ericsson |
| 1-7 | **TP 1-7**: **Alt1:** To endorse the following text proposal for TS 38.213:**7 Uplink Power control**< Unchanged parts are omitted >In the remaining of this clause, if a UE is provided *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* and for an indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* as described in [6, TS 38.214] - in clauses 7.1.1, 7.2.1, and 7.3.1, the RS index $q\_{d}$ for obtaining the downlink pathloss estimate for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS transmission is provided by *PL-RS* associated with or included in the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* except for SRS transmission that is not provided *useIndicatedTCIState*- for the case when *AdditionalPCIInfo* is provided, and if the *PL-RS* maps to a SS/PBCH index, the UE assumes that the *PL-RS* is associated with the PCI associated with *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* - in clause 7.1.1, if *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* is provided, the values of $P\_{O\\_UE\\_PUSCH,b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, $α\_{b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, and the PUSCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*- in clause 7.2.1, if *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUCCHSet* is provided, the values of $P\_{O\\_PUCCH,b,f,c}\left(q\_{u}\right)$ and the PUCCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUCCH-Set* associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIstate*- in clause 7.3.1, if *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* is provided, - if *useIndicatedTCIState* is provided for a SRS resource set, the values of $P\_{O\\_SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, $α\_{SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, and SRS power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* associated with the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIState*- else, if *useIndicatedTCIState* is not provided for a SRS resource set and for a first SRS resource from the SRS resource set, the values of $P\_{O\\_SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, $α\_{SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, and SRS power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* associated with *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set and a RS index $q\_{d}$ for obtaining a pathloss estimate for the SRS transmission is provided by PL-RS associated with or included in the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set< Unchanged parts are omitted >**Alt2:** To introduce “additionalPCI-r17” in “PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS” when the RS is SSB. For instance,PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS ::= SEQUENCE { pucch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id PUCCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id, referenceSignal CHOICE { ssb-Index SSB-Index, csi-RS-Index NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId } additionalPCI-r17 AdditionalPCIIndex-r17} | **Alt1**: ZTE, CATT, Ericsson, vivo, LGE, Docomo**Alt2:** QC, SS, HW, Docomo* Not support: Ericsson, CATT, ZTE, LGE
 |
| 1-14 | **TP 1-14**: To endorse the following text proposal for TS 38.214:**5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location**< Unchanged parts are omitted >If a UE receives a higher layer configuration of a single DLorJoint-TCIState or UL-TCIState, that can be used as an indicated TCI state, the UE determines an UL TX spatial filter, if applicable, from the configured TCI state for dynamic-grant and configured-grant based PUSCH and PUCCH, and SRS applying the indicated TCI state.If a UE is provided *followUnifiedTCIstate-r17* for a CORESET with index 0* After a random access procedure not initiated by a PDCCH order that triggers a contention-free random access procedure, if no DCI Format or MAC CE indicating a TCI state is received, the UE assumes that DM-RS of PDCCH and DM-RS of PDSCH associated with the CORESET with index 0 are quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block the UE identified during the random access procedure, and the UE assumes that the UL TX spatial filter, if applicable, for dynamic-grant based PUSCH and PUCCH associated with the CORESET of index 0 is the same as that for a PUSCH transmission scheduled by a RAR UL grant during the initial access procedure.
* After the UE receives a DCI Format or MAC CE indicating a TCI state, and after a beam application delay as described in this clause; the UE obtains the QCL assumptions from the indicated [*DLorJoint-TCIState-r17]* TCI state for DM-RS of PDCCH and DM-RS of PDSCH associated with the CORESET with index 0, and the UE determines an UL TX spatial filter, if applicable, from the indicated [*DLorJoint-TCIState-r17]* or [*UL-TCIState-r17]* for a dynamic-grant based PUSCH and PUCCH associated with the CORESET with index 0.

**FL Note**: When CORESET 0 has been configured by RRC to follow the unified TCI state (or not configured to no follow the unified TCI state), the TCI state/quasi-co-location is determined by the indicated (unified) TCI state, or the most recent random access procedure if no unified TCI state has been indicated after the most recent random access procedure. | **Support/fine**: OPPO, Apple, ZTE, SS, Google, Spreadtrum, Nokia, Docomo**Not support:** MTK, QC, vivo (need clarification on scenarios), Huawei/HiSilicon, LG, CATT, Ericsson |
| 1-15 | **TP 1-15**: To endorse the following text proposal for TS 38.214:**5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location**< Unchanged parts are omitted >When *tci-PresentInDCI* is set as 'enabled' or *tci-PresentDCI-1-2* is configured for the CORESET, the UE with activated *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIState* receives DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 providing indicated *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIState* for a CC or all CCs in the same CC list configured by *simultaneousTCI-UpdateList1-r17, simultaneousTCI-UpdateList2-r17, simultaneousTCI-UpdateList3-r17, simultaneousTCI-UpdateList4-r17*. The DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 can be with or without, if applicable, DL assignment. If the DCI format 1\_1/1\_2/ is without DL assignment, the UE can assume the following:- CS-RNTI is used to scramble the CRC for the DCI- The values of the following DCI fields are set as follows:- RV = all '1's- MCS = all '1's- NDI = 0- Set to all '0's for FDRA Type 0, or all '1's for FDRA Type 1, or all '0's for dynamicSwitch (same as in Table 10.2-4 of [6, TS 38.213]). If a UE is configured with *CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig* for a serving cell the value of the DCI field ‘*carrier indicator*’ corresponds to the value indicated by *CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig.* The codepoint indicated by the DCI field ‘*Transmission Configuration Indicator*’ is applied to the carrier indicated by the DCI field ‘*carrier indicator*’ and all CCs configured in a same CC list as that carrier, and corresponds to indicated TCI state configured and activated for that carrier and all CCs, respectively.**FL Note**: For the Rel-17 unified TCI framework, update 38.214 to describe cross carrier beam indication based on the "carrier indicator field" in DCI Format 1\_1 or DCI Format 1\_2 based on the above TP. | **Support/fine**: Apple, SS, Google, Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia, Ericsson, Docomo**Not support:** MTK, QC, OPPO, ZTE, Spreadtrum, LG, CATT |
| 1-20 | **Proposal 1-20(Updated): To calculate the Type 1 power headroom based on a reference PUSCH, the UE uses the PUSCH power control parameters (i.e., PL-RS, P0, alpha, closed loop index) associated with the indicated joint/UL-TCI state.****FL Note**: For virtual PHR, we may firstly discuss above proposal from E/// (with some modification in red) on confirming the functionality of virtual PHR calculation in unified TCI for reference PUSCH. After that, we can further review whether/how to draft the corresponding TP in the second round. | **Support/fine**: QC, ZTE **Not support:**  |
| 1-30 | **TP 1-30**: To endorse the following text proposal for TS 38.213:**7 Uplink Power control**< Unchanged parts are omitted >- else, if *useIndicatedTCIState* is not provided for a SRS resource set and for a first SRS resource from the SRS resource set, the values of $P\_{O\\_SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, $α\_{SRS,b,f,c}\left(q\_{s}\right)$, and SRS power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-SRS-Set* associated with *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set and a RS index $q\_{d}$ for obtaining a pathloss estimate for the SRS transmission is provided by PL-RS associated with or included in the indicated *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL-TCIState* of an SRS resource with lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set. If two SRS resource sets are configured by higher layer parameter *srs-ResourceSetToAddModList* and *srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2*, respectively, and associated with the higher layer parameter usage of value 'codeBook' or 'nonCodeBook', and if *useIndicatedTCIState* is not provided for at least one SRS resource set of the two, UE expects the power control parameters associated with the TCI state of the SRS resources with the lowest *SRS-ResourceId* in the SRS resource set are the same as those applied for the other SRS resource set. **FL Note**: For unified TCI framework, if *useIndicatedTCIState* is not provided for a SRS resource set, the SRS is not to follow the PC parameters may not be identical for the two SRS resource sets configured by srs-ResourceSetToAddModList and srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2. Therefore, in R1-2204976, it is proposed that we should have identical PC parameters as above two sets. | **Support/fine**: QC, OPPO**Not support:** MTK, Apple, ZTE, vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon, LG, CATT, Nokia, Docomo |

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Re 1-1, technically speaking, it is dangerous for NW operation if P0/alpha/*l* is not defined. @SS, E/// can you live with the majority views for progress.****Re 1-2, thanks for QC’s being flexible. @vivo, SS, HW can you live with the majority views, i.e., Alt-2?****Re 1-7, it seems that many companies mentioned that only the case that SSB is used as PL-RS should be considered. How about above update?****Re 1-20, @HW, based on your command, the proposal is updated. Generally, legacy UL power control parameter is precluded for unified TCI. Either way, we need to identify the new behavior for virtual PHR determination.** * **@HW, SS, Could you live with majority companies views?**

