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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT116-e][015][feMIMO] (Nokia [lead], Ericsson, vivo)

Scope: On RAN1 LSes [R2-2111214](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111214.zip), [R2-2111246](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111246.zip), [R2-2109326](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109326.zip) and their General and high level consequences. Review impacts to RRC (top down) and R2 work, e.g. general observations, structure, common impacts and impact specific to mTRP and MCBF - Find Easy/Potential Agreements, identify points for online discussion, can also identify and capture open issues, and whether LS out is needed. (Comment: please focus on points that need to be discussed/decided to pave the way for more detailed later discussions).

Intended outcome: Report

Deadline: For online W1 Thursday

The LSs in the discussion are shown below:

LS in

[R2-2109326](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109326.zip) LS on Rel-17 inter-cell multi TRP (R1-2108633; contact: vivo) RAN1 LS in Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core To:RAN2

[R2-2111214](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111214.zip) LS Reply on inter-cell beam management and multi-TRP in Rel-17 (R1-2110631; contact: Nokia) RAN1 LS in Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core To:RAN2 Cc:RAN4

[R2-2111246](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111246.zip) LS on Re-17 LTE and NR higher-layers parameter list (R1-2110575; contact: Ericsson) RAN1 LS in Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO, NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz, NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh, NR\_NTN\_solutions, NR\_pos\_enh, NR\_redcap, NR\_UE\_pow\_sav\_enh, NR\_cov\_enh, NR\_IAB\_enh, NR\_SL\_enh, NR\_MBS, NR\_DSS, LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2, LTE\_NBIOT\_eMTC\_NTN, NB\_IOTenh4\_LTE\_eMTC6, LTE\_terr\_bcast\_bands\_part1 To:RAN2, RAN3 Cc:RAN4

Copied here

The contributions on this discussion from AI 8.17.2 are shown below (with proposal copied after each document).

RAN2 impacts of inter-cell beam mgmt

[R2-2109573](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109573.zip) Discussion on inter-cell beam management OPPO discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Observation 1: Serving TRP and TRP with different PCI belong to same cell*

*Observation 2: Serving TRP and TRP with different PCI don’t belong to different BWP*

*Proposal 1: TRP with another PCI is modelled as beam resource of the same serving cell*

*Proposal 2: A new structure of SSB for both serving TRP and at least one TRP with different PCI should be introduced*

*Proposal 3: This new reference signal is to replace “SSB index” in legacy signalling including beam measurement/reporting, unified TCI state and pathloss reference signal etc.*

*Proposal 4: Agree SSB definition of serving TRP and TRP with different PCI in table 2*

*Proposal 5: Agree the definition of SSB resource set for serving TRP and TRP with different PCI in table 3*

*Proposal 6: Agree definition of unified TCI state in table 4*

*Proposal 7: Proposal 2~6 are applicable for both inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP*

*Proposal 8: CORESET pool ID is not needed for inter-cell beam management.*

[R2-2109641](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109641.zip) Inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP Intel Corporation discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Proposal 1: RAN2 discuss whether the following points comparing inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP are correct and can consider as a starting point for further discussion.*

*- A common BFR procedure for inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP should be supported.*

*- RRC signaling structure for TCI configuration may be different for inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP.*

*o For inter-cell BM, RAN2 should discuss how to define RRC signaling structure for unified TCI framework (linking both DL and UL TCI for joint TCI, or independent DL/UL TCI for separate TCI).*

*o For inter-cell mTRP, RAN2 should discuss what modification/additions to the existing TCI state configuration are needed to support inter-cell mTRP (e.g. adding PCI to TCI state information).*

*- MAC procedure for TCI update may be different for inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP.*

*o For inter-cell BM, RAN2 should discuss how to support the unified TCI framework and TRP/TCI state switching.*

*o For inter-cell mTRP, there seems no need to change in the current TCI activation procedure.*

*- It is not necessary to introduce an independent configuration for physical channels associated to TRP with different PCI.*

*- To support joint TCI and separate TCI, DL and UL should be indicated only by TCI and not a cell (or TRP with different PCI) because DL and UL can be decoupled for inter-cell BM. In case of inter-cell mTRP, “PCI” is not visible to MAC as different TRP is distinguished only by TCI.*

*- “different PCI” doesn’t affect MAC functionality because 1) it is managed by TCI state and BFD-RS set and 2) MAC functions (TA, PC, PHR, HARQ) is still single function for multiple TRPs in inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP.*

[R2-2109745](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109745.zip) Discussion on inter-cell BM and RRC structure for inter-cell BM and mTRP vivo discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Proposal 1: RAN2 to discuss how to define the association between non-serving cell configuration with TCI state, e.g. explicitly or implicitly.*

*Proposal 2: Define the association between measurement configuration of TRPs with different PCIs and report/resource configuration.*

*Proposal 3: Reuse the unified TCI switching signaling for inter-cell beam management, i.e. no need to introduce any new L1/L2 signaling.*

*Proposal 4: During transmission/reception on the other TRP with different PCI, UE should keep the RRC connection from serving cell, i.e., RRC procedure will continue on serving cell, e.g., RLM/BFD, SI reception, etc.*

*Proposal 5: During transmission/reception on the other TRP with different PCI, network could reconfigure/(de)activate the configurations of TRP(s) with different PCI(s) for inter-cell beam management.*

*Proposal 6: During transmission/reception on other TRP with different PCI, UE could perform legacy mobility procedure with the change of serving cell, e.g., legacy normal handover, or any enhanced procedure.*

*Proposal 7: The RRC model for inter-cell beam management and mTRP could be (merge of option 1, 3, 4 in RAN2#115e):*

*• PCI of Acell is included in the new IE (e.g. ACellConfig) for “non-serving” cell, which is located at [FFS] the same level of cell/or under BWP.*

*• An index of Acell with corresponding configurations is introduced to associate with TCI state.*

[R2-2109793](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109793.zip) Inter-cell beam management in RAN2 Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Observation 1: ICBM without multi-TRP requires TCI state switch to change PDSCH reception, while multi-TRP ICBM supports PDSCH reception from both TRPs using the Rel-16 CORESET-pool indexes.*

*Observation 2: ICBM can be seen as an extension to TCI state switching and UEs will only support at most two PCIs for the active TCI states.*

*Observation 3: No RAN2 specification changes seem required to MAC for RACH, PHR, HARQ due to ICBM.*

*Observation 4: UE serving and neighbour cell (L3) RRM measurements are not impacted by the ICBM operation.*

*Observation 5: UE configured with ICBM and using TCI state corresponding to ACell TRP will still have to monitor serving cell for system information reception.*

*Observation 6: UE continues doing RLM based on serving cell even when ACell is used for UL or DL.*

*Observation 7: For any BWP-related parameter, current RAN4 requirements in TS38.133 indicate that UE is allowed to have ~16ms UP interruption.*

*Proposal 1: The cell additionally configured for UE in multi-cell multi-TRP is called "Assisting Cell (ACell)". The corresponding serving cell that uses ACell is called "Main Cell (MCell)". When UE is configured with ACell, it is configured with "inter-cell beam management (ICBM)".*

*Proposal 2: Introduce the (inter-cell) PCI for ICBM outside the TCI state configuration.*

*Proposal 3: Model ICBM by introducing a new "TCI state type" (and other necessary parameters) in the TCI-State IE.*

*Proposal 4: Introduce a TDM pattern that enables network to restrict UE SI monitoring occasions when UE is using the ACell TRP.*

*Proposal 5: RAN2 to allow RLM to follow UL TCI state.*

*Proposal 6: Network can configure UE to report L1 measurements via RRC in the L3 measurement report, including PCI that the UE is currently using.*

*Proposal 7: The change of configured TCI state parameters for ICBM that are not activated shall not cause UP interruption in Rel-17.*

*Proposal 8: ICBM configuration is not optimized for SUL and no SUL-specific optimizations to make it work better shall be done in Rel-17.*

*Proposal 9: Do not preclude and do not optimize how ICBM works with other features at this point. Discuss feature interaction once the UE capabilities are discussed at the end of Rel-17.*

[R2-2110131](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110131.zip) Discussion on inter-cell beam management Spreadtrum Communications discussion Rel-17

*Observation 1：The main difference between the operation of “inter-cell beam management” and “inter-cell multi-TRP” is related to simultaneous Rx/Tx.*

*Proposal 1: It is suggested to consider separate RRC modeling for the operation of “inter-cell beam management” and “inter-cell multi-TRP”.*

*Proposal 2: It is proposed to use the option of beam resource to model RRC.*

*Proposal 3: It is suggested to preconfigure the relevant system information associated to the non-serving cell.*

[R2-2110167](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110167.zip) Inter-cell Beam Management and mTRP Qualcomm Incorporated discussion

*Proposal 1: RAN2 should consider inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP as different features and classify agreements explicitly for either or for both.*

*Proposal 2: RAN2 design on MAC CE for unified TCI applies to only inter-cell BM.*

*Proposal 3: RAN2 should confirm that TRP specific BFR is also applicable to inter-cell BM.*

*Proposal 4: Based on RAN1 input, RAN2 should assume that both the serving cell and the TRP with different PCI will share a common PxCH configuration for both inter-cell BM and mTRP.*

*Proposal 5: Based on RAN1 input, RAN2 should assume that a single HARQ entity is used for the serving cell and the associated TRP with different PCI and HARQ re-transmissions across the TRPs are supported.*

*Observation 1: Sharing a single HARQ entity between two separate cells will require signification changes to MAC specification.*

*Proposal 6: As a baseline, TRP with different PCI is modeled as part of the associated serving cell.*

*Observation 2: The maximum number of RRC configured TRPs with different PCIs only impacts the stage-3 details of configuration since there is at most one active TRP with different PCI.*

*Proposal 7: RAN2 should assume that any legacy serving cell (SpCell or SCell) can have an associated TRP with different PCI.*

[R2-2110333](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110333.zip) Discussion on support of inter-cell multi-TRP operation Lenovo, Motorola Mobility discussion Rel-17

*Proposal 1: SSB index from a non-serving cell is configured in QCL-info, and the corresponding information for the SSB is configured by SSB-InfoNcell-r17 and SSB-Configuration-r17 provided in Table 2.*

*Proposal 2: In inter-cell multi-TRP operation, the CORESETPoolIndex with value 0 is associated with the serving cell, while CORESETPoolIndex with value 1 is associated with the non-serving cell.*

[R2-2110341](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110341.zip) On Rel-17 FeMIMO Ericsson discussion NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Observation 1 Based on Rel-16 mTRP enhancements, a UE is able to perform simultaneous reception from two TRPs transmitting SSBs associated to the serving cell PCI.*

*Observation 2 The changes to the WID points at extending the Rel-16 mTRP concepts with enhancing L1-measurement reports of an SSB belonging to a different PCI than the serving cell PCI and TCI state configuration with QCL possibility to a SSB belonging to a different PCI than the serving cell PCI.*

*Observation 3 Large number of RAN1 parameters in R1-2110635 contain notes like “it can be discussed in RAN2” or “detailed design up to RAN2”*

*Observation 4 Unlike in previous releases, in this release the RAN2 work on the objective “Specify higher layer support of enhancements listed above, at least including [RAN2]” involves more RAN2 decision making for the parameters than in earlier releases.*

*Observation 5 As DLonly and ULOnly TCI states are supported in Rel-17 framework the use of the ID space need to be considered to be able to configure enough TCI states for UL and DL*

*Observation 6 A MAC CE very similar to the Rel-16 “Enhanced TCI States Activation/Deactivation for UE-specific PDSCH MAC CE” is used to operate the Rel-17 TCI state.*

*Proposal 1 RRM measurements of the serving cell or the non-serving cell is not impacted in Rel-17.*

*Proposal 2 RAN2 to adopt separate DL and UL TCI state configurations and enable joint with either of these. Details FFS.*

*Proposal 3 RAN2 to hope RAN1 gives more details on what all different variations are planned to be supported*

*Proposal 4 RAN2 to adopt the above way of configuring the additional PCI information while details are FFS*

*Proposal 5 Enable search space linking by including same linkage ID(e.g. searchSpaceLinkingId) in each of two SS sets to be linked.FFS details*

*Proposal 6 Define New IE for PUCCH power control for mTRP*

*Proposal 7 Define New list “sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList2” for PUSCH power control for mTRP*

*Proposal 8 Wait for further RAN1 input for power control design for BM*

[R2-2110435](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110435.zip) Considerations on Inter-cell Beam Management CATT discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Proposal 1: RAN2 to discuss the following two issues:*

*Issues 1: whether beam failure recovery on TRP with different PCI is allowed*

*Issues 2: whether BFR on current serving cell TRP is allowed when the UE detects the beam failure on TRP with different PCI*

*Proposal 2: RAN2 to discuss whether the candidate target TRP can be re-configured, and what conditions to reconfigure it.*

[R2-2110436](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110436.zip) Discussion on RRC Modeling of Inter-cell Beam Management CATT discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Proposal 1: RAN2 to agree that the modeling of inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP are discussed separately.*

*Proposal 2: The option 3, i.e., beam resource level modeling, can be taken as baseline for the RRC modeling of inter-cell beam management.*

[R2-2110534](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110534.zip) Considerations on Inter-Cell Beam Management CMCC discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Observation1: It seems that the TCI framework is some kind of beam indication mechanism, and potential RAN2 impacts may include the corresponding RRC configurations for inter-cell beam management and mTRP are different, and could not be reused between them.*

*Observation2: Different UE capabilities may be involved since the simultaneous Rx in DL is not supported for inter-cell BM but supported for inter-cell mTRP, although simultaneous Tx in UL is not supported for both. Also, network side configuration and scheduling will also be different.*

*Observation 3: It seems that almost no MAC changes to support inter-cell beam management. But some changes are needed for inter-cell mTRP.*

*Observation 4: The HARQ operation is the same for inter-cell BM and mTRP since one single HARQ entity is assumed.*

*Observation 5: Inter-cell beam management uses the R17 unified TCI framework, inter-cell mTRP uses the legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 TCI framework. RRC parameters for configuring each of these frameworks are different. RAN1 just started the discussion and no conclusion can be achieved now.*

