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# Introduction

This document summarizes the following email discussion.

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

Scope: Based on R2-2110962, R2-2110035, RAN LS’s and RAN1 progress. Do an initial review of impacts to MAC (MAC CEs) and related R2 work, collect initial comments, assess maturity and if possible Find Potential Agreements, identify points for online discussion, can also identify open issues.

Intended outcome: Report

Deadline: For online W1 Thursday

The intention of this offline discussion is reviewing impacts to MAC CEs on RAN1 LSes and their consequences/agreements. As results of this offline discussion, RAN2 will find Easy/Potential Agreements, identify points for online discussion, can also identify and capture open issues, and whether LS out is needed.

# Contact Points

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Samsung | Seungri Jin | seungri.jin@samsung.com |
| LGE | Hanul Lee | hanul.lee@lge.com |
| Ericsson | Helka-Liina Määttänen | Helka-liina.maattanen@ericsson.com |
| Qualcomm | Ruiming Zheng | rzheng@qti.qualcomm.com |
| ZTE | Fei Dong | Dong.fei@zte.com.cn |
| Xiaomi | Yumin Wu | wuyumin@xiaomi.com |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Tero Henttonen | tero.henttonen@nokia.com |
| InterDigital | Dylan Watts | dylan.watts@interdigital.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Discussion:

## Uplink MAC CE enhancements for multi-TRP operations

Based on RAN1 agreements captured in [4], there are some issues regarding potential MAC CE enhancements/introduction. These issues are related to the uplink enhancement to enhance the reliability features for mTRP operation (e.g. PUCCH repetition, PUSCH repetition, etc.) which is listed in feMIMO WID [1]. In addition, some RRC impacts about uplink enhancements are provided in [5].

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Enhancement on the support for multi-TRP deployment, targeting both FR1 and FR2:    1. Identify and specify features to improve reliability and robustness for channels other than PDSCH (that is, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH) using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel, with Rel.16 reliability features as the baseline |

Below summarized issues have been identified in [4] in terms of expected UL MA CE enhancements:

* + - 1. PUCCH related issues
         * Issue 1-1: How to enhance/design PUCCH spatial relation activation/deactivation MAC CE for mTRP PUCCH repetition
         * Issue 1-2: How to support per-TRP power control in FR1;
      2. PUSCH related issues
         * Issue 2-1: How to enhance/design pathloss reference RS update MAC CE for mTRP PUSCH repetition
         * Issue 2-2: How to enhance/design PHR reporting MAC CE for mTRP PUSCH repetition

### 3.1.1 PUCCH spatial relation activation/deactivation MAC CE for mTRP PUCCH repetition

RAN1 agreed to introduce the multi-TRP PUCCH repetition in Rel-17 (i.e. each PUCCH resource can be associated with one or two spatial relations and support simultaneous activation/deactivation of spatial relations in a PUCCH groups).

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#106-e Agreements**  **Agreement**  For the grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes,   * Support MAC-CE activating two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * Support MAC-CE activating two sets of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters (via a MAC-CE that activating two spatial relation info’s or a MAC-CE that activating two sets of power control parameters for a group of PUCCH resources, respectively), the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with one spatial relation info or one set of power control parameters (via a MAC-CE that activating single spatial relation info or a MAC-CE that activating single set of power control parameters for a group of PUCCH resources, respectively), then the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same spatial relation info or the same set of power control parameters. * The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide. * Note: Impacts coming from coverage enhancement work item on associating PUCCH resource with repetition factor can be discussed separately |

As captured in above, some enhancements on “Enhanced PUCCH Spatial Relation Activation/Deactivation MAC CE” to support multi-TRP PUCCH repetition scheme seem required.