**After that, the following issues are still controversial. If still unchanged, we have to conclude the corresponding issue with no consensus. Any suggestion?*** **1-14, 1-15 , 1-30**
 |
| QC | For TP 1-7, we think perhaps the clean way is to ask RAN2 to add PCI for the PL RS, which may provide more flexibility**[Mod]: Tend to agree with you. But, as you see, for many items, some companies provided serious concerns for introducing a new RRC.** For TP 1-20, we think PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id is still used by unified TCI, and the default PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id = 0 can still be configured. So it still works as in legacy VPHR.  |
| Apple | For TP 1-20, @QC, according to latest ASN.1, the UL PC parameters should be as follows, and the RRC parameters in the statement in current 38.213 “where $P\_{O\\_PUSCH,b,f,c}(j)$ and $α\_{b,f,c}\left(j\right)$ are obtained using $P\_{O\\_NOMINAL,PUSCH,f,c}\left(0\right)$ and *p0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId* *=* 0, $PL\_{b,f,c}(q\_{d})$ is obtained using *pusch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id =* 0, and $l=0$.” may be missing. In addition, with the help of unified TCI, why not use the correct PC parameters to calculate vPHR?DLorJoint-TCIState-r17 ::= SEQUENCE { tci-StateUnifiedId-r17 TCI-StateId, qcl-Type1-r17 QCL-Info, qcl-Type2-r17 QCL-Info OPTIONAL, -- Need R ul-powerControl-r17 Uplink-powerControlId-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R pathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17 PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id OPTIONAL -- Need S -- Editor's Note: Check if new id -r17 is needed to cover full ID range }Uplink-powerControl-r17 ::= SEQUENCE { ul-powercontrolId-r17 Uplink-powerControlId-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R p0AlphaSetforPUSCH-r17 P0AlphaSet-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R p0AlphaSetforPUCCH-r17 P0AlphaSet-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need R p0AlphaSetforSRS-r17 P0AlphaSet-r17 OPTIONAL -- Need R} |
| vivo | For TP 1-2, still prefer Alt-1. Alt-1 is more flexible by configuring PC parameters per BWP/CC. And compared to Alt-2, the spec change is smaller. Could companies elaborate why they prefer Alt-2?**[Mod]: Thank you. Personally speaking, it may not be a serious issue. Either way should be fine, just for majority. I will ask proponent companies to reply your comments.**For TP 1-7, Ok with the updated TP. The clarification in RRC is another solution, i.e. the PCI of PLRS follows that of the TCI state. If so, RAN1 needs to have a conclusion and send LS to RAN2. |
| LG | TP 1-7: Fine with the update TP considering SSB case only. |
| CATT | For TP 1-7, fine with the updated TP. For TP 1-20, it’s necessary to clarify the type-1 power head room calculation in Rel-17 unified TCI framework, i.e. the PC parameters associated with/included in the indicated Rel-17 TCI state is used instead of the parameters defined in Rel-15/16.  |
| Samsung | For **1.1**: it is fine to have a default value for the PC parameters, but why use the smallest power control ID? It would seem more reasonable to use the power control ID included in the UL BWP. Therefore, we suggest the following change:* the values of $P\_{O\\_UE\\_PUSCH,b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, $α\_{b,f,c}\left(j\right)$, and the PUSCH power control adjustment state $l$ are provided by *p0-Alpha-CLID-PUSCH-Set* associated with the ~~lowest value of~~ *uplink-powercontrolId-r17* configured in *BWP-UplinkDedicated* for the PCell or the PSCell

This is repeated for the other paragraphs.**[Mod]: After reviewing E/// and offline discussion, thanks for your being flexible.**For **1.2**: We still don’t think such an update is needed. If the UE is using for, a CC, the TCI state configured in a reference CC, it should also be using the corresponding power control parameters without having to mention that. But if the majority still thinks that this clarification is needed, we can accept to move forward.**[Mod]: Thank you so much for being flexible.**For **1.7**: We think a better solution is to include the “additionalPCI-r17” in the definition of “PUCCH-PathlossReferenceRS” when the RS is SSB. In case of an SSB, the RS is defined the ssb-Index in the cell and by the AdditionalPCIIndexPUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS ::= SEQUENCE { pucch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id PUCCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id, referenceSignal CHOICE { ssb-Index SSB-Index, csi-RS-Index NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId } additionalPCI-r17 AdditionalPCIIndex-r17}**[Mod]: Tend to agree with you. But, as you see, for many items, some companies provided serious concerns for introducing a new RRC.** For **1.14**: We have already provided answers to the companies objecting. We would appreciate it if the companies consider these replies that are repeated here for convenience.The following companies provided reasons for not agreeing. This is our reply:* MediaTek: “Current spec TS 38.214 already specifies the default behaviors for all PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH after initial access and reconfiguration with sync. It is unclear which scenario is missed”. There are many reasons for CBRA, for example SR failure, loss of uplink sync, etc. (these are described in TS 38.300). In Rel-15/16 as described in 38.213, the beam for CORESET is based on the beam found during the random access procedure. We believe that this should also apply to Rel-17 when CORESET#0 follows a Rel-17 TCI state. In this case, after CBRA the beam for CORESET#0 and associated channels is that found during the random access procedure unit a new beam is indicated.
* QC: “the TP may not always achieve better performance than the case without this TP”. The case QC brings up is when the beam found during RACH doesn’t change and it is better to use the indicated narrow beam before RACH. This can’t always be guaranteed. The fact that the UE triggers a CBRA could be an indication that the current beam is no longer good (e.g., SR failure or loss of UL Sync). Even in the case when the narrow beam doesn’t change before and after CBRA (we think that this is a rare case), the network can always indicate the narrow beam right after CBRA. On the other hand, if the narrow beam is not the right beam to use, there could be a beam failure after CBRA, if the beam from RACH is not used.
* Huawei/HiSilicon: “QCL assumption for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUCCH/PUSCH before application of the first TCI indication has already been captured in the spec which includes the case of CORESET0”. The case covered by this proposal is after a CBRA procedure, which is not that of initial access and is not that of reconfiguration with Sync. We don’t find this case captured in the specs.
* LG: “To our understanding, default behaviors are already specified for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH”. Please see above comments to MediaTek and Huawei/HiSilicon.
* CATT: “QCL assumption before the initial beam indication has been captured in the spec”. Please see above comments to MediaTek and Huawei/HiSilicon.

**[Mod]: Thank you. @above companies, please review SS’ reply. Can you be flexible now? Highly appreciated.**For **1.15**: We have already provided answers to the companies objecting. We would appreciate it if the companies consider these replies that are repeated here for convenience.The following companies provided reasons for not agreeing. This is our reply* MediaTek: “We still don't think this has to be explicitly specified in spec” First, do you agree that for TCI state update, the UE should update the TCI state (as signaled by transmission configuration indication) of the carrier indicated by the carrier indicator field. If yes, where is this specified in the specifications.
* QC: “to our understanding, this is legacy behavior and hence may not be needed”. Can you please point out where this is defined in the spec?
* Oppo: “This may not be needed since the proposed specification seems to be redundant”. Can you please point out where this is defined in the spec?
* ZTE: “It is a straightforward understanding, may not need to specify”. Can you please point out where this is defined in the spec?
* Vivo: “the intended behavior with current specification is exactly what the proposal wants to achieve”. Can you please point out where this is defined in the spec?
* Spreadtrum: “We think this is already supported”. Can you please point out where this is defined in the spec?
* LG: “We have a similar understanding with Qualcomm”. Can you please point out where this is defined in the spec?
* CATT: “This is legacy behavior and has been specified”. Can you please point out where this is defined in the spec?
* Ericsson: “If this is legacy behaviour, we think it should be clarified. In contrast to other types of information conveyed in DCI, this applies not only to the current scheduling occasion: it changes state, and is applicable also to other scheduling instants and channels”. Agree that this should be clarified in the spec.