*Proposal 1: RAN2 starts the work from inter-cell BM, and whether to reuse for mTRP objective could be based studied later.*

*Proposal 2: RAN2 starts the work on RRC modelling for inter-cell BM after RAN1 achieve some progress on RRC parameter discussion.*

*Proposal 3: RAN2 studies the inter-cell BM with no impacts to L3 handover.*

[R2-2110622](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110622.zip) Further Consideration on the inter-cell beam management ZTE Corporation,Sanechips discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Observation 1: According to the Reply LS from RAN1, the framework between inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP is not the same, the inter-cell beam management use the R17 unified TCI framework while the inter-cell mTRP reuse the legacy R15/R16 TCI framework. In addition, inter-cell mTRP is mostly like an enhancement of mPDCCH mTRP in R16 while the DL for UE dedicated channel with inter-cell beam management is only associated with a TRP from either serving cell or non-serving cell at one time.*

*Proposal 1: From RAN2 point of view, RRC models of inter-cell beam management is like beam resource (e.g TCI states, QCL info) which can be configured in PDSCH-Config for each BWP/CC or a reference BWP/CC.*

[R2-2110876](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110876.zip) Inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP Huawei, HiSilicon discussion NR\_feMIMO-Core Revised

[R2-2111205](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111205.zip) Inter-cell beam management and inter-cell mTRP Huawei, HiSilicon discussion NR\_feMIMO-Core [R2-2110876](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110876.zip)

*Proposal 1: RAN2 assumes that, for CSI measurements with inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP:*

*- each serving cell configuration (e.g. in ServingCellConfig or ServingCellConfigCommon) should be extended to include a list of SSB resources associated with PCI(s) different from that of the serving cell*

*- the CSI-SSB-ResourceSet IE should be extended to include the ID of one element of this list.*

*Proposal 2: In Rel-17 inter-cell BM, for PDCCH/PDSCH reception and PUCCH/PUSCH transmission, a new MAC CE for activating/indicating joint TCI state(s) or separate DL/UL TCI state(s) is needed.*

*Proposal 3: RAN2 assumes that, for inter-cell mTRP:*

*- each serving cell configuration should be extended to include a list of additional PCIs*

*- the TCI-State IE should be extended to include an index into this list.*

*More RAN1 inputs are needed for Rel-17 inter-cell mTRP, at least including:*

*a) the maximum number of TCI states that can be configured per UE and/or per serving cell*

*b) the maximum number of additional PCIs that can be configured per UE and/or per serving cell.*

*Proposal 4: In Rel-17 inter-cell BM, we can model TRPs associated with different PCIs as different beam resources (i.e. Rel-17 TCI states) of the same BWP of the same serving cell.*

[R2-2110976](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110976.zip) Support of Inter-cell Beam Management and Multi-TRP MediaTek Inc. discussion

*Observation 1: A single cell may consist of multiple TRPs, and legacy beam management procedure allows UE to switch between beams from different TRPs.*

*Observation 2: The key enhancement brought by Rel-16 multi-TRP is overlapped transmission by two TRPs, which means UE is indicated to use two TCI states for multi-PDSCH reception.*

*Observation 3: Inter-cell BM procedure allows the UE to be a “guest” in a TRP with different PCI, using the SSBs in that cell only for QCL purposes.*

*Observation 4: When extending Rel-15/16 TCI framework to support inter-cell multi-TRP scenario in Rel-17, we need a way to prevent UEs using Rel-15/16 TCI framework from operating inter-cell BM.*

*Proposal 1: The Rel-15/16 (legacy) and Rel-17 unified TCI frameworks are not configured together in a UE. RAN2 can further study how to tell UE which framework to use.*

*Proposal 2: Inter-cell TCI states are configured as beam resources in the serving cell configurations.*

*Proposal 3: TCI states from serving cell and TRP with different PCI can be contained in the same list in PDSCH-Config.*

*Proposal 4: If UE is configured to use Rel-15/16 TCI framework, TCI states from TRP with different PCI can be configured only in CORESETs with CORESETPoolIndex=1.*

*Proposal 5: The “TCI States Activation/Deactivation for UE-specific PDSCH” MAC CE can be used for both inter-cell BM and inter-cell multi-TRP operations.*

*• For inter-cell multi-TRP, TCI states from TRP with different PCI can only be activated for CORESET Pool #1.*

*• For inter-cell BM, CORESET Pool ID field is always ‘0’, or ignored by UE.*

*Proposal 6: If UE is configured to use Rel-15/16 TCI framework, TCI states from TRP with different PCI can only be indicated for PDCCH monitoring in a CORESET in Pool#1.*

[R2-2111141](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111141.zip) Inter-cell mTRP and inter-cell BM LG Electronics discussion Rel-17

*Proposal 1: RAN2 does not strive for building a common framework in signaling design, i.e., a separate framework is a baseline for inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP.*

*Proposal 2: To adopt option3, i.e., non-serving cell TRP is modelled as beam resources of a serving cell.*

*Proposal 3: For inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP, RRC supports that only one PHY configuration for each of PHY channel is configured for each BWP.*

*Proposal 4: For inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP, RRC supports that one or more non-serving cell TRPs can be configured by RRC.*

*Proposal 5: For inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP, RRC supports that only one additional non-serving cell TRP (the one with different PCI from the serving cell) can be associated with active TCI state(s) per CC.*

*Proposal 6: The maximum number of additional RRC-configured non-serving cell TRP per CC for inter-cell BM/mTRP is introduced as a UE capability. Details of the UE capabilities are discussed based on future RAN1 input, e.g., supported values and whether it is per CC/band per BC, or whether there is per-UE capability constraint).*

*Proposal 7: RAN2 discuss if RA on non-serving cell TRP should be supported or prevented.*

*Proposal 8: No enhancement to existing RRM is pursued.*

*Proposal 9: No enhancement to existing RLM is pursued.*

*Proposal 10: RAN2 to confirm that UE is receiving system information from serving cell TRP.*

*Proposal 11: RAN2 to confirm that UE is required to monitor short messages from serving cell TRP.*

*Proposal 13: No enhancements to support TA management in a non-serving cell TRP is introduced.*

*Proposal 14: To introduce signaling support for unified TCI framework based on further RAN1 input (no immediate action in RAN2)*

*Proposal 15: To introduce signaling support for necessary enhancements of L1 measurement and reporting based on further RAN1 input (no immediate action in RAN2).*

*Proposal 16: No enhancement to PHR is needed.*

[R2-2109746](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109746.zip) Discussion on inter-cell MTRP operation vivo discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Proposal 1: Introduce a new IE (e.g. NonServingCellConfig) to include all non-serving cell information, at least including: SSB time domain position, SSB transmission periodicity, SSB transmission power of non-serving cell. Others could wait for RAN1.*

*Proposal 2: PCI of non-serving cell is included in the new IE (e.g. NonServingCellConfig) for non-serving cell.*

*Proposal 3: An index of non-serving cell with corresponding configurations is introduced to associate with TCI state.*

[R2-2110621](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110621.zip) Further Consideration on the beam managment for intra-cell mTRP ZTE Corporation,Sanechips discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Proposal 1:Whether the beam management for mTRP can be applied to inter-cell mTRP case is up to RAN1.*

*Proposal 2: For one serving cell configured with mTRP, if BFI\_COUNTERs for both TRPs are no less than the value of beamFailureInstanceMaxCounter , the Cell level BFR is triggered for SCell or the RACH based BFR is triggered for SpCell.*

*Proposal 3: A new cell level BFR MAC CE shall be used for providing the beam information for both failed TRPs when the cell level BFR is triggered on one SCell.*

*Proposal 4: The new cell level BFR MAC CE shall also be used for UE to provide the beam information to NW when the TRP level BFR is triggered on one SCell.*

*Proposal 5: The BFR MAC CE for RACH based BFR on SpCell is postponed until RAN 1 have concluded all scenarios for triggering RACH based BFR.*

[R2-2110200](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110200.zip) Discussion on RLM for inter-cell Multi-TRP KDDI Corporation discussion

*Proposal 1: RAN2 agree to discuss RLM mechanism for Inter-cell TRP, combined RLM or separate RLM*

*Proposal2:RAN2 agree to discuss Random Access problem detection for Inter-cell TRP, combined detection or separate detection.*

[R2-2110678](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110678.zip) Serving cell measurement for mTRP Xiaomi Communications discussion Rel-17 NR\_feMIMO-Core

*Observation 1: According to the current servingCellMO configuration, the UE obtains the measurement results of multiple PCI(s) (including multiple serving cell PCIs), when multiple PCIs are associated to the same serving cell.*

*Observation 2: In the measurement event configuration, the UE needs to know which measurement result of the serving cell PCI is used for the measurement event evaluation, when multiple PCIs are associated to the same serving cell.*

*Observation 3: In the measurement report, the UE needs to know which measurement result of the serving cell PCI is reported, when multiple PCIs are associated to the same serving cell.*

*Proposal 1: When multiple PCIs are associated to the same serving cell, the gNB indicates which PCI is used for the measurement event evaluation.*

*Proposal 2: When multiple PCIs are associated to the same serving cell, all available measurement results of multiple PCIs are included in the serving cell measurement report.*

# 2 Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Nokia (Rapporteur) | Tero Henttonen | tero.henttonen@nokia.com |
| Ericsson | Helka-Liina Määttänen | Helka-liina.maattanen@ericsson.com |
| Vivo | Chenli | Chenli5g@vivo.com |
| MediaTek | Li-Chuan TSENG | li-chuan.tseng@mediatek.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | David Lecompte | david.lecompte@huawei.com |
| ZTE | Fei Dong | Dong.fei@zte.com.cn |
| Xiaomi | Yumin Wu | wuyumin@xiaomi.com |
| Samsung | Seungri Jin | seungri.jin@samsung.com |
| Apple | Fangli XU | fangli\_xu@apple.com |
| OPPO | ZhongdaDu | duzhongda@oppo.com |
| Sharp | Hidekazu Tsuboi | tsuboi.hidekazu@sharp.co.jp |
| CATT | Erlin Zeng | erlin.zeng@catt.cn |
| KDDI | Yanwei Li | ya-li@kddi.com |
| LG | SungHoon Jung | Sunghoon.jung@lge.com |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Questions

The rapporteur proposes to use the following terminology in this discussion

* TRP1: Serving cell TRP
* TRP2: (Active) TRP with different PCI

The moderators proposes to divide the questions to the following categories: Stage-2 impacts (overall points that impact many of Stage-3 details), RRC impacts (mainly on configuration and procedural aspects), and MAC impacts (MAC specification affecting aspects)

Stage-2 aspects

* **Terminology:** In 38.300, TRP is defined as transmit/Receive Point and the TRP operation is shortly described under 6.12. In Rel-17, “intercell” mTRP operation is specified which means the other TRP will be associated with PCI different from original serving cell TRP but the TRPs share same HARQ entity and (most of) physical layer parameters.From RAN2 perspective, we need to consider if the PCI aspect results in a need to be able to refer one of these TRPs such that it is known whether the TRP is associated to serving cell PCI or to the additional PCI, with possible examples could be ”main-TRP” and ”additional-TRP” or "Main cell" and "additional cell" [[R2-2109793](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109793.zip)]. Is there a need to have a specific terminology for the different TRPs? If yes, what would be the preferred terminology?
* **SI/Short message reception:** According to RAN1, UE always receives SI from TRP1. When UE is using DL with TRP2, does SI/Short Message reception impact TRP2 reception?
* **RLM:** How to handle radio link monitoring with TRP1 and TRP2 - does UE always use TRP1, including doing RRC re-establishment towards TRP1 when the link fails?
* **ICBM vs. multi-TRP**: According to the RAN1 LS, there are commonalities between the ICBM and multi-TRP operation, but there are also some differences (e.g. DL reception and use of unified TCI states). Can there be inter-cell procedures that are common between ICBM and multi-TRP? E.g. do we have common or separate RRC modelling, common or separate PxxCH configuration, common or separate RLM/BFR procedures, etc?

RRC aspects

* **RRM:** According to RAN1, there is no impact to the actual RRM measurements. Are there any RAN2-specific aspects (not impacting RAN1) that would need to be considered for RRM?
* **Unified TCI:** The unified TCI state only applies for ICBM without multi-TRP (as per RAN1 decision). As this is new configuration, RRC impacts will be necessary. RAN1 has agreed that the following reference signals may be used as source RS:
  + DL TCI state: SSB, CSI-RS
  + UL TCI state: SSB, CSI-RS, SRS

For DL TCI state, these are the same as for Rel-16 DL TCI state, but UL TCI state has not been allowed before. At least two options for the TCI state structure have been proposed in [[R2-2110341](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110341.zip)], which differ in how they handle the TCI state IDs: Option 1 shares the ID space for both UL and DL, Option2 has separate ID space for UL and DL. More details can be found in [[R2-2110341](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110341.zip)], but to summarise those options:

**Option 1:** Use common ID for all TCI states, i.e. DL-only, UL-Only and joint use the same ID space.

**Option 2:** Use separate IDs for joint, UL and DL TCI states (with some possibly combined)

It's assumed that the unified TCI state can reuse the existing TCI-State IE (with extensions), but RAN2 needs to decide on the best way to configure the unified TCI state: Will there be separate IDs for joint TCIs, UL TCIs and DL TCIs, or are the IDs part of a common ID space?

* **PCI and SSB configuration:** UE may need to receive SSB from TRP1 and TRP2, and both may have different PCIs. How do we configure the beams with the PCI/SSB information:
  + For the TRP with different TRP, where is the added SSB/PCI located - should it be e.g. within *ServingCellConfig* or within dedicated BWP configuration?
  + Can the existing IEs or fields be reused for the PCI/SSB configuration?
  + How is TRP2 configuration associated with TCI state(s)?
* **TRP-specific configuration:** As per RAN1 LS, additional PHY configuration for TRP2 is **not** needed and TRP2 will use TRP1 configuration. However, it seems the latest RAN1 parameter excel also indicated some TRP-specific parameters, and the TCI states will be per TRP. How should the TRP-specific parameters be configured (e.g. initial addition, modification, release), and are there any ambiguities in the L1 parameters that would need to be clarified from RAN1?

