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# Introduction

In RAN#94e, the Rel-18 WID of MIMO evolution for downlink and uplink is approved [1]. In the approved WID, extension of unified TCI framework is a part of the RAN1 objectives, and the detailed scope of this agenda item (Item 1A) includes the following highlighted objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1:**1. …
2. Specify extension of Rel-17 Unified TCI framework for indication of multiple DL and UL TCI states focusing on multi-TRP use case, using Rel-17 unified TCI framework.
3. …
4. …
5. …
6. Study, and if needed, specify the following items to facilitate simultaneous multi-panel UL transmission for higher UL throughput/reliability, focusing on FR2 and multi-TRP, assuming up to 2 TRPs and up to 2 panels, targeting CPE/FWA/vehicle/industrial devices (if applicable)
	* UL precoding indication for PUSCH, where no new codebook is introduced for multi-panel simultaneous transmission
		+ The total number of layers is up to four across all panels and total number of codewords is up to two across all panels, considering single DCI and multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation.
	* UL beam indication for PUCCH/PUSCH, where unified TCI framework extension in objective 2 is assumed, considering single DCI and multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation
		+ For the case of multi-DCI based multi-TRP operation, only PUSCH+PUSCH, or PUCCH+PUCCH is transmitted across two panels in a same CC.
7. Study, and if justified, specify the following
	* Two TAs for UL multi-DCI for multi-TRP operation
	* Power control for UL single DCI for multi-TRP operation where unified TCI framework extension in objective 2 is assumed.

For the case of simultaneous UL transmission from multiple panels, the operation will only be limited to the objective 6 scenarios. |

Based on the contributions from companies [2]-[31], the followings are provided in this document:

* Summary of companies’ views on each of open issues raised by interested companies
* Observation and recommended proposal based on the summary of companies’ views

**Round 1 is intended to prepare the group for the GTW session on Thursday May 12th 03:00 UTC. Please share your inputs by Wednesday May 11th 23:59 UTC.**

# Issue 1 – Extension of Unified TCI Framework

Open issues on unified TCI framework extension and company views are summarized below.

Table 1 Summary for Issue 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **FL note/observation** |
| 1.1 | All the MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16/17 are considered/applicable by extension of unified TCI framework, including the followings:* Rel-16 M-DCI based MTRP
* Rel-16 S-DCI based SDM scheme for PDSCH
* Rel-16 S-DCI based PDSCH repetition schemes with FDM and TDM
* Rel-17 S-DCI based PUSCH repetition scheme with TDM
* Rel-17 S-DCI based PDCCH repetition scheme
* Rel-17 S-DCI based PUCCH repetition scheme with TDM
* Rel-17 PDCCH-SFN and PDSCH-SFN
 | Support: Ericsson, Samsung, Docomo, vivo, Qualcomm, ZTE, MTK, CATT, NEC, Lenovo, Intel, Huawei, Nokia, InterDigital, FGI, OPPO, Fujitsu, LG, AT&TConcern: Apple (Clarification for R16 mDCI, does it include PDSCH only or not? ) | Given the majority view on this issue, Proposal 1.A is recommended accordingly.Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) for simultaneous UL transmission can be further discussed once it is agreed |
| 1.2 | Rel-17 inter-cell MTRP is considered/applicable by extension of unified TCI framework | Support: Docomo, MTK, CATT, NEC, Lenovo, Ericsson, Huawei, Apple, Nokia, InterDigital, FGI, Fujitsu, LG, IntelConcern: | Rel-17 inter-cell MTRP is also captured in Proposal 1.A since it is also one of Rel-17 MTRP schemes, even it was not mentioned by many contributions. |
| 1.3 | Max number of indicated joint TCI states (M1) for joint DL/UL TCI update Max number of indicated DL TCI states (M2) for separate DL/UL TCI updateMax number of indicated UL TCI states (N2) for separate DL/UL TCI update  | Atl1: M1 = 2, M2 = 2, N2 = 2* Support: Samsung, Docomo, OPPO, Apple, Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia, ZTE, MTK, InterDigital, CATT, Spreadtrum, Sony, LGE, ITRI, TransHold, Fraunhofer, Fujitsu, Huawei, FGI, AT&T

Atl2: M1 > 2, M2 > 2, N2 > 2* Support: Ericsson (up to 4 indicated joint, DL, and/or UL TCI states)
 | From moderator’s observation, {M1, M2, N2} = {2, 2, 2} is sufficient to support MTRP operation, which is the use case that should be focused on according to the WID. Another potential use case (separate control and data beams) has been proposed in one contribution, however, {M1, M2, N2} = {2, 2, 2} doesn't prevent that use case. {M1, M2, N2} = {2, 2, 2} is incapable only when both use cases work at the same time (i.e., MTRP + separate control and data beams per TRP-link), but whether such direction is still within the scope defined in the WID is doubtful. Since these max numbers could impact the later designs a lot, moderator suggests concluding them as early as possible. Given the majority view, Proposal 1.B is recommended.How to configure/ determine the exact number of indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states can be further discussed |
| 1.4 | The multiple indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation (analogous to Rel-17 procedure) | Support: Ericsson, Samsung, Docomo, OPPO, ZTE, vivo, Apple, Qualcomm, MTK, InterDigital, CATT, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, Sony, Xiaomi, LGE, Lenovo, CMCC, TransHold, Fraunhofer, Fujitsu, Nokia (s-DCI mode), FGI, AT&T, Intel Concern:  | Given the majority view on this issue, Proposal 1.B is recommended accordingly.Details of TCI state update and activation are discussed in the following sub-issues |
| 1.5 | Individual TCI update mode (joint or separate DL/UL TCI update) for each TRP, i.e., one TRP with joint DL/UL TCI update and another with separate DL/UL TCI update | Support: Nokia (m-DCI mode), Qualcomm, , CATT, Sony, Xiaomi, ITRI, FGI, ZTE, IntelConcern: Apple (no use case), OPPO |  |
| **Note: On definition of “unified TCI” in this table, for joint DL/UL TCI update, one “unified TCI” comprises one indicated joint TCI state. For separate DL/UL TCI update, one “unified TCI” comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state.** |
| 1.6 | TCI state update for S-DCI based MTRP | Use existing (single) TCI field in DCI to update all **unified TCIs**: * Support: Ericsson, Samsung (DCI w/ DLA), Docomo, OPPO (DCI w/ DLA), Apple, Qualcomm, Intel, ZTE, vivo, InterDigital, CATT, TransHold, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, Sony, CEWiT, MTK, Nokia, Fujitsu, LG, AT&T
* Concern:

More than one TCI fields in DCI w/o DLA and each TCI field can update one respective **unified TCI**: * Support: Samsung, OPPO, FGI, LG
* Concern: Apple (DCI overhead), Intel
 | Given the majority view on this issue, Proposal 1.C is recommended accordingly.How to activate TCI states for the multiple unified TCIs can be discussed after the update scheme is sufficiently matureIf single TCI field in DCI is agreed, whether to increase the max number of codepoints/bits can be further discussedIf single TCI field in DCI is agreed, whether the switching between S-TRP and M-TRP is determined from the number of TCI states associated with the indicated codepoint can be further discussed |
| 1.7 | TCI state update for M-DCI based MTRP | Alt1: Use existing (single) TCI field in DCI associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to update the **unified TCI** respective to the *CORESETPoolIndex* value* Support: Samsung, Nokia, Docomo, Qualcomm, Intel, ZTE, vivo, MTK, Xiaomi. LGE, Fraunhofer, FGI, OPPO, Fujitsu, TransHold
* Concern: Apple (does it support cross-TRP beam indication?), Ericsson

Alt2: Use existing (single) TCI field DCI associated with one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values to update the **unified TCIs** respective to both *CORESETPoolIndex* values* Support: Apple, Xiaomi
* Concern: Docomo (not good in non-ideal backhaul), Ericsson, InterDigital, Intel
 | How to activate TCI states for the multiple unified TCIs can be discussed after the update scheme is sufficiently mature |
| 1.8 | DCI format for updating the **unified TCIs** | Alt1: Reuse the same DCI formats as in Rel-17 (i.e., DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DLA), and no additional DCI format is introduced* Support: ZTE, vivo, CATT, Apple, OPPO Docomo, Nokia, Ericsson, Fujitsu, LG
* Concern:

Atl2: In addition to the DCI formats used in Rel-17, introduce DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 for updating at least the indicated UL TCI states: * Support: Xiaomi, Intel, FGI, LG
* Concern: Docomo, Ericsson, Spreadtrum
 |  |
| 1.9 | RRC-configured TCI state lists  | Alt1: Reuse Rel-17 design (i.e., one TCI state list for joint/DL TCI states and one TCI state list for UL TCI states)* Support: Ericsson, MTK, Docomo (if the max # of configured TCI states is not increased for MTRP), Nokia, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi, OPPO, Fujitsu, Intel
* Concern: Apple (not good for TCI pool sharing for CCs with different sTRP/mTRP operation)

Atl2: TRP-specific TCI state list(s)* Support: ZTE, Apple, vivo (if individual TCI update mode is allowed for each TRP), Docomo (if the max # of configured TCI states is increased for MTRP), FGI
* Concern: Ericsson
 | Whether to increase the max number of configured joint/DL/UL TCI states can be discussed together with this sub-issue |
| 1.10 | Introduction of TRP-ID associated with or included in each TCI state | Support: CMCC, Spreadtrum, ZTE (still case-by-case)Concern: Ericsson, MTK, Apple, Docomo, Nokia, CATT, OPPO, LG, Intel |  |
| 1.11 | Applying/mapping the **unified TCIs** to target channel/signals for S-DCI based MTRP | To inform to the UE at least which **unified TCI(s)** (or which TRP(s)) is mapped to the corresponding channel/signal, an indicator is introduced:* Per CORESET or per search space set: Ericsson, Xiaomi, ZTE, vivo, CATT, Nokia, MTK, Qualcomm, Samsung, Apple (CORESET), Docomo, FGI, OPPO (per CORESET), Fujitsu, LG, Intel (CORESET)
* Per DCI with DL assignment for the scheduled/activated PDSCH: ZTE, vivo, MTK, Qualcomm, CATT, FGI, Fujitsu, LG
* Per TDRA codepoint for scheduled/activated PDSCH/PUSCH: Apple
* Per DCI with UL grant for the scheduled/activated PUSCH: vivo (reinterpret the SRS resource set indicator), Qualcomm, MTK, Xiaomi(reinterpret the SRS resource set indicator), Fujitsu, LG
* Per dedicated PUCCH resource: Ericsson, ZTE, CATT (MAC-CE update), Nokia, MTK, Apple, Docomo, Xiaomi, LG
* Per [P/SP] CSI-RS resource or resource set: Ericsson, ZTE, vivo, MTK, Apple (set), Docomo, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi, LG
* Per [P/SP] SRS resource set: Ericsson, OPPO, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, MTK, Apple (set) , Docomo, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi, LG
* Per DCI with CSI request for the triggered AP CSI-RS: vivo
* Per DCI with SRS request for the triggered AP SRS: vivo
* Per Type-1 CG configuration: Nokia, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi
 | If more than one unified TCIs are mapped to a target channel, how to map the unified TCIs to each of repetition occasions (or CDM groups) of the target channel can be further discussed. |
| 1.12 | Applying/mapping the **unified TCIs** to target channels/signals for M-DCI based MTRP | Unified schemes for both S-DCI and M-DCI to apply/map the **unified TCIs** to target channels/signals* Support: Ericsson, Docomo
* Concern: Nokia, Huawei

The **unified TCI** respective to one of *CORESETPoolIndex* values applies to:* PDCCH on the CORESET(s) configured/associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value (as in Rel-17): ZTE, Qualcomm, Nokia, vivo, Samsung, MTK, LGE, Xiaomi, Apple, Docomo, Fraunhofer, OPPO, Fujitsu, TransHold, Intel
* PDSCH/PUSCH scheduled/activated by the DCI associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value: ZTE, Xiaomi, MTK, vivo, Qualcomm, Samsung, Apple, Fraunhofer, Fujitsu, TransHold, Intel
* PUCCH with HARQ-ACK corresponding to the DCI associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value: Nokia, vivo, Qualcomm, Apple, Fraunhofer, TransHold
* AP CSI-RS triggered by the DCI associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value: ZTE, Xiaomi, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, Qualcomm, Apple, OPPO
* AP SRS triggered by the DCI associated with the *CORESETPoolIndex* value: ZTE, Xiaomi, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, Qualcomm, Apple

For channels/signals that don't have explicit/implicit association with a *CORESETPoolIndex* value:* Introduce an indicator (reuse *CORESETPoolIndex* or a new one) to indicate at least which **unified TCI** (or which TRP) is associated with the corresponding channel/signal: Nokia, Apple, vivo, Fraunhofer, ZTE, MTK, Xiaomi, Docomo, FGI, LG
 | Whether an explicit association between a unified TCI and an *CORESETPoolIndex* value is needed may depend on the result of sub-issue 1.7, thus can be discussed later. |

## Proposal 1.A: On unified TCI framework extension, consider at least all the MTPR schemes specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17 as follows:

* Rel-16 M-DCI based MTRP schemes for PDSCH
* Rel-16 S-DCI based PDSCH SDM scheme
* Rel-16 S-DCI based PDSCH FDM and TDM schemes
* Rel-17 S-DCI based PUSCH TDM schemes
* Rel-17 S-DCI based PDCCH repetition scheme
* Rel-17 S-DCI based PUCCH TDM schemes
* Rel-17 PDCCH-SFN and PDSCH-SFN
* Rel-17 inter-cell MTRP based on M-DCI based MTRP schemes for PDSCH
* FFS: Consider, if STxMP is supported, Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP

## Proposal 1.B-2: On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 4 indicated TCI states in a CC/BWP at least for MTRP operation

* The indicated TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* The UE can be configured/provided with one of the following combinations for DL and/or UL MTRP operations in a CC/BWP:
	+ - 2 indicated joint TCI states
		- 2 pairs of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states + 1 indicated UL TCI state
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated UL TCI state
	+ FFS: How to configure/determine one of above combinations for a CC/BWP
	+ FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP
	+ FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP
	+ FFS: How to map/apply one or more indicated TCI states to a target channel/signal

## Proposal 1.C: On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update all indicated TCI states for single-DCI based MTRP

* FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint for updating all or subset of indicated TCI states, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI states that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint for updating all or subset of indicated TCI states
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits
* Note: This doesn't imply that support of one additional TCI field is precluded

Table 2 Additional inputs for Issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **1) Please check and update your views in Table 1** **2) Share your inputs on the above moderator proposals** |
| QC | For Proposal 1.A, supportFor Proposal 1.B, suggest to add “set”, since each set can include a pair of DL and UL TCIs. Otherwise, it will cause ambiguity in future. Also, each set conceptually corresponds to one TRP. **Proposal 1.B:** On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 2 unified TCI~~s~~ sets in a CC at least for MTRP operation* A unified TCI set for joint DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated joint TCI state that is updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* A unified TCI set for sperate DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state that is/are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the unified TCIs for S-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the unified TCIs for M-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Whether individual TCI update mode (joint or separate DL/UL TCI update) can be supported for each unified TCI set (i.e., one unified TCI set comprises one indicated joint TCI state, and another comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state)

For Proposal 1.C, same comment as for Proposal 1.B**Proposal 1.C**: On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update both unified TCI sets at least for single-DCI based MTRP* FFS: How to map joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint for both unified TCI sets
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field codepoints/bits, i.e., more than 8 codepoints/3 bits

[Mod] Thanks for the suggestion. Captured! |
| Apple | Proposal 1.A: We suggest we clarify whether R16 mDCI only includes PDSCH?[Mod] Rel-16 M-DCI supports individual scheduling for each of MTRP. Thus, Rel-16 M-DCI should include PUSCH as well, but just doesn’t support overlapped PUSCH transmissions in time and frequency. The 1st sub-bullet is revised to clarify accordingly, please check whether this is your understanding.Proposal 1.B: Suggest the following revision, since UE may support mTRP operation for a particular channel instead of all channels.**Proposal 1.B:** On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 2 unified TCIs in a CC for the channel(s) configured with MTRP operation* A unified TCI for joint DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated joint TCI state that is updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* A unified TCI for sperate DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state that is/are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the unified TCIs for S-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the unified TCIs for M-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Whether individual TCI update mode (joint or separate DL/UL TCI update) can be supported for each unified TCI (i.e., one unified TCI comprises one indicated joint TCI state, and another comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state)