In addition, Spreadtrum made the following comment after our last reply: “For TP 1-15, the legacy behavior in our mind: The carrier indicator field in DCI is used to indicate which carrier the scheduled PDSCH will be transmitted on, while the TCI field in the same DCI is used to indicate which beam the scheduled PDSCH on the carrier is transmitted with. So, the TCI state is effective to the carrier indicated by the carrier indicator field”We would like to point that for a DCI without a DL assignment, there is no corresponding PDSCH being scheduled, then at least for that case, it should be clarified that the carrier indicator field points to the carrier on which the TCI state is to be applied.**[Mod]: Thank you. @above companies, please review SS’ reply. Can you be flexible now? Highly appreciated.**For **1-20**: This is an optimization that is not needed.For **1-30**: Our understand is that if two SRS resource sets are configured by higher layer parameter *srs-ResourceSetToAddModList* and *srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2* then the PUSCH transmission is for mTRP. This is not within the scope of the Rel-17 unified TCI state framework and hence is not needed. |
| Ericsson | P1.1: The ordering of the UL power control parameters is arbitrary, meaning that the first has no special meaning. Samsung’s proposal makes more sense, but we’ve told RAN2 that the parameters are not defined in the UL BWP and in TCI states at the same time.The common view seems to be that the PL RS should be qnew. I propose we go with that, and leave the rest to UE implementation.**[Mod]: Thanks for your in-depth analysis. From moderator perspective, target power is essential for NW operation, and up to UE implementation should be bad/dangerous. Technically speaking, for any PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission in NR, regardless of initial access or others, P0 should be clearly provided in spec. If anything wrong, please feel free to correct it.** **Regarding ‘lowest ID’, I tend to agree with you that it is just for pointing out, as what we did for many times. Highest, lowest or whatever, either way should be fine ^ ^.** P1.2: Don’t support. We agree with Samsung. All the properties of the TCI state are shared if a reference CC is used, and if we need to confirm this for some properties, then we need to do it for all properties. **[Mod]: Yeah, it is hard to justify why some parts are specified or something not. Thank you.**P1.7: Support. To Qualcomm: it’s too late to ask RAN2 to add new parameters, and having more than one additional PCI in a TCI state is confusing. I wonder why RAN2 put the additional PCI in the QCL info.**[Mod]: Yeah, let’s check companies’ views.**P1.15: we think there is a need to clarify this. There are two possibilities: 1) the beam indication applies to the CC where it was transmitted or 2) to the CC where the PDSCH is scheduled. Either possibility works, and I think 1) is more natural, since the indication is not coupled with the PDSCH. But this should be clarified.**[Mod]: Okay.**P1.20: Thanks to Huawei and Qualcomm for pointing to the RRC spec: it is not as bad as I thought. But as Apple points out, *p0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId* is not configured in the unified TCI framework. We’ve worked hard to have a leaner power control framework with the unified TCI, and it would be unfortunate to not complete it. **[Mod]: Fully agree.** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | For 1-2, we can support alt-2.For 1-7, we share the same view with QC. Currently RAN2 mistakenly reuses Rel-16 IE “PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id” for Rel-17 PL-RS in UL-TCIState-r17 or DLorJoint-TCIState-r17. Legacy PL-RS pool can only configure with serving cell SSB and CSI-RS resources. To support the inter-cell beam management, there should be a new pool for PL-RS for Rel-17 in RRC that allow the SSB to be a SSB associated with additionalPCI. As long as RAN2 update the RRC signaling, such TP is not needed anymore.**[Mod]: Tend to agree with you. But, as you see, for many items, some companies provided serious concerns for introducing a new RRC.** For 1-20, still our strong preference is to reuse the legacy mechanism, i.e., PL\_RS with PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id = 0. |
| Lenovo | 1-2: Fine with Alt-2.1-15: In this case the TCI codepoint indicated by the TCI is applied to all the BWPs of a carrier. We suggest to make it clear in the text: If a UE is configured with *CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig* for a serving cell the value of the DCI field ‘*carrier indicator*’ corresponds to the value indicated by *CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig.* The codepoint indicated by the DCI field ‘*Transmission Configuration Indicator*’ is applied to all the configured BWPs of the carrier indicated by the DCI field ‘*carrier indicator*’ and all CCs configured in a same CC list as that carrier, and corresponds to indicated TCI state configured and activated for that carrier and all CCs, respectively.**[Mod]: Got it. But, the key issue is to convince other companies to support this TP in principle.**1-20: This is OK with us. |
| **Round-2** |
| **Mod****(Round-2)** | **1-1: @SS, Thank you so much for your being flexible based on offline discussion.****@E///, it seems that ‘first’ or ‘lowest ID’ has been widely used for UL power control in spec (frankly speaking, we do not need to worry about it, e.g., as follows. Alternatively we can use highest ID or whatever).**

|  |
| --- |
| - If *P0-PUSCH-Set* is provided to the UE and the DCI format includes an open-loop power control parameter set indication field, the UE determines a value of C:\Users\10190306\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml13816\wps1.jpg from- a first *P0-PUSCH-AlphaSet* in *p0-AlphaSets* if a value of the open-loop power control parameter set indication field is '0' or '00'- a first value in *P0-PUSCH-Set* with the lowest *p0-PUSCH-SetID* value if a value of the open-loop power control parameter set indication field is '1' or '01'- a second value in *P0-PUSCH-Set* with the lowest *p0-PUSCH-SetID* value if a value of the open-loop power control parameter set indication field is '10' |

**1-2: Thanks so much for being flexible, SS. Then, could any proponent nicely reply to vivo’s comments?****1-7: Some companies prefer to have a new RRC parameter for handling this issue. So, another alternative is provided above. Please provide your views accordingly. Anyway, we may need to make a decision this meeting.****1-14/15, @all opponent companies, please review SS and E///’s in-depth reply above! It is time to move forward both of them. Any suggestions are highly appreciated.** **1-20, please review Apple and E///’s reply. Technically speaking, we may not have complete solution in the spec for virtual PHR in unified TCI.****1-30, no update.** |
| DOCOMO | 1-7: We are fine with either the TP or introducing a new RRC parameter to handle the issue.**[Mod]: Okay, thank you so much.** |
| Ericsson | 1.1: I am a little surprised on this. Clearly, there has been consensus on how to select the PL RS throughout the discussion, and I was expecting that an updated proposal with this meaning. **[Mod]: It is due to that majority companies’ views are clearly converged into this TP. From moderator perspective, we need to fix all holes of this BFR issue quickly, if possible, and also for other issues, e.g., inter-cell beam management and signaling medium. Hopefully the number of proposal/TPs for next meeting can be reduced significantly!** P1.2: Don’t support. The spec is clear.**[Mod]: Okay, got it.**P1.7 Technically, alt2 is cleaner. But if we ask RAN2 to introduce an RRC parameter, it should be critical. We can’t see that this is critical.**[Mod]: Okay, got it.** |
| QC | For 1-7, Alt2 is the cleaner and more flexible solution. If the issue is critical, then the new RRC parameter is critical as well. **[Mod]: Okay. Make sense!**For 1-14To SS’s comment below, the indicated narrow beam should work to our understanding. Otherwise, BFR will be triggered and all channels sharing the indicated narrow beam will be reset to RACH beam already. So we think resetting all channels’ indicated narrow beam to RACH beam will be most likely to degrade the performance if the indicated narrow beam does not fail. * QC: “the TP may not always achieve better performance than the case without this TP”. The case QC brings up is when the beam found during RACH doesn’t change and it is better to use the indicated narrow beam before RACH. This can’t always be guaranteed. The fact that the UE triggers a CBRA could be an indication that the current beam is no longer good (e.g., SR failure or loss of UL Sync). Even in the case when the narrow beam doesn’t change before and after CBRA (we think that this is a rare case), the network can always indicate the narrow beam right after CBRA. On the other hand, if the narrow beam is not the right beam to use, there could be a beam failure after CBRA, if the beam from RACH is not used.

For 1-15To SS’s comment below, in R15/16, the TCI field in DCI corresponds to the CC indicated by CIF. I think that is the common understanding. Does any company have different view?* QC: “to our understanding, this is legacy behavior and hence may not be needed”. Can you please point out where this is defined in the spec?

For 1-20, if the intention is to update the whole PC parameters, then we suggest to include them all, instead of only PL RS, which is not needed to our understanding.**Proposal 1-20: To calculate the Type 1 power headroom based on a reference PUSCH, the UE uses the UL PC parameters ~~pathloss reference signal~~ associated with the indicated joint/UL-TCI state, including*** The PL RS associated with the indicated joint/UL TCI state
* The P0, alpha, closed-loop index for PUSCH associated with the indicated joint/UL TCI state, if configured
	+ Otherwise, the default P0, alpha, closed-loop index for PUSCH

