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## Introduction

In this summary, the term “item 1” refers to the first item in the Rel.17 NR FeMIMO WID, i.e. multi-beam enhancement:

|  |
| --- |
| * Enhancement on multi-beam operation, mainly targeting FR2 while also applicable to FR1:
	+ Identify and specify features to facilitate more efficient (lower latency and overhead) DL/UL beam management to support higher intra- and L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and/or a larger number of configured TCI states:
		1. Common beam for data and control transmission/reception for DL and UL, especially for intra-band CA
		2. Unified TCI framework for DL and UL beam indication
		3. Enhancement on signaling mechanisms for the above features to improve latency and efficiency with more usage of dynamic control signaling (as opposed to RRC)
	+ Identify and specify features to facilitate UL beam selection for UEs equipped with multiple panels, considering UL coverage loss mitigation due to MPE, based on UL beam indication with the unified TCI framework for UL fast panel selection
 |

This summary includes the following:

* Observation and proposal
* Summary of current companies’ positions on each of the aspects within the category

## Summary of companies’ inputs

The listed issues are structured primarily to facilitate some progress on pending issues identified in the agreements (see Appendix A).

### Issue 1 (Rel.17 unified TCI framework – note: for intra-cell beam management)

UL PC parameters other than PL-RS

**Proposal 1.1A**: On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for PUSCH and PUCCH, the setting is either included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.

* Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed and the signaling) is up to RAN2

Note: It has been agreed that the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is associated with UL channel or UL RS (therefore the setting is channel- and signal-specific)

**vs.**

**Proposal 1.1B:** On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework,

* For each of PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) can be associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.
	+ In this case, multiple settings are configured where each setting is associated with at least one TCI state
	+ Details of the association (including the manner it is performed and the signaling) is up to RAN2
* If not associated, for each of the PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS, only one setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) per channel/signal is configured for and will be applied to all the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI states

Note: It has been agreed that the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is associated with UL channel or UL RS (therefore the setting is channel- and signal-specific).

Table 1 Additional inputs: issue 1 – UL PC other than PL-RS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Two alternatives for compromise proposals: 1.1A vs 1.1B**1. **Proposal 1.1A: to accommodate AltC proponents, AltA/B is made applicable only for PUSCH and PUCCH. This means that AltC is used for SRS**
2. **Proposal 1.1B: proposed by Ericsson as a compromise/synthesis between AltB and AltC (based on Samsung, Apple, and Spreadtrum wording proposals)**

**Please share your inputs on the above proposals** |
| Apple | Support Proposal 1.1B.  |
| OPPO | We support 1.1A. the reason is in our view, for SRS resource, the PC parameters (P0, alpha, closed loop index) shall be configured per SRS resource set, but not associated/contained in each TCI states.  |
| vivo | The proposals would make the TCI framework design complicated. If the TCI pool is across all CCs, then the the framework would be rather heavy. And we would need three lists.The legacy framework is working well without further enhancement on this.[Mod: The option to use of legacy scheme has been removed last meeting. If there is no consensus in this meeting AltC is the default for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS – meaning UL PC setting is channel/signal-specific and not TCI-state (beam)-specific] |
| Docomo | Considering the unified solution for PUCCH/PUSCH/SRS in proposal 1.1B, we prefer proposal 1.1B. |
| MediaTek | Slightly prefer P1.1B since it is more flexible for NW configuration. But we would like to clarify the followings:* Regarding the first bullet, further study the detail of association, and whether it is up to RAN2.

 * + FFS: Detains of the association (including the manner it is performed and the signaling), and whether it is up to RAN2

[Mod: Done]* Regarding the second bullet, whether Rel-15/16 mechanism can be used to provide UL PC parameters for each channel/signal w/o any issue?
	+ FFS: Whether Rel-15/16 mechanism can be used to provide UL PC parameters for each channel/signal

[Mod: This option has been removed in the last meeting ☹ Please see my comment for vivo] |
| LG | Support Proposal 1.1A.Regarding Proposal 1.1B, it seems to be clarified on the meaning of ‘only one PC setting’ is configured for all the UL/joint TCI states’. In our understanding, there can be multiple settings configured and a specific one of them would be ‘applied’ (e.g. one default PC setting) if PC setting is not associated for each of PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS since it could be associated to some (not all) of UL channels[Mod: It is one setting per channel/signal, not one setting for all channels/signal. Clarified a bit more] |
| Mod V7 | **Revised proposal 1.1B** per inputs  |
| Sony | Support Proposal 1.1B. Appreciate the compromise to include Alt.C. |
| ZTE | Support Proposal 1.1A, but we can live with proposal 1.1B.In general, we can have a unified framework for PUSCH, PUCCH and SRS, and so proposal 1.B seems better. But, to be honest, we are not a fan of providing a default solution if not associated (like we did for PL RS, if not associated). We are not against this proposal 1.1B if majority supports, but if, unfortunately, we still need to distinguish SRS from PUSCH and PUCCH (as OPPO proposed), we suggest to go with Proposal 1.1A directly. |
| Mod V10 | **No revision** |
| Spreadtrum | Support Proposal 1.1B in principle. In our views, the words ‘per channel/signal’ should also be added in the 1st subbullet.For the 2nd subbullet, since ‘If not associated’ is before ‘for each of the PUSCH, PUCCH’, is it correct understanding that the association should be configured for either all or none of the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS?[Mod: No. If not associated, it is reduced to AltC. It means the setting is not dependent on TCI state, It is one setting for PUSCH, another setting PUCCH, another for SRS – without beam dependency]OPPO’s concern can be solved by simply adding a configuration restriction. The suggested changes can be found in red as below,**Proposal 1.1B:** On the setting of UL PC parameters except for PL-RS (P0, alpha, closed loop index) for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, * For each of PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS, the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) can be associated with UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state.
	+ In this case, multiple settings per channel/signal are configured where each setting is associated with at least one TCI state
	+ For SRS, UE does not expect to be configured with different setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) within the same set
	+ FFS: Details of the association (including the manner it is performed and the signaling), and whether it is up to RAN2
* If not associated, for each of the PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS, only one setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) per channel/signal is configured for all the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI states

