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# Introduction

This document contains a summary of the contributions under AI 8.4.4 at RAN1#105e. This include the topics for RAN1 that should be specified if beneficial and needed as listed in Release-17 NR NTN WID:

* *Enhancement on the PRACH sequence and/or format and extension of the ra-ResponseWindow duration (in the case of UE with GNSS capability but without pre-compensation of timing and frequency offset capabilities) [RAN1/2].*
* *Feeder link switch [RAN2,RAN1]*
* *Beam management and Bandwidth Parts (BWP) operation for NTN with frequency reuse [RAN1/2]*
	+ *Including signalling of polarization mode*

# Beam management discussions

In this section, we discuss beam management related issues and potential enhancements.

## NR-NTN beam management issues

### Background

In RAN1#104-e meeting, the following list of issues were raised and companies were encouraged to provide further contributions to analyse these issues. The analysis of these listed issues can help reaching decisions on potential beam management enhancements in this release.

Conclusion:

Discuss whether or not at least following issues are valid and decide whether or not enhancements are needed in addition to current NR specification for supporting NTN beam management:

* Issue 1: NR BWP is not directly associated with a beam. Thus, when using TCI to change beam from beam 1 to beam 2, it does not trigger NR BWP switching. However, in NTN FRF>1 case, beam switching may result in a BWP switching.
* Issue 2: NR BWP switching in UL and DL are not jointly triggered for FDD. However, in NTN FRF>1 FDD scenario, beam switching may result in a BWP switching in both DL and UL.
* Issue 3: NR dynamic BWP switching requires data scheduling. While in NTN FRF>1 scenario, we may need a fast BWP switching triggering without data scheduling.
* Issue 4: NR BWP switching does not require re-synchronization. However, in NTN FRF>1 scenario, when a satellite beam switching is triggered, UE may need to perform re-synchronization in the switched BWP.
* Issue 5: Since satellite beam switching can be frequent and often highly predictable, mechanisms of configured BWP switching (can be a sequence of BWPs) may be preferred but current NR does not allow it.
* Issue 6: How to deal with BWP switching triggered by bwpInactivityTimer, RA procedure, or simply a need to increase throughput instead of for beam-level mobility.
* Issue 7: NR BWP switching/beam switching is done with UE specific signalling due to UE movement’s. However, in NTN scenario, a satellite BWP/beam switching is common for set of UEs, we may need to a common BWP/beam switching mechanism to save the signalling overhead.

Company’s contributions on issue analysis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| THALES | **Observation 9 In the proposed solution, an a-priori BBWP planning can be used to allocate the BWP to each beam. Or a dynamic allocation can be performed by the gNB to configure beam-specific BWP based on the traffic distribution between the beams within the cell****Proposal 3 The new beam-specific BWP (BBWP) concept should be introduced on top of existing UE specific BWP****Proposal 4 The new beam-specific BWP (BBWP) should reuse Release-15/16 BWP operation procedures with the enhancements provided in this TDOC** **Observation 10 The size of the common Initial-active BWP should be defined carefully to avoid any congestion and blocking within the cell** **Proposal 5 Bandwidth part indicator field on DCI should be unchanged****Proposal 6 MAC CE transmission configuration indication (MAC CE TCI) can be used to indicate and update serving beam and implicitly the BBWP**  |
| vivo | ***Observation 4: The following issues require enhancements on NTN beam management:*** * ***Beam switching may result in a BWP switching.***
* ***Beam switching in FDD systems may result in a BWP switching in both DL and UL.***
* ***Dynamic BWP switching triggering without data scheduling if support beam switching based on BWP switching.***

***Observation 5: In some NTN scenarios, NR BWP switching mechanism and NR TCI framework can be reused for beam switching.*** |
| Spreadtrum Communications | ***Proposal 1: Additional association to map SSB index and BWP index is not needed.******Proposal 2: BWP switching of UL and DL simultaneously in NTN FRF>1 FDD scenario should be supported.******Proposal 3: BWP switching without data scheduling should be supported in NTN FRF>1 FDD scenario.*** |
| CATT | **Major issues:*** **Issue 1**: NR BWP switching in UL and DL are not jointly triggered. However, in NTN FRF>1 FDD scenario, beam switching should result in a BWP switching in both DL and UL.
* **Issue 2**: NR dynamic BWP switching requires data scheduling. While in NTN FRF>1 scenario, we may need a fast BWP switching triggering without data scheduling.
* **Issue 3**: NR BWP switching does not require re-synchronization. However, in NTN FRF>1 scenario, when a satellite beam switching is triggered, UE needs to perform re-synchronization in the switched BWP.