**[Mod]: Thank you so much. Please review above update based on your views but just briefly.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1-20: We still have serious concern about this and prefer to reuse the legacy mechanism, i.e., PL\_RS with PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id = 0. Also, we are not sure what “**pathloss reference signal associated with or included in”** means.**[Mod]: Please review the updated version from QC. Besides for PL-RS, other power control parameters are also used for virtual PUSCH PHR determination. ‘or included in’ is removed.** |
| **Mod****(v06)** | **1-1/1-2/1-7/1-14/1-15/1-30: No update (Please review above reply from my side)****1-20: Proposal is updated based on QC’s suggestion. Let’s see whether we can reach consensus on that.**  |
| CATT | For TP 1-7，Fine with the updated TP. PCI information has been included in the TCI state, introducing additional PCI parameter in the PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS seems redundant and brings confusion.**[Mod]: Okay. Got it.** |
| ZTE | 1-2: @vivo: Here are our understandings for supporting Alt2, for your reference. Both Alt-1 and Alt-2 share the same mechanism for PL-RS obtaining which you obviously agree with. The difference between Alt-1 and Alt-2 is PC parameters for open-loop and closed-loop PC parameters.In the case of “ if the *TCI-State\_r17* configurations is absent in a BWP of the CC”, the UE also needs to determine open-loop and closed-loop PC parameters, which is naturally based on “the indicated *TCI-StateID\_r17* from a reference BWP of a reference CC”. In other words, same mechanism as for PL-RS obtaining. We don’t see the need to to keep another way to obtain open-loop and closed-loop parameters, such as from the PC parameters configured in the CC itself. “if the *TCI-State\_r17* configurations is absent in a BWP of the CC”, it may not need to configure open-loop and closed-loop parameters in the BWP/CC, what are them used for, given that TCI state referring from other BWP/CC?*vivo: “For TP 1-2, still prefer Alt-1. Alt-1 is more flexible by configuring PC parameters per BWP/CC. And compared to Alt-2, the spec change is smaller. Could companies elaborate why they prefer Alt-2?”***[Mod]: Thanks for clarification. But, if opponent companies still stick to their views, we may have to close this discussion this meeting.**1-7: We agree that either Alt1 or Alt2 can address the issue. We can live with either one. Alt1 maybe suitable at this stage as pointed out by FL and other companies that it needs no RRC impact. **[Mod]: Okay. Got it.**1-15: We share the same view as QC, that in R15/16, the TCI field in DCI corresponds to the CC indicated by CIF. **[Mod]: Okay. Got it.**1-20: Fine with the updated proposal. **[Mod]: Thank you for being flexible.** |
| LG | Issue 1-7: We have a similar view with CATT/ZTE that it can be sufficiently addressed by the updated TP without RRC impact.**[Mod]: Okay. Got it.** |
| **Mod****(v11)** | **1.1: Thanks for E///’s being flexible for 1-1 after offline. Since now, it is offline agreed.****1-2/1-7/1-14/1-15/1-20/1-30: No update** |
| Ericsson | P1.1: We are OK for progressP1.2: Don’t supportP1.7: Based on the discussion, we consider this as critical. Hence we support adding an RRC parameterP1.20: Support |
| Samsung | P1.1: OKP1.2: Not neededP1.7: This is a critical issue, that should be fixed with a new RRC parameter, hence support Alt2.P1.14: In reply to the comment from QC, in Rel-15, when CBRA is triggered, the beam for CBRA is used CORESET 0. The same behavior is supported for extended to the unified TCI state framework in Rel-17. Without this, we fear that performance can degrade by having may beam failures as an older beam is being used rather than the most recent one found by RACH.P1.15: In reply to ZTE and QC, we think that there is an ambiguity in the spec that is good to clarify. As Ericsson pointed out there are two options (1) Beam apply to the carrier where the PDCCH is transmitted. (2) beam applied to carrier indicated by the carrier indicator field. We should clarify which of these applies. We think it should be (2)P1.20: Not neededP1.30: Not needed for single TRP. |
| Spreadtrum | 1-1: Support.1-2: OK to clarify.1-7: Prefer Alt1, but Alt2 is also fine if there’s majority support.1-15: With the understanding that the indicated TCI state is decoupled from the scheduled PDSCH, we are OK to this TP.1-20: Support |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | For 1-20, we can support the updated proposal for progress. |

### Issue 2 (inter-cell beam management)

Table 3 Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2-2 | **Proposal 2-2A:** On inter-cell beam management, * Alt1: The PDCCH/PDSCH should be rate matched around the SSBs associated with an activated TCI state [which is associated with the same PCI as the PDSCH/PDCCH]
* Alt2: On inter-cell beam management, The PDCCH/PDSCH should be rate matched around the SSBs indicated by ssb-PositionsInBurst-r17 for the same PCI as that associated with TCI state of the PDSCH/PDCCH

**FL note**: It was pointed out that there are some concerns about further introducing others except for rate matching. Hence, let’s firstly handle the above rate matching issue (based on the proposal in P16 in R1-2203505) and then the corresponding TP. If we still have sufficient time after handling above, we can handle the others in the second/third round.  | **Option-1:** ~~QC,~~ OPPO, Apple (change “L1-RSRP measurement” into “L1-RSRP/CBD measurement or associated with active TCI”), ZTE (with change), SS, vivo, Google, Huawei, HiSilicon, Spreadtrum, ~~CATT,~~ Nokia, ~~Ericsson (with ZTE’s change)~~, Docomo (with ZTE’s change), Lenovo (with ZTE’s change)**Option-2:** QC, CATT, Ericsson, MTK, DOCOMO, HW |
| **Proposal 2-2B:** On inter-cell beam management, introduce additional CRS-rate matching pattern parameter for each additional PCI**FL note**: Like *crs-RateMatch-PerCORESETPoolIndex-r16* in Rel-16 mDCI-mTRP. | **Support/fine**: ~~QC,~~ Apple, ZTE, Nokia, Ericsson, Docomo, Lenovo**Not support:** SS, ~~Huawei/HiSilicon,~~ ~~CATT~~ |
| 2-3 | **Proposal 2-3 (For discussion purpose):** On inter-cell beam management, the following should be supported.* non-UE-dedicated PDSCH with scheduling offset < a threshold (TBD: default QCL assumption, e.g., reusing Rel-15/16)
* Note: non-UE-dedicated PDSCH refers to PDSCH scheduled from the CORESET associated with CSS

**FL note**: It was pointed out that, before the detailed discussion, we may need to identify whether the above scenario should be supported or not. After that, we may identify the solution in the second round. | **Support/fine**: QC, OPPO, Apple (This is already in spec), ZTE, vivo, Google, Spreadtrum, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson**Not support:** SS, Huawei/HiSilicon |
| 2-7 | **Proposal 2-7:** On inter-cell beam management, the following QCL Types should be additionally supported:* For a TCI state configured for periodic TRS,
	+ Alt-1a: SS/PBCH block associated with additional PCI w.r.t. QCL-TypeC + the same SS/PBCH w.r.t. QCL-TypeD
	+ Alt-1b: SS/PBCH block associated with additional PCI w.r.t. QCL-TypeC + CSI-RS for BM w.r.t. QCL-TypeD
* For a TCI state configured for CSI-RS for CSI,
	+ Alt-2: TRS w.r.t. QCL-TypeA + SS/PBCH block associated with additional PCI w.r.t. QCL-TypeD

**FL note**: Above proposals are offline agreed. Please review the following TP:**5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location in TS 38.214**<Unchanged Parts omitted>For a periodic CSI-RS resource in an *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info*, the UE shall expect that a TCI-State indicates one of the following quasi co-location type(s):- 'typeC' with an SS/PBCH block and, when applicable, 'typeD' with the same SS/PBCH block, where SS/PBCH block may have a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell, and the UE can assume center frequency, SCS, SFN offset are the same for SS/PBCH block from the serving cell and SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the serving cell, or- 'typeC' with an SS/PBCH block and, when applicable,'typeD' with a CSI-RS resource in an *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition*, where SS/PBCH block may have a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell, and the UE can assume center frequency, SCS, SFN offset are the same for SS/PBCH block from the serving cell and SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the serving cell.<Unchanged Parts omitted>For a CSI-RS resource in an *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured without higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and without the higher layer parameter *repetition*, the UE shall expect that a TCI-State indicates one of the following quasi co-location type(s): - 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with the same CSI-RS resource, or- 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with an SS/PBCH block, where SS/PBCH block may have a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell, and the UE can assume center frequency, SCS, SFN offset are the same for SS/PBCH block from the serving cell and SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the serving cell, or- 'typeA' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, 'typeD' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition*, or- 'typeB' with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* when 'typeD' is not applicable. | **Alt-1a*** Support/fine: MTK, QC, OPPO, Apple, ZTE, SS (proposal is fine, some refinement needed for TP), vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon, Spreadtrum, LG, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson, Docomo, Lenovo
* Not support:

**Alt-1b**: * Support/fine: Apple, ZTE, SS (proposal is fine, some refinement needed for TP), Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT, Ericsson, Docomo
* Not support:

**Alt-2:*** Support/fine: Apple, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, Spreadtrum, CATT, Ericsson, Docomo
* Not support:~~, SS~~
 |

Table 4 Additional inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Re 2-2A, it seems that majority companies seem fine with ZTE’s update. Let’s check the new version.****Re 2-2B, from moderator perspective, the intention of this proposal is to achieve the same target as ‘***crs-RateMatch-PerCORESETPoolIndex-r16***’ as for mTRP. But, no doubt that the legacy parameter can not be used in inter-cell beam management. So, opponents please double check it.****Re 2-3, discuss by email directly together with Samsung’s new proposal in Issue 1-31.****Re 2-7, @MTK and SS, can you be flexible for Alt-1b and Alt 1-c?** |
| QC | For Proposal 2-2A, the wording seems to only rate match around SSBs in those active TCIs. To our understanding, it should be matched around ALL SSBs indicated by ssb-PositionsInBurst for the same PCI associated with TCI of PDSCH/PDCCH. This is based on the agreement below as well as 214->5.1.4. Therefore, we suggest the following change**Proposal 2-2A:** On inter-cell beam management, The PDCCH/PDSCH should be rate matched around the SSBs ~~associated with an activate TCI state which is associated with~~ indicated by ssb-PositionsInBurst-r17 for the same PCI as that associated with TCI state of the PDSCH/PDCCH **Agreement**Agree on scheme1* Scheme1: PDSCH/PDCCH from non-serving cell (PCI) associated with TCI state and/or QCL-info is rate matched around non-serving cell SSB with the same PCI
* FFS: whether PDSCH /PDCCH from serving cell (PCI) is rate matched around non-serving cell SSB
* FFS: whether PDSCH/PDCCH from non-serving cell (PCI) associated with TCI state and/or QCL-info is rate matched around serving cell SSB