Note: It has been agreed that the setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) is associated with UL channel or UL RS (therefore the setting is channel- and signal-specific).[Mod: This bullet “For SRS, UE does not expect to be configured with different setting of (P0, alpha, closed loop index) within the same set” may not be needed since if one setting is used for SRS, it is by default not resource-set-specific.] |
| Xiaomi | Support proposal 1.1B for unified framework for PUSCH, PUCCH and SRS, in addition to NW configuration flexibility.  |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support proposal 1.1B |
| Ericsson | Support proposal 1.1B |
| Samsung | While the original proposal 1.1A is our first preference, for progress we can support proposal 1.1B |
| CATT | Support proposal 1.1B |
| AT&T | Support proposal 1.1B |
| Mod V19 | **No revision** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1.1A: In the sub-bullet, suggesting removing “, and whether it”. [Mod: This is also fine – perhaps slightly preferred]Proposal 1.1B: Suggest adding “will be applied” after “is configured” in the bullet of “If not associated”.[Mod: OK]Support Proposal 1.1A – consistent handling as Proposal 1.2.  |
| Futurewei | Support proposal 1.1B for progress. |
| Qualcomm | Support 1.A for single option. |
| Mod V24 | **Minor revision** per Huawei’s comments Given companies’ views, 1.1B represents the super-majority support so far.  |
| ZTE | Our views are no changed for the updated version:* We are not against this proposal 1.1B if majority supports, but if, unfortunately, we still need to distinguish SRS from PUSCH and PUCCH (as OPPO proposed), we suggest to go with Proposal 1.1A directly.
 |
| Mod V27 | **No revision** |

PL-RS

**Proposal 1.2**: On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, a PL-RS (configured for path-loss calculation) is either included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.

* If the DL source RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state to provide spatial relation indication is different from PL-RS, the choice of RS for path-loss measurement (either the DL source RS in the TCI state or the PL-RS) is up to the UE as assumed in Rel-15/16
* Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed and the signaling) is up to RAN2
* The UE maintains the PL-RS of the activated UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The maximum number of activated UL TCI states or (if applicable) joint TCI states per band per cell is a UE capability
* FFS: detailed aspects of PL-RS, e.g. CSI-RS type(s), time-domain behavior(s), restriction on configuration

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1 – PL-RS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **The wording of proposal 1.2 has been relatively stable****Please share your inputs, if any** |
| Apple | We can accept this compromise proposal |
| OPPO | Overall the proposal is fine to us.One clarification question on 4th bullet: here the maximum number activated UL TCI states or joint TCI states intents to specify the UE capability of the maximum number of PL RS the UE can maintain at the same time, right? If so, we suggest to add “per serving cell” there too.* The maximum number of activated UL TCI states or (if applicable) joint TCI states per band, per serving cell is a UE capability

[Mod: Done (per “cell”)] |
| vivo | The very essential case of DL RS for beam directly used as the PL RS should be firstly agreed. |
| Docomo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Okay to this proposal  |
| LG | For the first sub-bullet, we suggest the following modification below. I understand it is to address the concern on an additional RAN4 test and it is left to UE implementation as in Rel-15/16. If the sub-bullet is maintained with the correct understanding as in Rel-15/16, this modification may avoid the ambiguity related to the UE implementation where a number of companies raise a concern.* If the DL source RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state to provide spatial relation indication is different from PL-RS, the choice of RS for path-loss measurement (either the DL source RS in the TCI state or the PL-RS) is up to the UE as assumed in Rel-15/16.

[Mod: Yes, done] |
| Mod V7 | **Minor revision** |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. If we would like to discuss the solution if not associated for proposal 1.1, we wonder whether we need to bring back the last meeting possible agreement for the case that the PL RS is not associated.  |
| Mod V10 | **No revision** |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support the proposal. Minor correction: the second sub-bullet should be mentioned as a FFS.[Mod: correct, thanks] |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal |
| CATT | Support |
| AT&T | Support the proposal |
| Mod V19 | **Minor revision (added obviously missing “FFS” on 2nd sub-bullet)** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1.2: We thought the intention is to leave the choice between “included in” and “associated with” to RAN2. With this understanding, in the 2nd sub-bullet, we suggest removing “FFS” and “, and whether it”. [Mod: I see what you mean. I agree. Done]Based on the experience from R16, we agree with vivo that it is better to start with the case where DL RS used for UL beam indication is used as PL-RS directly. [Mod: While personally I agree with you/vivo/Samsung/Ericsson/Apple, many AltA/B companies argue this is not a “complete” solution and would like to avoid two-scheme solution (default/optional) for PL-RS ☹] |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the main bullet. * For the first sub-bullet, we still have the same view as in Round 0 that if the DL source RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state to provide spatial relation indication is different from the PL-RS, the PL-RS configured for path-loss calculation should be used.
	+ Since “as assumed in Rel-15/16” is used in the first sub-bullet, to help the group to have a clear and same understanding on this, it would be appreciated if the proponent of the first sub-bullet can provide clear spec reference describing the Rel-15/16 UE’s behavior claimed in the first sub-bullet.
	+ Also “beam misalignment” or “beam alignment” has been mentioned in Round 0 as reason to introduce the first sub-bullet, for clarification purpose, it would be appreciated if the proponent can provide clear spec reference defining these terms. It was also claimed in Round 0 that the first sub-bullet is introduced to ensure no additional RAN4 test is introduced for beam misalignment. But RAN4 testing is not RAN1’s expertise and should be discussed in RAN4, and avoiding RAN4 testing doesn’t seem to be a valid reason to introduce the first sub-bullet.
* For the fourth sub-bullet, as Oppo commented, the maximum number of activated UL TCI states or joint TCI states intends to specify the UE capability of the maximum number of PL RS per serving cell the UE can maintain simultaneously. Since we already had agreement on the maximum number of PL RS from previous meeting, we would like to modify this sub-bullet to make the intention of this sub-bullet clear.