**Minor Issues**:* **Issue 1**: NR BWP is not directly associated with a beam. Thus, when using TCI to change beam from beam 1 to beam 2, it does not trigger NR BWP switching. However, in NTN FRF>1 case, beam switching should result in a BWP switching.
* **Issue 2:** Since satellite beam switching can be frequent and often highly predictable, mechanisms of configured BWP switching (can be a sequence of BWPs) is preferred but current NR does not allow it.
* **Issue 3**: How to deal with BWP switching triggered by bwpInactivityTimer, RA procedure, or simply a need to increase throughput instead of for beam-level mobility.
* **Issue 4**: NR BWP switching/beam switching is done with UE specific signalling due to UE movements. However, in NTN scenario, a satellite BWP/beam switching is common for set of UEs, we need to a common BWP/beam switching mechanism to save the signalling overhead.
1. **Support BWP based beam switching enhancement in NTN to reduce beam switching latency.**
2. **Enable BWP switching of UL and DL simultaneously and support UE confirmation after BWP switching successfully.**
3. **Support DCI to indicate beam switching with BWP index indication.**
 |
| CMCC | ***Observation 1:*** Enhancement on association of NR BWP with NR beam is not essential but it is beneficial.***Proposal 1:*** Further discuss on the issue of enhancement on association of NR BWP with NR beam, if needed.***Observation 2:*** Enhancement on joint trigger of NR BWP switching in UL and DL for FDD is not essential but it is beneficial.***Proposal 2:*** Further discuss on the issue of enhancement on joint trigger of NR BWP switching in UL and DL for FDD, if needed.***Observation 3:*** Enhancement on new DCI for fast BWP switching triggering without data scheduling is not essential.***Observation 4:*** Enhancement on UE group DCI to trigger BWP/beam switching for a set of UEs is not essential but it is beneficial.***Proposal 3:*** Further discuss on the issue of enhancement on UE group DCI to trigger BWP/beam switching for a set of UEs, if needed.***Proposal 4:*** If a new DCI format is to be designed for fast BWP/beam switching in NTN, joint support of one or more enhancements for Issue 1, Issue 2, Issue 3, and Issue 4 can be considered. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | **Proposal 1: Support satellite beam specific initial BWPs.** **Proposal 5: Consider increasing the number of bits for the BWP ID (bwp-Id)** * **The network can signal the difference between a BWP and a reference BWP to reduce the signalling overhead of BWP configuration.**