For Proposal 2-2B, we are fine to withdraw the support |
| vivo | For 2-2A, if we have to go through this route, we prefer to rate match around all SSBs associated with activated TCI. Since these SSBs can potentially be used for measurement.**Proposal 2-2A:** On inter-cell beam management, The PDCCH/PDSCH should be rate matched around the SSBs associated with an activate TCI state. ~~which is associated with the same PCI as the PDSCH/PDCCH~~ **[Mod]:** If my understanding is correct, it may be also relevant to discussion in 8.1.2.2. As you proposed, the following part is in the bracket. |
| ZTE | Regarding QC’s and vivo’s comments, we don’t need to rate match around all SSBs of neighbour cells. Only the SSBs associated with active TCI state and with same PCI need to be considered. Other SSBs have few relation with the PDSCH/PDCCH and should not be considered for rate matching. **[Mod]:** Okay. Reasonable. But, can you live with QC or vivo’s proposals for progress? |
| CATT | For proposal 2-2A, we share the similar view as QC that PDCCH/PDSCH should be rate matched around all SSBs with the same PCI, not only those SSBs in active TCIs.**[Mod]:** Okay. Already in the above table. |
| Samsung | For **2-3**: Our understanding of the unified TCI state framework is that the data and control channels use the same beam. If the channel follows the unified TCI state, both PDSCH and PDCCH follow the DL or Joint TCI state.If the channel doesn’t follow the unified TCI state. (e.g., non-UE-dedicated channel), the PDCCH is configured a TCI state (for the CORESET), the associated PDSCH follows the same TCI state. Hence no need for a default beam for PDSCH. Before the beam is configured for the CORESET, the CORESET can use the unified TCI state.**[Mod]:** Already updated the proposal in the RAN1 email thread. Thanks again.For **2-7**: We are fine with Alt 1-b, for progress we can also be fine with Alt-2 as this is the majority view.**[Mod]:** Thank you so much for being flexible. Always constructive! |
| Ericsson | P2-2A: agree with Qualcomm. The UE should rate match around all the SSBs that are associated with the PCI of the activated TCI state, not the single SSB that is actually used as QCL source for the PDCCH/PDSCH reception. The important point is that it is still only one PCI that is considered, but all the SSBs of that PCI. For sure, the one TRP will not transmit SSB and PDCCH/PDSCH in the same REs.**[Mod]:** Okay. Captured!P2-2B: ok to skipP2-7: Alt-1a is the important addition – Alt 1b and Alt 2 the others are more for making the spec consistent. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | OK with Proposal 2-2AWe can accept Proposal 2-2B if it has strong majority**[Mod]:** Okay. Thank you so much for being flexible. |
| Lenovo | 2-3: A UE only receives non-UE dedicated PDSCH from the serving cell. This is not a valid scenario.  |
| **Round-2** |
| **Mod****(Round-2)** | **2-2A:** QC and vivo’s suggestions are captured. @all, please review QC’s update, and any further inputs are highly appreciated.**2-2B:** Thanks for HW’s being flexible. Let’s wait for some more inputs.**2-7:** Thanks for SS’s being flexible. @MTK, can you be flexible for Alt-1b and Alt 1-c? Regarding the TP, from the moderator perspective, I think that Example-2 should be sufficient. Any views are welcome. |
| MediaTek | On 2-7, we can compromise to Alt-1b and 1c, but the sentence “and the UE can assume center frequency, SCS, SFN offset are the same for SS/PBCH block from the serving cell and SS/PBCH block having a PCI different from the serving cell” in each TP.**[Mod]:** Thank you. Got it. |
| DOCOMO | 2-2A: Support. We are fine with either options.**[Mod]:** Thank you. Got it. |
| Ericsson | P2-2A: Support QCs updateP2-2B: Support**[Mod]:** Thank you. Got it. |
| QC | For 2-2A, prefer Alt2. The PDSCH can overlap with SSBs not associated with the active TCI state. This is allowed to our understanding.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2-2A: The added Alt2 in Round 2 is reasonable and we can support it. |
| Mod(V06) | 2-2: No update, but it looks that majority companies’ views are converged into Alt22-7: Thanks for MTK’s compromise. The proposal is offline agreed. Please review the above TP per MTK’s suggestion. |
| CATT | Proposal 2-2A: support Alt2.Proposal 2-2B: we are fine for progress.**[Mod]:** Thank you so much. Highly appreciated! |
| ZTE | 2-2A: after further consideration, we still believe the original Alt1 is best. With two conditions of same PCI and associated with active TCI state may filter a smaller set of SSBs which are needed to consider for rate matching. This is more reasonable. Otherwise, the UE needs to rate match for a lager set of SSBs, and obviously some of them without associated with active TCI state can be neglected. Alt2 may cause lower efficiency. As a compromise, we can also live with updated version by vivo. **[Mod]:** Okay. |
| vivo | Proposal 2-2A: Alt-2 is not our preference. UE needs additional capability to simultaneously receive PDCCH/PDSCH and SSB for L1-RSRP measurement. If this is supported, at least additional UE capability is needed. For UEs not supporting the capability, the UE does not expect such overlap. * Alt2: On inter-cell beam management, The PDCCH/PDSCH should be rate matched around the SSBs indicated by ssb-PositionsInBurst-r17 for the same PCI as that associated with the TCI state of the PDSCH/PDCCH.
	+ Support UE capability for simultaneous reception of PDCCH/PDSCH and SSBs associated with a PCI different from that involved in the active TCI state for the PDCCH/PDSCH on the same REs. For UEs not supporting simultaneous reception, UE does not expect overlap.

**[Mod]:** Okay. Let's check other companies’ views |
| Mod(V11) | 2-2A: No update, but please review vivo’s compromise solution. Is that okay for other companies?2-2B: It looks stable now. But, for introducing another RRC parameter, @SS and other companies, can you live with that? |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.2A: there are some comments that I don’t understand. The UE rate matches around certain REs, since it knows no PDSCH is transmitted there. Rate matching is about what REs are available for PDSCH transmission.Proposal 2.2B: support. But we need to agree on the RRC parameter ASAP. |
| QC | For 2.2A, we prefer Alt2, which matches the existing spec. To ZTE, PDSCH can overlap with SSBs not in active PDSCH TCI at least in FR1. That is why the current spec requires rate matching around all transmitted SSBs. When receiving PDSCH scheduled by PDCCH with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, G-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI, MCCH-RNTI or PDSCHs with SPS, the REs corresponding to the configured or dynamically indicated resources in Clauses 5.1.4.1, 5.1.4.2 are not available for PDSCH. Furthermore, the UE assumes SS/PBCH block transmission according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* if the PDSCH resource allocation overlaps with PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources, and the UE shall assume that the PRBs containing SS/PBCH block transmission resources are not available for PDSCH in the OFDM symbols where SS/PBCH block is transmitted. To Vivo, the new red text is not needed to our understanding. There is no simultaneous Rx for overlapped PDSCH and SSB in current spec. For FR1, there is no such issue. For FR2, UE will use the Rx beam for the overlapped SSB to receive the PDSCH. We prefer to stick to legacy non-simultaneous Rx for simplicity. If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with 'typeD', if 'typeD' is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.For 2-2B, RRC parameter is the clean and flexible way if the issue is critical. It is not late for new RRC parameter to our understanding.  |
| Samsung | 2-2B: Don’t support. This seems to be a non-critical issue to introduce an RRC parameter for. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2-2A:** we can support Alt2, SSB is transmitted regardless of whether the associated TCI state is active or not. |

### Issue 3 (signaling medium)

Table 5 Summary: issue 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 3-1 | **Alt-4: TS 38.214**6.1.1.1 Codebook based UL transmission<Unchanged parts are omitted>The UE shall transmit PUSCH using the same antenna port(s) as the SRS port(s) in the SRS resource indicated by the DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 or by *configuredGrantConfig* according to clause 6.1.2.3.If an SRS resource set with parameter *usage* set to 'codebook' is not configured with *followUnifiedTCIstate,* the UE shall expect that the configured [TCI-State]s with [tci-StateId\_r17] of the SRS resource(s) are always equal to the indicated *[TCI-State]* with *[tci-StateId\_r17].*6.1.1.2 Non-Codebook based UL transmission<Unchanged parts are omitted>The UE shall transmit PUSCH using the same antenna ports as the SRS port(s) in the SRS resource(s) indicated by SRI(s) given by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 or by *configuredGrantConfig* according to clause 6.1.2.3, where the SRS port in (*i*+1)-th SRS resource in the SRS resource set is indexed as .If an SRS resource set with parameter *usage* set to 'nonCodebook' is not configured with *followUnifiedTCIstate,* the UE shall expect that the configured *[TCI-State]s* with *[tci-StateId\_r17]* of the SRS resource(s) are equal to the indicated *[TCI-State]* with *[tci-StateId\_r17].***Alt-5 (Update from LG): TS 38.214**When UE is indicated with an SRI corresponding to the UL transmission and UE is configured *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIState*, if the spatial domain transmission filter associated with the indicated SRI is different from the spatial domain transmission filter by the TCI state, the UE applies the UL spatial filter determined from the indicated *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIState* **FL note**: The above four alternatives are from R1-2203105, TP5 in R1-2203257, P2 in R1-2203673, P2 in R1-2203948, respectively.  | **~~Alt-1~~**~~: ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia~~**~~Alt-2:~~** ~~ZTE~~**~~Alt-3:~~** ~~ZTE, NEC, Nokia, Lenovo~~**Alt-4:** MTK, QC, OPPO, Apple, SS (also fine to have no TP and leave for network implementation), vivo, Spreadtrum~~, LG,~~ CATT, Ericsson (with reformulation) , Docomo, Lenovo, Intel, HW* Not support: NEC (one comment), ZTE