MAC aspects

The moderators would like to point out there are two separate offline discussions led by Samsung:

[AT116-e][016][feMIMO] MAC CE impacts (Samsung)

* Mostly mTRP related MAC CEs with last question about BM related MAC CEs

[AT116-e][017][feMIMO] BFD BFR and Initial Running CRs (Samsung)

* Not started (as of November 2nd, 2021)

The moderator assumes the need for new MAC CEs due to the unified TCI framework will be discussed under (one of) these discussions, so MAC aspects will be omitted in this discussion.

# 4 Discussion

## 4.1 Stage-2 aspects

This section considers Stage-2 aspects that can help the RAN2 discussion to progress.

**Question 1**: Companies are requested to indicate their views to the Stage-2 aspects, i.e.:

* **Terminology:** In 38.300, TRP is defined as transmit/Receive Point and the TRP operation is shortly described under 6.12. In Rel-17, “intercell” mTRP operation is specified which means the other TRP will be associated with PCI different from original serving cell TRP but the TRPs share same HARQ entity and (most of) physical layer parameters.From RAN2 perspective, we need to consider if the PCI aspect results in a need to be able to refer one of these TRPs such that it is known whether the TRP is associated to serving cell PCI or to the additional PCI, with possible examples could be ”main-TRP” and ”additional-TRP” or "Main cell" and "additional cell" [[R2-2109793](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109793.zip)]. Is there a need to have a specific terminology for the different TRPs? If yes, what would be the preferred terminology?
* **SI/Short message reception:** According to RAN1, UE always receives SI from TRP1. When UE is using DL with TRP2, does SI/Short Message reception impact TRP2 reception?
* **RLM:** How to handle radio link monitoring with TRP1 and TRP2 - does UE always use TRP1, including doing RRC re-establishment towards TRP1 when the link fails?
* **ICBM vs. multi-TRP**: According to the RAN1 LS, there are commonalities between the ICBM and multi-TRP operation, but there are also some differences (e.g. DL reception and use of unified TCI states). Can there be inter-cell procedures that are common between ICBM and multi-TRP? E.g. do we have common or separate RRC modelling, common or separate PxxCH configuration, common or separate RLM/BFR procedures, etc?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 1A: Is there a need to have a specific terminology for the different TRPs? If yes, what would be the preferred terminology? what could be used? | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Terminology |
| Ericsson | maybe | At least in stage-2 one could have explanation added to 6.12 about “intercell” TRP/BM and at least explain how each TRP related to a given PCI. Then, if one needs explicit names that can be further discussed. However, calling these cells does not seem appropriate due to shared HARQ entity. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes | We think agreeing to terminology will help us in the long run. The exact term is not so important, as long as it's concise.  We would be fine with "main TRP" and "additional TRP", but the acronyms would be "mTRP" (which is ambiguous) and "aTRP" which is fine. Hence, perhaps "primary TRP (pTRP)" and "secondary TRP (sTRP)" could be good alternatives and these would also conform to the PCell/SCell terminology we already use. |
| MediaTek | Yes | A specific terminology would be helpful, we may use “primary TRP (pTRP)” and “secondary TRP (sTRP)” or “assisting TRP (aTRP)”. |
| Intel | Maybe | Until now, we have not found the need to introduce a specific terminology for the different TRPs because TCI state is the one representing actual operation. Nevertheless, it might be convenient for discussion and for stage-2 purpose. In this case, additional-TRP/assisted-TRP seems preferred than additional cell because it wouldn’t be treated as an independent cell. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not until we finish stage 3 | We suggest doing like in Rel-16: finish stage 3 work and add stage 2 description after. Unless we really need a definition for stage 3. |
| ZTE | Maybe | We also think we need focus on the stage 3 work first. If we really need a terminology for easing our work on stage 3 discussion, for TRP, we think MTK’s suggestion is better,i.e assisted TRP. For the cell other than serving cell, we think using ‘TRP Cell’ to represent the non-serving cell providing a TRP transmission which is more straight forward |
| Xiaomi | Maybe | We slightly prefer “"Main cell" and "additional cell"”, as the terminology of TRP is quite ambiguous. |
| Qualcomm | Yes but | We should definitely add that the TRP can have a different PCI in Section 6.12. More details can be added as we make progress on the details. However, we shouldn’t use terms which imply a different cell (e.g. assisted cell), assuming RAN2 will model the new TRP as part of the serving cell. |
| Samsung | Maybe | We tend to agree introducing that the terminology of TRP will help for the functional understanding but this discussion can be finalized after stage-3 work done.  We have same view with Huawei. |
| vivo | Yes | As cell may cause confusion with the existing “cell”, we prefer to use “primary TRP (pTRP)” and “secondary TRP (sTRP)” or “additional TRP (aTRP)”. |
| Apple | Yes | The specific terminology is needed since it’s helpful to define the different UE operation on different TRPs. We can consider the terminology as “primary TRP (pTRP)” and “secondary TRP (sTRP)”or “assistance TRP (aTRP)”, and the detailed description can be based further progress. |
| OPPO | Yes, but no strong view at this stage | We think it could be useful in RAN2 discussion and stage 2 spec. As for stage 3 signalling, we expect signalling itself can already differentiate between pTPR and sTRP(or aTRP). But just to point out that the term sTRP doesn’t mean there is only one TRP with different PCI i.e. it could be more than one and how much UE can support is up to reported UE capability.  Here is relevant RAN1 decision about the number of TRP with different PCI: |
| Sharp | Yes | We agree to define the terminology for “intercell” TRP/BM. We don’t have strong preferences for the exact name but “assisted or additional TRP” is preferable because it is configured as the part of serving cell. |
| CATT | Maybe | We also think in stage 2 it should have some description on the additionally ‎configured TRP that is associated with a PCI different from the current serving cell. ‎For the naming maybe it can be TRP associated with a different PCI / TRP with ‎different PCI or something like that. ‎ |
| KDDI | Yes | We agree a specific terminology will be helpful for the discussion. We slightly prefer main TRP and additional TRP or assistance TRP |
| LGE | Maybe but | We can *temporarily* use TRP-like terms such as primary/secondary TRP, but the need to introduce new such terms in specifications can be assessed when stage-3 is mature. |

Summary (1A): All companies think terminology may be introduced, but most companies are not sure whether it needs to be done yet. Rappporteur proposes to adopt "primary TRP (pTRP)" and "additional TRP (aTRP)" **temporarily** for RAN2 discussion purposes, and use them when continuing the RAN2 discussion. If it's found they are needed in Stage-2/Stage-3 text, they can be retained, otherwise they are just used while finalizing the ICBM work.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 1B: According to RAN1, UE always receives SI/short message from TRP1. When UE is using DL with TRP2, does SI/Short message reception impact TRP2 reception? | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Ericsson | No | To be confirmed with RAN1 if needed |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes | RAN1 LS [R2-2111214](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111214.zip) indicated this:  *Answer 2.b: The system information for inter-cell beam management can be only received from the serving cell TRP.*  *With respect to the paging/short messages for inter-cell beam management, RAN1 is currently discussing this issue.*  This means that regardless of which TRP UE is using for DL, UE always receives SI from TRP1. Since UE is not required to support TRP1 and TRP2 reception simultaneously, if UE is using TRP2, then all occasions where UE could receive SI (from TRP1) may create interruption in TRP2 reception. To make it easier to avoid this in TRP2 scheduling, using TDM pattern (signalled by serving cell) for UE SI reception to better control the TRP2 scheduling occasions. |
| MediaTek | Yes | When UE is using TRP2, SI reception from TRP1 causes interruption. However, we are not sure if a TDM pattern is needed: This may be resolved by proper scheduling, i.e., UE is indicated to a beam from TRP1 when it should receive SI? |
| Intel | No | If it is not feasible to receive SI from TRP1 while the UE is switched to TRP2, the possible way is to rely on dedicated signaling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Our understanding is that the UE is not required to receive SI/short message from the serving cell while it is switched to TRP2. The network could choose to either, not switch the UE to TRP2 while short message is transmitted or to send any necessary information by dedicated signalling. We don't see the need to transmit a TDM pattern to the UE for that. RAN1 is also currently discussing alternative methods for short message reception from TRP2. |
| ZTE | No | We admit the interruption is caused when UE using TRP 2 and receive the SI information with TRP1. At least for now, NW can handle this issue, i.e send a dedicated SI. For short/Paging, we’d love to wait for RAN1 conclusion. |
| Xiaomi | No | It is difficult to conclude this in RAN2, as the interruption on TRP2 while receiving SI/Short message should be evaluated in RAN1 first.  We can ask a clarification question for RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | No | We should leave this to NW implementation and not introduce TDM type complexity. The gNB can switch the UE back to TRP1 when short messages are transmitted. They are used for SI update and PWS and these are not common occurences. In addition, gNB can also transmit the SIs to the UE via dedicated RRC signalling over TRP2 as discussed below. |
| Samsung | No | We also have same understanding that this issue can be solved by NW implementation, not by TDM pattern. As other companies mentioned, the dedicated RRC signalling could be used over TRP2 if it is needed. |
| vivo | No | As agreed in RAN1, UE always receive SI/short message from serving cell TRP. For Inter-cell beam management, simultaneous reception on both TRP1 and TRP2 is not allowed, then, interruption on TRP2 transmission may occur. But understanding is that it could be left to network implementation, e.g. dynamic point selection. Otherwise, we could wait for further inputs from RAN1. |
| Apple | No | It should be up to NW implementation. And we also share Intel’s view.  If the reception of the SI from TRP1 and the unicast from TRP2 conflicts, we can rely on dedicate signaling for the SI delivery. |
| OPPO | No | The scheduling of SI and PO is fixed for both UE and network. From UE point of view, UE will prioritize to receive SI/short message based which is captured also in current RAN1 spec. From network point of view, the “interruption” is also well known and network can easily avoid scheduling another via TRP2 during this “interruption slot” to avoid any real interruption. So we don’t think any new rule is needed. But we are also fine to check with RAN1, if RAN2 is not really sure. |
| Sharp | No | Since UE receives from one TRP for itner-cell BM, SI/Short message reception impacts TRP2 reception. Therefore, to avoid the spec impact, NW ensures to switch TRP for their reception adequately or should use dedicated signalling for them. |
| CATT | No | It is true that as indicated by R1 ‘simultaneous Rx in DL is not supported for inter-cell BM’, but still we do not see strong need to optimize for it. We think in RAN2 we just assume no any impact to SI/Short message reception, unless RAN1 told us otherwise. |
| LGE | Possibly yes but not sure | The meaning of Yes/No seems different across companies here.  RAN1 concluded on the principle that SI reception is only possible on serving cell TRP. But for short message reception, it remains as FFS. We think the reason of FFS in the RAN1 was that short message reception may be slightly delayed and this may be considered undesirable in case of emergency message notifications.  We think, however, that the same principle can apply to short message notification as well. Reasonable network implementation can avoid any problematic situation from happing by using timely TRP switching and dedicated SI delivery, as already mentioned by companies above. Hence we do not see the need of any specific enhancements, such as introducing TDM pattern, to further facilitate SI/Short Message reception on TRP1 while configured to receive on TRP2. |

Summary (1B): Several companies think RAN2 may not need to do anything for SI or Short message reception from TRP1,, but several also think RAN1 should indicate whether to do something, or that NW implementation can handle this. Some also consider dedicated signalling for SI. Given the split views, the rapporteur proposes to postpone handling of this to next meeting based on company inputs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 1C: How to handle radio link monitoring with TRP1 and TRP2 - does UE always use TRP1, including doing RRC re-establishment towards TRP1 when the link fails? | | |
| Company | RLM is only for TRP1? | Technical Arguments |
| Ericsson | yes | To avoid RAN2 work and technically argumented that if UE is assumed to hear TRP1 all the time, RLM can as well be assumed there. RLM and RRM decision goes hand in hand in our view. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No - active TRP(s) | RLM is used to detect both UL and DL problems. For DL, the RLM should follow the active DL TRP, and for UL, the active UL TRP. Hence, this requires separate RLM parameters for each TRP, which are then used by the UE when the TRP is active (i.e. there is at least one activated TCI states for the TRP). This may necessitate UE to do RLM for both TRPs.  We would note that if RLM is only for TRP1, then TRP1 DL failure could cause RLF even when UE is fully using TRP2. That doesn't seem the intent of the ICBM, as it can allow to extend the UE service area (similar to mTRP). |
| MediaTek | Yes | In inter-cell BM, UE is like a “guest” in TRP2. UE just uses SSB from TRP2 as QCL source when TRP2 signal is stronger, but UE is assumed to be in the coverage of TRP1. If TRP2 fails, UE simply doesn’t use it. If TRP1 fails, it is true that TRP2 is good, but we think that in this case RLF should still be declared so that UE can change its serving cell, or UE should perform handover before TRP1 RLF. |
| Intel | Yes | In Rel-17 inter-cell BM, we assume that the UE is still in coverage of TRP1. There is no need to change RLM. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Agree with Intel. |
| ZTE | Yes, but | In general , the RLM is based on TRP1. Some details need to be confirmed or updated by RAN2, such as：  ***failureDetectionResourcesToAddModList***  A list of reference signals for detecting beam failure and/or cell level radio link failure (RLF). The limits of the reference signals that the network can configure are specified in TS 38.213 [13], table 5-1. The network configures at most two detectionResources per BWP for the purpose *beamFailure* or *both*. If no RSs are provided for the purpose of beam failure detection, the UE performs beam monitoring based on the activated *TCI-State* for PDCCH as described in TS 38.213 [13], clause 6. If no RSs are provided in this list for the purpose of RLF detection, the UE performs Cell-RLM based on the activated *TCI-State* of PDCCH as described in TS 38.213 [13], clause 5. The network ensures that the UE has a suitable set of reference signals for performing cell-RLM.    As we know the PDCCH may also follow the TRP2 transmission, which means UE may perform the RLM based on the TRP2 reference signal if the RS is absent for RLM, it may somewhat violate the principle mentioned in the question. So it seems we need update this yellow highlighted sentence anyway. |
| Xiaomi | Not sure | Maybe this can be discussed in RAN1 first. How the reference signal is used for RLM or how the RLM is performed can be asked for RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | Yes but | The baseline should be using TRP1 only and this will simplify the specification and UE complexity. This is also related to whether separate BFD will be used per TRP for ICBM. It would be good to discuss these in RAN1 as well. |
| Samsung | Yes | At least in Rel-17, RLM optimization seems not really needed i.e. UE always connected with the serving cell which TRP 1 is serving. It means UE is still in coverage of TRP1 (i.e. serving cell). |
| vivo | Yes | As there is no “serving cell” change for inter-cell beam management, it is reasonable to use TRP1 for radio link monitoring. If the link on TRP1 fails, UE anyway needs to perform re-establishment on another “serving cell”, as legacy. Regarding the link on TRP2, we think there is no need to perform RLM and corresponding re-establishment after RLF, as UE could easily change to another TRPx without any “serving cell” change.  We assume RLM and corresponding link recover on TRP2 is in the scope of Rel-18. |
| Apple | Yes | R17 inter-cel BM has no impact on the L3 measurement in UE side. Therefore, UE should be always assumed in the TRP1 coverage, and RLM is only performed on TRP1. |
| OPPO | No | We think RLM should run based on both TRP1 and TRP2 instead of TRP1 only or TRP specific. The problem for TRP1 only is that UE will detect out-of-syn when UE turns from TRP1 to TRP2 but it is not reasonable since the link could be actually good. The same problem for TRP specific approach since UE will not monitor both TRP simultaneously following RAN1’s answer. |
| Sharp | Yes | Since TRP1 is not swapped with TRP2, RLM should be performed using TRP1. |
| CATT | Yes | We do not think any enhancement on RLM is needed for Rel-17. |
| KDDI | No | Share the similar view with Nokia and OPPO, We also think RLM on both TRP1 and TRP2 should be considered, e.g when UE detect out of sync with TRP1, but in sync with TRP2, as UE still can use TRP2 to receive/transmit data, there is no need to initiate any procedure to recovery the link, same as in sync with TRP1, but out of sync with TRP2. |
| LGE | Yes | We think Serving TRP based RLM is sufficient for Rel-17 based on the assumption that UE is always in the serving cell TRP coverage. There is no room for RAN1 and RAN2 to discuss any enhancements on this in this release, so RLM related enhancements for this and other scenarios can be considered in REL-18. |