[Mod] True, but current proposal doesn't mention which channel/signal should apply the unified TCI(s), that can be the next level discussion in sub-issues 1.11 and 1.12. One FFS is added to clarify the target channel/signal of the supported unified TCI(s) need to be further discussed.Proposal 1.C: OK with QC’s revision |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.A**: we are fine with the proposal in principle. We do not support “new” MTRP schemes – for unified TCI framework extension in Rel-18 – in addition to those specified in Rel-16/17. We therefore propose to delete “at least” in the main sentence of this proposal – also given that assuming unified TCI framework for STxMP beam indication has already been captured in the WID.[Mod] Understood. Then, I would suggest leaving the discussion on whether to consider MTRP schemes introduced in Rel-18 (if specified) later. An FFS is added accordingly, please check.**Proposal 1.B**: our understanding of the first and second bullets is to define (i) TCI state types applicable for a unified TCI, i.e., a joint TCI state or a pair of separate DL and UL TCI states – same as in Rel-17, and (ii) a generic signaling medium/flow, i.e., MAC CE+DCI analogous to Rel-17, that will be used to indicate/update the 2 unified TCIs (issue #1.4 in Table 1). The first and second bullets, however, may also imply that when the 2 unified TCIs are simultaneously indicated: (1) the 2 unified TCIs can correspond to different TCI state types, e.g., one unified TCI can indicate a joint TCI state, and the other unified TCI can indicate a separate UL TCI state, and (2) signaling medium(s)/flow for updating only one of the 2 unified TCIs has been specified. A note, clarifying that the above (1) and (2) are not implied by the first and second bullets, is needed (and enough). But we are OK to discuss these issues later.[Mod] Correct understanding! On your 1st issue, it is still an open issue captured in the third FFS and sub-issue 1.5 will be further discussed and decided. On your 2nd issue, this proposal doesn't mean that the two unified TCIs are updated individually. As mentioned by the 1st and 2nd FFS, details on how to update is still open.**Proposal 1.C**: We are fine to use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DLA to indicate/update the two TCIs. Regarding the second FFS, from our understanding, increasing the number of TCI states hypotheses does not necessarily result in increasing the number of codepoints of the existing TCI field. Hence, we suggest to also (first) study whether the number of MAC CE activated TCI state codepoints should be increased (i.e., more than 8). We prefer not to increase the DCI payload w.r.t. Rel-17 and a common design for both with and without DLA. **Proposal 1.C**: On unified TCI framework extension to MTRP operation, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update both unified TCIs for single-DCI based MTRP* FFS: How to map joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint for both unified TCIs
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI state codepoints, i.e., more than 8
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field codepoints/bits, i.e., more than 8 codepoints/3 bits

[Mod] It is okay to separate increasing # of codepoints and # of bits of field into two FFS. |
| Docomo | Proposal 1.A: Support. Re Samsung’s comment (removing “at least”), we believe Rel.18 beam indication should also use in unified TCI state (We are open which AI will handle it). In Rel.17, it is not possible to configure both UE features#1 using Rel.17 unified TCI framework and UE features#2 using Rel.15/16 TCI in the same band. We want to avoid this issue happens in Rel.18 again. Hence, all Rel.18 beam indication should use Rel.17 unified TCI framework.Proposal 1.B: Support (including QC’s update).Re Apple’s comment, even if UE supports M-TRP operation for a particular channel (e.g. PDSCH), the “indicated TCI states” should be 2, otherwise, it is not possible to indicate 2 TCIs for the particular channel. For other channels which does not support M-TRP operation, one of the two indicated TCI state can be applied.Proposal 1.C: Support. We don’t clearly understand the difference between 2nd FFS and 3rd FFS, even if we see Samsung’s comment, but we can live with it. |
| Nokia | P1.A: okP1.B: okP1.C: ok with main bullet. first sub-bullet is not needed to our reading[Mod] Agree with you that how to map should be clear (by MAC-CE activation). However, there are still some details need to be discussed, e.g., the possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI states that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint. Change the wording a bit, please check. |
| NEC | **Proposal 1.A:** support**Issue#1.3 in Table 1:** Starting from Rel-17 spec, we only have *DLorJointTCIState* and *UL-TCIState*, so it seems that we don’t need M1/M2 differentiation.**Proposal 1.B:** It seems that current formulation precludes the case M ≠ N. Based on QC’s revision, we suggest to add the following change - **Proposal 1.B:** On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 2 unified TCIs or 2 unified TCI~~s~~ sets in a CC at least for MTRP operation[Mod] According to current wording “a unified TCI set for separate DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state”. So, it doesn't preclude the possibility that one unified TCI set comprises both indicated DL and UL TCI states and another set comprises only one indicated DL TCI state or UL TCI state, i.e., M≠N. A note is added to clarify, please check.**Proposal 1.C:** one TCI field in DCI is very limited and cannot handle the case of updating beam(s) for only one of TRPs in a flexible way, we suggest to add FFS on increasing additional TCI field in DCI.- FFS: Whether to add an additional TCI field[Mod] Proposal 1.C doesn't preclude TCI update for only one of the TRPs. Please check the FFS, this detail can be further discussed. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1.A: We are essentially OK, but we prefer to remove “at least”. We note that the WID says “multiple DL and UL TCI states”, so it is not limited to mTRP. We should aim for a solution that works also for sTRPWe are also a little concerned to directly dive into mTRP schemes. The strength of the unified TCI scheme in R17 is that it is very lean and streamlined. Starting with a list could lead to that we start looking into special solutions for all the individual schemes, and this may lead to that a lot of the benefits of the unified TCI are lost. Needless to say, the solutions in for mTRP schemes currently specified are very diverse, and it would be very beneficial to align them.Proposal 1.B: We would not be OK to introduce the term “TCI state set” – it would just be confusing to have a term that almost means TRP. The benefit is also unclear. The fact remains that we need to indicate 4 TCI states to the UE. If there needs to be a restriction on what types are signalled, that can be added. Also, in Rel-17, we talk about indicated TCI states. We think it is useful to stick with that formulation. “unified TCI” was used as a slogan in Rel-17, but the definition was always a bit unclear.We propose the following formulation:**Proposal 1.B:** On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 4 indicated TCIs in a CC at least for MTRP operation* The TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or indicated by DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* The UE can be provided with
	+ 2 joint TCI states
	+ 1 joint TCI state, 1 DL TCI state and one UL TCI state
	+ 2 DL TCI states and 2 UL TCI states
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Whether individual TCI update mode (joint or separate DL/UL TCI update) can be supported for each indicated TCI
* FFS: What/how channel(s)/signal(s) applies the unified TCI set(s)

[Mod] Proposal 1.B-2 is added accordingly, with some modifications.**Proposal 1.C**: On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update all indicated TCI states at least for single-DCI based MTRP* FFS: How to map joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits

For issue 1.5, we think this is unnecessary, and complicates the interpretation of the DCI field. It may also increase the risk for errors.Issue 1.6: difficult to motivate additional TCI field: better to increase the size of the single field in that caseIssue 1.7: We are concerned in rushing ahead to design a separate solution for mDCI: the sDCI scheme should work fine. We propose to delay the design of a dedicated mDCI scheme before the sDCI (and sTRP) scheme is designed.Issue 1.8, Alt2: This is not an extension of the Rel-17 unified TCI framework to handle multiple TCI states, and is hence out of scope. |
| Lenovo | Proposal 1.A: In general we support this proposal. We have the following suggestion: * The scope shall include R18 MTRP simultaneous UL multi-panel transmission.
* R16 MDCI MTRP only supports PDSCH, so PUSCH shall be removed from the first bullet.