**Q1: Do you agree to enhance the “Enhanced PUCCH Spatial Relation Activation/Deactivation MAC CE” to support multi-TRP PUCCH repetition scheme in Rel-17?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| LGE | Yes, but we think it is enough not to apply the restriction in the current specification than to change the MAC CE format.  The details are answered in Q2. |
| Ericsson | yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes |
| ZTE | Yes |
| Xiaomi | Yes |
| Intel | Yes |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes - unless blocking issues are found, it's best to use (and extend, if needed) the existing MAC CE. |
| InterDigital | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur summary**

**TBD**

In [4], there are two candidate approaches to support this feature:

1. Option 1: Introduce the new PUCCH spatial relation activation/deactivation MAC CE for mTRP PUCCH repetition.
2. Option 2: Revise the legacy “Enhanced PUCCH Spatial Relation Activation/Deactivation MAC CE” with additional fields (e.g. indicator for mTRP operation, additional Spatial Relation Info ID(s) for added TRP).
3. Option 3: Others

**Q2: If yes for Q1, which option is preferred to support PUCCH spatial relation activation/deactivation MAC CE for mTRP PUCCH repetition? (i.e. activate/deactivate one or two spatial relations for a group of PUCCH resources).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Option** | **Comments** |
| LGE | Option 3 | We think the reuse of legacy MAC CE is the simplest way.  There is a restriction not to include PUCCH Resources within the same PUCCH Resource group in one MAC CE.   * no other PUCCH Resources within the same PUCCH Resource group are indicated in the MAC CE.   If the restriction is not applied for the multi-TRP PUCCH repetition applicable UE, multiple PUCCH Resources within the same PUCCH Resource group can be included in one MAC CE, and multiple Spatial Relation Info can be included in the MAC CE, i.e., multiple Spatial Relation Info can be activated in the same PUCCH resource group by the MAC CE. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | Main point is the functionality but also clarity is important.  It seems simpler to have new MAC CE rather than trying to reuse R field in an existing MAC CE and explain another interpretation of the fields as the other interpretation would mean that per one PUCCH resource up to two spatial relation IDs follow. Thus, the interpretation of the field would mean restructuring of the rest of the fields.  The suggestion to lift the restriction related to PUCCH group results in mixing two concepts, mTRP and BM as PUCCH group can have multiple, more than one PUCCH resource and these resources are not per TRP/in relation to a TRP. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | The legacy MAC CE (6.1.3.25 in 38.321) can be revised to support new requriment, i.e. activate/deactivate one or two spatial relations and for a group of PUCCH resources.  The legacy restriction should be kept for new MAC CE, otherwise, updating the spatial relation for the PUCCH resource within one group may not work. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | Both options can work but we think the new MAC CE could be well-designed for the newly added functionality.  We agree with Ericsson’s comments above. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | First of all, Reuse the R bit to indicate the TRP PUCCH used.  The main difference between option 1 and option 2 is whether we need to keep a PUCCH resource ID solely in one MAC CE?   * If answer is yes, which means one PUCCH resource ID should be followed by two spatial relation info ID field, please see below:     This is obviously option 1because the legacy format is totally changed.   * If the answer is no, which means, in legacy enhanced PUCCH spatial relation activation/deactivation MAC CE, one PUCCH resources ID can be emerged at most twice in one MAC CE, each equal PUCCH resources ID is followed by one spatial relation field. This is option 2, where we only need to re-define one R bit in spatial relation info octet. No other parts modification is needed, the restriction is still kept.   For the option 1, we can save the bit consumption for PUCCH spatial relation activation/deactivation MAC CE for mTRP PUCCH repetition capable UE with more specification effort.  For the option 2 which flip the option 1, minimize specification effort by paying the price of the more bit consumption for MAC CE size.  To us, option 1 seems more beneficial from RAN interface perspective , we would like to introduce a new MAC CE. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | A new MAC CE is clean from the specification. |
| Intel | Option 1 | We slightly prefer to introduce a new MAC CE. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 2 | RAN2 normally extends existing MAC CEs that extend the same functionality. That's why we have R-bits.  Of course we can always create new MAC CEs, but it's highly likely that we just duplicate specification procedures. If we need to indicate both the legacy MAC CE and the new MAC CE at the same time, then it may be necessary to create a new MAC CE. |
| InterDigital | Option 1 | Prefer to add a new MAC CE for simplicity |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 or option 2 | Agree with Ericsson about option 3. |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary**

**TBD**

### 3.1.2 Association between PUCCH and TRP for PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements in FR1

RAN1 agreed that the linking of PUCCH resource with two power control parameter sets is required in case of FR1 mTRP operation (i.e. spatial relation activation/deactivation) in Rel-17.

|  |
| --- |
| **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. |

Based on explanation in [4], RAN1 also provides their view how to handle this issue, i.e. reuse *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo* IE except for the *referenceSignal* in case of FR1. It means the same MAC CE what used for FR2 could be used to activate/deactivate the spatial relation for FR1 as well. If RAN2 accept the suggested signling what RAN1 suggested, there would be no MAC CE issues but only have RRC impacts e.g. restrictions in field description. Or, the new MAC CE for spatial relation update (with power control) for FR1 case could be introduced.