In summary, we would like to modify Proposal 1.2 as follows:**Proposal 1.2**: On path-loss measurement for Rel.17 unified TCI framework, a PL-RS (configured for path-loss calculation) is either included in UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state or associated with UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state.* ~~If the DL source RS in the UL or (if applicable) joint TCI state to provide spatial relation indication is different from PL-RS, the choice of RS for path-loss measurement (either the DL source RS in the TCI state or the PL-RS) is up to the UE as assumed in Rel-15/16~~
* FFS: Whether it is ‘included in’ or ‘associated with’ (including the manner it is performed and the signaling), and whether it is up to RAN2
* The UE maintains the PL-RS of the activated UL TCI state or (if applicable) joint TCI state
* The maximum number of activated UL TCI states or (if applicable) joint TCI states per band per cell is a UE capability and the resulting number of maintained PL RS per cell is no more than four.
* FFS: detailed aspects of PL-RS, e.g. CSI-RS type(s), time-domain behavior(s), restriction on configuration

 [Mod: Appreciate the effort but I am sorry I am not removing the 1st bullet – I have explained this at length and am repeating this again. It has been tried before and triggered objection from at least Apple (and perhaps other UE vendors). Since this has been assumed in Rel-15/16 I see no harm in including this to avoid adding a RAN4 test. Please review Round 0 summary especially Apple’s comment. I see no harm adding this bullet. I hope Futurewei can accept for progress. Else we may end up with no PL-RS ☹ Re the 2nd comment, we are again repeating a previous discussion. Please also review Round 0 summary toward the end and look at LG’s comment. There is no need for repeating this, else we would end up repeating everything from the last agreement frim “In addition...”. ] |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 1.2, OK |
| Mod V24 | **Minor revision** per Huawei’s input |
| ZTE | Support the minor updated version, and we are fine with combination version between AltA/B and AltC. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For the first bullet we still think the UE behavior should be standardized. But given this has been discussed extensively, for the sake of making progress we will not oppose it. We appreciate feature lead’s effort to moving towards agreement. [Mod: Thanks for your understanding] |
| Mod V27 | **No revision** |

QCL for CA

**Proposal 1.3A**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide common QCL information and/or common UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs

* The determined source RSs to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter for the set of configured CCs/BWPs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS

**Proposal 1.3X:** ‘A single RRC pool of TCI states’ for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide common QCL information and/or common UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs is supported. This implies that the single RRC TCI state pool can be configured in a reference BWP of a reference CC and can be shared among the set of configured CCs.

* The reference BWP and reference CC can/shall be configured per target BWP per target CC by a RRC parameter
	+ Note: in the target BWP in the target CC, the UE would use the TCI states configured in the reference BWP in the reference CC.
	+ FFS: whether it is mandatorily configured or not, if not, FFS default behavior
* For QCL Type-A/D, the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS can be absent in a TCI state
* When the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS is absent in the TCI state, it implies that the target CC of the TCI state and the corresponding active BWP should be used to determine the source RS
	+ Note: In such case, UE uses the corresponding BWP ID + target CC ID + QCL TypeA/D RS source ID of the TCI state configured in the reference BWP in the reference CC to locate the corresponding QCL Type-A/D source RS
* Note that cross-CC UL power control indication is FFS as a separate issue
* FFS: inter-band CA, e.g. two or more sets of configured CCs in a UE

Table 3 Additional inputs: issue 1 – QCL for CA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Given the views of companies in round 0 (super-majority wanting 1.3A and many having concern with 1.3B) and differences among 1.3B proponents regarding the additional QCL rule (e.g. same vs same/different), we will focus on proposal 1.3A and see how this can be reworded to be agreeable.** **Note: If the proponents of 1.3B can converge, we can introduce 1.3B again for consideration.****Proposed for common pool for CA was provided by ZTE (1.3X).****Please provide your inputs, if any, for 1.3A and 1.3X** |
| Apple | We support both proposals and we support single RRC pool of TCI states in principle, which is important to reduce UE memory size. |
| OPPO | 1.3A: we do not support. This proposal reverts our previous agreement made in RAN1#103e meeting:* The agreement made in 103e meeting requires “**same/single RS for QCL TypeD**”, but the proposal 1.3A proposes CC-specific RS for TypeD
* The motivation of rel17 TCI for CA is to provide same beam/QCL-TypeD to multiple CCs. The proposal 1.3A does not satisfy that. The CC-specific QCL-TypeD RS associated with same QCL-TypeD RS does not provide same QCL-TypeD/beam for the PDCCH/PDSCH in different CCs.

Proposal 1.3X: we prefer to use CC-specific RRC TCI state pool. The only benefit of using a single RRC TCI state pool is the overhead of RRC can be reduced. But on the other hand, it would impose big restriction on the system scheduling. Furthermore, how much RRC overhead can be saved is unclear, which depends on the ratio of RRC overhead for TCI state pool configuration in the whole RRC configuration. If the RRC overhead for TCI state pool configuration is only a very small portion of the whole RRC configuration, then the benefit of overhead reduction is not so important.  |
| vivo | Fine with current version. And also support single RRC pool. |
| Docomo | Support proposal 1.3A.For proposal 1.3X, as we commented in round 0, both QCL-Type A/D RS are CC specific in proposal 1.3A. But, proposal 1.3X does not clarify behavior of QCL-type D RS. So, we suggest to update as following.**Proposal 1.3X:** ‘A single RRC pool of TCI states’ implies that the single RRC TCI state pool can be configured in a CC and can be shared among the set of configured CCs.* For QCL Type-A/D, the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS can be absent in a TCI state
* When the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS is absent in the TCI state, the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS is determined according to a target CC of the TCI state and the corresponding active BWP
* For each applied active BWP per CC, UE uses the corresponding BWP ID + CC ID + QCL TypeA/D RS source ID to locate the corresponding QCL Type-A/D source RS
* Note that cross-CC UL power control indication is FFS as a separate issue
* FFS: inter-band CA, e.g. two or more sets of configured CCs in a UE

