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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)

QCL for CA

*Current status from Round 1 discussion:*

**Proposal 1.3**: 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, following the Rel-15/16 rules for cross-CC QCL indication

* The source RS determined from the indicated common TCI state ID to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter for a target CC can be configured in the target CC or other CC
* For intra-band CA, the source RSs determined from the indicated common TCI state ID to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter for the set of configured CCs are further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS or a same UL TX spatial relation RS.

**Proposal 1.4**: ‘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.

* The TCI states can be configured in the PDSCH configuration for each BWP /CC
* The TCI states can be absent in the PDSCH configuration in any BWP /CC, and replaced with a reference to the TCI states in a reference BWP /CC.
* For TCI states configured in a BWP/CC not as a reference BWP/CC
  + As in Rel-15/16, if the CC ID is absent in a TCI state, it applies to the serving cell in which the TCI -State is configured
* For TCI states configured in a reference BWP/CC
  + 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 active BWP ID + target CC ID + QCL-Type A/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
  + When the BWP /CC ID for QCL-Type D source RS is present in the TCI state, it is applied to all corresponding active BWP (s) of target CC(s)
  + 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
* Introduce UE capability for TCI states configured for each BWP/CC, and UE capability for TCI states configured in a reference BWP/CC and shared by multiple target BWPs/CCs

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1 – Qualcomm’s note

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your inputs on proposals 1.3 (used to be 1.3A) and 1.4 (used to be 1.3X)** |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 1.3, suggest the following change. We still do not see the benefit of mandating such configuration, which cannot ensure real common beam across CCs, since the QCL-D sources per CC can still indicate different Rx beams across CCs even the QCL-D source RSs across CCs share the same QCL-D source. To our understanding, the real common beam across CCs can be achieve by using the same QCL-D source RS across CCs, as in original agreement.   * ~~For intra-band CA,~~ Up to NW’s implementation, the source RSs determined from the indicated common TCI state ID to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter for the set of configured CCs can be ~~are~~ further associated with a same QCL-TypeD RS or a same UL TX spatial relation RS.   **Agreement**  On Rel-17 unified TCI framework, support 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:   * The above applies to intra-band CA * The above applies to joint DL/UL and separate DL/UL beam indications * Just as Rel.16, the RS in the TCI state that provides QCL-TypeA [or QCL-TypeB] shall be in the same CC as the target channel or RS * The common TCI state ID implies that the same/single RS determined according to the TCI state(s) indicated by a common TCI state ID is used to provide QCL Type-D indication and to determine UL TX spatial filter across the set of configured CCs * […] |
| OPPO | Copied some comments from the email discussion here and questions are added:  Re 1.3A:  it totally reverts the agreement made in 103e meeting. And the newly added wording “following the Rel-15/16 rules for cross-CC QCL indication” also revert the agreement.  What we agreed in 103e meeting is  ‘same/single RS determined ’ for multiple CCs. 1.3A reverts the agreement by the following ways:   * The QCL relationship is defined between A and B. The spec does not specify indirect QCL relationship. Specification in 38.214: “Each *TCI-State* contains parameters for configuring a quasi co-location relationship between one or two downlink reference signals and the DM-RS ports of the PDSCH, the DM-RS port of PDCCH or the CSI-RS port(s) of a CSI-RS resource”. When CSI-RS A is configured as QCL source for PDSCH, the QCL relationship is between DMRS of PDSCH and CSI-RS A. And the spec does not specify that the DMRS of PDSCH Is QCLed with the QCL source of CSI-RS A, i.e., the two-hop indirect QCL relationship is not specified. * The “indirect QCL” in 1.3A does not ensure same beam on multi-CCs: take an example: one CC1: PDSCH is QCLed with CSI-RS A and on CC2, PDSCH is QCLed with CSI-RS B. Both CSI-RS A and CSI-RS B are QCLed with SSB#1. Do the CC1 and CC2 use the same QCL-TypeD? The answer is no. Do the CC1 and CC2 use the same beam? The answer is also  no. * Regarding the newly added “following the Rel-15/16 rules for cross-CC QCL indication”: in rel-16, the cross-CC QCL indication only indicate TCI state ID for the set of CCs and those CCs are still applied with CC-specific TCI state/QCL.     And a couple questions to the proponents: take the following examples:   * In CC#1, the QCL-TypeD RS for PDSCH is CSI-RS #A and In CC#2, the QCL-TypeD RS for PDSCH is CSI-RS #B. And the QCL-TypeD RS for CSI-RS #A is SSB#1 and QCL-TypeRS for CSI-RS #B is SSB#1 too. In this example, which RS is the DMRS of PDSCH in CC#1 is QCLed w.r.t TypeD? And which RS is the DMRS of PDSCH in CC#2 is QCLed w.r.t TypeD? When the UE receives PDSCH in CC#1 and PDSCH in CC#2, can the UE assume a same QCL-TypeD applied on them. * The same question for PDCCH: in this example, CSI-RS #A is configured as the QCL-typeD RS for PDCCH in CC#1 and CSI-RS #B is configured as the QCL-TypeD RS for PDCCH in CC#2. Our question is：when the UE receives PDCCH on both CC#1 and CC#2, can the UE assume they have same QCL-TypeD? * Per our understanding, the answer to the above question is NO according to specification of QCL in 213 and 214.   Re proposal 1.4: Suggest to change the main bullet as follows. We do not need wording “a single RRC pool of TCI states” since the sub-bullets do not talk about that.  **Proposal 1.4**: ~~‘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~~: |
| Apple | Proposal 1.3: We do not agree with QC’s suggestion.  Direct and indirect QCL-TypeD are valid from simultaneous Rx point of view, which is defined in PDCCH+PDCCH QCL-TypeD collision handling rule in 38.213.  We support current proposal 1.3.  Proposal 1.4: We suggest clean-up the proposal as follows.  **Proposal 1.4**: Support the following options for TCI state list configuration in RRC     * Option 1: A TCI state list can be configured in the PDSCH configuration only in the BWP/CC with lowest BWP-ID and CC-ID across CCs in a band   + 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 active BWP ID + target CC ID + QCL-Type A/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   + When the BWP /CC ID for QCL-Type D source RS is present in the TCI state, it is applied to all corresponding BWP (s) of target CC(s)   + 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 * Option 2: A TCI states list can be configured in the PDSCH configuration for each BWP /CC   + For TCI states configured in a BWP/CC,     - As in Rel-15/16, if the CC ID is absent in a TCI state, it applies to the serving cell in which the TCI -State is configured * Introduce UE capability to report whether UE supports option 1 or option 2 or both |