[Mod] PUSCH is removed from Rel-16 M-DCI now.Proposal 1.B: We want to clarify that the “2 unified TCI sets in a CC” refers to the indicated/signaled TCI activated/indicated by MAC-CE/DCI, not the total number of TCI sets that can be activated by MAC-CE or configured in RRC. Is this understanding correct?[Mod] Correct understanding. Proposal 1.C: We are OK with it, but the 2nd and 3rd FFS are basically the same and one of them can be removed. [Mod] Please check comment from Samsung 2. If my understanding to Samsung’s comment is correct, at least some of unused DCI fields in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 w/o DLA can be reused/reinterpreted to support more TCI codepoints, even w/o increasing the number of bits of the existing TCI field. |
| vivo | **Proposal 1.A:** We are fine with the updated proposal in general. For the third sub-bullet, “Rel-16 S-DCI based PDSCH repetition schemes with FDM” doesn’t include the FDM scheme A in our view, because it is not a kind of repetition. Thus, we suggest change it as follows:* Rel-16 S-DCI based PDSCH FDM scheme A and repetition schemes with FDM scheme B and TDM

[Mod] Yes. Some modifications to avoid missing out.**Proposal 1.B:** Suggest remove “at least” as we are only study on MTRP operation in WID.On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 2 unified TCI sets in a CC ~~at least~~ for MTRP operation**Proposal 1.C:** We have two comments:1. Update two TCI sets should only work for single-DCI based MTRP, suggest remove “at least”2. Does the proposal cover the case that only one TCI set of a TRP is to be updated while the TCI set for the other TRP is maintained? To cover this case, we suggest modify the main bullet as follows:On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update one or both unified TCI sets in a pair of unified TCI sets indicated by the TCI field codepoint ~~at least~~ for single-DCI based MTRP [Mod] Yes, could be possible, and the 1st FFS in this proposal is intended for this. The detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint for all or subset of indicated TCI states need to be further discussed. |
| InterDigital | We provided our views in the above table.**Proposal 1.A:** OKBut, Proposals 1.B & 1.C should be revised, as follows, by removing “set” wording here, since it’s rather confusing to restrict always ‘set’-level simultaneous unified TCI updates unintentionally. But, only one of the unified TCI (from one TRP) may need to be updated separately in time, e.g., for MDCI case. So, it seems risky and premature to always say based on a set-wise description. Further, current Modified P1.A says “support up to 2 unified TCI sets in a CC” which unintentionally sounds unclear in that: in total 4 unified TCIs? which can be indicated or configured?.Therefore, the following modification is suggested, which seems the FL’s original intension, and we can discuss here based on that “a unified TCI” is what is indicated by a DCI out of up to two unified TCIs (which can be simultaneously indicated by one TCI-codepoint of the DCI for MTRP).**Proposal 1.B:** On unified TCI framework extension, support indication of up to 2 unified TCIs simultaneously in a CC at least for MTRP operation* A unified TCI by the indication for joint DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated joint TCI state that is updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* A unified TCI by the indication for separate DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state that is/are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the unified TCI for S-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the unified TCI for M-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Whether individual TCI update mode (joint or separate DL/UL TCI update) can be supported for each unified TCI by the indication (i.e., one unified TCI comprises one indicated joint TCI state, and another comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state)
* FFS: What/how channel(s)/signal(s) applies the unified TCI

**Proposal 1.C**: On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update both unified TCIs at least for single-DCI based MTRP* FFS: How to map joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint for both unified TCIs
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits

[Mod] Decision on how many TCI states can be indicated by DCI for TCI update is not the intension of Proposal 1.B, which is the next level detail and now captured by the 1st FFS of the updated Proposal 1.C. In Rel-17, one indicated DL TCI state and one indicated UL TCI state are introduced for separate DL/UL TCI update, but it doesn't mean DCI always has to indicate both DL and UL TCI states. Similarly, Proposal 1.B only intends to decide how many indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states can be supported for MTRP operation.  |
| FGI | **Proposal 1.A:** It seems that mDCI based MTRP scheme for PUSCH hasn’t been supported neither in Rel-16 or Rel-17, so we suggest that we change the sentence to ‘On unified TCI framework extension, consider ~~at least~~ all the potential MTPR schemes ~~specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17~~ as follows.’ [Mod] PUSCH is removed from Rel-16 M-DCI now.**Proposal 1.B:** We suggest that we consider this issue as one of FFS:* FFS: What/how channel(s)/signal(s) applies the unified TCI set(s)and whether different channel(s)/signal(s) could individually apply different number of unified TCI sets

For example, is it possible to apply two unified TCI sets to PDCCH and apply single unified TCI set to PDSCH? [Mod] Yes, this need to be further discussed. This is the reason “(s)” is put after the unified TCI set.**Proposal 1.C:** We don’t need to preclude the possibility that adding one TCI field in current stage, and thus it would be better to capture a FFS regarding whether to support additional TCI field in this proposal.[Mod] Current proposal doesn't preclude the possibility now. |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 1.A:** Support. Our view is similar to Docomo that the extension of Rel-17 unified TCI framework should be applied to all the Rel-16/17/18 (if supported) MTRP schemes to streamline the operation of beam indication/updating.**Proposal 1.B:** We are in general ok with the proposal. **Proposal 1.C:** We are in general ok with the proposal. We share the same view as Lenovo that the second and the third FFS are basically the same and one of them can be removed.[Mod] Please check comment from Samsung 2. If my understanding to Samsung’s comment is correct, at least some of unused DCI fields in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 w/o DLA can be reused/reinterpreted to support more TCI codepoints, even w/o increasing the number of bits for the existing TCI field. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI | Proposal 1.A: Support the proposal. Proposal 1.B: Just a clarification regarding ‘up to 2 unified sets’ in the case of separate DL/UL TCI indication. The second sub-bullet states “A unified TCI set for separate DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state.” Does this mean that the indication of 1 DL TCI-state and 2 UL TCI-states, or 2 DL TCI-states and 1 UL TCI-state is possible?[Mod] According to current wording “a unified TCI set for separate DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state”. So, your examples are possible. A note is added to clarify, please check.Proposal 1.C: SupportIssue 1.5: Tend to agree with Apple that no applicable use-case exists.Issue 1.7: Ok to discuss both alternatives, but slightly prefer Alt. 1Issue 1.9: Prefer Alt. 1 for simplicity.Issue 1.10: The index is better associated with channels instead of TCI-states. So, don’t support. Issue 1.11 and 1.12: Updated our preferences  |
| Mod V1 | **Please also check Proposal 1.B-2 as an alternative of Proposal 1.B according to Ericsson’s suggestion and share your inputs** |
| CATT | Proposal 1.A: SupportProposal 1.B: Support. Regarding Proposal 1.B-2, we’d like to know why the following combinations are listed as FFS:* + - FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated UL TCI state

[Mod] The 3 combinations are also FFS in Proposal 1.B, according to the 3rd FFS in that proposal. According to the input to sub-issue 1.5, some companies still have concern, thus we will further discuss later.To our understanding, above cases are included in Proposal 1.B.Proposal 1.C Support in principle. We have similar view as DCM that the different between the last two FFS are not quite clear.[Mod] Please check comment from Samsung 2. If my understanding to Samsung’s comment is correct, at least some of unused DCI fields in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 w/o DLA can be reused/reinterpreted to support more TCI codepoints, even w/o increasing the number of bits for the existing TCI field.Regarding Issue 1.10, we also have concern on it. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1.A: support Proposal 1.B/1.B-2: support. For 1.B-2, we support the following three combinations noted as FFS, since each TRP should be configured joint TCI state and separate TCI state independently because of different MPE or interference.* + - FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated UL TCI state

Proposal 1.C: what does “for all or subset of indicated TCI states” mean? What is the use case for “subset of indicated TCI states”?[Mod] It means some codepoints may be used to update TCI states for all indicated TCI states, but some codepoints may be used to update TCI states for a subset of indicated TCI states. We will further discuss whether this is allowed.For 1.9, prefer Alt 1For 1.11, add our view in the table |
| Samsung2 | Regarding the last two FFSs of Proposal 1.C: increasing the number of MAC CE activated codepoints does not necessarily mean that we need to increase the number of ‘TCI’ field bits. Other existing (reserved) DCI fields can be repurposed to indicate additional TCI states/TCI state set – to keep the same DCI payload size.  |
| OPPO | We add some of our preference on issues which were not clearly captured in our Tdoc. Sorry for being unclear and hope that’s not too late. Next, we present our view on each FL proposal. Thank you for taking care our views. [Mod] It's never too late 😊 Thanks for your update**Proposal 1.A**: we are totally fine with extending unified TCI states to Rel.16/17 MTRP schemes. Regarding the second last bullet, we are wondering whether it would be better to clearly state the exact transmission scheme as others. If we understand it correctly, they are M-DCI MTRP schemes for PDSCH and PUSCH with different PCIs for TRPs.Regarding the last bullet, we think the situation for STxMP was discussed in the 1st GTW session. In our reading, since the term “further consider” and “if supported” are down there, it seems redundant to use “FFS” in front of the bullet again. * Rel-17 inter-cell MTRP (M-DCI based MTRP schemes for PDSCH)
* Further consider, if supported, Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with simultaneous UL transmission across multi-panel