--Re OPPO’s comment: Proposal 1.3A says “*The determined CC-specific source RSs for the set of configured CCs/BWPs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS*. Thus, it does not contradict with the previous agreement. |
| LG | We support 1.3A but still preferred with separated RRC pool per CC. |
| Mod V7 | **Minor revision to 1.3X, no revision for 1.3A** |
| Sony | For Proposal 1.3A, it may not perfectly obey previous agreement as OPPO mentioned. We see the effort or intention of restricting CC-specific source RSs to share one common root QCL-TypeD RS. But in our view, whether this restriction can be implicitly viewed as “single/same” source RS and whether it is beneficial to do so are still questionable. For Proposal 1.3X, we support in principle for the sake of reducing RRC configuration signaling and UE storage. In our understanding, in Rel.15/16, RRC pool of TCI states are configured under *PDSCH-Config* which is per DL BWP configured. So in Rel.17 for unified TCI states, shall we apply the same rule for consistency? (Of course, how to structure it in RRC parameters is up to RAN2.) If so, may I suggest to slightly re-worded the main bullet as ‘A single RRC pool of TCI states’ implies that the single RRC TCI state pool can be configured in a BWP of a CC and can be shared among the set of configured CCs[Mod: Done] |
| ZTE | As our first preference, we prefer to go with original 1.3B, but for progress, we can live with 1.3A with a single RRC pool.Regarding OPPO’s comments, please review our analysis for memory saving in our contribution Section 3 in R1-2100292 (1.12kB (single) vs 35.84 kB (legacy/per-CC) for 8-CC, and 1.12kB (single) vs 143.36 kB (legacy/per-CC) in 32-CC). In our views, it is essential for saving RRC overhead and UE power consumption/memory/chip-size. We are fine with Song’s update, and it seems the one indent for the following highlighted bullet needed to be increased for readable.**Proposal 1.3X:** ‘A single RRC pool of TCI states’ implies that the single RRC TCI state pool can be configured in a CC and can be shared among the set of configured CCs.* For QCL Type-A/D, the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS can be absent in a TCI state
* When the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS is absent in the TCI state, the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS is determined according to a target CC of the TCI state and the corresponding active BWP
	+ For each applied active BWP per CC, UE uses the corresponding BWP ID + CC ID + QCL TypeA/D RS source ID to locate the corresponding QCL Type-A/D source RS
* Note that cross-CC UL power control indication is FFS as a separate issue
* FFS: inter-band CA, e.g. two or more sets of configured CCs in a UE

[Mod: Done] |
| Mod V10 | **No revision** |
| Spreadtrum | Support Proposal 1.3A. For Proposal 1.3X with Docomo’s update, it means that both single QCL TypeD RS determination across CCs (BWP /CC ID configured) and per-CC QCL TypeD RS determination (BWP /CC ID absent) will be supported, which is not necessary. |
| Xiaomi | Support proposal 1.3A and prefer a single TCI state pool. |
| Ericsson | Still, we do not understand why the pool is discussed in the same proposal: it is a separate issue, and deserve more attention and focused discussion. However, as long as the brackets remain, we could accept proposal 1.3A with the following updates:**Proposal 1.3A**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, [a single RRC pool of TCI states is used] for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide common QCL information and/or common UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs* A CC~~-~~specific source RS can be determined from the indicated TCI state ID to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter. The determined CC-specific source RSs for the set of configured CCs/BWPs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS.
	+ The CC-specific source RS is applied to all BWPs within the CC but measured only within the active BWP
	+ [FFS: how to provide the CC/BWP-specific RSs in a TCI state of the single RRC TCI state pool shared among the set of configured CCs/BWPs, e.g., the BWP/CC ID for the source RS for QCL Type-D reference and/or UL TX spatial reference can be absent in a TCI state]

The reasons for the proposed updates are:* Common TCI state is unclear: “common” in the first sentence refers to the update, not to the TCI state
* “a set of configured CCs/BWPs” can mean something else, and configuration is agnostic to bands, so that restriction is not relevant.

[Mod: Done]ZTE’s proposal on the pool is a good starting point, since we are now starting to talk about a reference CC, rather than a pool on cell group level. However, we don’t see that it is enough with one pool, or one reference CC: we need multiple, to handle FR1-FR2 CA, and also potentially inter-band CA. We cannot agree on a signalling solution that only works for intra-band, since RAN1 and RAN2 specs are agnostic to bands.[Mod: I’d appreciate if ZTE and Ericsson can give me a good text for this, thanks] |
| Samsung | Support proposal 1.3X |
| CATT | Support proposal 1.3A (with [a single RRC pool of TCI state] in bracket). If proposal 1.3A is not agreeable, we are also OK with proposal 1.3X for compromise. [Mod: Thanks. For clarification, 1.3A and 1.3X are separate proposals, not competing. The goal is to endorse both] |
| Mod V19 | **Revision** per Ericsson’s comment on 1.3A and 1.3XJust to be clear, **proposals 1.3A and 1.3X are not competing with each other**. The goal is to endorse both in their final forms. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1.3A: We share similar view as Ericsson. Proposal 1.3X: We share similar view as Ericsson that more focused discussion is needed and cannot agree on a signaling solution that only works for intra-band. In particular, we are not sure whether “cross-CC UL power control indication” can really be claimed as a separate issue. In our understanding, if Proposal 1.1A/B and Proposal 1.3X are to be agreed, some simultaneous multi-CC power control mechanism would be implied, and this requires more attention.  |
| MediaTek | Support both. However, on Proposal 1.3A, single TCI pool can be configured separately from common TCI update/activation though P1.3X, we think CC-specific TypeD source RS in P1.3A is not needed anymore. This is because per-CC TCI pool can be configured for each CC in P1.3A. CC-specific TypeD source RS is needed only for single TCI pool.**Proposal 1.3A**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide common QCL information and/or common UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs* The determined source RSs to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter for the set of configured CCs/BWPs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS
* “A set of configured CCs/BWPs” includes all the BWPs in the set of configured CCs in one band

[Mod: Done]  |
| Futurewei | We are ok with Proposal 1.3A in general and we prefer separate TCI state pool per CC. |
| Qualcomm | Support 1.3X. 1.3A is one detailed RS configuration, and does not address the key part, which is in bracket.  |
| Mod V24 | **Revision from MTK for 1.3A** to make it more concise. **Please check**. |
| ZTE | We are fine with updated Proposal 1.3A. After offline discussion, based on the comments from Ericsson and Huawei, the FL proposal can be updated as follows: To support inter-band CC, the reference CC/BWP can be configured for each of target CC, and consequently the TCI list in the target CC can be replaced by a pointer to that in the reference CC. * For instance, on the Rel.17 unified TCI framework, the list of TCI states in PDSCH config in a CC\_target/BWP \_target can be replaced by a pointer to a reference CC (CC\_ref) and a reference BWP (BWP \_ref). In (CC\_target, BWP \_target), the UE would use the TCI states configured in (CC\_ref,BWP \_ref).