Summary (1C): Majority thinks there's no need for RLM enhancements in Rel-17, but something may be done in Rel-18. Few companies think both TRP1 and TRP2 should have RLM, and some point that this is realted to RAN1 discussions and some changes may be needed based on RAN1 L1 parameters and BFD handling. The rapporteur therefore proposes to only consider RLM-related changes based on RAN1 parameter list and otherwise not modify RLM procedures for Rel-17, i.e. RLM will follow only TRP1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 1D: A. Can there be inter-cell procedures that are common between ICBM and multi-TRP? E.g. do we have common or separate RRC modelling, common or separate PxxCH configuration, common or separate RLM/BFR procedures, etc? | | |
| Company | Common procedures | Separate procedures |
| Ericsson | There are parameters under BM and under mTRP and under other acronyms and it should be clarified if some of those are or are not pending on what TCI state framework was configured, that is if BM or mTRP of Rel-17 was configured. Potential question to RAN1. | TCI state configuration, power control/UL configuration possibly.  There are parameters under BM and under mTRP and under other acronyms and it should be clarified if some of those are or are not pending on what TCI state framework was configured. Potential question to RAN1. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Inter-cell PCI/SSB, PxxCH configuration, HO procedure | TCI framework (unified for ICBM, R15/16 for mTRP), RLM/BFR (for each TRP), SI/Short message reception (only for TRP1) |
| MediaTek | RRC configurations for “assisting cell” (PCI, SSB, PxxCH, etc.) | TCI frameworks, RLM/BFR, SI reception. |
| Intel | Beam management including BFR. | TCI frameworks including TCI update procedure, RRC configuration. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with Ericsson that the main question is relationship between RRC parameters and the TCI state framework and RAN1 should say it.  Then we could ask RAN1 whether BM and mTRP can be configured simultaneously for the same serving cell or not. | BFR enhancement is only for mTRP |
| ZTE | TCI state resource pool/TCI state, PCI list with SSB, PxxCH. We also think RAN1 shall confirm whether the mTRP can be configured alone with BM first. | At least for now BFR is only for intra-cell mTRP unless RAN 1 have made any progress on the scale, so  RLM/BFR is none of business of both mTRP and BFR but some update in RRC is needed as we comment in question 1C. |
| Xiaomi | PxxCH configuration | TCI framework, FFS on RLM/BFR for RAN1. The current RAN1/RAN2 discussion on BFR is only for intra-cell mTRP BFR. |
| Qualcomm | Configuration for SSB, PCI, PxCH, Mobility. Possibly BFR and RLM. | TCI configuration. Possibly BFR and RLM. |
| Samsung | Agree with Ericsson and Huawei. | TCI configuration. BFR enhancement is only for mTRP |
| vivo | PxxCH/SSB configuration, TCI state resource pool.  Serving cell change procedure, i.e. legacy handover. | TCI framework, which was agreed by RAN1.  BFR enhancement is only for mTRP, as there is no discussion on BFR in ICBM in RAN1. P  Power control, which needs to further check with RAN1. |
| Apple |  | TCI framework could be different. |
| OPPO | RRC modelling;  Definition of beam resource of TRP with different PCI;  Definition of DL TCI state;  Beam measurement/report; | TCI framework;  Dedicated PXXCH configuration;  PHR report (mTRP only);  RLM monitoring  BFR |
| Sharp | PxxCH configuration | TCI framework, RLM/BFR |
| CATT | For procedure it is already clear from the WID beam measurement/reporting mechanism are the same. | According to RAN1 reply, the TCI framework are different. |
| LGE | TCI-related RRC configuration (as much as possible) | TCI framework (legacy vs unified). |

Summary (1D): Most companies see the TCI framework and RLM/BFR for mTRP being separated for TRPs, even iof the configuration is done jointly. Some companies also mention ULPC and SI reception, along with some RRC configurations. The rapporteur proposes to start the RRC CR on unified TCI state to further clarify these details as that is agreed by majority.

**Summary 1**: The summary of Q1 is divided into 4 parts (one per sub-question):.

* Summary (1A): All companies think terminology may be introduced, but most companies are not sure whether it needs to be done yet. Rappporteur proposes to adopt "primary TRP (pTRP)" and "additional TRP (aTRP)" **temporarily** for RAN2 discussion purposes, and use them when continuing the RAN2 discussion. If it's found they are needed in Stage-2/Stage-3 text, they can be retained, otherwise they are just used while finalizing the ICBM work.
* Summary (1B): Several companies think RAN2 may not need to do anything for SI or Short message reception from TRP1,, but several also think RAN1 should indicate whether to do something, or that NW implementation can handle this. Some also consider dedicated signalling for SI. Given the split views, the rapporteur proposes to postpone handling of this to next meeting based on company inputs.
* Summary (1C): Majority thinks there's no need for RLM enhancements in Rel-17, but something may be done in Rel-18. Few companies think both TRP1 and TRP2 should have RLM, and some point that this is realted to RAN1 discussions and some changes may be needed based on RAN1 L1 parameters and BFD handling. The rapporteur therefore proposes to only consider RLM-related changes based on RAN1 parameter list and otherwise not modify RLM procedures for Rel-17, i.e. RLM will follow only TRP1.
* Summary (1D): Most companies see the TCI framework and RLM/BFR for mTRP being separated for TRPs, even iof the configuration is done jointly. Some companies also mention ULPC and SI reception, along with some RRC configurations. The rapporteur proposes to start the RRC CR on unified TCI state to further clarify these details as that is agreed by majority.

**Proposal 1a**: RAN2 to use the terminology "primary TRP (pTRP)" and "additional TRP (aTRP)" for RAN2 discussion purposes. FFS whether these will really be needed in Stage-2/3 specifications.

**Proposal 1b:** RAN2 does not consider RLM for TRP2 or SI/Short Message reception from TRP while using TRP2 in Rel-17 work.

## 4.2 RRC aspects

This section considers RRC aspects that can help the RAN2 discussion to progress.

**Question 2**: Companies are requested to indicate their views to the RRC aspects, i.e.:

* **RRM:** According to RAN1, there is no impact to the actual RRM measurements. Are there any RAN2-specific aspects (not impacting RAN1) that would need to be considered for RRM?
* **Unified TCI:** The unified TCI state only applies for ICBM without multi-TRP (as per RAN1 decision). As this is new configuration, RRC impacts will be necessary. RAN1 has agreed that the following reference signals may be used as source RS:
  + DL TCI state: SSB, CSI-RS
  + UL TCI state: SSB, CSI-RS, SRS

For DL TCI state, these are the same as for Rel-16 DL TCI state, but UL TCI state has not been allowed before. At least two options for the TCI state structure have been proposed in [[R2-2110341](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110341.zip)], which differ in how they handle the TCI state IDs: Option 1 shares the ID space for both UL and DL, Option2 has separate ID space for UL and DL. More details can be found in [[R2-2110341](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110341.zip)], but to summarise those options:

**Option 1:** Use common ID for all TCI states, i.e. DL-only, UL-Only and joint use the same ID space.

**Option 2:** Use separate IDs for joint, UL and DL TCI states (with some possibly combined)

It's assumed that the unified TCI state can reuse the existing TCI-State IE (with extensions), but RAN2 needs to decide on the best way to configure the unified TCI state: Will there be separate IDs for joint TCIs, UL TCIs and DL TCIs, or are the IDs part of a common ID space?

* **PCI and SSB configuration:** UE may need to receive SSB from TRP1 and TRP2, and both may have different PCIs. How do we configure the beams with the PCI/SSB information:
  + For the TRP with different TRP, where is the added SSB/PCI located - should it be e.g. within *ServingCellConfig* or within dedicated BWP configuration?
  + Can the existing IEs or fields be reused for the PCI/SSB configuration?
  + How is TRP2 configuration associated with TCI state(s)?

**TRP-specific configuration:** As per RAN1 LS, additional PHY configuration for TRP2 is **not** needed and TRP2 will use TRP1 configuration. However, it seems the latest RAN1 parameter excel also indicated some TRP-specific parameters, and the TCI states will be per TRP. How should the TRP-specific parameters be configured (e.g. initial addition, modification, release), and are there any ambiguities in the L1 parameters that would need to be clarified from RAN1?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 2A: According to RAN1, there is no impact to the actual RRM measurements. Are there any RAN2-specific aspects (not impacting RAN1) that would need to be considered for RRM? | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| Ericsson | No | Well, potentially there are but we can pretend we don’t see those in Rel-17 😊 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes | **L3 report including L1 measurements:** When L3 measurement is triggered, network should be allowed to configure that UE includes also L1 measurement result of both TRPs at the same time. This allows CU to be aware of the latest L1 measurements e.g. when making the L3 HO decision.  **L3 report including TRP PCI:** When L3 measurement is triggered, UE should also indicate the used PCI for UL and DL. This allows CU to be aware of the currently used TRP e.g. when making L3 HO decision. |
| MediaTek | No | It’s possible to do some optimization in RAN2, but we don’t have time. So, let’s follow RAN1 suggestions. |
| Intel | No | Some optimization can be considered but not so essential especially considering the limited time and the fact that we assume the UE is still in coverage of serving TRP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| ZTE | No | The L3 mobility is not got involved in the inter-cell BM. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | RAN1’s reply is only for the RRM measurement, not for the RRM report.  Firstly, we would agree with the issues mentioned by Nokia. If the UE follows the current RRC specification for RRM report, when more than one PCI(s) are configured, we observe the following ambiguities:  *Ambiguity 1: The UE needs to know which PCI measurement of the serving cell is used for the measurement event evaluation*.  *Ambiguity 2: The UE needs to know which PCI measurement result of the serving cell is reported as the serving cell measurement result.* |
| Qualcomm | No | RRM is relatively long term compared to L1 and thus relying on TRP1 and re-using existing measurements and framework should be the baseline. Some optimizations taking into account the existing of other TRP are feasible, but these should not be high priority and preferably left to future releases. Note that the UE may report TRP2 separately in the existing framework, but the NW can ignore those for RRM, e.g. for mobility. |
| Samsung | No | First, we want to finalize the essential features in Rel-17. |
| vivo | No with comments | As there is no “serving cell” change for inter-cell beam management, there would be no impact to actual RRM measurement. It was also confirmed by RAN1.  Regarding the RRM report issue raised by Nokia:   1. For L3 report including L1 measurement, we think existing L1 and L3 reporting may be enough for L3 handover and ICBM.   For L3 report including TRP PCI, it would be useful to allow NW know the current used TRP. Thus, we are fine to discuss it. |
| Apple | No | According to the WID description, there is no impact on the L3 RRM measurement in R17 scope.  A screenshot of a computer  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| OPPO | No | The two aspects pointed out by Nokia are necessary but the TRP information can be also ready derived from the measurement result based on existing measurement report framework assuming the relevant information e.g. PCI is already coded with the SSB index of TRP2 which is part of the measurement objective. |
| Sharp | Yes | Measurement reporting can be enhanced to support additional PCI. |
| CATT | No | We do not see strong need to optimize RRM in Rel-17. |
| LGE | No | RAN1 already confirmed that there is no impact to RRM measurement. This also means that there is need or consideration for any RRM enhancements including measurement report. As Apple indicated, no impact to L3 measurement/reporting is also confirmed by revised WID. |