[Mod] Since at least one company has concern to consider Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s), even STxMP is supported. Thus, whether to consider it in extension of unified TCI will be further discussed once STxMP is agreed. **Proposal 1.B**: we think it’s reasonable. One tiny comment on the main bullet would be as follow, since either DL(Joint) TCI states or UL TCI states are configured on a BWP basis in Rel.17. On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 2 unified TCI states in a CC/BWP at least for MTRP operation[Mod] Captured!**Proposal 1.B-2:** supportive.**Proposal 1.C**: we are fine with reusing existing TCI field in DL DCI for S-DCI MTRP. We are just confused a little on the last two FFSs. The MAC CE activated TCI state codepoints and TCI field bits in DCI are highly correlated in our view, e.g. 8 codepoints correspond to 3 bits. Hope this could be clarified more. Thank you in advance. [Mod] Please check comment from Samsung 2. If my understanding to Samsung’s comment is correct, at least some of unused DCI fields in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 w/o DLA can be reused/reinterpreted to support more TCI codepoints, even w/o increasing the number of bits for the existing TCI field. |
| ZTE | Proposal 1.A: Support the updated version.Proposal 1.B: We suggest we should clarify S-DCI based MTRP with high priority. For the first note, we think that the controversial part is just relevant to indicated TCI state(s), right? Otherwise, confusion may be caused in subsequent discussions. Then, just for clarification, for some case as in HST, more than one TCI state sets may be applied to a single channel.**Proposal 1.B:** On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 2 unified TCI sets in a CC for MTRP operation* A unified TCI set for joint DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated joint TCI state that is updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* A unified TCI set for separate DL/UL TCI update comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state that is/are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* Note: This doesn't imply that the total numbers of indicated DL and UL TCI states in the updated MAC-CE or DCI must be the same
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the unified TCI sets for S-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Details of update and activation for the unified TCI sets for M-DCI based MTRP
* FFS: Whether individual TCI update mode (joint or separate DL/UL TCI update) can be supported for each unified TCI set (i.e., one unified TCI set comprises one indicated joint TCI state, and another comprises one indicated DL TCI state and/or one indicated UL TCI state)
* FFS: How to map/apply one or more of the unified TCI set(s) to a target channel/signal

[Mod] Decision on how many TCI states can be indicated by DCI for TCI update is not the intension of Proposal 1.B, which is the next level detail and now captured by the 1st FFS of the updated Proposal 1.C. In Rel-17, one indicated DL TCI state and one indicated UL TCI state are introduced for separate DL/UL TCI update, but it doesn't mean DCI always has to indicate both DL and UL TCI states. Similarly, Proposal 1.B only intends to decide how many indicated joint/DL/UL TCI states can be supported for MTRP operation. On the suggestion to the last FFS, captured! Proposal 1.B-2: Thank you for further update. Then in our views, the following mode may be distinguished in RRC level firstly. For instance, joint or DL/UL indication can be configured by RRC as what we did in Rel-17. Then, individual update for one TRP should be supported. **Proposal 1.B-2:** On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 4 indicated TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation* The indicated TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* The UE can be configured/provided with one of the following combinations for DL and/or UL MTRP operations in a CC:
	+ - 1 or 2 indicated joint TCI states
		- 1 or 2 pairs of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states + 1 indicated UL TCI state
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated UL TCI state
	+ FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP
	+ FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP
	+ FFS: How to map/apply the indicated TCI set(s) to a target channel/signal
	+ The joint or separate TCI indication mode is RRC configured.

[Mod] If these is only 1 indicated joint TCI state or only 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states in a CC/BWP, it is supported by Rel-17 and no agreement is needed. Notes are added to clarify. On how to configure/determine the one of above combinations for DL and/or UL MTRP operations in a CC/BWP, this can be further discussed.Regarding Proposal 1.C, we tend to agree that using the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DLA to indicate/update the both unified TCIs should be considered. However, for the second FFS, the essence of whether the number of bits in DCI needs to be increased is the maximum number in RRC TCI state pool(s). Thus, we should first discuss whether to increase the max number of RRC configured TCIs.**Proposal 1.C**: On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update all indicated TCI states for single-DCI based MTRP* FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint for all or subset of indicated TCI states, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI states that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint for all or subset of indicated TCI states
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of RRC configured TCI states, i.e., two separate pools corresponding to different TRPs
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits

[Mod] This proposal is intended for TCI update. How to configure and whether to increase the configured number will be discussed in another issue (sub-issue 1.9) together. Corresponding proposal will be provided in the next round discussion. |
| QC | For latest Proposal 1.A, supportFor latest Proposal 1.B, fineSupport Proposal 1.B-2, which is more concreteFor Proposal 1.C, suggest to replace “indicated” with “activated”, since activated TCIs are mapped to each TCI codepoint in R16/17. Also, suggest to add FFS for mDCI case.**Proposal 1.C**: On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update all indicated TCI states for single-DCI based MTRP* FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint for all or subset of activated ~~indicated~~ TCI states, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI states that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint for all or subset of activated ~~indicated~~ TCI states
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits
* FFS: Whether/how to use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update all indicated TCI states for multi-DCI based MTRP

[Mod] When joint/DL/UL TCI states are mapped TCI field codepoints in an activation command, they are activated. However, the 1st FFS is intended for discussing how to update the indicated TCI states in a CC/BWP. Some wording changes are done to avoid confusion.Regarding M-DCI, corresponding proposal will be provided in the next round discussion. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1.A: Support.Proposal 1.B / Proposal 1.B-2: Support and Proposal 1.B-2 is slightly preferred. One clarification question on Proposal 1.B-2 is whether “1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states” has been excluded. **Proposal 1.B-2:** On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 4 indicated TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation* The indicated TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* The UE can be configured/provided with one of the following combinations for DL and/or UL MTRP operations in a CC/BWP:
	+ - 2 indicated joint TCI states
		- 2 pairs of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states + 1 indicated UL TCI state
		- 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- …

[Mod] If these is only 1 indicated joint TCI state or only 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states in a CC/BWP, it is supported by Rel-17 and no agreement is needed. Notes are added to clarify.Proposal 1.C: Support. |
| LG | Proposal 1.A: SupportProposal 1.B: Support in principle. To our understanding with M/N>1, it should be also possible that some DL/UL transmission is for mTRP, e.g. mTRP repetition and SFN, but some other transmission is for sTRP. In this sense, we suggest the following**Proposal 1.B:** On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 2 unified TCI sets in a CC at least for MTRP operation[Mod] OK Proposal 1.C: Support in principle. While the proposal does not preclude the possibility of additional TCI field as FL mentioned, it would be better to add a related note to avoid ambiguity as some companies commented on this.[Mod] OK, hope this will not be controversialIssue 1-12: It needs to be clarified further on ‘unified schemes for both S-DCI and M-DCI to apply/map the **unified TCIs** to target channels/signals’ with some example for this. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 1.A:** Support.**Proposal 1.B-2**: We support the following FFS:* + - FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated UL TCI state