Then we have the following update as a suggestion.**Proposal 1.3X:** ‘A single RRC pool of TCI states’ for common TCI state ID update and activation to provide common QCL information and/or common UL TX spatial filter(s) across a set of configured CCs/BWPs is supported. This implies that the single RRC TCI state pool can be configured in a reference BWP of a reference CC and can be shared among the set of configured CCs.* The reference BWP and reference CC can/shall be configured per target BWP per target CC by a RRC parameter
	+ Note: in the target BWP in the target CC, the UE would use the TCI states configured in the reference BWP in the reference CC.
	+ FFS: whether it is mandatorily configured or not, if not, FFS default behavior.
* For QCL Type-A/D, the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS can be absent in a TCI state
	+ When the BWP /CC ID for QCL -Type A/D source RS is absent in the TCI state, it implies that the target CC of the TCI state and the corresponding active BWP should be used for determining the source RS.
	+ Note: in such case, UE uses the corresponding BWP ID + target CC ID + QCL TypeA/D RS source ID of the TCI state configured in the reference BWP in the reference CC to locate the corresponding QCL Type-A/D source RS
* Note that cross-CC UL power control indication is FFS as a separate issue
* FFS: inter-band CA, e.g. two or more sets of configured CCs in a UE

[Mod: Done] |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support 1.3A |
| Mod V27 | **Revision for 1.3X**  |
| Qualcomm | For the modified 1.3X, we think the following new bullet may not be needed. gNB can configure the single pool in an arbitrary CC in a CC list. UE just uses that CC as the reference CC. No need to further configure that reference CC per target BWP/CC. Suggest to remove. * The reference BWP and reference CC can/shall be configured per target BWP per target CC by a RRC parameter
	+ Note: in the target BWP in the target CC, the UE would use the TCI states configured in the reference BWP in the reference CC.
	+ FFS: whether it is mandatorily configured or not, if not, FFS default behavior
 |
| ZTE | @QC, The bullet you highlighted is drafted based on the comments from opponent companies. Their concerns are about how to support inter-band CA case, like FR1+FR2, with minimal spec impacts. * If my understanding for their concern is correct, for instance, if NW schedules a transmission in a CC#B in FR2 based on the DCI command in CC#A in FR1, they expect that the reference CC corresponding to the CC#B should be specified clearly (for instance, the reference CC may be a CC#C in a FR2). From RRC perspective, it may be simple for spec change that the list of TCI states in PDSCH config in a CC\_target/BWP \_target can be replaced by a pointer, i.e., reference CC ID + reference BWP ID, to a reference CC (CC\_ref) and a reference BWP (BWP \_ref), rather than being based on some rules.

@Ericsson and Huawei, if something is missing or misunderstood, please correct it.  |

’Other’ signals/channels

**Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework,

* Any DL RS that is a valid target DL RS of a Rel-15/16 TCI state based on the Rel-15/16 QCL rules can be configured as a target DL RS of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool)
	+ Note: This does not imply that all such DL RSs necessarily share a same TCI
	+ The DL RS includes DMRS for PDSCH or PDCCH
* FFS: Whether some SRS resources or resource sets for BM can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 UL TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL TCI state pool)
* Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is still TBD)

**Proposal 1.5**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, discuss and decide by RAN1#106-e (August 2021)

* Whether each of the following DL RSs can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC
	+ CSI-RS resources for CSI
	+ Some CSI-RS resources for BM, if so, which ones (e.g. aperiodic, repetition ‘ON’)
	+ CSI-RS for tracking
	+ DMRS(s) associated with non-UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and all/subset of CORESETs
* Whether some SRS resources or resource sets for BM can share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as dynamic-grant/configured-grant based PUSCH, all or subset of dedicated PUCCH resources in a CC

**Proposal 1.6**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for any DL RS that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC, but can be configured as a target DL RS of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool), discuss and down-select by RAN1#106-e (August 2021) between the following two alternatives:

* Alt1. Rel-15/16 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are reused to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state
* Alt2. Rel-17 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are used, e.g. with Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication for Rel-17 joint/separate TCI

Note: The DL RS includes DMRS for PDSCH or PDCCH

Note: For some channels/signals, only one of the above two alternatives may apply (to be discussed).

Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is still TBD)

Table 4 Additional inputs: issue 1 –‘Other’ signals/channels

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **The wording of proposal 1.4-1.6 has been quite stable from last round. The last discussion was only on the last FFS in 1.6.****Please share your inputs, if any, on proposals 1.4-1.6** |
| Apple | Proposal 1.4: SupportProposal 1.5: Support Proposal 1.6: Support Alt1.  |
| OPPO | For proposal 1.6: we support Alt1.One question on Alt2 in Proposal 1.6: What does it mean by “e.g. with Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication for Rel-17 joint/separate TCI”? Is the ‘common’ TCI state indicated by DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 applied here?[Mod: No. It is to use Rel-17 beam indication for updating another Rel-17 DL TCI independent of the Rel-17 “common” TCI] |
| vivo | Fine with current formulations |
| Docomo | Fine with the proposals. |
| MediaTek | Regarding the last FFS in P1.6, we still think not necessary. Looking into the example under the FFS, why it cannot be done by NW configuration if the same TCI pool is shared across all DL channels/signals? We believe QC’s concern is already addressed by P1.4:* *Any DL RS or DL physical channel that is a valid target signal/channel of a Rel-15/16 TCI state based on the Rel-15/16 QCL rules can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool)*