**Alt-5(from LG):** LGE, CATT,  |
| 3-3 | **Proposal 3-3A:** On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, for both CA and non-CA cases, * ~~Alt-1: TCI update signaling is applied to all configured BWP(s).~~
* Alt-2: TCI update signaling is applied to active BWP(s)

**FL note**: The corresponding TP can be discussed in the second round. | **~~Alt-1~~**~~: Apple, ZTE, Spreadtrum~~**Alt-2: QC, OPPO, SS, vivo, Google, Huawei/HiSilicon, Xiaomi, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson, Docomo, Intel,** **Spreadtrum, Samsung, Lenovo, ZTE****Not support: Apple** |
| **Proposal 3-3B:** On Rel-17 DCI-based beam indication, for both CA and non-CA cases, * ~~Alt-1: BAT should count the BeamAppTime\_r17 in all configured BWP(s).~~
* Alt-2: BAT should count the BeamAppTime\_r17 in active BWP(s) only

**FL note**: The corresponding TP can be discussed in the second round. | **~~Alt-1~~**~~: Apple, ZTE, Spreadtrum~~**Alt-2: QC, OPPO, SS, vivo, Google, Huawei/HiSilicon, Xiaomi, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson, Docomo, Intel,** **Spreadtrum, Samsung, ZTE****Not support: Apple** |
| 3-4 | **Alt 2:** **TS 38.214**The DM-RS antenna ports  in Clause 6.4.1.1.3 of [4, TS 38.211] are determined according to the ordering of DM-RS port(s) given by Tables 7.3.1.1.2-6 to 7.3.1.1.2-23 in Clause 7.3.1.1.2 of [5, TS 38.212].For non-codebook based transmission, the UE does not expect to be configured with both *spatialRelationInfo* for SRS resource and *associatedCSI-RS* in *SRS-ResourceSet* for SRS resource set. For non-codebook based transmission, the UE does not expect to be configured with both *DLorJoint-TCIState* or *UL*-*TCIState* for SRS resource and *associatedCSI-RS* in *SRS-ResourceSet* for SRS resource set.For non-codebook based transmission, when the SRS resource set is configured with *followUnifiedTCIstate-r17*, the UE does not expect to be configured *associatedCSI-RS* in *SRS-ResourceSet* for SRS resource set.For non-codebook based transmission, the UE can be scheduled with DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 when at least one SRS resource is configured in *SRS-ResourceSet* with *usage* set to 'nonCodebook'.**FL note**: The above two alternatives are from R1-2203257 and R1-2204169, respectively. | **~~Alt-1~~**~~: ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, LG~~**Alt-2:** MTK, QC, OPPO, Apple, vivo, Spreadtrum, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson, Lenovo**Not support:** **~~SS,~~** ZTE, HW, LGE |
| 3-5 | **Alt 1**: **Section 5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location in TS 38.214**< Unchanged parts are omitted >When the UE would transmit the last symbol of a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information corresponding to the DCI carrying the TCI State indication and without DL assignment, or corresponding to the PDSCH scheduling by the DCI carrying the TCI State indication, and if the indicated TCI State is different from the previously indicated one, the indicated *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* should be applied starting from the first slot that is at least $BeamAppTime\\_r17$ symbols after the last symbol of the PUCCH. The first slot and the $BeamAppTime\\_r17$ symbols are both determined on the carrier with the smallest SCS among the carrier(s) applying the beam indication. The applied indicated TCI state should be based on the activated TCI states in each slot.< Unchanged parts are omitted >**Alt 2**: **Section 5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location in TS 38.214**<Unchanged parts are omitted>If a PDSCH is scheduled by a DCI format having the TCI field present, the TCI field in DCI in the scheduling component carrier points to the activated TCI states in the scheduled component carrier or DL BWP, the UE shall use the *TCI-State* according to the value of the '*Transmission Configuration Indication*' field in the detected PDCCH with DCI for determining PDSCH antenna port quasi co-location. The UE may assume that the DM-RS ports of PDSCH of a serving cell are quasi co-located with the RS(s) in the TCI state with respect to the QCL type parameter(s) given by the indicated TCI state if the time offset between the reception of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is equal to or greater than a threshold *timeDurationForQCL*, where the threshold is based on reported UE capability [13, TS 38.306]. When the UE is configured with a single slot PDSCH, the indicated TCI state should be based on the activated TCI states in the slot with the scheduled PDSCH. When the UE is configured with a multi-slot PDSCH, the indicated TCI state should be based on the activated TCI states in the first slot with the scheduled PDSCH, and UE shall expect the activated TCI states are the same across the slots with the scheduled PDSCH. When the UE is configured with DLorJoint-TCIState-r17 ~~and~~ or UL-TCIState-r17, the indicated TCI state(s) should be based on the activated TCI states in the slot with the TCI state indication DCI. When the UE is configured with CORESET associated with a search space set for cross-carrier scheduling and the UE is not configured with *enableDefaultBeamForCCS*, the UE expects *tci-PresentInDCI* is set as 'enabled' or *tci-PresentDCI-1-2* is configured for the CORESET, and if one or more of the TCI states configured for the serving cell scheduled by the search space set contains *qcl-Type* set to 'typeD', the UE expects the time offset between the reception of the detected PDCCH in the search space set and the corresponding PDSCH is larger than or equal to the threshold *timeDurationForQCL.*<Unchanged parts are omitted>**FL note**: The above are from P7 in R1-2203505 and P6 in R1-2203948, respectively. | **Alt-1**: MTK, ZTE, vivo, Google, Ericsson, Docomo, Huawei, CATT**Alt-2: OPPO, Apple,** SS (reword “DLorJoint-TCIState-r17 and UL-TCIState-r17” to “DLorJoint-TCIState-r17 or UL-TCIState-r17”)**Not supported: QC, ~~Huawei/HiSilicon,~~ ~~CATT,~~ Nokia, Intel** |
| 3-7 | **Proposal 3-7:** For DCI format 1\_1 and 1\_2 with PDSCH assignment indicating TCI state, the acknowledgement to the TCI state update is the ACK of the PDSCH**FL note**: The above has been discussed for several meeting, and either way we need to make a conclusion (or NACK is still possible). After that, we may discuss the following issues: in case of HARQ-ACK multiplexing, the TCI state(s) indicated in a DCI corresponding to last position with ACK value in the HARQ-ACK codebook is applied after application timing (P5 in R1-2203673, P6 in R1-2203771, P2 in R1-2204535). | **Support/fine**: QC, OPPO, Apple, ZTE, NEC, SS (when gNB can’t distinguish NACK and DTX)), Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson, Docomo, Intel**Not support:** MTK, Google |
| 3-10 | **TP 3-10**: To endorse the following text proposal for TS 38.214:**5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location**<Unchanged parts are omitted>When the UE would transmit the last symbol of a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information or a PUSCH with HARQ-ACK information corresponding to the DCI carrying the TCI State indication and without DL assignment, or corresponding to the PDSCH scheduling by the DCI carrying the TCI State indication, and if the indicated TCI State is different from the previously indicated one, the indicated *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* should be applied starting from the first slot that is at least $BeamAppTime\\_r17$ symbols after the last symbol of the PUCCH or the PUSCH. The first slot and the $BeamAppTime\\_r17$ symbols are both determined on the carrier with the smallest SCS among the carrier(s) applying the beam indication. <Unchanged parts are omitted> | **Support/fine**: MTK, QC, OPPO (ok with the TP even through it is not 100% needed.) Apple (clarification for PUSCH repetition case is needed), ZTE, NEC, SS, vivo, Google, Huawei/HiSilicon, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson, Docomo, Intel**Not support:**  |

Table 6 Additional inputs: issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Re 3-1, we have super majority views. Let’s try Alt-4 in second round, and any wording refinement is highly appreciated.** * **@ZTE, HW, Nokia, Lenovo, can you live with that?**