Summary (2A): Some companies think RRM impacts would be needed, but most companies think either RAN2 does not need to or has no time to do RRM changes in Rel-17. The rapporteur proposes to continue the work based on no RRM impacts unless critical issues are found and agreed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 2B: Will there be separate IDs for joint TCIs, UL TCIs and DL TCIs, or are the IDs part of a common ID space? | | |
| Company | Separate or common ID? | Technical Arguments |
| Ericsson | Separate for UL and DL. Joint common with either DL or UL | If we have common ID space for UL and DL and joint, we need to start explaining somewhere when all space can be used and when not. E.g. if UE is configured with only joint TCI states then the cannot be as much as there should be when UE is configured with UL and DL TCI states.  In MAC CE it is easier to have separate as the name of the ID will tell if it is UL or DL. With common, there is exactly the issue described by Nokia, or need to say which part of ID list is indicated. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Common | We think it's easier if we have common ID space: Otherwise we will end up having to identify the type of TCI in MAC CEs, whereas with common ID space we can just use the TCI state ID. |
| MediaTek | Separate for UL and DL, “joint” flag with DL | This helps UE be indicated with proper TCI state (e.g., a Joint TCI state applied to both DL and UL, or a DL plus a UL TCI state, but not one DL TCI state only). We anyway need to design new MAC CEs for Rel-17 unified TCI farmeworks.  **NOTE:** We may need to study the co-existence of Rel-17 unified TCI frameworks with legacy ones. If inter-cell BM and multi-TRP use different TCI frameworks, do we need separate TCI state list? How does UE know which framework to use? Or only one type is allowed? |
| Intel | Both should be supported | RAN1 agree to have both joint TCI and separate TCI. So, Id should be defined flexibly. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Separate as a starting point | Common ID means increase of ID range, while the distinction between joint and separate or between UL and DL could be implicitly derived from how the ID is indicated. Also, if RAN1 does not allow mixing joint/separate TCI states in some case, the type may need to be indicated only once for multiple TCI states.  From RRC signalling perspective, we could assume separate ToAddModList but we can decide later whether there are benefits to assume that each ID value is only used in one list. |
| ZTE | See comments,  Common ID space is supported | We understand the question have two sub-questions, one is whether there will be separate IDs for joint TCI, UL TCIs and DL TCIs, in other word, whether the ID number shall be separated for joint TCIs, UL TCIs and DL TCIs. The last half of the question is to ask whether these IDs shall be in one common ID space, in other word, whether joint TCI, UL TCI and DL TCIs for inter-cell BM shall be in one TCI state pool.  For the yellow highlighted sub-question, considering anyway a new TRP activation/deactivation MAC CE shall be introduced, How about using a flag in MAC CE to indicate the transmission type (i.e UL, DL or joint) for the active TCI state indicated in MAC CE, and then there is no need for us to flag any transmission type within the TCI state configuration for inter-cell BM.  For the green highlighted sub-question, for inter-cell BM,we think one common TCI state pool for all TCI state configuration including DL,UL, joint is enough, no need to build more than one TCI state pools , or in other word, to establish more than one addmodlists for TCI state configuration. |
| Xiaomi | Common | It would be simpler to have a common ID space for all TCI mode in Rel-17, so as to avoid the TCI state ambiguity in the DCI/MAC CE. The benefit/use case of using separate ID space can be discussed in the next release. |
| Qualcomm | Separate | Since UL TCI is new in Rel-17, at least that should use a new ID space. The joint can share the ID space with DL. |
| Samsung | Separate | Both options are possible but we think the separate TCI state pools for UL and DL/Joint are more aligned with RAN1 agreements.  **Conclusion**  On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in case of separate DL/UL TCI, it is up to RAN2 whether UL TCI shares the same TCI state pool as joint DL/UL TCI or UL TCI uses a separate TCI state pool from joint DL/UL TCI   * Note: By previous agreements, DL TCI shares the same TCI state pool as joint DL/UL TCI   We agree QC’s comments that new ID space for UL TCI states are required. |
| vivo | Common | We think a common ID space for all TCI states including DL, UL and Joint case is enough, which is also much simpler. The distinguish between them could be implicitly indicated by a flag, e.g. DL, UL and Joint, defined in TCI configuration. |
| Apple | Separate as the starting point | Since the RAN1 agreed to use the separate TCI state or joint TCI state, from configuration flexibility perspective, the RRC signaling design should be started from the separate IDs. |
| OPPO | Separated for Joint, UL and DL | We think both are feasible but separated 3 lists are clean and clear for UE.  In case of joint list, the benefit of the design is that MAC CE could simply refer to one list. But the id length is increased since RAN1 doesn’t define maximum number of TCI states altogether, rather separated somehow. In addition UE need peep into every TCI state in the pool to understand whether it is UL or DL or Joint TCI state to understand which type of TCI state is activated by MAC CE in order to build a proper mapping between activated TCI state IDs and code point in DCI. By configuring 3 different TCI state lists, these issues can be easily resolved. |
| Sharp | Separate | It is preferable to use separate ID space for UL and DL |
| CATT | common/DL + UL | Based on the latest R1 agreement,  **On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in case of separate DL/UL TCI, it is up to RAN2 whether UL TCI shares the same TCI state pool as joint DL/UL TCI or UL TCI uses a separate TCI state pool from joint DL/UL TCI**   * **Note: By previous agreements, DL TCI shares the same TCI state pool as joint DL/UL TCI**   it seems that there will be cases where DL/UL TCIs are indicated jointly (one ID indicated the same TCI state for UL and DL), and there will be cases that they are separate values (a first ID indicated TCI state for UL and then another for DL). The question here seems to be that whether these different cases are indicated so that these IDs point to some entry in a common ID index pool or separate pools.  From R1 agreement it seems that at least a common pool is needed if joint DL/UL TCI is used, which is also used for DL TCI state pool. Then one more pool can be defined for UL if needed (if separate TCI value is needed for UL than this separate pool is needed. ) |
| LGE | Separate for UL TCI | Separate IDs would be cleaner for UL  No strong view for now on sharing for joint TCI states |

**Summary (2B):** Slight majority prefers separate TCI state ID pools, but the views are qwuite split and many also consider common ID space as feasible. The main arguments for separate are having smaller ID space and RAN1 decisions, while common is claimed as simpler. It is also noted that the questions of **ID pool** and **number of IDs** (for each TCI state type) should be separated. The rapporteur notes that the question was badly formed and Q8 further clarifies this, so decision should be made based on both Q2B and Q8.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Answers to Question 2C: UE may need to receive SSB from TRP1 and TRP2, and both may have different PCIs. How are the beams configured with the PCI/SSB information?**   * **For the TRP with different PCI, where is the added SSB/PCI located - should it be e.g. within ServingCellConfig or within dedicated BWP configuration?** * **Can the existing IEs or fields be reused for the PCI/SSB configuration?**   **How is TRP2 configuration associated with TCI state(s)?** | |
| Company | Company views |
| Ericsson | added SSB/PCI located in ServingCellconfig as it is assumed the added PCI does not vary per BWP but is per serving cell. Then as the added PCI needs certain SSB related parameters given, those can be placed under SSB IE(does not really functionally matter but that seems logical place).  Then the added SSB/PCI has hanle i.e. ID that can be then assopciated to TCI state, CSI, etc. That is, use normal way of configuring these type of things (one can compare Rel-16 TCI states in PDSCH vs PDCCH, or CSI-RS resources and ID of that and where it is used) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **SSB/PCI:** We assume most TRP configuration is cell-specific (i.e. within ServingCellConfig) except where indicated by RAN1. As it seems that RAN1 allowed to have multiple PCI/SSB pairs, we assume we can just use SetupRelease-structure for those and use the ID to refer to those in the TCI state configurations. Then we will need an new IE for the joint SSB+PCI configuration that also contains the ID. As always, we should reuse the existing IEs where possible but that will be more easily seen when we start the CR.  **TRP association:** We assume the SSB/PCI ID used in the IE can be used in the TCI states to refer to the TRP being used. Assuming we have 1-8 such IDs, this will just require 3 bits / TCI state for the ID, which is far less than the 9 bits required for just the PCI IE. |
| MediaTek | The configurations of TRP2 SSB/PCI should be in *servingCellConfig*; they may be encapsulated in a structure, e.g., *AssistingCellInfo*, with some IDs. Then the TCI states can be associated with TRP2 configurations via the IDs. |
| Intel | Definitely, we need additional SSB information associated to TRP with different PCI. We can look at the detail signalling structure further. Initial thinking is that it can be added under servingCellConfig and linked in TCI state. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A list of additional SSB configurations with different PCIs can be put in ServingCellConfig (not per BWP). Then, in each TCI state, whenever the referenceSignal in qcl-Type1 or qcl-Type2 is ssb and qcl-Type is typeD, we should add an optional index referring to one of the additional SSB configurations with different PCI. |
| ZTE | PCI with SSB configuration list shall be put into the servingCellConfig.And for each PCI with SSB configuration have an index attached, TCI state for TRP2 can reference with such index. |
| Xiaomi | We think that additional SSB and PCI can be added in servingCellConfig and in the QCL-Info IE. |
| Qualcomm | SSB and PCI in servingCellConfig as new IEs. The index of the TRP(s) can be added to the TCI configuration. |
| Samsung | We have same view that the additional SSB information associated to TRP with different PCI can be under the servingCellConfig and linked in TCI state. |
| vivo | We think multiple SSB configurations with different PCIs should be configured, which would be considered to put under servingCellConfig. At the same time, an index for TRP associated with different PCIs could be added into TCI state, to define the link with TCI state. More details is provided in our contribution [[R2-2109745](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109745.zip)]. |
| Apple | The SSB/PCI info is added as the new IEs within servingCellConfig.  The index of the SSB/PCI config can be added in the TCI-state to establish the association between the TCI-state and the SSB/PCI. |
| OPPO | We think TRP specific configuration is cell level configuration since they supposes to be common for all BWPs;  We also think existing IE can be reused as much as possible. One candidate is ssb-InfoNcell-r16. But as we pointed out in our paper [R2-2109573](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109573.zip), some enhancement is needed to make it more efficient.  We agree with Nokia that index referring to SSB/PCI within the new IE of SSB can be referred to avoid referring to PCI directly. In addition there is index within the new IE of SSB can then be used to replace legacy SSB-Index for further definition of e.g. unified TCI state, reference signal etc. you can find the detail in our paper [R2-2109573](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109573.zip). |
| Sharp | We think additional TRP’s SSB/PCI information should be included in servingCellConfig and TCI configuration refers their ids. |
| CATT | SSB with different PCI configuration provided in ServingCellconfig. Then measurement and TCI related configuration can point to these newly defined SSBs if they are associated to TRPs with different PCI. |
|  |  |

Summary (2C):All companies think that the SSB/PCI information can be added as cell-level information to ServingCellConfig, but exact details can be considered later. All companies also think the TCI states can link to these configurations. The rapporteur proposes to agree that the SSB/PCI information is per-cell (and not per-BWP), and can be used to link the (unified) TCI states with PCI information.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answers to Question 2D: How should the TRP-specific parameters be configured (e.g. initial addition, modification, release), and are there any ambiguities in the L1 parameters that would need to be clarified from RAN1?** | | |
| Company | Ambiguities needing LS to RAN1 (Y/N)? | Technical Arguments |
| Ericsson |  | Per TRP configuration in Rel-17 seems to be spread under different IEs like PxxCH, CSI similar to Rel16 and there seems not to be per TRP specific way to do add/mod/release.  What should be clarified with RAN1 is what all can be configured at same time and where there are restrictions. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Perhaps | **Configuration:** We assume most TRP configuration is cell-specific (i.e. within ServingCellConfig) except where indicated by RAN1. As it seems that RAN1 allowed to have multiple PCI/SSB pairs, we assume we can just use SetupRelease-structure for those and use the ID to refer to those in the TCI state configurations. That seems both simple and straightforward.  **RAN1 LS:** It's still not clear how the TRP-specific parameters are used: Which are common with mTRP, and which are not? It's clear that unified TCIs are not for mTRP, but are all other ICBM parameters also applicable to mTRP? And what about the mTRP parameters, are those only for mTRP or are some also applicable to the ICBM framework?  That said, we also do think RAN1 will still discuss these and provide updates, so we can also ask later. |
| MediaTek | Maybe | Clarifications about how TRP-specific parameters are used in inter-cell BM may be needed. When UE is “using” TRP2 but serving cell is not change (TRP1), should it apply the *servingCellConfig* of TRP1 or TRP2? Our understanding is that UE should apply the *servingCellConfig* of TRP1, and the necessary TRP2-related parameters (e.g., SSB periodicity) are configured in the *servingCellConfig* of TRP1. However, we can wait for further RAN1 updates. |
| Intel |  | We need to fist take a look at RRC parameter list from RAN1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We need to fist take a look at RRC parameter list from RAN1. |
| ZTE |  | We need to fist take a look at RRC parameter list from RAN1. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | It is not clear whether the Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be configured together with the Rel-15/16 TCI state configuration. |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with others that we haven’t even looked at the initial RAN1 list yet officially. We can ask RAN1 on the separation/commonality and simultaneous configuration of mTRP and ICBM parameters. But better wait for the next meeting if there is still ambiguity. |
| Samsung |  | We need to fist take a look at RRC parameter list from RAN1. |
| vivo | Yes | We could ask RAN1 about which part of configuration are common between TRPs, and the commonality between ICBM and mTRP. Besides, which parameters could be configured simultaneously. |
| Apple |  | We need to fist take a look at RRC parameter list from RAN1. |
| OPPO | comments | A bit confused by the question. Firstly no parameter provided in R1-2110573 for beam management are per TRP. So far the key per TRP parameter is PCI which needed included within the definition of new SSB resource.  Also a bit confused by Mediatek’s comments. To us the *servingCellConfig* is common for both TRP1 and TRP2 in high level unless some specific parameters are configured for TRP2 e.g. PCI and other parameters built on top of such key parameters i.e. there is no such *servingCellConfig* of TRP1 and TRP2. |
| Sharp |  | We need to fist take a look at RRC parameter list from RAN1. |
| CATT |  | We haven’t looked into the details, can discuss later. |
| LGE | Yes but | We need to fist take a look at RRC parameter list from RAN1 and then generate a collective list of questions. |

Summary (2D): Majority thinks RAN2 should first take a look at the RAN1 parameter list and start the RRC work. Some point out ambiguities in which parameters apply only to mTRP and which only to ICBM. The rapporteur proposes that RAN2 starts the RRC work via email discussion based on latest RAN1 input and at the same time notes down any questions arising that need RAN1 feedback.