 Besides，we think the content in 2nd sub bullet “2 pairs of indicated DL and UL TCI states” already includes the 3rd and 4th sub-bullet.[Mod] From vies of some companies, if MTRP is configured for DL only or UL only, it doesn't necessary to configure two indicated DL or UL TCI states in a CC/BWP.For 1.8, we add our views in table. |
| Mod V2 | 1. **Please check above updated proposals**
2. **Please share your preference between Proposal 1.B and Proposal 1.B-2:**
 |
| CMCC | For Proposal 1.A, 1.C, support.For Proposal 1.B and 1.B-2, prefer 1.B-2. We support individual TCI mode for each TRP, since MPE issue may be occurred between UE and only one of the TRPs. The TCI mode for each TRP can be configured via RRC. |
| Transsion | Proposal 1.A: Support. We think the extension of Rel-17 unified TCI framework should be applied to all the Rel-16/17/18 MTRP schemes.For Proposal 1.B and 1.B-2, we prefer 1.B-2. Proposal 1.C: Support in principle. We think the second and the third FFS are basically the same. Since the relationship between TCI field in DCI and the activated TCI field codepoint in MAC CE is 1-to-1, regarding Samsung’s comment, if the unused DCI fields in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 are reused/reinterpreted to support more TCI fields, the mapping between TCI field in DCI and the activated TCI field codepoint in MAC CE should be redesigned. In our view, we are fine with reusing existing TCI field.  |
| CATT | For Proposal 1.B-2, we don’t think it is necessary to add the note. Because the main bullet is focused on mTRP scenario, but the TCI indication mentioned by the added notes is related to sTRP in Rel-17. Therefore, these notes are preferred to be removed from the proposal.[Mod] I tend to agree with you. Those two combinations supported in Rel-17 cannot be used for MTRP operation. |
| CEWiT | **Proposal 1.A:** We support the proposal**Proposal 1.B:** Support. **Proposal 1.B-2:** We also share the same view as Ericsson.**Proposal 1.C:** We are fine to use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DLA to indicate/update all indicated TCI states. Regarding the second FFS, from our understanding, we don’t see any need to increase the number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints. Hence, third FFS will not be needed which avoid the increasing DCI overhead. |
| Mod V3 | **Please check above updated proposals****Proposal 1.B is removed now since Proposal 1.B-1 is favored by more companies** |
| Samsung | For Proposal 1.A, we are actually fine/supportive of STxMP. We may not express ourselves clearly in previous rounds.For Proposal 1.B-2, we agree with other companies that it is for MTRP operation. And also, the combinations of TCI states (i.e., ‘+’) under the second bullet need to be further clarified for MTRP. We therefore suggest the following edits. Proposal 1.B-2: On unified TCI framework extension, support up to 4 indicated TCI states in a CC/BWP for MTRP operation* The indicated TCI states are updated by MAC-CE or DCI with the necessary MAC-CE based TCI state activation
* The UE can be configured/provided with one of the following combinations of two TCI states sets for DL and/or UL MTRP operations in a CC/BWP:
	+ - 2 indicated joint TCI states
		- 2 pairs of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states + 1 indicated UL TCI state
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 pair of indicated DL and UL TCI states
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated DL TCI state
		- FFS: 1 indicated joint TCI state + 1 indicated UL TCI state
	+ FFS: How to configure/determine one of above combinations for a CC/BWP
	+ FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated TCI states for S-DCI based MTRP
	+ FFS: Details of update and activation for the indicated TCI states for M-DCI based MTRP
	+ FFS: How to map/apply one or more indicated TCI states to a target channel/signal

For Proposal 1-C: we propose the following revision on the main sentence – more inclusive in our view.**Proposal 1.C:** On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update indicated TCI states for single-DCI based MTRP |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 1.A:** After further checking, is there a reason why Rel-17 SDCI PUSCH FDM B is not included in the list? We still prefer to remove “at least”, and would also like to understand why STRP is not mentioned?Proposal 1.B-2: We already stated “at least for MTRP operation” in the first row. Suggest removing that from the 2nd bullet:* The UE can be configured/provided with one of the following combinations in a CC/BWP:
 |
| vivo2 | **On the updated Proposal 1.A**,In the 1st bullet, Rel-16 M-DCI based MTRP schemes for PUSCH should be kept as it has been supported in Rel-16 allowing out-of-order scheduling by different TRPs.* Rel-16 M-DCI based MTRP schemes for PDSCH and PUSCH

**On the updated Proposal 1.B-2**,* Suggest remove “at least” in the main bullet because this WID is “focusing on multi-TRP use case”.
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Views about Proposals:****Proposal 1.A:** In general, we are open to discuss how to support all mTRP transmission schemes specified in previous releases.**Proposal 1.B-2:** Regarding the three FFSs on one joint plus one (pair) of separate TCI, we believe that supporting such combination makes sense considering a potential MPE on one of two beams. In such a case, it is not necessary to use a separate TCI mode for both beams.**Proposal 1.C:** In general, we are OK with the intention of the proposal but we have a couple of comments:1. Regarding “to update all indicated TCI states for single-DCI based MTRP” in the main part of the proposal, in our understanding, even with the S-DCI based mTRP, the DCI update of one of the pairs of TCI states is possible by indicated a codepoint that maps only to one TCI state.
2. We are OK with the added note but, other than adding a second TCI field, there may also be alternative mechanisms to associate the TCI field in DCI to the TRP that are worth considering. For instance, a field may be added to the DCI to associate the TCI field with the TRP(s).

Based on the above discussion, we suggest to modify the proposal as follows:Proposal 1.C (modified): On unified TCI framework extension, use the existing TCI field in DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 with or without DL assignment to update ~~all~~ one or more indicated TCI states for single-DCI based MTRP* FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint for updating all or subset of indicated TCI states, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI states that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint for updating all or subset of indicated TCI states
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of MAC CE activated TCI field codepoints, i.e., more than 8 codepoints
* FFS: Whether to increase the max number of TCI field bits, i.e., more than 3 bits
* Note: This doesn't imply that support of one additional TCI field or a field associating the TCI field to the TRP(s) is precluded

**Views about Issues:****1.5:** This is useful in the scenario where a potential MPE is on one of the two beams.**1.6:** A concern with designs that “Use existing (single) TCI field in DCI to update all unified TCIs”, is that it is possible to have 4 TCI states mapped to a codepoint. In such a case, MAC-CE may need to be frequently updated due to the UE mobility, as, whenany of the four TCI states that are mapped to a TCI codepoint change, the MAC-CE may need to be resent to UE.**1.7:** Alt 1 is preferred. We prefer the flexible Rel-16 based design where, depending on PDDCH association with the CORESETpoolindex, the corresponding beam for PDSCH is updated.**1.8:** Alt 1 is preferred as the current DCI 1\_1/1\_2 seem enough for the beam indication. DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 don’t have a HARQ-ACK from NW. If the intention is to use the SRI based UL beam indication in DCI 0\_1/0\_2, we could further discuss the details but we think that such a mechanism is only applicable to PUSCH and not the unified beam.**1.9:** We prefer to reuse Rel-17 design. The motivation of per-TRP pool is not clear.**1.10:** It seems not necessary to introduce TRP-ID. This has been discussed in previous releases.**1.11:** We think the mapping of unified TCI state to the two beams (corresponding to the two TRPs) should be studied case by case for each channel/signal. If the same mapping mechanism is deemed applicable for some of the channels/signals, we are open to discuss it. Given our above view, it is not clear for us what the intention of introducing an indicator is. Is it a flag that is equally used for all signals/channels? If it is the intention, we have concern about it since, in our view, an indicator is not necessary for many cases. For example, for the S-DCI PDSCH, the mapping can be based on the order of CDM group, i.e when two TCI states indicated, the first one is used for the 1st CDM group and second TCI state is used for the 2nd CDM group. In our understanding, a similar mapping rule (without specifying an explicit indicator) could be applied to PDSCH, PDCCH/PUSCH repetition, PDCCH SFN, CSI-RS and SRS, etc. **1.12:** In general, we are OK to use the CORESETpoolIndex for TCI mapping in M-DCI based mTRP scheme. |
| AT&T | We updated our views in Table 1. Proposal 1.A: we agree with the current proposal. We also don’t see the need for FFS on the last bullet. It is clear from the WID that if STxMP is supported, extension of unified TCI framework to MTRP should be used. We suggest including the bullet with no FFS. i.e. * + - Consider, if STxMP is supported, Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP
 |
| Intel  | Proposal 1.A: OK with current formulation. Check typo in main bullet: On unified TCI framework extension, consider at least all the ~~MTPR~~  MTRP schemes specified in Rel-16 and Rel-17 as follows.Proposal 1.B.2: We would also like to add an FFS for the case that dynamic configuration of separate DL/UL TCI and joint TCI is allowed. In Rel-17 only semi-static configuration is allowed. Such restriction may not be needed in Rel-18 for flexible support of the listed combinations. Proposal 1.C.2: we think that the first FFS can be revised as follows:* FFS: Detail of mapping joint/DL/UL TCI states to a TCI field codepoint ~~for updating all or subset of indicated TCI states~~, e.g., possible combinations of joint, DL, and/or UL TCI states that can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint ~~for updating all or subset of indicated TCI states~~

The FFS should be about mapping of codepoints to TCI states. Whether all or subset of indicated TCI states are updated can be a separate issue. Also, here indicated TCI refers to DCI indicated TCI states or MAC-CE update of TCI codepoints?Additionally our views are updated in Table 2 |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 1.B-2:** We are generally OK with its current form, except the last FFS. The “one or more indicated TCI states” is confusing here, since all the other FFS talk about “the indicated TCI states” and it is clear this is the set of up to 4 TCI states indicated together by a MAC-CE or DCI. It is clear if the last FFS also uses the same term (the indicated TCI states), but the phrase “one ore more” makes it unclear whether these TCI states are still as a whole or can be separately indicated and applied. Whether some or all of the indicated TCI states are applied is another issue and can be discussed separately. It is better to remove “one ore more” from the last FFS to prevent the confusion. |

# Issue 2 – UL Power Control for UL MTRP

Open issues on UL PC for UL MTRP and company views are summarized below.