**Q3: Which option is preferred to support spatial relation update (with power control) for FR1?**

1. Option 1: Reuse the legacy MAC CEs (Enhanced PUCCH Spatial Relation Activation/Deactivation MAC CE and MAC CE could be introduced as a result of Q1/Q2) to FR1 case as well.
2. Option 2: Introduce the new MAC CE(s) to support spatial relation update (with power control) for FR1 cases.
3. Option 3: Others
4. Option 4: Introduce the new MAC CE(s) to support PUCCH Power control set update (with power control) for FR1 cases.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Option** | **Comments** |
| LGE | Option 1 | In RAN1 agreement in RAN1#104-e, RAN1 has already given the example of what they think, i.e., *reuse PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo except for the referenceSignal*. |
| Ericsson | Option 4 | Note that the suggestion from RAN1 is just an example, and the exact design of the signaling is up to RAN2. What needs to be enhanced according to the above RAN1 agreement is to *link a PUCCH resource with either one or two power control parameter sets for FR1.*  *Currently there is no need to configure spatial relations to a UE in FR1.* For this reason, we do not prefer reusing PUCCH-spatialRelationsInfo to configure the power control parameter sets. The power control parameter sets for PUCCH can be configured separately from PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo.Further, there is no reason to introduce new MAC CE that has spatial relation functionality as that is not needed for FR1.  Finally, power control and spatial relation are separate functionality, it is cleaner to have separate MAC CE for PUCCH power control even if FR1 would use spatial relations.  For the reasons above we added the Option 4:  Introduce the new MAC CE(s) to support PUCCH Power control set update (with power control) for FR1 cases. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2, but | Legacy MAC CE (6.1.3.25 in 38.321) cannot indicate two sets of power control parameters.  The MAC CE format can reuse the one in Q2 instead of the legacy, and the signaling restriction suggested by RAN1 can be described accordingly if RAN2 accept, i.e. reuse PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo IE except for the referenceSignal in case of FR1.  Further, no need to configure spatil relations to UE in FR1, the option 2 should be updated. -- to support PUCCH Power control set update for FR1 case. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | We don’t see big motivation to separately handle the FR1 case.  As RAN1 suggested, some RRC restriction could be enough.  For Qualcomm’s comment that legacy MAC CE cannot indicate two sets of power control parameters, the intention of Option 1 is reuse both legacy MAC CE (6.1.3.25 in 38.321) and the new MAC CE format will be introduced as outcome of Q2 for FR1 case.  In addition, we think the power control set can be implicitly indicated by spatial relation info. if SpatialRelationInfo IE includes corresponding power control parameters. |
| ZTE | Option 4, which maybe originally option 2 | See our comments above, introduction a new MAC CE can save the overhead of the resources for sending the MAC CE.  By the way, we think only one new MAC CE is needed for both Q2 and Q3. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | We think that the RRC configuration restriction could be used to fulfil the RAN1 requirements, and agree with the clarifications provided by Samsung. |
| Intel | Option 4 or option 1 | We agree that RAN1 seem to suggest to reuse Enhanced PUCCH Spatial Relation Activation/Deactivation MAC CE.  It would be dependent on how RRC IE can be introduced to support PUCCH Power control set. If the modification is easy, option 1 would be acceptable. Otherwise, option 4 is more clear. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 1 | The main point of the new MAC CE should be to introduce functionality. If we extend existing functionality, normally we would extemnd existing MAC CE. If the functionality is completely new, then we would usually create new MAC CE.  The intent here seems tobe to switch which PC set is being used, including PUCCH spatial relation. Hence, this seems to extend existing PUCCH spatial relation update, so option 1 seems to be the usual way.  Of course both options 2 and 4 could work, too, but this depends on the action for the previous question - we should be consistent. |
| InterDigital | Neutral | No strong opinion, okay to go with majority. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It depends on how clear it can be made in each option | We should not use an RRC structure for FR1 that includes as mandatory fields parameters that have no meaning for FR1, and has a name that refers to Spatial relation info although it is irrelevant, even if RAN1 would come with such a bad suggestion.  If we can have a reasonably clear description of a single new MAC CE that handles both the FR1 case (power control only) and FR2 case (spatial relation info), it could be ok but otherwise, separate MAC CEs are preferrable. |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary**