**Summary 2**: The summary of Q2 is divided into 4 parts (one per sub-question):.

* Summary (2A): Some companies think RRM impacts would be needed, but most companies think either RAN2 does not need to or has no time to do RRM changes in Rel-17. The rapporteur proposes to continue the work based on no RRM impacts unless critical issues are found and agreed.
* Summary (2B):Slight majority prefers separate TCI state ID pools, but the views are qwuite split and many also consider common ID space as feasible. The main arguments for separate are having smaller ID space and RAN1 decisions, while common is claimed as simpler. It is also noted that the questions of **ID pool** and **number of IDs** (for each TCI state type) should be separated. The rapporteur notes that the question was badly formed and Q8 further clarifies this, so decision should be made based on both Q2B and Q8.
* Summary (2C):All companies think that the SSB/PCI information can be added as cell-level information to ServingCellConfig, but exact details can be considered later. All companies also think the TCI states can link to these configurations. The rapporteur proposes to agree that the SSB/PCI information is per-cell (and not per-BWP), and can be used to link the (unified) TCI states with PCI information.
* Summary (2D): Majority thinks RAN2 should first take a look at the RAN1 parameter list and start the RRC work. Some point out ambiguities in which parameters apply only to mTRP and which only to ICBM. The rapporteur proposes that RAN2 starts the RRC work via email discussion based on latest RAN1 input and at the same time notes down any questions arising that need RAN1 feedback.

**Proposal 2a**: No RRM enhancements for ICBM are done in Rel-17 (unless they are critical to the functionality).

**Proposal 2b:** Add SSB/PCI information for ICBM as cell-level information and link unified TCI state information to that. FFS on exact Stage-3 details.

**Proposal 2c**: RAN2 starts the RRC CR work based on latest RAN1 input before sending LS to RAN1.

# 5 RRC parameters

## 5.0 Session notes from November 3rd

After the online session on Thursday, November 3rd, there were some additional notes added to this discussion as per below:

|  |
| --- |
| * [AT116-e][015][feMIMO] (Nokia [lead], Ericsson, vivo)   Scope: On RAN1 LSes [R2-2111214](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111214.zip), [R2-2111246](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111246.zip), [R2-2109326](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2109326.zip) and their General and high level consequences. Review impacts to RRC (top down) and R2 work, e.g. general observations, structure, common impacts and impact specific to mTRP and MCBF - Find Easy/Potential Agreements, identify points for online discussion, can also identify and capture open issues, and whether LS out is needed. (Comment: please focus on points that need to be discussed/decided to pave the way for more detailed later discussions).  Intended outcome: Report  Deadline: For online W2 Wednesday  DISCUSSION  - Chair: Included in above: identification of functional impact to be determined by RAN2, included also whether we have questions to RAN1, including questions on the RRC params LS  - Intel wonder if we should have prioritization of feMIMO sub-features, e.g. according to maturity in R1. ZTE think it depends on R1 status. Chair think Inter-cell beam management includes more new things than mTRP, so there may be more confusion for it, but not clear whether any part should be discussed with higher priority. |

There was also one high-level agreement on TCI state configuration aspects:

|  |
| --- |
| [R2-2110341](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110341.zip) On Rel-17 FeMIMO Ericsson discussion NR\_feMIMO-Core  DISCUSSION  - Samsung think there are ongoing discussions in R1. UL could be common or separate.  - MTK support this proposal. Think that what could make it complex is if we have to mix both R16 and R17 new frameworks for one UE.  - Chair proposes a high level text. OPPO want to wait. CATT think we can agree on a high level.   * RAN2 to support separate DL and UL and joint TCI state configurations. Details FFS. |

The moderator assumes this will be further discussed once we start the RRC CR discussion, and the question 2B is also related to thisunder The latest RAN1 L1 parameter list can be found in [R2-2111246](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2111246.zip) for NR and includes feNR-MIMO, and as per online discussion, RAN2 should identify if there are any aspects that would require additional clarification from RAN1 (as is also partly asked in question 2D already). The following discussion points out some aspects from the online discussion and companies are requested to provide feedback also on other aspects they may have spotted.

## 5.1 UL power control framework for BM

The UL power control parameters in the RAN1 LS (see below) belong to the "MultiBeam" category, but it's not made clear whether these are applicable to 1) ICBM without multi-TRP, 2) multi-TRP or 3) both. The parameter comments also indicate that how to define the parameters has been left up to RAN2, and that the details of "one setting can (optionally) be associated with an UL or if applicable joint TCI state via RRC." are up to RAN2.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter name in the spec** | **Description** | **Value Range** | **Per (UE, cell, TRP, …)** | **Comment** |
| p0\_Alpha\_CLIdPUSCHSet | UL PC parameters other than PLRS (Set of P0, alpha and closed loop index): PUSCH |  | Per UE per cell per BWP | It can be discussed in RAN2 whether a new parameter is needed or the associated legacy parameter can be reused. Or if one parameter that includes all UL PC setting (other than PLRS) pars can be used.  It was agreed that one setting can (optionally) be associated with an UL or if applicable joint TCI state via RRC. The details are up to RAN2 |
| p0\_Alpha\_CLIdPUCCHSet | UL PC parameters other than PLRS (Set of P0, alpha and closed loop index): PUCCH |  | Per UE per cell per BWP | It can be discussed in RAN2 whether a new parameter is needed or the associated legacy parameter can be reused. Or if one parameter that includes all UL PC setting (other than PLRS) pars can be used.  It was agreed that one setting can (optionally) be associated with an UL or if applicable joint TCI state via RRC. The details are up to RAN2 |
| p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSRSSet | UL PC parameters other than PLRS (Set of P0, alpha and closed loop index): SRS |  | Per UE per cell per BWP | It can be discussed in RAN2 whether a new parameter is needed or the associated legacy parameter can be reused. Or if one parameter that includes all UL PC setting (other than PLRS) pars can be used.  It was agreed that one setting can (optionally) be associated with an UL or if applicable joint TCI state via RRC. The details are up to RAN2 |
| p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSetId | p0\_Alpha\_CLIdSet ID (Set of P0, alpha and closed loop index) | p0 INTEGER in range (-16 … 15)  [alpha of type Alpha]  CLId ENUMERATE (0,1) | Per UE per cell per BWP | It can be discussed in RAN2 whether a new parameter is needed or the associated legacy parameter can be reused. Or if one parameter that includes all UL PC setting (other than PLRS) pars can be used.  It was agreed that one setting can (optionally) be associated with an UL or if applicable joint TCI state via RRC. The details are up to RAN2 |

Since these are part of the "MultiBeam" framework, they seem to be potentially applicable to the inter-cell beam management, but whether this is the correct interpretation and what exactly RAN2 should design is not crystal clear. In Rel-16, each UL channel and SRS has its own Set of P0, alpha and closed loop index configured. The information in the excel does not describe what is the intended functionality with these but they are marked as "new", but it's also noted that it's up to RAN2 whether new or existing parameters can be used, which is quite confusing. So are these additional PC sets for PUCCH, PUSCH, SRS and CLI, or is it RAN2 decision whether to utilize exiting PC parameters instead?

One way to understand this is that there would be a common list of UL PC parameters, and one entry in the list can be associated with an UL TCI state (either via UL-only or joint TCI state). Companies are requested to provide feedback on whether this is the same understanding, or whether we need to ask this from RAN1?

**Question 3**: How are the UL PC parameters for "MultiBeam" used?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 3: How are the UL PC parameters for "MultiBeam" used? | | | | |
| Company | Are the UL PC applicable to inter-cell beam management or something else? | Does RAN2 need to create a common list of UL PC parameters, which can then be associated with UL TCI state (i.e. either UL-only or joint TCI state)? | Do we need to request RAN1 to clarify how these parameters are used? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Inter-cell beam management (with unified TCI state, i.e. not for mTRP) | We understood that what would be needed is the following:   * List of UL PC parameters (max 4 entries) * UL-only or joint TCI state can be associated with one of the UL PC parameters | No strong view - preference would bne that companies talk to their RAN1 delegates.  If LS needs to be sent, we can ask if the RAN2 interpretation is correct, but let's not make open-ended questions. |
| Ericsson | For BM | Nokia: what does it mean “one of the PC parameters”? One of P0, alpha and closed loop index? Or one set of these? I think the latter. | Current input is unclear in many ways. Preference is to send LS to steer RAN1 attention to these ambiguities. |
| Xiaomi | For BM | Maybe. It seems a common list is more aligned with RAN1 parameter list. We would like to understand how the parameters are configured together with the legacy parameters. | No strong view. |
| Qualcomm | ICBM only | Common list is fine. Our assumption is also that the set is associated with the joint state. We can confirm this with our RAN1 colleagues. | A brief question can be added if an LS is sent to RAN1 if it helps with the drafting of the running CR. |
| ZTE | Yes | We share the same views with Nokia that one of sets of UL PC parameters can be associated with UL TCI state or joint TCI state | No needed. |
| Samsung | For ICBM  (all these PCs are related to the unified TCI states) | Common list for UL PC using unified TCI state is more efficient than the extension of the legacy signalling. | No strong view. |
| vivo | Inter-cell beam management only | We also think a common list of UL PC parameter is needed, while on entry can be associated with UL or joint TCI state. | We could check with RAN1 about our interpretation. |
| Apple | For BM | We agree with the second bullet from Nokia.  For the first bullet, we think only a list for SRS is needed, for PUCCH and PUSCH legacy parameter can be reused including: p0-AlphaSets in PUSCH-PowerControl, p0-Set in PUCCH-PowerControl.  The 4th RRC parameter is only needed for SRS, since PUCCH/SRS already includes an ID | No strong view. |
| OPPO | For beam management | Similar view as Nokia | But we still want to confirm with RAN1 since it is not clear from official parameter list. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, only application to inter-cell BM.  For mTRP PUSCH/PUCCH power control, there any other parameters in the list, e.g., PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo (without reference signal) | Yes | No |
| Intel | Inter-cell BM | Agree with Nokia |  |
| MediaTek | Inter-cell BM | Agree with Nokia | No strong view |
| Sharp | For BM | Yes, common list can be used. | No strong view. |
| CATT | Inter cell BM | Yes | seems not |
| LGE | Only for BM | Same view with Nokia | No strong view |

**Summary 3**: All companies think the "MultiBeam" parameters are for inter-cell beam management with unified TCI and but not for mTRP. Most companies also think we can have a common list of UL PC sets, which are then referred to be the other configurations (similar to the SSB/PCI configuration from Q2C). Most companies have no strong view on whether LS to RAN1 is needed. Rapporteur proposes to start RAN2 work based on majority assumptions and wait for further RAN1 input before sending an LS.

**Proposal 3**: The RAN1 parameters for "MultiBeam" are only applicable to ICBM with unified TCI framework (i.e. not to mTRP). Discuss further in Stage-3 phase how the UL PC configuration parameters are defined.

## 5.2 Extensions to MPE reporting

RAN1 has also agreed several parameters for the MPE reporting (see below):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter name in the spec** | **Description** | **Value Range** | **Per (UE, cell, TRP, …)** | **Comment** |
| mpe-Reporting-FR2-r17 | Indicates whether the UE shall report Rel17 MPE P-MPR in the PHR MAC control element, as specified in TS 38.321 [3] - This can be in PHR-Config (up to RAN2) | {0, 1} | Per UE per cell per BWP |  |
| numberOfN | Number of reported P-MPR values  In addition to the existing field in the PHR MAC-CE, N≥1 P-MPR values can be reported P-MPRs. This can be in PHR-Config (up to RAN2) |  | Per UE per cell per BWP | It can be discussed in RAN2 whether a new parameter/structutre is needed or the associated legacy parameter/structure for PHR reporting can be directly reused |
| mpe-ResourcePool | SSB/CSI-RS resource pool for P-MPR reporting |  | Per UE per cell per BWP | Detailed design (location, etc.) is up to RAN2 |

These are also under the "MultiBeam" category (see below), and as such could be applicable to the general ICBM framework. But since MPE is a property of FR2, this is also not fully clear and they could also apply to mTRP, in which case it would be good to understand if we can (re)use the MPE MAC CE design (as part of PHR configuration). It also seems there are some FFSs with these, but overall they seem to be additional features on top the Rel-16 MPE reporting.

**Question 4**: How are the MPE parameters for "MultiBeam" used?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 4: How are the MPE parameters for "MultiBeam" used? | | |
| Company | 1. Should the MPE parameters extend Rel-16 MPE configuration? | 1. Are the MPE reporting parameters applicable to both ICBM and multi-TRP? If they are, can we use common MAC CE design? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes (but that means PHR-Config as the Rel-16 MPE IE is not extendible, as was noticed after Rel-16 ASN.1 freeze) | Yes - the MPE reporting should be enabled for all PHR MAC CEs. If we keep the MPE as part of PHR config, this will be a straightforward thing to do.  For MAC CE design, RAN2 should start the discussion either based on contributions or an email discussion until next meeting. |
| Ericsson | In PHR-Config | Agree with above |
| ZTE | Seems should be in PHR-Config | No strong view, agree above |
| Xiaomi | In PHR-Config | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes, in PHR-Config as a separate IE | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes, in PHR-Config as a separate IE | No. From our understanding, MPE related parameters are only related with ICBM case, not for the mTRP operations in Rel-17.  RAN2 can consider this aspect will be added in future release but no explicit fields in mTRP PHR MAC CE is not needed (i.e. prepare some spare fields in MAC CE would be fine) |
| Vivo | Yes, as a separate one. | Yes |
| Apple | In PHR-Config | Yes for both questions. |
| OPPO | Yes | Not sure. From the RAN1 parameter list it is only for beam management since the parameters are listed in order of RAN1 agenda items. So we need check with RAN1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | These parameters need to be put somewhere but not sure what the question means. | These MPE reporting parameters can be used even without ICBM and without mTRP. We are not sure whether they can be used with ICBM and mTRP too. |
| Intel | Yes, in PHR-Config | Not sure yet. In our limited understanding, RAN1 seems to think that in BM, N of P-MPR values are reported but PHR is still one PHR associated to activated TCI, while in mTRP, there are two PHRs which are associated with two TRPs. We can get confirmation from RAN1 if this understanding is correct. |
| MediaTek | Yes, in PHR-Config as a separate IE | Yes |
| Sharp | Yes | Yes |
| CATT | in PHR-Config | Not sue. can check with R1. |
| LGE | Yes (but wonder if not?) | Not sure. We think MPE related parameters are only applicable to ICBM, but whether these are completely irrelevant with mTRP need further check. . |

**Summary 4**: Almost all companies think PHR-Config can be extended with new MPE configurations. Most also think MPE applies for both ICBM and mTRP, but one company thinks it's only for ICBM and one company points out the PHR reporting is different for mTRP. Rapporteur proposes to start the MAC CE design with the assumption that MPE reporting is needed for both cases, and further check from RAN1 whether this is the correct assumption.