**Re 3-3, let’s go with supper majority views (Alt-2 for both), and any objection @Apple, ZTE?****Re 3-4, can we go with majority view, Alt-2?@ LG, HW, ZTE, SS****Re 3-5, the wording is refined according to comments. Either way, from the moderator perspective, we may need to have a decision.****Re 3-7, let’s go with supper majority views. @MTK and Google, can you live with that?****Re 3-10, let’s approve that by email.** |
| QC | For 3-5, Alt1 is the legacy rule and is not needed to specify just for R17. The applied indicated TCI is based on the activated TCI definition in that slot. For the case of multi-slot PDSCH and multi-PDSCH, the activated TCI cannot be changed across slots as in existing spec, so the indicated TCI will also not be changed. |
| Apple | Issue 3-3: If the indicated TCI is only applied to active BWP, we would like to understand how BWP switching can work. When should gNB update the beam for the new BWP? If this can only be done after BWP switching, how to receive this TCI update signaling in the new BWP as the TCI in this new BWP has already got outdated. We may need to think about the case when UE falls back to the default BWP, how to maintain the communication.**[Mod]: Okay. Let’s hear some more companies’ views.**Issue 3-5: We can also accept Alt1.Issue 3-10: We would like to clarify for PUSCH with HARQ transmitted in multiple repetitions, should we count the starting point at the last repetition with HARQ or the whole PUSCH transmission? |
| vivo | For 3-5, @companies who believe current specification is working: legacy rule in current spec cannot be applicable to unified TCI and it is necessary to clarify which TCI state is applied for the channel/RS following the indicated TCI state when there is MAC CE update of active TCI state list between beam indication and PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH transmission and reception.In 38.214 5.1.5, the TCI state determination rule is as follows. It is only applicable for Rel-15/16 mechanism since it only mentions PDSCH.

|  |
| --- |
| For a single slot PDSCH, the indicated TCI state(s) should be based on the activated TCI states in the slot with the scheduled PDSCH. For a multi-slot PDSCH or the UE is configured with higher layer parameter [*pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPDSCH-r17*], the indicated TCI state(s) should be based on the activated TCI states in the first slot with the scheduled PDSCH(s), and UE shall expect the activated TCI states are the same across the slots with the scheduled PDSCH(s). |

There are at least the following two cases need clarification.Case 1, for single slot PDSCHIn RAN1 #94 agreement, when the UE is configured with a single slot PDSCH, if the candidate TCI states for PDSCH are updated by MAC CE between the PDCCH and the corresponding PDSCH, the indicated TCI state should be based on the activated TCI states in the slot with the scheduled PDSCH. The rule is only used for single slot PDSCH but not for all DL/UL channels/RSs following the indicated Rel-17 TCI state. For example, as the figure below, when a PDSCH is scheduled by a PDCCH after BAT, the indicated TCI state for scheduled PDSCH is based on the activated TCI states by first MAC CE, if the application time of the second MAC CE for TCI state activation is between PDSCH and PUCCH, we think the indicated TCI state for the PUCCH should be based on the activated TCI states by second MAC CE. The 38.214 only specifies ‘the indicated *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIstate* should be applied starting from the first slot that is at least $BeamAppTime\\_r17$ symbols after the last symbol of the PUCCH.’ However, the current rules are not enough to clarify which TCI state is used for DCI based beam indication when there is MAC CE update of active TCI state list.Case 2, for multi-transmission and reception.In current spec, the TCI state determination rule is for multi-slot PDSCH and multi-PDSCH. However, not only for PDSCH, but also for any multi-slot transmission and reception configured for a UE, e.g. PUCCH repetition, PUSCH repetition, multi-slot PUSCH, multiple PUSCHs scheduled by DCI and so on. When the first slot of BAT is a slot in the transmission occasions, it is unclear whether the new indicated TCI state needs to be applied for the transmission occasions after the BAT.If the TCI state of the transmission occasions after the BAT also is based on the TCI state in the first occasion, there may be some issues as follows.- Need to clarify that the BAT is postponed until the last transmission occasion of these DL/UL channels. - During the multiple transmission occasions, the network cannot apply the optimal TCI state to transmit other channels/RSs sharing the indicated TCI state, which will affect the performance of these channels/RSs and limit the scheduling flexibility, especially when the CC list with common TCI state update is configured. - If another channel overlaps with the transmission occasion after the BAT, at this time the UE needs to maintain multiple beams, which is contrary to the purpose of the unified TCI framework and also requires to define new behaviors to clarify the priority of these overlapped channels. According to the analysis mentioned above, it is necessary to be clarified in current spec that the indicated TCI state should be based on the activated TCI states in each slot for single slot transmission and is applied to the transmission occasion after BAT for these channels across multi-slots.**[Mod]: Thank you so much for in-depth analysis. Anyway, we need to make a decision.** |
| NEC | 3-1: We appreciate if proponents of alt4 could kindly clarify the follow question.How could it be possible that NW can configure a TCI state of SRS (say configuration is at time n) being equal to the TCI state indicated afterward (say, indication is at time n’> n)?**[Mod]:** Good comments. Let’s see other companies’ views. |
| LG | Issue 3-1: Based on Mod’s comment in Round 0, we suggest the following for alt 4 to make it more clear asWhen UE is indicated with an SRI corresponding to the UL transmission and UE is configured *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIState*, if the spatial domain transmission filter associated with the indicated SRI is different from the spatial domain transmission filter by the TCI state, the UE applies the UL spatial filter determined from the indicated *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIState***[Mod]:** Already kept in mind. Now, your proposal is updated.Issue 3-4: Concerned. Regarding Alt2, it causes another problem on the determination of precoder for SRS resources if *associatedCSI* is not configured and the SRS resource set is configured with *followUnifiedTCIstate-r17* as ZTE pointed out in Round 0. Alt1 can address the problem when the associated NZP CSI-RS resource follows the indicated TCI state, the precoder of SRS can be aligned with the indicated TCI state for non-codebook based transmission where the UE calculates the precoder based on measurement of an associated NZP CSI-RS resource. |
| ZTE | 3-1: Regarding Alt 4, it is hard to align configured *[TCI-State]s* with *[tci-StateId\_r17]* of the SRS resource(s) with the indicated *[TCI-State],* RRC signaling can not be sent as frequently as MAC CE or DCI. So this is meaningless to specify as the proposal. The gNB has no other choice but to configure SRS resource with CB/NCB to be with *followUnifiedTCIstate.*  We suggest not to specify it, and leave it to implementation.**[Mod]: Okay.**3-4: It is not proper to configure an SRS resource set without *associatedCSI-RS*, especially in FR1, where the spatial relation for UL transmission is not supposed to be present, how the UE determines precoder for SRS resources is not clear in this case. For example, a TRS in the indicated TCI state is not good to deduce percoders. We suggest to postpone the decision after the above issue is addressed.**[Mod]: Okay.** |
| CATT | For issue 3-1, we are also fine with LG’s update.**[Mod]: Okay. Thank you.** |
| Samsung | For **3-4**: We can accept the majority view and go with Alt2 for progress. **[Mod]: Thank you so much for being flexible.** |
| Ericsson | P3.1: We support the FL proposal. Effectively, this means that SRS for CB and NCB always follows the indicated TCI state, which is OK. Not following the indicated TCI state is more important for SRS for BM**[Mod]: Okay. Make sense.**P3.5: Several companies say that Alt1 is the legacy rule. Hopefully, it would be ok to clarify this – these things often come back if they are not captured. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Issue 3-1: We still have a strong concern Alt-4. With Alt 4, it restricts that the beam of SRS resource set indicated by SRI is identical to DL beam (for joint mode) or PUCCH beam (for joint/separate UL mode). However, we still believe that NW should have the flexibility to indicate UE’s UL beam for PUSCH. The dynamic PUSCH beam/precoder indicated by SRI is beneficial especially for the case of UL MU-MIMO scheduling. **[Mod]: Okay. How about LG’s update?**For 3-4, we still have concern on the second paragraph of Alt-2. We would like to ask the proponents the following question: if associated CSI-RS is not configured for NCB SRS resource set, how can it work? How can UE measure the channel?**[Mod]: Okay. Let’s see other companies’ views**For 3-5, we could accept Alt. 1.  |
| Lenovo | 3-1: Support Alt-4.3-2: Support Alt-2.3-10: Support. |
| **Round-2** |
| **Mod****(Round-2)** | **3-1:** Per LG’s input, @all, please review the updated solution. If opponents still stick to their views, we may have no consensus this meeting!**3-3:** It seems that we have super majority support. @proponents, please review Apple’s above comment: how to guarantee the system work well in the case of BWP switching?**3-4:** Thanks so much for Samsung’s being flexible. Please review above ZTE and HW’s replies, and the following HW’s question: if associated CSI-RS is not configured for NCB SRS resource set, how can it work? How can UE measure the channel?**3-5:** @ QC, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT, Nokia, Intel, please review vivo’s above analysis. Either way, we need to make a decision.**3-7:** It seems no objection in this round. Considering that this issue has been discussed for several meetings, let’s try it in the email thread with 3-10. |
| MediaTek | On 3-7, sorry for the late response. We still have concern on it due the corresponding spec effort. |
| Ericsson | On 3.1: we think Alt4 is fine, it essentially means that the only viable option is to configure the SRS resource set with “followUnifiedTCI”. Alt5 is unclear, there are many “indicated” in Alt5. Is the meaning that the UE should ignore its indicated TCI state?**[Mod]: I guess so. At least for PUSCH, the TCI state is applied after the associated SRS transmission, if my understanding is correct.** |
| QC | For 3-1, prefer Alt4. Not sure why gNB wants to configure the new Alt5**[Mod]: Okay, got it.** For 3-3, if the DCI also indicates BWP switch, the BAT is the smallest SCS of all applied BWPs, which is either indicated by the DCI’s BWP field or current active BWPs on other CCs. Our understanding is that NW should ensure the new BWP indicated by the DCI takes effect before the resultant TCI application time. For 3-5, the issues listed by vivo for UL are not clarified even in legacy spec to our understanding, e.g. which activated spatial relation should UE follow if gNB updates the spatial relation in middle of PUCCH slot aggregation. For legacy, our understanding is that those unspecified cases follow the specified case for PDSCH. For R17 unified TCI, the legacy principle for PDSCH can still be applied without changing the spec. In addition, we do not prefer any new behavior different from legacy PDSCH rule, e.g. activated TCI can be updated in the middle of repetitions. **[Mod]: Okay, got it.**  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 3-1: For the sake of progress, we can support alt4.**[Mod]: Okay, thank you.** 3-4: We cannot support the proposal. Still we have to reiterate our earlier comment: if associated CSI-RS is not configured for NCB SRS resource set, how can UE measure the channel?**[Mod]: Okay, got it.** 3-5: For the sake of progress, we can support Alt-1. **[Mod]: Okay, got it.**  |
| **Mod****(V06)** | **3-1/3-3/3-4/3-5: No update** |
| CATT | For issue 3-1, we are fine for either Alt-4 or Alt-5.**[Mod]: Thank you so much.**For issue 3-5, fine with Alt-1 for progress.**[Mod]: Okay.** |
| ZTE | 3-1, We still cannot support Alt4 with the same reason mentioned above in last round. As for Alt5, we don’t see the need to specify like this, seems the current spec is more general and can cover such meaning.**[Mod]: Okay.**3-3A/B: we can live with the Alt2 for the sake of progress.**[Mod]: Okay. Thank you.**3-4: Not support. As stated above, it cannot work. **[Mod]: Okay.** |
| LG | Issue 3-1: For UE configured with joint/UL TCI state, the issue is to clarify the UE behavior when spatial domain transmit filter provided by TCI-State configurations is mismatched with the configured *spatialRelationInfo* for SRS resource indicated by SRI for PUSCH transmission. In this case, the intention of Alt 5 is that the UE applies the UL spatial filter from the UL/joint TCI state. To our understanding, Alt5 is to make it clear. Based on this, we are also open for refining the description on that.**[Mod]: Okay. Make sense!**Issue 3-4: Concerned. We have a same understanding with Huawei/ZTE.**[Mod]: Okay.** |
| vivo | In RAN1 MIMO, the following behaviors are agreed not only for PDSCH.* RAN1 #94, for single slot PDSCH