Table 3 Summary for Issue 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **Moderator notes/observation** |
| 2.1 | Discussion on Issue 2 should start after simultaneous UL　transmission schemes are determined in AI 9.1.4.1 | Support: Samsung, ZTE, Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon, IntelConcern: Nokia, LG | From moderator perspective, sub-issue 2.2 still can be discussed first, at least for Rel-17 UL MTRP  |
| 2.2 | Reuse Rel-17 TCI-specific UL PC parameter setting (including PLRS, and per-PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS P0, alpha, CL index) to support per panel/TRP power control | Support: Ericsson, Docomo, OPPO, vivo, Futurewei, Xiaomi, Lenovo, MTK, LGE, Fujitsu, CATT, Apple, Nokia, NEC, TransHold, IntelConcern: | Given the majority view on this issue, Proposal 2.A is recommended at least for Rel-17 UL MTRP.How to handle the case if the indicated joint or UL TCI states for S-DCI based UL MTRP are not associated with power control settings can be further discussed |
| 2.4 | Tx power limitation for simultaneous UL transmission | Study per-panel power limit* Support: Nokia, OPPO, Docomo, Huawei, ZTE, Qualcomm (per-TRP), vivo (LS to RAN4), CATT, Spreadtrum, LGE, Lenovo, CMCC, Apple, NEC, TransHold
* Concern:

Study total power limit shared by two panels* Support: Huawei, CATT, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Apple, Intel, NEC, OPPO, ZTE, LG, TransHold
* Concern:

Send LS to RAN4 to check the feasibility for above two cases* Support: vivo, Apple, Lenovo, QC, CMCC
* Concern:
 |  |

## Proposal 2.A: On unified TCI framework extension, if an indicated joint or UL TCI state applies to a PUSCH/PUCCH transmission occasion at least for S-DCI based PUSCH/PUCCH repetition with TDM and the indicated joint or UL TCI state is associated with an UL PC parameter setting for PUSCH/PUCCH (including P0, alpha for PUSCH, and closed loop index) and a PL-RS, the UE should apply the UL PC parameter setting and the PL-RS for the PUSCH/PUCCH transmission occasion.

* FFS: If the indicated joint or UL TCI state is not associated with an UL PC parameter setting (including P0, alpha for PUSCH, and closed loop index) for PUCCH/PUSCH
* FFS: Extend to other Rel-18 MTRP scheme(s) with STxMP, if supported

Table 4 Additional inputs for Issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **1) Please check and update your views in Table 3****2) Share your inputs on the above moderator proposal** |
| QC | For Proposal 2.A, support |
| Apple  | Support Proposal 2.A. In addition, added our position on different aspects listed in Table 3 for Issue 2. On the scheme 2.4, we are open for both schemes, i.e., defining per-TRP power limitation or limiting per serving cell with sharing across two panels. However, for per-TRP power limitation option, we need to send LS to RAN4 to check the feasibility of defining the per-panel max power as it is specified in RAN4 spec. Otherwise, there is risk that RAN1 develops solutions assuming per-panel max power would be introduced, but RAN4 decides to not introduce it for FR2. This happens for FR2-FR2 NR-DC already.  |
| Samsung | Support in principle |
| Docomo | Support |
| Nokia | Support |
| NEC | **Proposal 2.A**: support**Issue#2.4** in table 2, we support to study both and then down-select the most reasonable implementation. We want to check if the following statement is common understanding: if per-panel power limit is assumed, transmit power is doubled for STxMP compared to single panel transmission. |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2.A:** SupportIssue 2.4: we really do not see how power can be shared between panels. A UE that transmits close to the maximum EIRP limit is unrealistic: realistic UEs will not be limited by EIRP limits, but by the size of the PA. From 38.101:The configured UE maximum output power PCMAX,f,c for carrier *f* of a serving cell *c* shall be set such that the corresponding measured peak EIRP PUMAX,f,c is within the following boundsPPowerclass + PIBE – MAX(MAX(MPRf,c, A- MPRf,c,) + ΔMBP,n, P-MPRf,c) – MAX{T(MAX(MPRf,c, A- MPRf,c,)), T(P-MPRf,c)} ≤ PUMAX,f,c ≤ EIRPmaxSo in FR2, PCMAX,f,c is calculated by the UE, based on the EIRP limits. Despite the fact that it is called “configured UE maximum power”, it is not really configured. Furthermore, we don’t see what we should study. The text in 38.101 applies – this is how the UE determines its Tx power. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 2.A**: support**Issue#2.4** in table 2, we think some clarification for simultaneous multi-panel UL transmission is required from RAN4. From implementation we think there is a hardware limit so the power cannot be shared between two panels. From interference management point of view, both per-panel or per-UE total TX power may be applied.  |
| vivo | Support |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 2.A:** Support |
| Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI | Proposal 2.A: SupportIssue 2.1: Agree with the FL’s viewIssue 2.4: Ok to further study both alternatives. |
| Mod V1 | **No change to Proposal 2.A** |
| CATT | Support Proposal 2.A |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 2.A:** Support.**Issue 2.4:** Both methods to define the power limit are OK for us. Support to further discuss which one is more feasible. |
| OPPO | Support Proposal 2.AAdd our preference on study per panel and total power limit, if STxMP supported in AI 9.1.4.1. |
| ZTE | Firstly of all, it seems that SRS is missing herein.[Mod] Rel-17 UL MTRP schemes don't include SRS, thus unclear why SRS is included in this proposal. Based on the discussion before, it seems that we would like to remove the first FFS. Motivation of the FFS is unclear. In other words, we assume the association between TCI and PC parameters always exist under the unified TCI framework according to RRC configuration. And does default behavior in case of any of other parameters are not associated with TCI state exist? If no, such default behaviour should not be introduced for PC parameters. [Mod] As indicated by QC, in Rel-17 unified TCI framework, the UL PC parameters expect PL-RS are not always associated with a joint/UL TCI state, and a default setting configured per UL BWP is applied if the UL PC setting is not associated with the indicated joint/UL TCI state. However, the default setting is not provided per TRP, thus whether to enhance the default setting can be further discussed. The wording is revised to better clarify the issue.We support to discuss both Alts for Tx power limitation. Both alts are required to study further, and per panel power limit is more related to the decision from RAN4, therefore we still suggest to postpone the discussion on issues except issue 2.2. A minor issue: for PUCCH transmission, we do not have alpha.Regarding E///’s comment, it is up to regulation requirement, rather than just implementation issue. For intra-/inter-band CA, the total Tx power should be restricted, also for DC case. So, either way, the total maximum Tx power across different panels should be specified. **Proposal 2.A:** On unified TCI framework extension, if an indicated joint or UL TCI state applies to a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission occasion at least for S-DCI based PUSCH/PUCCH repetition with TDM and the indicated joint or UL TCI state is associated with an UL PC parameter setting for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS (including P0, alpha, if any, closed loop index, and PL-RS), the UE should apply the UL PC parameter setting for the PUSCH/PUCCH transmission occasion.* FFS: Extend to other Rel-18 MTRP UL transmission scheme(s), if supported
 |
| QC | For issue 2.4, we are open to study both cases. But sharing the power across panels may not be typical/feasible implementation. Perhaps we can send LS to RAN4 to check feasibility per case if no quick consensus in RAN1For Proposal 2.A, to ZTE’s comment on the FFS, we think default PC parameters except PL RS should be supported as in R17, since P0, alpha, closed-loop index are not sensitive to individual UL beams for the same TRP. If company has concern, we are open to discuss whether default PC parameters should be supported in R18 |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 2.A: Support. |
| Samsung 2 | As response to ZTE’s medication, we are O.K. to discuss SRS wither together or separately, but the text looks incomplete since the main bullet is valid ‘at least for’ PUSCH/PUCCH repetition. And as Qualcomm, we also prefer to keep the FFS point. For issue 2.4, since support scenarios/schemes for STxMP are not clear yet, we are currently open to consider both cases, but more prefer not to discuss this issue yet.  |
| LG | Proposal 2.A: Support |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.A:** Support. |
| Mod V2 | **Please check the updated Proposal 2.A** |
| CMCC | Support in principle. For issue 2.4, agree with QC to send LS to RAN4 for guidance. |
| Transsion | Proposal 2.A: supportFor issue 2.4, we are fine to study both alternatives. For per-panel power limit, it may depend on RAN4. In addition, if the Tx power for a panel is below the limit, the remaining power cannot be shared by other other panel and this will lead to low utilization of power. |
| Mod V3 | 1. **No change to Proposal 2.A**
2. **Please check the new bullet in sub-issue 2.4, about whether to send LS to RAN4**
 |
| vivo2 | Support Proposal 2.A.On sub-issue 2.4, we are fine to send LS to RAN4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Our view about Proposal 2.A:**Generally OK with the proposal as it is a natural extension based on PC mechanism of Rel-17.**Our view about the issues:****2.1**: We agree this since whether to support STxMP in Rel-18 is still under discussion in 9.1.4.1.**2.2:** Support. It would be a straightforward solution without any change on the PC configuration in TCI state based on Rel-17.**2.4:** We think both kinds of limitation is valid depending on the UE implementation. In particular, UE class is defined based on both EIRP and the total radiated power. Therefore, the sum total transmit power from both panels should always be below the total transmit power restriction imposed by UE class.  |
| Intel | Views updated in the TableSupport Proposal 2.A.For issue 2.4, both total transmit power and per-panel transmit power should be limited for interference management. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 2.A:** Support |