**Proposal 4**: Rel-17 MPE configuration can be included in PHR-Config. For MAC CE design, RAN2 assumes MPE information can apply to both ICBM and mTRP for now, but will request RAN1 to clarify this further if the latest RAN1 parameter list doesn't make this clear.

## 5.3 Beam app time

RAN1 also has a somewhat "mysterious" parameter called "beam application time" in the L1 parameter list as per below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter name in the spec** | **Description** | **Value Range** | **Per (UE, cell, TRP, …)** | **Comment** |
| BeamAppTime\_r17 | Beam application time in symbols | TBD | Per UE per cell per BWP |  |

As this is also listed under "MultiBeam", it could be applicable to the general ICBM framework, but it seems like something belonging to the unified TCI only. The idea seems to be that this indicates the "beam switch" delay that occurs after UE indicates HARQ ACK for the DCI format effecting the TCI state switch, but it's not clear whether this is something that network should signal or whether it would be a UE capability instead.

**Question 5**: What is the intent of the "beam application time" parameter for the "MultiBeam" in the RAN1 excel?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 5: What is the intent of the "beam application time" parameter for the "MultiBeam" in the RAN1 excel? | | |
| Company | 1. Is the "beam application time" configured as part of the unified TCI state configuration, or is it part of another IE? | 1. Is there a need to ask RAN1 to clarify how this parameter is used (including whether this is a UE capability or a signalling parameter)? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **We assume this would be UE capability and not a configuration parameter**: UE indicates what it can do, and network assumes that always. We don't really understand why network would opt to do a shorter beam switch time than UE can do.  However, in any case RAN1 needs to provide more information on this for RAN2 to take it into account. | Yes - but hopefully RAN1 can clarify this after their November meeting without RAN2 asking. |
| Ericsson |  | We need to make decision whether we rely on hoping, or companies internal coordination, or we ask RAN1. Two latter seem more assuring. |
| ZTE | We do not agree with Nokia that it is not a UE capability but a configuration parameter. We think that this parameter can be assumed as a part of unified TCI state configuration. But, as we can see, it is just per BWP or per UE, rather than per TCI state. | Need more information of this IE from RAN1 to make a decision, and for now, this can be marked as a FFS for companies further check. Based on our knowledge, it is a signaling configured by gNB for indicating the timeline of applying the indicated TCI state. |
| Xiaomi |  | Ok to ask RAN1. |
| Qualcomm |  | The companies can check with their colleagues internally. If there is still confusion, we can ask RAN1. No need to speculate in RAN2. |
| Samsung |  | Yes - but hopefully RAN1 can clarify this after their November meeting without RAN2 asking. |
| vivo | What we understand is it should be a configuration parameter, but not a capability, while the UE capability is still being discussed in RAN1, which is expected to be received in next meeting.  We think it should be part of another IE, as it is not per-TCI state | We could ask RAN1 how to use it. |
| Apple | We think this can be configured per serving cell, which is used to indicate the activation delay for DCI based TCI indication. | Not needed |
| OPPO |  | We can check whether this is UE capability or a configuration parameter |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have similar understanding like Nokia. Also, we understand that this parameter is also applicable to intra-cell beam management. | Agree with Nokia. |
| Intel | We understand that beam application time is RRC parameter and RAN1 changed the name to the current one to avoid confusion of the UE capability. | Since it is per cell/UE/BWP, it is the same value for all TCI state (both UL and DL). |
| MediaTek | It looks like a RRC configuration parameter rather than a UE capability. But we agree that it would be strange if network asks UE to do what UE cannot do. Further clarification from RAN1 would be helpful. | Yes |
| CATT | not sure | can check with R1. |
| LGE | We initially think that it is a part of unified TCI configuration , but the Nokia’s question is valid since network should confirm to UE capability and in this case the meaning of this parameter is unclear. | Fine to ask RAN1. |

**Summary 5**: Most companies think the RAN1 parameter list states this as configuration parameter, while some think this is more UE capability, and some are not sure. Almost all companies think this should be asked from RAN1. Rapporteur proposes to explicitly ask this from RAN1 to avoid confusion.

**Proposal 5**: Request RAN1 to clarify how the "beam application time" would be used, and whether it is configuration parameter, UE capability or both.

## 5.4 mTRP aspects

There are also several L1 parameters related to multi-TRP in the RAN1 excel: The sub-feature areas are 1) mTRP BM, 2) mTRP PUSCH, 3) mTRP PUCCH, 4) mTRP PDCCH, 5) CSI-mTRP and 6) intercell mTRP. It seems that these would all be applicable to **only multi-TRP**, i.e. they are not used in the ICBM context without multi-TRP. Hence, the RAN2 design should consider these parameters as separate from the overall ICBM configuration.

**Question 6**: Are the mTRP parameters independent of the ICBM framework? Are there any ambiguities in mTRP parameters that need to be asked from RAN1?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 6: Are the mTRP parameters independent of the ICBM framework? Are there any ambiguities in mTRP parameters that need to be asked from RAN1? | | |
| Company | 1. Are the mTRP parameters independent of the ICBM framework? | 1. Are there any ambiguities in mTRP parameters that need to be asked from RAN1? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes - anything under "mTRP-XXX" is considered to apply **only** for mTRP cases | Once we start the RRC work it will be easier to assess this. Hence, we think RAN2 can just start the work in implementing the RRC/MAC CRs for mTRP first. |
| Ericsson | we should clarify difference between mTRP parameter being independent of ICBM parameter and whether there is restriction what can be simultaneously configured. | We can start implementing esp parameters that do not have “up to RAN2”. We can also make general agreement that RRC rapporteur can take some assumption on these “up to RAN2” while implementing and then we see if any of these were controversial. Other approach is that we first make RAN2 discussion and decision.  Further, we should clarify difference between mTRP parameter being independent of ICBM parameter and whether there is restriction what can be simultaneously configured. |
| Xiaomi | Not sure. We may ask RAN1 for clarification. | We can ask a more general question for RAN1, to clarify whether the BM parameters can be configured together with the mTRP parameters. |
| Qualcomm | For now, they are intended for mTRP by RAN1. But “independent” is a stronger condition. | Agree that we can ask whether simultaneous configuration is allowed or not. We can also include if there is any intention of extending these mTRP parameters to ICBM. |
| ZTE | As pointed out in LS reply from RAN1, the inter-cell mTRP and inter-cell BM have a common part, but the detail is not listed in the L reply (i.e only mention the measurement part), so we are not sure whether the understanding from NOKIA is correct. | We think we can discuss all these parameters first, and collect those parameters can apply to ICBM as well from RAN2 point of view, Then we resort them together and send a LS to RAN1 for asking |
| Samsung | Yes – All parameters are separately discussed. If some fields are related both aspects, we assume RAN1 indicate it in the excel for RAN1 parameters. |  |
| vivo | I assume it is true based on the current information from RAN1. But I assume there will be some common between mTRP and ICBM, which needs to confirm with RAN1. | We could start our stage-3 running CR. As the configuration for mTRP has been almost complete, it could be implemented firstly. During the discussion on that, we need to understand which part of parameters have dependence. Then, we could ask RAN1 to check. |
| Apple | In our view, the neighbour cell related info should be shared between mTRP and ICBM. Others can be independent. | We can ask whether the mTRP parameters are applicable for ICBM. |
| OPPO | So far yes | In general the MIMO parameters are listed in the order of agenda items. And so far the common part between inter-cell beam management and mTRP is beam measurement and configuration. Thus the parameters marked as multi-TRP are not applicable for inter-cell beam management. But we are fine to check with RAN1 any way. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | yes (and this is when the legacy TCI framework is used) | We think RAN2 can start the work in implementing the RRC/MAC CRs for all of the features according to RAN2 understanding, there is no justification to prioritize mTRP over ICBM.  If there are doubts on something expressed in RAN2, we can ask RAN1 for confirmation. |
| Intel | Yes. We agree with Nokia |  |
| MediaTek | Yes, since different TCI frameworks are used | RAN2 can start the works first, and then we will see if there’s any ambiguity. |
| Sharp | It seems yes but RAN1 confirmation may be needed. |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes | Similar view with ZTE |

**Summary 6**: Most companies agree the mTRP parameters are not for ICBM, but some are not sure and would like to ask from RAN1. Several companies propose RAN2 starts the Stage-3 work before asking, while some companies think this can be coordinated between RAN1 and RAN2 delegates. Rapporteur proposes to consider the mTRP parameters independent from ICBM and start Stage-3 work based on that, and collect questions to RAN1 based on the work.

**Proposal 6**: RAN2 assumes "mTRP" parameters are not for ICBM and starts Stage-3 work based on that assumption. If ambiguities are found, LS can be sent to RAN1 to ask for clarification from next meeting.

## 5.5 Other aspects

This section is intended to allow companies to comment in case there are issues spotted with any other L1 parameters for FeMIMO (on top of ICBM and mTRP, there are sub-features for i) HST, ii) SRS, iii) CSI-FDD and iv) URLLC PDCCH). One particular question is how to develop the RRC CRs for this - should there be separate RRC CRs per feature (at least to start with, to be merged later), or should RAN2 start with a common CR immediately?

**Question 7**: Are there any other issues with L1 parameters for FeMIMO? Should RAN2 develop CR per sub-feature, or one common CR for all sub-features?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 7: Are there any other issues with L1 parameters for FeMIMO? Should RAN2 develop CR per sub-feature, or one common CR for all sub-features? | | |
| Company | Should RAN2 develop CR per sub-feature, or one common CR for all sub-features? | Are there any other issues with L1 parameters for FeMIMO? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Common CR: While making sub-feature CRs seems attractive at first, it will make the merging phase more complicated. | Once we start the RRC work it will be easier to assess this. Hence, we think RAN2 can just start the work in implementing the RRC/MAC CRs. |
| Ericsson | One CR | Running RRC CR was submitted to this meeting with BFD related content according to RAN2 agreements.  After more RAN2 agreements specific to RAN1 parameters(that all flag up to RAN2 one or more aspects), more can be implemented for email review. |
| Xiaomi | Common CR: To avoid feature collision. |  |
| Qualcomm | One common CR |  |
| Samsung | Common CR | There are some controversial issues in other offline discussion (i.e. [016]) regarding the needs of new RRC IE for FR1 dedicated power control parameters.  RAN1 recommended as below but some companies provided the concerns on adding this mandatory field (i.e. *referenceSingal*) in case of FR1.  RAN2 may ask if there are any problems if this field is included in FR1 case i.e. UE configured for FR1 ignore this field even *referenceSingal* is configured.  **RAN1#104-e Agreements**  **Agreement**  For the case of multi-TRP, to support per-TRP power control in FR1, the linking of PUCCH resource with [one or] two power control parameter sets, the following is supported   * MAC-CE indicates RRC IE that configures power control parameter sets (p0, pathloss RS ID, and a closed-loop index).   + The exact design of RRC IE is up to RAN2 but from RAN1 point of view, one possible example is to reuse *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo* except for the *referenceSignal*   Note: It is common understanding in RAN1 that one PUCCH resource can be linked to one power control parameter set. |
| vivo | Either is fine. We think one common CR will be more complicated at the beginning, while separate CRs per-sub feature will be complicated at the later phase of merging. | More questions might be identified during running CR phase. |
| Apple | One common CR |  |
| OPPO | One common CR but maybe starting with a running CR and do it step by step | We are fine to start RRC running CR this meeting. On the other hand we feel there is no so much agreement can be captured given current situation of parameter list. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Common CR |  |
| Intel | Ok with common CR. However, we are not sure if RAN2 directly work with the CR. We need to discuss how to structure all IEs or how overall structure look like in high level. |  |
| MediaTek | Common CR | RAN2 can start RRC/MAC works first |
| Sharp | One common CR is preferable to overlook related sub-features. |  |
| CATT | Common CR |  |
| LGE | Seems that only common CR can work. |  |

**Summary 7**: All companies agree RAN2 can start with common CR for the WI, but some companies point that we may not want to start with CR work and first consider only RRC structure. Rapporteur proposes to start the Stage-3 work in post-meeting email discussion, which can have a first discuss RRC structure via concrete proposals and then focus on converged version.

**Proposal 7**: RAN2 will use one RRC CR for the FeMIMO WI and start the work in post-meeting email discussion. Can also discuss RRC structure during the discussion before going for final Stage-3 details.