If clarification is really needed, we prefer to conclude it as follows in this proposal w/o FFS.[Mod: After your explanation, I tend to agree with your conclusion. Alignment seems to be a NW implementation usage of the outcome of down selection in proposal 1.6. FFS is now in brackets to await Qualcomm’s response]Note: A same Rel-17 DL TCI state or different Rel-17 DL TCI states can be configured/indicated for any two target channels/signals |
| LG | On Proposal 1.4: Support. For clarification, is this correct understanding that the granularity of target channel configuration (e.g. per resource set) will be discussed later after agreeing on this?[Mod: This is a next-level discussion – relevant after proposal 1.4 and 1.5 are agreed]Proposal 1.5 and 1.6: Support |
| Mod V7 | **No revision** except putting the last FFS in 1.6 in brackets. **Qualcomm: please check MTK’s comment**. After this explanation I agree that the FFS is an implementation issue (NW usage of the outcome of proposal 1.6 in a spec transparent manner) |
| Sony | For Proposal 1.4 and Proposal 1.5, we support. For Proposal 1.6, we also support with preference on Alt1.  |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposals. Alt1 in proposal 1.6 is preferred, in our views. |
| Mod V10 | **No revision** |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 1.4: SupportProposal 1.5: SupportProposal 1.6: Support and prefer Alt1. Similar view as MTK on the FFS. For Alt2, in our views, it doesn’t work because Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication cannot indicate which channels the TCI state is applied to. Further enhancement is required, but not desired.[Mod: Thanks. Noted for next step discussion] |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposals |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support proposals 1.4 and 1.5. Prefer Alt. 1 in proposal 1.6 and agree with MTK’s comment on the last FFS. |
| Ericsson | P1.4: support with the following update:**Proposal 1.4**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, * Any DL RS that is a valid target DL RS of a Rel-15/16 TCI state based on the Rel-15/16 QCL rules can be configured as a target DL RS of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool)
	+ Note: This does not imply that all such DL RSs necessarily share a same TCI
* FFS: Whether some SRS resources or resource sets for BM can be configured as a target signal/channel of a Rel-17 UL TCI (hence the Rel-17 UL TCI state pool)
* Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is still TBD)

Targets of TCI states in Rel-15/16 are always DL RSs.[Mod: Correct, thanks for pointing this out. I added DMRS to the 4th sub-bullet in 1.5 to be consistent with this]P1.5: SupportP1.6: support with the same update as in P1.4**Proposal 1.6**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for any DL RS that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC, but can be configured as a target DL RS of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool), discuss and down-select by RAN1#106-e (August 2021) between the following two alternatives:* Alt1. Rel-15/16 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are reused to update/configure the Rel-17 TCI state
* Alt2. Rel-17 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) are used, e.g. with Rel-17 MAC-CE/DCI-based beam indication for Rel-17 joint/separate TCI

Note: For some channels/signals, only one of the above two alternatives may apply (to be discussed).Note: This does not imply that DL and UL TCI state pools are separate or shared for separate DL/UL TCI (this issue is still TBD)[FFS: Whether/how the selected alternative can be used to align the Rel-17 DL TCI state between two target channels/signals which do not share the same Rel-17 DL TCI state * E.g. TCI state #1 can be activated for PDCCH+PDSCH as in Rel-17 and can also be simultaneously configured for a CSI-RS resource for BM as in Rel-15/16.]
 |
| CATT | Support all proposals.  |
| AT&T | Support the latest proposals |
| Mod V19 | **Minor revision per Ericsson’s comment** to align more precisely with spec term (DL RS as target) on 1.4 and 1.6. Added “DMRS” for the non-UE-dedicated channels in 1.5 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1.4: Support the revisions from Ericsson. Proposal 1.6: We share similar view as MediaTek that the last FFS point is not needed. The note suggested by MediaTek is not needed either, and may lead to potential ambiguity that implies new QCL rules. In addition, we support the revisions suggested by Ericsson.  |
| MediaTek | Re the change according to Ericsson’s comment, maybe “DL RS/DMRS” would be better.[Mod: While DMRS is an RS ☺ it is ok to say RS (including DMRS)] |
| Futurewei | Proposal 1.4: Support.Proposal 1.5: Support.Proposal 1.6: We are ok with the direction of the proposal and we support Alt. 2. Our view is that a mixture of Rel-15/16 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) and Rel-17 TCI state update signaling/configuration mechanism(s) should be avoided to reduce UE complexity. As we commented in Round 0, “indicated Rel-17 TCI state” should be “indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s)” as M or N may > 1 which is to be discussed and decided. So we would like to make the following change:**Proposal 1.6**: On Rel.17 unified TCI framework, for any DL RS that does not share the same indicated Rel-17 TCI state(s) as UE-dedicated reception on PDSCH and for UE-dedicated reception on all or subset of CORESETs in a CC, but can be configured as a target DL RS of a Rel-17 DL TCI (hence the Rel-17 DL TCI state pool), discuss and down-select by RAN1#106-e (August 2021) between the following two alternatives: [Mod: This makes sense. Done]…… |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 1.4, does the DL RS include PDCCH/PDSCH DMRS or not? Please clarify in the proposal[Mod: Done, please check]For Proposal 1.5, OKFor Proposal 1.6, (1) Same comment as for 1.4; (2) Why the FFS still in bracket? Other people may not even comment on the wording. [Mod: Please check the comment from MTK and other companies. After reading MTK’s comment, I agree that the FFS is simply a use case of the outcome of 1.6, i.e. already allowed via NW implementation] |
| Mod V24 | **Minor wordsmithing** (note on DL RS include DMRS) per MTK and Futurewei’s comment. The **last FFS** in brackets is now removed per request from MTK (now I agree with the interpretation that the content of the FFS is an implementation of the outcome of 1.6), Ericsson, Huawei, Spreadtrum, Fraunhofer |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support proposals 1.4, 1.5, 1.6.  |
| Mod V27 | **No revision** |
| Qualcomm | For the deleted FFS, the intention is to simply get answer whether using same TCI is allowed or not for the pre-determined channel/RS set sharing the TCI and a RS/channel not in the pre-determined set. If the common understanding is it is up to NW implementation, then the answer is YES to my understanding. If this is common understanding, suggest directly add the note below. If not, we are fine to discuss as FFS.Note: The selected alternative can be used by the NW to align the Rel-17 DL TCI state between two target channels/signals which do not share the same Rel-17 DL TCI state * E.g. TCI state #1 can be activated for PDCCH+PDSCH as in Rel-17 and can also be simultaneously configured for a CSI-RS resource for BM as in Rel-15/16.
 |

### Issue 2 (L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility)

Beam indication

**Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, support the following:

* At least for UE reception (on PDSCH and PDCCH) and transmission (on PUSCH and PUCCH) associated with UE-dedicated CORESETs, Rel-17 MAC-CE-based and DCI-based beam indication (at least using DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 with and without DL assignment including the associated MAC-CE-based TCI state activation) for joint TCI [and/or separate DL/UL TCI]
	+ {FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Beam indication support for separate DL/UL TCI in case of L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility}
	+ FFS: Whether to support activation of TCI states for more than one cells simultaneously
* The DL QCL and UL spatial relation rules already agreed for intra-cell scenario
* The use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as an indirect QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH
	+ Note: When RS X is an indirect QCL reference of a target channel, there exists at least one other source signal on the QCL chain between RS X and the target channel
	+ FFS (to be decided in RAN1#106-e): Whether SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell can also be used as a direct QCL reference (source RS) for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH

Table 5 Additional inputs: issue 2 – Beam indication

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **The wording of proposal 2.1 has been quite stable from last round except for the following:**1. **Joint vs separate TCI – raised by Nokia**
2. **The last bullet (note) was removed since it has caused confusion (pointed out by Huawei).**

**Please share your inputs, if any, on proposal 2.1** |
| Apple | We support current version. |
| OPPO | Suggest to add “at least for the case when the serving cell is not changed” because we are not sure what would be the impact if the serving cell is changed. When the serving cell is changed, both control plane and data plane need change, including the whole MAC entity. **Proposal 2.1**: On Rel.17 beam indication enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility, support the following at least for the case when the serving cell is not changed:[Mod: We can check if this is agreeable to companies] |
| vivo | Support |
| Docomo | Support in general. We are a bit confused with the following text. Is it correct understanding that 1)SSB with different cell ID can be direct QCL reference except for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH and 2)SSB with different cell ID can be used for indirect QCL reference for all cases (including UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH)?* The use of SSB associated with a physical cell ID different from that of the serving cell as a direct/indirect QCL reference, except for a direct QCL reference for UE-dedicated PDCCH/PDSCH

[Mod: Revised.] |
| LG | Support the current version |
| Mod V7 | **Revision** to remove confusion on SSB usage pointed out by Docomo. **Please check OPPO’s comment** on adding “at least for the case when the serving cell is not changed” if it is agreeable.**Please share your view on whether the support for separate TCI should be agreed in this meeting together with joint TCI, or it should be FFS for now**. |
| Sony | We see no strong technical reason to bracket separate DL/UL TCI. But progress-wise, we are fine with current version.  |
| ZTE | Firstly we suggest to NOT touch whether the serving cell/RNTI is changed or not. It is up to RAN2 discussion, and if involved, we need to wait for LS reply.Then, regarding indirect QCL definition, it seems that our description is to limit this case to only one jump case, but we need to consider multiple jumps case: e.g., non-serving SSB -> CSI-RS for BM -> TRS -> channel. To be more general, we have the following suggestion:Note: When RS X is an indirect QCL reference of a target channel, RS X serves as a QCL source RS in the QCL chain but not being direct source RS for the target channel |
| Mod V10 | **No revision** |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.1: Support the current version. For separate TCI, we don’t see any problem on supporting it. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. Comment to Oppo: it is unclear what is meant by changing the whole MAC entity. When receiving an RRC reconfiguration with sync, the UE performs a MAC reset, but the MAC reset is an independent action, which is unnecessary when the HO is intra-DU.In any case, we do not see the impact on P2.1, but of course, if there is such an impact, it can and should be brought forward at any point in time, irrespective of any agreement.  |
| Samsung | Supportive of what is being proposed. However, we would like to remove “[and/or separate DL/UL TCI]”, and remove the curly braces around first sub-bullet. Separate DL/UL TCI for L1/L2 centric mobility can be decided in RAN1#106-e after more analysis.[Mod: OK, let’s see if other companies have the same concern on agreeing to separate TCI as well and keeping it FFS] |
| CATT | Support the proposal.  |
| AT&T | Support the latest version of the proposal |
| Mod V19 | **No revision****Please check OPPO’s comment** on adding “at least for the case when the serving cell is not changed” if it is agreeable. So far no other company sees the need for adding this.**Please share your view on whether the support for separate TCI should be agreed in this meeting together with joint TCI, or it should be FFS for now**. So far only Samsung proposes to keep it FFS for this meeting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 2.1: * Our RAN2 colleagues informed us that some progress has been made in RAN2, with which L1/L2 signaling can be used to switch among “the cells for L1/L2 centric mobility”. As the serving cell is to be switched, the third bullet (QCL assistance from non-serving SSB) becomes unnecessary in the context of L1/L2-centric mobility. So we suggest removing the 3rd bullet (and its sub-bullets).
* The second bullet also becomes unnecessary, as the QCL and spatial relation rules within a cell applies naturally for that cell. So we suggest removing the 2nd bullet.
* Note that TCI indication for inter-cell mTRP operation is handled in a separate agenda 8.1.2.2, which is not to be discussed in this meeting, and it is also expected to reuse R15/R16 TCI framework per previous guidance from Mr. Chair.

[Mod: Thanks for the info. It seems that the agreement does not mandate SC and RNTI change. If SC is not changed, it seems clear that the 2nd and 3rd bullets are still needed.Re 8.1.2.2, since this doesn’t utilize Rel-17 unified TCI, there is no need to tie this AI with L12XCM.]Agreements from RAN2:* **RRC provides the configuration for “the cells for L1/L2 centric mobility”, and L1/L2 signaling can be used/feasible for the dynamic usage/switching of the configured value.**
* **R2 didn’t see a problem with using different C-RNTIs for different cells. Different C-RNTI seems more natural in a mobility scenario. No conclusion in R2 for mTRP scenario.**
* **RRC configurations of the cells for L1/L2 centric mobility, including C-RNTI, are configured by RRC.**
* **RAN2 prefer to restrict the scope of the deployment only for intra-DU case in Rel-17.**
* **RAN2 assumes to prioritize intra-frequency case in Rel-17, but RAN2 follows the RAN4 decision to support inter-frequency case.**
* **Use P1 and P2 as baseline for further discussion, aiming to reply to the LS. (P1 seems to be too detailed need generalizing).**
 |
| Futurewei | Proposal 2.1: We suggest discussing this proposal after RAN1 receives RAN2’s LS response on L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility. [Mod: So far there has been no strong indication that the content of this proposal depends on the outcome of the LS response. The next level details may be] |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 2.1, OK |
| Mod V24 | **No revision. 2nd and 3rd bullet may need to be conditioned on no change in SC/RNTI – need discussion. But the 1st bullet has been stable.** |
| ZTE | It seems that our previous comments have not been considered and copied herein again:**‘**Then, regarding indirect QCL definition, it seems that our description is to limit this case to only one jump case, but we need to consider multiple jumps case: e.g., non-serving SSB -> CSI-RS for BM -> TRS -> channel. To be more general, we have the following suggestion:Note: When RS X is an indirect QCL reference of a target channel, RS X serves as a QCL source RS in the QCL chain but not being direct source RS for the target channel**’**[Mod: Sorry I missed this. The proposed wording however is semantically problematic (circular) since indirect is defined relative to direct. But your point is now addressed in the revised wording (please check)] |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the current version of Proposal 2.1. |
| Mod V27 | **Slight revision on the definition of indirect QCL to account for longer chain** |
| ZTE | We are fine with the updated version. |