# Issue 3 – Beam reporting and beam failure recovery

Open issues on beam reporting and BFR enhancements and company views are summarized below.

Table 5 Summary for Issue 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** | **Moderator notes/observation** |
| 3.1 | Enhance group-based reporting to support simultaneous UL transmission | Support: Qualcomm, Samsung, vivo, MTK, Nokia, Xiaomi, ZTEConcern: Apple, Ericsson, OPPO | This issue can be discussed once any Rel-18 MTRP scheme for simultaneous UL transmission is agreed |
| 3.2 | Extend Rel-17 UE capability correspondence reporting to support simultaneous UL transmission | Support: Samsung, Nokia, CATT, LGE, MTK, AT&T, QC, Apple, Docomo, Lenovo, Xiaomi, OPPO, ZTEConcern: Ericsson | This issue can be discussed once any Rel-18 MTRP scheme for simultaneous UL transmission is agreed |
| 3.3 | Enhancement to TRP-specific BFR under unified TCI framework | Support: InterDigital, vivo, Samsung, Apple, Qualcomm, Docomo, Nokia, NEC, Lenovo, Xiaomi, ZTE, Spreadtrum, TransHoldConcern: Ericsson |  |

Table 6 Additional inputs for Issue 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please check and update your views in Table 5** |
| QC | We are also fine for 3.2 with table updated |
| Apple | For beam report, in our view, current group based beam report cannot be reused, as it cannot provide enough information for simultaneous transmission. |
| Samsung | We don’t see strong association between supported STxMP tx schemes and beam management for STxMP. But O.K. to focus on other issues first before we tread this one. |
| Docomo | Added our views in the table. |
| Nokia | Added our views in the table. |
| NEC | We support to study issue#3.3. |
| Ericsson | We are OK to study 3.1 and 3.2 in AI 9.1.4.1. (In our view, 3.1 is needed, 3.2 is not needed). 3.3 is out of scope of the WI. |
| Lenovo | Added our views in the table. |
| vivo | Current description of 3.1 and 3.2 is not clear. Details should be provided for us to make decision. Additionally, we wonder whether 3.1 and 3.2 are exclusive? For example, can extending Rel-17 UE capability correspondence reporting work in group-based beam reporting?We suggest further study on this issue. |
| Futurewei | Our view is that these issues should be treated with lower priority than those listed under Issues 1 and 2. |
| CATT | We think how to facilitate gNB to know the association of panels and beams should be studied. 3.2 can be studied as a start point. |
| Xiaomi | Added our view in the table, same view with Vivo that 3.1 and 3.2 are two approaches to solve this issue. The use of the index of UE capability value set can be a starting point to facilitate the simultaneous multi-panel transmission. We think this issue is important for STxMP, and we are fine to either discuss here or in AI 9.1.4.1. |
| OPPO | Add our concern on Issue 3.1 that group-based reporting is based on DL operation in which UE may apply single Rx beam for receiving two DL beams. As for STxMP, such group-based reporting cannot be simply feasible for UL transmission. On Issue 3.2, we think it’s time to remove the artificial constraint on UE capability value set reporting. But we are fine to hold a while until there are progresses on STxMP in other AI.  |
| ZTE | Please review our position in the above table. Generally speaking, we tend to agree with Samsung. We can first focus on the discussion of issue 1 and 2, and then consider issue 3 after they are stable. |
| QC | Among all 3 issues, we suggest to prioritize issue 3.1, which is needed for simultaneous UL beam Tx.* To Apple/OPPO, agree the current group-based report cannot be reused. Our understanding is that the issue 3.1 is to investigate how to make it work
* To E///, we think the beam reporting issue should be treated in 9.1.1.1, since 9.1.4.1 is mostly for non-beam related issues, e.g. precoder as in the WID
 |
| Fujitsu | In our view, beam reporting should at least be able to distinguish STxMP scheme and panel selection/TDM-based scheme. In that sense, we are also open to the beam reporting 3.1 and 3.2. |
| Spreadtrum | We support 3.3 with table updated. Same view as vivo, we think the scheme in issue 3.1 and 3.2 could be described in detail before we have further discussion.  |
| CMCC | At this stage, both 3.1 and 3.2 can be viewed as potential way to facilitate simultaneous UL transmission. For issue 3.3, we support to study it in this AI. |
| Transsion | Added our views in the table. |
| Samsung | We support 3.3 BFR enhancements. We think it is within the scope. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **3.1:** Support. **3.2:** Just to clarify, does the “UE capability correspondence reporting” refers to the capability value based reporting? If so, then we can support it.**3.3:** Ok to support. |
| Intel | **3.1** can be studied. Others are of lower priority and should be discussed after STxMP schemes are discussed in 9.1.4.1. Ideally 3.2 should be discussed in 9.1.4.1.  |

# Other potential issues

Table 7 Inputs for other potential issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your view if there is any open issue that need to be addressed with high priority but is not captured above** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Appendix A: Agreements in RAN1#109-e
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3. R1-2203793 Unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP Sony
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13. R1-2203378 On Extension of Unified TCI Framework InterDigital, Inc.
14. R1-2203441 On unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP operation CATT
15. R1-2203149 Discussion on unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP Huawei, HiSilicon
16. R1-2203061 Unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP FUTUREWEI
17. R1-2203320 Discussion on Unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP Spreadtrum Communications
18. R1-2203174 Discussion on Unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP CEWiT
19. R1-2203263 Enhancements on unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP ZTE
20. R1-2205071 Discussion on unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP Asia Pacific Telecom co. Ltd
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22. R1-2204785 On Unified TCI framework for mTRP Intel Corporation
23. R1-2204678 Multi-TRP enhancements for the unified TCI framework Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI
24. R1-2204857 Unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP AT&T
25. R1-2205014 Extension of unified TCI framework for mTRP Qualcomm Incorporated
26. R1-2204584 Enhancement on unified TCI framework for multi-TRP Transsion Holdings
27. R1-2204538 Unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
28. R1-2204684 Unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP MediaTek Inc.
29. R1-2204287 Discussion on unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP CMCC
30. R1-2204506 Unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP Sharp
31. R1-2204440 Discussion on unified TCI framework extension for multi-TRP ITRI