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**The indicated TCI should be based on the candidate TCI states in the slot with the scheduled PDSCH* Applies for single slot PDSCH
 |

* RAN1 #100b, for AP-SRS

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**When the spatial relation for AP-SRS is updated by MAC-CE and the HARQ/ACK corresponding to the MAC-CE is transmitted in slot n, the updated spatial relation shall be active starting from slot n+3ms.The active spatial relation at the slot of AP SRS transmission is applied for the AP SRS transmission |

* RAN1 #101, for multi-slot PUCCH

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement*** For multi-slot PUCCH, a spatial relation/PL RS is commonly applied across the PUCCH slots, where the spatial relation/PL RS is determined by the first PUCCH slot.
 |

* for multi-slot PDSCH and multi-PDSCH

|  |
| --- |
| For a multi-slot PDSCH or the UE is configured with higher layer parameter [*pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPDSCH-r17*], the indicated TCI state(s) should be based on the activated TCI states in the first slot with the scheduled PDSCH(s), and UE shall expect the activated TCI states are the same across the slots with the scheduled PDSCH(s). |

@QC, the spatial relation of multi-slot PUCCH is defined in 38.213, i.e. the spatial relation is determined by the first PUCCH slot but not each PUCCH slot.From the RAN1 MIMO agreements and conclusion, the specified cases include single slot PDSCH, aperiodic SRS, multi-slot PDSCH, multi-PDSCH, multi-slot PUCCH. For these specified cases in legacy spec, when the unified TCI state is configured, what is the behavior for each case according to your understanding?For unified TCI framework, we think it is necessary to align the understanding for the indicated TCI state determination rule. Maybe companies can share understanding on this issue. We need common understanding on the issues as follows.* Which TCI state is applied for the channel/RS following the indicated TCI state when there is MAC CE update of active TCI state list between beam indication and PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/CSI-RS/SRS transmission and reception.
* Which TCI state is applied for multi-slot transmission and reception, e.g. PUCCH repetition, PUSCH repetition, multi-slot PUSCH, multiple PUSCHs scheduled by DCI, when the first slot of BAT is a slot in the transmission occasions.
* Which TCI state is applied for multi-slot transmission and reception, e.g. PUCCH repetition, PUSCH repetition, multi-slot PUSCH, multiple PUSCHs scheduled by DCI, when there is MAC CE update of active TCI state list in the middle of multiple slots.
* For CA case with common TCI state update, when multi-slot transmission of a specific channel is scheduled on CC1 and a single slot channel is scheduled on CC2, if there is BAT of beam indication DCI or MAC CE update of active TCI state list in the middle of the specific channel on CC1, and if the slot with the CC2 channel is in the multiple slots of the specific channel on CC1, which TCI state is applied for these channels.

**[Mod]: @all, please review above reply from vivo. It is the first time discussion for this issue; regardless of progress this meeting, we do need to think about it and identify a solution soon.** |
| **Mod****(V11)** | **3-1/3-3/3-4/3-5: No update** |
| Ericsson | P3.1: Regarding LGs update, is this a complicated way of saying that the PUSCH always follows the indicated TCI state when a UE is configured with *DLorJointTCIState* or *UL-TCIState?* |
| Samsung | 3.1: Alt 4 or have no TP and leave for network implementation3.3A and 3.3B: Alt 2 |
| Spreadtrum | 3-5: We have the same view that clarification is needed when the indicated/activated TCI state changes during UL/DL scheduling. We support Alt1 for single slot scheduling. For multi slot scheduling, similar discussion happened in R15, and per slot TCI state determination for PSDCH repetition has been proposed but not agreed. So, we prefer to follow R15 rule that the TCI state used for the first repetition is applied to all other repetitions |

### Issue 4 (MP-UE)

Table 7 Summary: issue 4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 4-2 | **Proposal 4-2**: On Rel.17 enhancements to facilitate UE-initiated panel activation and selection, down-select one of the following * ~~Alt-1: Introduce an RRC parameter to provide the indication of enabled UE capability index(es)~~
	+ ~~The bitwidth and interpretation of the capability index reported in beam report should be based on the configured UE capability index(es) instead of UE capability report~~
* ~~Alt-2:~~ The bitwidth of the capability index reported in beam report is fixed to 2-bit.

**FL Note:** Besides for Alt1 from Apple, Alt-2 is based on E///, SS and OPPO’s suggestion in the preparation phase. | **~~Alt-1~~**~~: MTK, QC, Apple, ZTE, NTT DOCOMO, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT, Nokia, Lenovo~~**Alt-2:** OPPO, Ericsson, Intel |

Table 8 Additional inputs: issue 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **No doubt that we need to make a conclusion on this issue. Although it may be relevant to optimization, but it is simple/straightforward as mentioned by several companies in first round.** **Can we go with majority views? Could opponent companies double check it. Highly appreciated.** |
| Ericsson | I have pinged my RAN2 colleagues but not got a response yet. However, it should be clear that the bar for new RRC parameters is very high. Since people seem to agree that Alt-1 is an optimization, we should not bother RAN2 this late in Rel-17 and go with Alt2. |
| **Round-2** |
| **Mod****(Round-2)** | **No update. BTW, in 1-7, 2-2B, we have the same requirement for new RRC parameters. Do understand preference from companies’ views. Can we have all of them for progress?** |
| Ericsson | Any RRC update should solve a critical problem. We should apply the same principle for P1.7, P2.2, and P4.2: no new RRC parameter. RAN1 is in maintenance, and we should not even consider optimizations. |
| **Mod****(V06)** | **Considering above situation, we have to go with Alt-2.**  |
| ZTE | We can live with Alt 2.**[Mod]: Thank you for being flexible.** |
| **Mod****(V11)** | **No update.**  |
| Samsung | Bit width should be 2 for 4 port UE and 1 for 2 port UE. Therefore, Alt2 is fine for 4 port UE. But for 2-port UE it should be 1 bit. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt2 is OK. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Issue 5 (MPE)

None.
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