**TBD**

### 3.1.3 PHR reporting for mTRP PDSCH repetition

For PHR reporting related to mTRP PUSCH repetition, RAN1 agreed the below baseline:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#106-e Agreements**  Agreement  For PHR reporting related to M-TRP PUSCH repetition, support Option 4 as UE optional capability for a UE that supports mTRP PUSCH,   * Option 4: Calculate two PHRs (at least corresponding to the CC that applies m-TRP PUSCH repetitions), each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, and report two PHRs.   **RAN1#106bis-e Agreements**  **Agreement**  If a UE does not support option 4 (Calculate two PHRs),   * If the PHR reporting is actual PHR, the UE uses the set of power control parameters corresponding to a first (earliest) repetition that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH that carries the PHR MAC-CE is transmitted. * If the PHR reporting is virtual PHR, it is reported based on legacy procedures. * Note: RAN2 may further discuss PHR triggering aspects related to mTRP PUSCH repetition |

Based on RAN1 agreements, there are two possibilities that UE reports PHR for mTRP PUSCH repetition.

1. If UE support PHR reporting related to mTRP PUSCH repetition (Calculate two PHRs)
2. If UE doesn’t support PHR reporting related to mTRP PUSCH repetition (Calculate two PHRs)

It seems RAN2 need to further discuss how to support PHR reporting related to mTRP PUSCH repetition because RAN1 already agreed the schems on PHR for mTRP PUSCH repetition.

**Q4: Do you agree to introduce the new MAC CE regarding PHR for mTRP PUSCH repetition?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| LGE | Yes. For "calculate two PHR" capable UE, we think the new MAC CE is essential. |
| Ericsson | Yes. If UE needs to calculate two PHRs and report those the MAC CE should either send one at the time and indicate which TRP(coreset ID or another indentifying ID from RRC) it is for or send PHR for both TRPs in same MAC CE. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, for UE with capability of calculate two PHR |
| Samsung | Yes, for UE with capability of calculate two PHR |
| ZTE | Yes, new MAC CE is introduced. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |
| Intel | Yes, new MAC CE for UE supporting calculating two PHRs (option 4) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes.  However, we would note that this will increase the RAN2 efforts as RAN1 is also asking to create extensions to the MPE reporting. But since the existing PHR format is already quite congested, it may be easier to just create a new version of it (with separate LCID). |
| InterDigital | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur summary**

**TBD**

In [4], RAN2 is requested to discuss how to support PHR reporting related to mTRP PUSCH repetition, and provides some considerable issues as below:

* + - * + New MAC CE design including the function which TRP is applied for PHR reporting.
        + How to handle if both MAC CEs are pending and UL grant is not large enough to accommodate both the MAC CEs.
* UE implementation
* one MAC CE have priority of the other (e.g. original PHR MAC CE has high priority)
* Network can indicate which TRP’s PHR has higher priority
  + - * + Whether use legacy parameters (timer, threshold, etc.) or adding TRP specific parameters
        + PHR triggering conditions