The need for Notes proposed by Qualcomm

The following note (highlighted in yellow) was proposed by Qualcomm to be added at the end of the agreement to clarify the feasibility of a particular use case:

**Agreement**:

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 CSI-RS and DMRS for PDSCH or PDCCH

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

Note: The selected alternative can be used by NW implementation to align the Rel-17 DL TCI state between two target channels/signals

* 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.

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1 – Qualcomm’s note

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your input whether the Note is needed or not, or proposed rewording** |
| OPPO | (From ROUND 1) In our view, it is not needed because none of proposal 1.4/1.5/1.6 propose to restrict TCI states that can be configured to a channel or reference signal.  Any TCI state in the configured pool can be configured to a channel or CSI-RS as long as the QCL contained in that TCI state satisfies the QCL configuration types specified for each channel or CSI-RS resource. The wording in the Note might even cause some confusion, for example a TCI state with TypeA and TypeD activated for PDCCH+PDSCH cannot be configured for CSI-RS for tracking because the QCL type does not match. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine without any note if no company has different view. The note is because the understanding may be different based on some offline discussion with other companies. |
| Apple | Either to keep or remove the note is fine to us. |

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

*Current status from Round 1 discussion:*

**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)
  + FFS: Whether the above is supported only for joint TCI, or both joint TCI and separate DL/UL TCI (including that, if separate DL/UL TCI is supported, the DL TCI and UL TCI associated with a same cell)
  + 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
* Note: It is assumed that serving cell and/or RNTI(s) are not mandated to change when L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility is configured and utilized

**Proposal 2.2**: On Rel.17 L1-RSRP multi-beam measurement/reporting enhancements for L1/L2-centric inter-cell mobility and inter-cell mTRP, decide by RAN1#106-e whether to support the following RS types as measurement RS or not:

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

Table 3 Additional inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Mod V0 | **Please share your input on the above proposals** |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 2.2, we suggest the same change for CSI-RS for mobility/RRM, since “associated with” may have different interpretations. Also, we are fine to put CSI-RS for BM as FFS, since CSI-RS for BM might be beneficial to identify P2 beams within the non-serving SSB to our understanding.  CSI-RS for mobility/RRM ~~associated with~~ configured for or QCLed with a non-serving cell |
| Apple | For proposal 2.1, we suggest we remove the note or change it as follows  “FFS: additional impact if serving cell and/or RNTI change is supported”  For proposal 2.2, support. |
|  |  |

### Issue 3 (signaling medium)

### Issue 4 (MPUE)

### Issue 5 (MPE)