Measurement/reporting

**Conclusion 2.2**: On Rel.17 L1-RSRP multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP, there is no consensus on supporting the following RS types as measurement RS in RAN1#105-e

* CSI-RS for mobility/RRM associated with a non-serving cell
* CSI-RS for BM associated with a non-serving cell SSB
* CSI-RS for tracking associated with a non-serving cell SSB

Note: If another beam metric other than L1-RSRP is supported (e.g. L3-RSRP is still FFS), the above also applies

**Proposal 2.3**: On Rel.17 L1-RSRP multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,

* Support at least K=4, where K is defined as the number of beams associated at least with non-serving cell(s) reported in a single CSI reporting instance
	+ The maximum value of supported K is a UE capability
	+ K is configured by NW based on the UE capability
	+ FFS: The support of K=8 and 16
		- For K>4, the maximum number of beams associated with one cell is 4
* FFS: Support L1-based event-driven reporting based on Rel-16 SCell BFR framework or analogous to L3-based event-driven reporting, including the definition of L1-based event, if needed

Note: If another beam metric other than L1-RSRP is supported (e.g. L3-RSRP is still FFS), the above also applies

Table 4 Additional inputs: issue 2 – measurement/reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Conclusion 2.2: Huawei pointed out that CSI-RS for BM and tracking should be reintroduced for this to be acceptable.****Proposal 2.3: The wording has been stable for a long time (no input)** **Please provide your inputs, if any, on conclusion 2.2 and proposal 2.3**  |
| Apple | Support in general, but we suggest some changes. I think they are editorial. We agree TRS should not be used for beam reporting, but it should be necessary for time/freq offset tracking. I understand there are some concerns about the scope of event driven based beam report. Is it possible that we try to modify the last bullet of proposal 2.3 like “Support L1-based event-driven reporting based on SCell BFR framework, including the definition of L1-based event, if needed”, so that the scope can be smaller? We only need to define an event based on L1 measurement (This is related to RAN1 spec), and the reporting MAC CE content.[Mod: Given the strong minority (yet valid) concern, this is a good step to reduce the scope of the FFS]**Conclusion 2.2**: On Rel.17 multi-beam L1-RSRP measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP, there is no consensus on supporting the following RS types as measurement RS in RAN1#105-e* CSI-RS for mobility/RRM associated with a non-serving cell
* CSI-RS for BM configured for a non-serving cell
* CSI-RS for tracking configured for a non-serving cell

**Proposal 2.3**: On Rel.17 multi-beam L1-RSRP measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP,* Support at least K=4, where K is defined as the number of beams associated at least with non-serving cell(s) reported in a single CSI reporting instance
	+ The maximum value of supported K is a UE capability
	+ K is configured by NW based on the UE capability
	+ FFS: The support of K=8 and 16
		- For K>4, the maximum number of beams associated with one cell is 4
* FFS: Support L1-based event-driven reporting, including the definition of L1-based event, if needed

[Mod: Done] |
| OPPO | Support 2.2 and 2.3 |
| vivo | Support |
| Docomo | Support 2.2 and 2.3. |
| MediaTek | Support both proposals |
| Mod V7 | **Minor revision** per Apple’s comment |
| Sony | Support Conclusion 2.2 to conclude all the controversial RS from NSC. As for Proposal 2.3, we appreciate the effort from Apple to unveil more details on L1-based event-driven reporting. If possible, may I also suggest adding something more for the group to consider as “Support L1-based event-driven reporting based on SCell BFR framework or analogous to L3-based event-driven reporting, including the definition of L1-based event, if needed”. Since this bullet is FFS in P2.3, we are fine with current version. [Mod: Done] |
| ZTE | Not our preference, but we can live with both proposal, except that ‘L1-RSRP’ should be removed. Either L1-RSRP or L3-RSRP should be left for further discussion with evaluation and may be also relevant to the maximum number of supported K in our views.[Mod: Note is added] |
| Mod V10 | **Minor revision** on note |
| Spreadtrum | Support 2.2 and 2.3. |
| Xiaomi | Support 2.2 and 2.3.We just have one point to clarify that “one cell” below refer to the one non-serving cell only, or both one serving cell and one non-serving cell?[Mod: Both SC and NSC. For SC that’s what we have from Rel-15/16. This is to extend the rule for NSC as well as mixture of SC and NSC]* + FFS: The support of K=8 and 16
		- For K>4, the maximum number of beams associated with one cell is 4
 |
| CMCC | For Conclusion 2.2, after we review companies’ contributions, there seems to be different understandings on “CSI-RS for BM configured for non-serving cell”. For the NZP-CSI-RS configured with an SSB from the NSC as its QCL-Type D source RS, whether it is serving cell RS or NSC RS is still questionable. We think the clarification is needed.[Mod: Yes, since CSI-RS for BM or tracking doesn’t include PCI related info, it is unclear what this means – perhaps one possibility is to use SSB of NSC as a QCL D source for the CSI-RS. I can try to clarify] |
| Ericsson | Conclusion 2.2: ok. We do think it would be valuable to have reporting of L1-RSRP for CSI-RS for BM, and the spec impact is marginalP2.3: Support |
| Samsung | Support conclusion 2.2 and proposal 2.3 |
| CATT | Support the conclusion and proposal.  |
| AT&T | Support the conclusion and proposal for progress |
| Mod V19 | **Minor revision** on conclusion 2.2 per CMCC’s input |
| Futurewei | Conclusion 2.2: Ok.Proposal 2.3: Support. |
| Qualcomm | For conclusion 2.2, OKFor Proposal 2.3, OK |
| Mod V24 | **No revision** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support proposal 2.3. |
| Mod V27 | **No revision** |