**Q5: If yes for Q4, do you agree the potential issues identified above? Please add further issues if you think necessary from RAN2 perspective.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| LGE | Agree with the design and handling of new MAC CE. However, we think the separate timer is not needed even TRP specific PHR is introduced, but RAN2 may ask RAN1 whether TRP specific threshold and TRP specific triggering condition are needed. |
| Ericsson | We agree MAC CE work is needed.  Then for second point, considering priority is ok especially for intercell case where there will be the original serving cell TRP and the added PCI TRP.  Having separate parameter configuration would provide more network flexibility as if same value is preferred, network can configure such.  For PHR triggering, per TRP triggering should be applied. |
| Qualcomm | It is unclear for us the second bullet. Why both the new PHR MAC CE and the legacy MAC CE are pending? If UE doesn’t support to report new PHR MAC CE, UE follows the legacy triggering condition and sends the legacy PHR MAC CE.  Whether separate parameter configuration for PHR is needed or not needs FFS. |
| Samsung | Agree what provided above.  We believe many detail procedure should be further discussed by RAN2. |
| ZTE | Agree with most part of rapporteur’s analysis. We share the same view with Qualcomm, we do not think both PHR shall be pending. To our understanding, only new MAC CE shall be pending if one TRP trigger the PHR. |
| Xiaomi | We are open to discuss all issues listed above. We also share the same concern as raised by Qualcomm on the two pending PHRs. |
| Intel | We are ok to discuss all issues but we could just follow the existing PHR approach i.e. new MCA CE is multiple entry including both TRPs’ PHR. In this case, we don’t need to define any priority. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Above questions all need to be discussed (even if we assume the default for most would be same as the legacy behaviour) . In addition, we will also have to discuss how to incorporate the additional MPE information coming in Rel-17 to the new PHR format. |
| InterDigital | Yes, we agree with all issues proposed by the rapporteur.  For the 2nd bullet, we don’t believe that it could be left to UE implementation. Also, it may not be efficient to expect a network-indicated priority. We should have clear rules for selecting one of the computed PHRs for reporting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We also think the priority issue does not apply to the new MAC CE. Agree on the other aspects. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur summary**

**TBD**

### 3.1.4 Pathloss Reference RS update MAC CE for mTRP

In Rel-17, RAN1 has introduced PUSCH repetition for mTRP, so it is required to enhance PUSCH Pathloss Reference RS Update MAC CE to support mTRP. It needs to be indicated which TRP is applied for this MAC CE i.e. adding TRP indication or SRS resource set associated with TRP information.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#104-e Agreements**  **Agreement**  When MAC-CE indicates a PL-RS ID for one or more SRI IDs, it also indicates whether the SRI IDs are associated with the first or the second SRS resource set. |

In [4], two candidate approaches have been provided to support this feature:

1. Option 1: Introduce the new PUSCH Pathloss Reference RS Update MAC CE for mTRP PUSCH repetition.
2. Option 2: Revise the legacy PUSCH Pathloss Reference RS Update MAC CE with additional field to differentiate the TRP information.
3. Option 3: Others

**Q6: Which option is preferred to support Pathloss Reference RS update MAC CE for mTRP?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| LGE | Option 2. Currently, there are two R bit in PUSCH Pathloss Reference RS Update MAC CE. We think it would be simple to replace R bit to one indicator. |
| Ericsson | Option 2. For this case it seems simpler to revise the existing MAC CE. The description would be simply that the revised field tells which TRP(SRS set ID or another indentifying ID from RRC) the update is for and not about structure of the MAC CE as it would be for the case in Questions Q2. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 but.  6.1.3.28 of 38.321 can be revised to support new requirement. In addition to the new field to indicate the TRP information, another inciation bit is also needed to enable whether two SRS resource set associated SRI IDs are both updated. |
| Samsung | No strong view (Slightly prefer Option 2).  But we agree that reusing the legacy MAC CE is simple so Option 2 seems beneficial. |
| ZTE | Option 2, R bit can be utilized. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2.  It seems simpler to use the R bit in the legacy MAC CE. |
| Intel | Option 2 is ok. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 2  This is extending existing functionality and we have R-bit in the MAC CE. Hence, we should just use it for this. |
| InterDigital | Option 2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 or option 2. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur summary**

**TBD**

## Other MAC CE enhancements

According to LSes [2][3] from RAN1, some MAC CE enhancements regarding inter-cell beam management are required, see relevant RAN1 responses:

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1: RAN2 notes that WI objective 1 states " The same beam measurement/reporting mechanism will be reused for inter-cell mTRP "). RAN2 would like to understand if the entire inter-cell BM is also applicable to inter-cell mTRP? If not, which part is not applicable to mTRP and how does that work?**  **Answer 1**: Rel17 Inter-cell BM and inter-cell mTRP have common points but they are not entirely the same. The common and different points are as follows: they both use the same beam measurement/reporting mechanisms but they have different TCI signaling framework (beam indication) as inter-cell BM is based on Rel17 unified TCI while inter-cell mTRP is based on Rel15/16 TCI framework. For inter-cell BM, UE assumes that the UE-dedicated channels/RSs can be switched to a TRP with different PCI according to DCI/MAC-CE based unified TCI update; for inter-cell mTRP, UE assumes mDCI-mTRPbased multi-PDSCH reception.  f) **TCI switching signalling:** Which signalling should be used for TCI switching for inter-cell beam management?  **Answer 2.f**: Inter-cell beam management is going to use Rel-17 unified TCI signaling where RAN1 agreed that a MAC-CE activates one or multiple TCI states out of RRC configured TCI state pool. If multiple TCI states are activated, DCI selects one TCI state among activated ones. If only one TCI state is activated, the activated TCI state is also implicitly selected without further DCI indication. |

In addition, [5] provides the analysis on the User plane impact of inter-cell beam management but it seems there are no further MAC CE impacts other than above issues. One further required MAC CE would be mTRP BFR related MAC CE which has been discussed in other offline discussion.

We think the detail MAC CE discussion for both TCI update for inter-cell mTRP and mTRP BFR will be discussed in other offline discussion.

**Q7: Are there further MAC CEs to be introduced in Rel-17 other than both inter-cell mTRP and mTRP BFR MAC CEs?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| LGE | No. Not needed anything other than the new PHR and some enhancements mentioned above. |
| Ericsson | For BM the mTRP enhancements that consider indicating two TCI states/spatial relations, power control or PHR are not relevant. PCI is hidden in TCI state thus apart from checking that ID spaces do not change, the TCI state related MAC Ces of Rel-16 should work.But, RAN2 should check where the aspect that PDSCH(maybe CSI-RS)follow PDCCH TCI state is specified. Shall we add corresponding text e.g. in PDCCH MAC CEs or will this become clear in RRC or L1 specification?  BM had interesting approach to power control according to RAN1 parameter excel but that seems quite open still. If there is unified configuration of different UL channels for BM Rel-17 then new MAC CE is needed for power control. How this MAC CE will look would depend a lot on how unified the PC configuration would look like and which aspects the MAC CE control. E.g. only pathloss reference RS or compbination of parameters and the RS. |
| Qualcomm | Unified TCI state update MAC CE. Should we discuss it here? |
| Samsung | RAN1 have not fully concluded for the issues on the unified TCI framework and inter cell BM, so RAN2 need to further check other MAC CE impacts are required. |
| ZTE | In our understanding, for inter-cell mTRP which is mainly an enhancement for R16 mPDCCH mTRP , the legacy MAC CE can be reused without any doubts.  While for inter-cell BM, which introduce the mTRP for UL in TCI state pool (i.e including both UL/DL TCI state and UL only TCI state), this is not similar with R15/R16, as we all know, the PUSCH spatial relationship is indicated by SRS spatial relation. We need to know whether the we need one MAC CE to indicate UL and DL both or we need a separate MAC CE for indicating UL. If we decided to use one MAC CE for both UL/DL (i.e enhanced PDSCH spatial relation A/D MAC CE), how to design DCI code point mapping mechanism to ensure the DCI for DL not to map the active TCI state for UL. If we need a separate MAC CE for UL only or DL/UL both, we may need two or one new MAC CE. |
| Intel | It seems enough for now although we are not sure the meaning of unified TCI and BFR MAC CE will be discussed separately. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | The new MPE-specific reporting (of multiple P-MPR for more than 1 beam) will have to be discussed for PHR formats.  Then on unified TCI format, it seems clear we will need new MAC CEs since the framework only applies to ICBM. For mTRP, the existing TCI state MAC CEs will continue to be used. What would be useful is to try to create design options with 1) reusing existing MAC CE and 2) creating new MAC CE. |
| InterDigital | TBD. The discussion about Inter-cell mTRP operation is still under way, we may need some enhancements for switching between Intra inter-cell TRP. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Rapporteur summary**

**TBD**

# Conclusion

**TBD**
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