## 5.6 Unified TCI state ID

The question 2B asks to consider whether we would have "common" or "separate" ID space for the UL/DL/Joint TCI states. RAN2 also made the following decision on this:

|  |
| --- |
| [R2-2110341](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_116-e/Docs/R2-2110341.zip) On Rel-17 FeMIMO Ericsson discussion NR\_feMIMO-Core  DISCUSSION  - Samsung think there are ongoing discussions in R1. UL could be common or separate.  - MTK support this proposal. Think that what could make it complex is if we have to mix both R16 and R17 new frameworks for one UE.  - Chair proposes a high level text. OPPO want to wait. CATT think we can agree on a high level.   * RAN2 to support separate DL and UL and joint TCI state configurations. Details FFS. |

This could imply we just have separate configurations for all TCI state cases, but the details were left FFS and would be good to clarify to ensure everyone shares the same understanding. Rapporteur also notes that the following agreement was already madmeeting (RAN1#106bis, from draft minutes [here](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106b-e/Report/Draft_Minutes_report_RAN1%23106b-e_v020.zip)) as per below:

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  **On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, in case of separate DL/UL TCI, it is up to RAN2 whether UL TCI shares the same TCI state pool as joint DL/UL TCI or UL TCI uses a separate TCI state pool from joint DL/UL TCI**   * **Note: By previous agreements, DL TCI shares the same TCI state pool as joint DL/UL TCI** |

This implies that the DL and joint TCI states are use “common pool”, but it’s up to RAN2 whether to also have UL TCI state use “common pool”. Based on this, it is perhaps not clear what does "common ID space" or "separate ID space" in question 2B would mean: Would "separate" mean RRC would have separate ID fields for UL/DL/joint TCI states, and the "type" could also be reflected in MAC CEs for unified TCI state? And would "common" mean that there would be just one ID field, and MAC CEs for unified TCI state only refer to a single ID, and the actual ID would identify which type of TCI state it is? Or would they have different meaning entirely?

Hence, companies are encouraged to clarify their interpretations on their answers here.

**Question 8**: What is the definition of "common ID space" and "separate ID space" in question 2B? How does it appear in RAN2 specifications?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 8: What is the definition of "common ID space" and "separate ID space" in question 2B? How does it appear in RAN2 specifications? | | |
| Company | Definition(s) of common and separate ID space in Question 2B | RAN2 specification impact of ID space? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Common ID space:** Unified TCI state configuration contains a) a single field for the TCI state ID, and b) a single field that indicates the "type" of the TCI state (i.e. UL-only, DL-only or joint TCI state).  **Separate ID space:** Unified TCI state configuration contains a) a CHOICE field for the ID of the TCI state type (i.e. UL, DL or joint), and the IEs for each TCI state ID may be separate. | **RRC impact:** Example ASN.1 for common and separate TCI states are shown below (red text is additions on top of Rel-15 TCI state):  Common    Separate (using same ID space value for simplicity)    **MAC impact:** Since MAC CEs have to be designed to work for all types of TCI states, the common/separate paradigms have slightly different impacts:   * **Common:** MAC CE only contains the ID of the TCI state (no need to indicate the type). This requires **log2(TCI-stateId-r17 values) = N bits** in the MAC CE. * **Separate:** MAC CE either contains the "type" of the TCI state (i.e. UL, DL, joint), or there are different MAC CEs for each TCI state type that are "separated". This requires **log2(max(TCI-stateId-r17 values for UL/DL/joint)) + log2(TCI state type values) = M+2 bits** in the MAC CE (same MAC CE) or **log2(max(TCI-stateId-r17 values for UL/DL/joint)) = M bits** (if we use separate MAC CEs). * Here we also assume with M<=N, with N-M<=2 (i.e. M is at most 2 bits smaller than N).   **UE capabilities:** We assume that in either case, UE capabilities may differ for how many TCI states of each type can be supported (up to RAN1). |
| ZTE | One thing we would like to clarify that:  What’s the difference between ‘common ID space’ and ‘separate ID space’  In our understanding, the ID in common ID space only can reference to only one TCI state configuration no matter what the TCI state type is (i.e UL, DL, joint)  The ID in separate ID space can reference more than one TCI state configuration,for example, may TCI state ID=1 can reference to more than one TCI states configuration whose types are UL,DL, joint respectively. | The common ID space, for RRC specification, which means one TCI state ID can reference to one TCI state  The separate ID space, for RRC specification , which means we have more than TCI states configuration with TCI state ID=X. |
| Intel | We agree that both common ID space and separate ID space approach are possible.  We slightly prefer common ID space approach because separate ID space will be more complicated in MAC CE design by adding 1 more indication. And also DL/Joint pool also include UL TCI related information for joint TCI case. Although it can just include the upper level IE only, it can be duplicated in signaling structure. | Agree with Nokia’s analysis |
| vivo | Common ID space means UL, DL and Joint TCI states share a common TCI state ID space, which is configured by one RRC IE. Moreover, the TCI type may not be needed to be indicated in RRC configuration, while it can be indicated by MAC CE. For example, some field in enhanced TCI activation MAC-CE can be used for indication.  Separate ID space means UL, DL and Joint TCI states will have separate ID space, which should be configured by separate IEs.  From our side, we prefer common ID space, which is simpler, and align with legacy.  Regarding the agreement in RAN2, we think it means from RAN2 signaling point of view, any of (UL, DL and Joint TCI states) can be configured by a specific TCI state configuration. While it doesn’t mean a decision on common or separate ID spaces, which should be FFS. | **Common TCI state ID space:**  1. RRC configuration on TCI state (only one IE to include TCI state ID, or TCI state ID+TCI type)  2. MAC CE indication on TCI sate ID+TCI type, or only TCI state ID.  **Separate TCI state ID space:**  1. RRC configuration on TCI state, each type of TCI state has one IE to include TCI state ID.  2. Separate MAC CE, which is used for indication on TCI state ID. |
| MediaTek | Our understanding is that ID space mean a xxxToAddModList, i.e., the ID represents one element in the list. Therefore,  Common TCI state ID space means that there’s only one TCI-StateToAddModList.  Separate TCI state space means that there are multiple TCI-StateToAddModList, for DL-only, UL-only, and joint TCI states.  Note: The choice may depend on whether a TCI state is allowed to support DL/UL only; if yes, separate ID space (i.e. separate lists) may be simpler (separate MAC CE for DL and UL TCI state indication), but common ID space still works (need to make sure that a DL/UL-only TCI state won’t be indicated for UL/DL use) | **Common TCI state ID space:**  1. RRC configurations of TCI states (one TCI-StateToAddModList)  2. One type of MAC CE indicating TCI state ID for DL and UL  **Separate TCI state ID space:**  1. RRC configurations of TCI states (multiple TCI-StateToAddModList)  2. Different type of MAC CEs indicating of TCI sate ID for DL and UL  Note: In both methods, TCI states for DL and UL should be we have the following cases  Case 1: MAC CE indicates a ‘joint’ TCI state, this TCI state is for DL and UL  Case 2: MAC CE indicates a ‘joint’ TCI state and a ‘UL-only’ TCI state; the former is for DL and latter is for UL  Case 3: MAC CE indicates a ‘joint’ TCI state and a ‘DL-only’ TCI state; the former is for UL and latter is for DL |
| Sharp | The difference is that the common ID space provides shared (variable) ID space for DL/UL/joint, while the separate ID space provides fixed ID space for each.  We think the agreed configuration (i.e. separate DL and UL and joint TCI state configurations) can be done for both ID spaces. | We have same view with Nokia. |
| Samsung | We also think the TCI state ID pool for unified TCI state framework is needed at least for below cases:   * DL-only and Joint UL/DL TCI states * UL-only TCI states   Here, common ID space or separate ID space means how above cases are handled  Common ID space  One TCI states “List” (e.g. as mentioned by MTK) includes all types of TCI states (i.e. DL-only, UL-only, and joint TCI states).  Separate ID space  Two TCI states “List”, one for DL-only and Joint UL/DC TCI states configurations, and the other is UL-only TCI state configurations.  So, each “List” has it’s own TCI states ID in the list.  Overall, we think the “Separate” TCI state pool would be more intuitive than “Common” TCI state pool. | We think vivo and MediaTek have similar understanding with us. |
|  | As Samsung writes:  Common ID space  One TCI states “List” (e.g. as mentioned by MTK) includes all types of TCI states (i.e. DL-only, UL-only, and joint TCI states).  Separate ID space  Two TCI states “List”, one for DL-only and Joint UL/DC TCI states configurations, and the other is UL-only TCI state configurations.  So, each “List” has it’s own TCI states ID in the list.  Common ID space is *not* as in legacy as in legacy there is separate ID space for TCI state and spatial relation.  For common, the ID space needs to be extended to accommodate both UL and DL. In joint case, only part of the ID space can be in use.  Further, our understanding on joint TCI state is that then UL follows DL TCI state and e.g. SRS cannot be configured. | Agree with Vivo, Mediatek and Samsung.  If we have common ID space for UL, DL and joint we need to start explaining which part of the ID space can be filled with UL, DL or joint.  The TCI stated can readily express DL/joint or UL. MAC CEs can be as in legacy, or have one MAC CE where one field tells the ID type expected(DL/joint or UL).  In the below ASN1 as UL is separate it is easy to add UL specific aspects like SRS.  -- ASN1START  -- TAG-TCI-STATE-START  TCI-State ::= SEQUENCE {  tci-StateId TCI-StateId,  qcl-Type1 QCL-Info,  qcl-Type2 QCL-Info OPTIONAL, -- Need R  ...,  [[  tci-StateType-r17 ENUMERATED {JointULDL} OPTIONAL,  ]]  }  QCL-Info ::= SEQUENCE {  cell ServCellIndex OPTIONAL, -- Need R  bwp-Id BWP-Id OPTIONAL, -- Cond CSI-RS-Indicated  referenceSignal CHOICE {  csi-rs NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceId,  ssb SSB-Index  },  qcl-Type ENUMERATED {typeA, typeB, typeC, typeD},  ...  }  -- Editor’s note: SRS should added as RS option for UL TCI state case  TCI-StateUL-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  tci-StateULId-r17 TCI-SatetULId-r17,  qcl-Type1-r17 QCL-Info,  qcl-Type2-r17 QCL-Info OPTIONAL -- Need R  }  -- TAG-TCI-STATE-STOP  -- ASN1STOP |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We understand that the "common pool" of joint DL/UL TCI states and DL TCI states is actually a list of a single type of TCI states that can be used either as joint UL/DL or as DL only.  We also understand that UL TCI states are defined so that they cannot be used for anything else than UL only TCI state.  So it makes sense to define:  - an xxToAddModList for TCI states that can be used as joint DL/UL or as DL only TCI state  - an yyToAddModList for TCI states that can be used as UL TCI state  With respect to ID space, a ToAddModList naturally has the elementID as ID, so that would mean separate ID space.  The ID space somehow impacts the MAC CE design, but we think it depends on the details of the MAC CE design, the analysis from Nokia does not really allow to understand the advantage or drawback of common vs. separate ID space.  **As a starting point, we suggest to consider separate ID space for TCI states that can be joint DL/UL or DL, and TCI states that are UL.**  Then, when we design the MAC CE, we can consider whether there would be advantages in having a common ID space and if so, how to do the common ID space (either make a single ToAddModList or add a common ID field to both). | There are at several aspects missing in Nokia's analysis:  - usually, in MAC CEs, we define the size of ID fields in order to align with octet boundaries  - there are cases in which the type of TCI state would be implicit, e.g. if a MAC CE indicates that a DCI value is associated with two TCI states, the first TCI state could always be for DL and the second one for UL  In addition, this is not 100% clear now, but we understand that, at any point in time, either all DCI values are mapped to joint TCI states, or all DCI values are mapped to one UL TCI state and/or one DL TCI state. This could also reduce the need for information on the type of TCI state. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 8**: The general view is that common ID space means 1) there is a single list of TCI states and 2) the ID pool is shared, while separate ID space means 2) there are multiple lists of TCI states (UL, DL, joint) and 2) each list has their own ID pool. The views are split on which way is better, and it seems difficult to conclude without going for exact Stage-3 details. Huawei suggestion that starting with separate lists has some merit as it allows to see optimizations later on, but may also mean more work if we combine the lists later on. Rapporteur proposes to consider the TCI state details based on concrete proposals, with companies illustrating the Stage-3 details in the RRC and MAC running CR discussions. Alternatively, the decision can be made online.

**Proposal 8**: RAN2 to discuss whether to go with one or multiple lists for TCI states. If no consensus, both can be discussed in running RRC CR discussion based on detailed proposals.

# 6 Conclusion

**Proposal 1a**: RAN2 to use the terminology "primary TRP (pTRP)" and "additional TRP (aTRP)" for RAN2 discussion purposes. FFS whether these will really be needed in Stage-2/3 specifications.

**Proposal 1b:** RAN2 does not consider RLM for TRP2 or SI/Short Message reception from TRP while using TRP2 in Rel-17 work.

**Proposal 2a**: No RRM enhancements for ICBM are done in Rel-17 (unless they are critical to the functionality).

**Proposal 2b:** Add SSB/PCI information for ICBM as cell-level information and link unified TCI state information to that. FFS on exact Stage-3 details.

**Proposal 2c**: RAN2 starts the RRC CR work based on latest RAN1 input before sending LS to RAN1.

**Proposal 3**: The RAN1 parameters for "MultiBeam" are only applicable to ICBM with unified TCI framework (i.e. not to mTRP). Discuss further in Stage-3 phase how the UL PC configuration parameters are defined.

**Proposal 4**: Rel-17 MPE configuration can be included in PHR-Config. For MAC CE design, RAN2 assumes MPE information can apply to both ICBM and mTRP for now, but will request RAN1 to clarify this further if the latest RAN1 parameter list doesn't make this clear.

**Proposal 5**: Request RAN1 to clarify how the "beam application time" would be used, and whether it is configuration parameter, UE capability or both.

**Proposal 6**: RAN2 assumes "mTRP" parameters are not for ICBM and starts Stage-3 work based on that assumption. If ambiguities are found, LS can be sent to RAN1 to ask for clarification from next meeting.

**Proposal 7**: RAN2 will use one RRC CR for the FeMIMO WI and start the work in post-meeting email discussion. Can also discuss RRC structure during the discussion before going for final Stage-3 details.

**Proposal 8**: RAN2 to discuss whether to go with one or multiple lists for TCI states. If no consensus, both can be discussed in running RRC CR discussion based on detailed proposals.