**Proposal 6: Support BWP frequency shift through DCI and/or configuration.****Proposal 7: Support RRC configuration to indicate BWP switching through DCI by either BWP ID or BWP frequency hopping.**  |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1: From the listed issues in RAN1#104-e meeting, at least the issue 5 and issue 7 are valid issues.** **Proposal 2: Enhancements to BWP operation are needed to address the issue 5 and issue 7.**  |
| Samsung | Proposal 1: Enhancement for BWP switching needs to be deprioritized. |
| Ericsson | [Observation 5 Issue #1 is not valid, because it is not necessary to directly associate a NR BWP with a beam and there is no need to necessarily trigger BWP switching upon beam switching.](#_Toc71640607)[Observation 6 Issue #2 is not valid, because it is not necessary to trigger BWP switching upon beam switching, let alone simultaneous BWP switching in both DL and UL.](#_Toc71640608)[Observation 7 Issue #3 is not valid, because it is not justified to introduce DCI based BWP switching without data scheduling.](#_Toc71640609)[Observation 8 Issue #4 is not valid, because it is not necessary for the UE to perform re-synchronization upon BWP switching.](#_Toc71640610)[Observation 9 Issue #5 is not valid, because BWP switching is not predictable and there is no need for configured BWP switching.](#_Toc71640611)[Observation 10 Issue #6 is not valid, because it is unclear what this issue is in the first place.](#_Toc71640612)[Observation 11 Issue #7 is not valid, because the need of group switching is not motivated.](#_Toc71640613)[Proposal 1 RAN1 to discuss the scope of beam management, i.e., whether NR beam management framework (TCI state and spatial relations) should be restricted within the same satellite or support the switching of the service links associated with different satellites.](#_Toc71640615)[Proposal 4 RAN1 to conclude that there is no need for additional enhancements for using BWPs to enable a frequency reuse.](#_Toc71640618) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Proposal 10: For Rel-17, do not support FRF>1 through the beam management framework.****Proposal 11: Reuse existing Rel-16 NR framework for beam and BWP management for NTN operation.** |
| Apple | ***Proposal 1:*** *Consider the association between satellite beam switching and BWP switching.****Proposal 2:*** *Consider the joint UL BWP switching and/or DL BWP switching, following the corresponding satellite beam switching.*  |
| Panasonic | **Observation 1: Issue#1 for beam management is not a valid issue and BWP operation per Rel-15/16 is sufficient to handle it.** **Observation 2: Issue#2 for beam management is not a valid issue and BWP operation per Rel-15/16 is sufficient to handle it.** **Observation 3: Issue#3 for beam management is not motivated.****Observation 4: Issue#4 for beam management is not a valid issue.** **Observation 5: Issue #5 for beam management is not well phased in the sense that it mixes the issue of frequent beam switching with the issue of linking beam switching to BWP switching.** **Observation 6: Issue #6 is unclear and further clarification is needed.** **Observation 7: There is a common assumption behind Issues #5 and #7 (called #8 below), which should be discussed first:****Issue #8: Increased signaling overhead and UE power consumption caused by frequent beam switching by Rel-15/16 beam switching mechanism (i.e. relying on UE-specific MAC CE and DCI).****Proposal 1: Rephase the Issue #5 for beam management as following:****Issue #5 (rephased): Since satellite beam switching can be frequent and often highly predictable, mechanisms of configured beam switching (can be a sequence of beams) may be preferred but current NR does not allow it****Proposal 2: Agree on Issue #8 before discussing Issues #5 and #7.****Issue #8: Increased signaling overhead and UE power consumption caused by frequent beam switching by Rel-15/16 beam switching mechanism (i.e. relying on UE-specific MAC CE and DCI).** |
| Sony | **Observation 1: in Earth-fixed beam scenario, beam selection in UE side may be needed.****Observation 2: in Earth-moving beam scenario, beam selection in at gNB side is needed while at UE side it may be needed.** **Observation 3: Introducing a fixed linkage between BWP and satellite beam is unnecessary.****Proposal 1: SSBs of satellite beams in the same cell are transmitted in the same BWP, e.g., BWP#0.** **Proposal 2: The beam used in UE side should be indicated by gNB via downlink information in NTN.** **Proposal 3: Support pre-configured timer and/or location-based beam switching in NTN.** **Proposal 4: Reuse the beam indication and BWP indication method in Rel.15/16. Furthermore, the BWP indication and beam indication should be coordinated.** **Proposal 5: Further study BWP switching without data scheduling or with invalid data scheduling.** |
| ZTE | ***Observation 1:*** *Similar trend on the channel condition is shared by the UEs within a large geographic zone.****Observation 2:*** *For issue 5, the timer based solution may not work well within consideration on the channel conditions and RAN’s progress on the UE location reporting.****Proposal 5:*** *The issue-7 should be prioritized and the common DCI based beam/BWP switching should be supported.****Proposal 6:*** *The issue 2 and 3 can be addressed by defining the common DCI for issue 7.****Proposal 7:*** *The issue 1 and 4 should be deprioritized and corresponding function can be handled by scheduling without performance degradation.* ***Proposal 8:*** *No additional enhancement is needed for addressing issue 6.****Proposal 9:*** *For issue 5, to achieve the predictable based beam switching, the UE dominant solution should be considered.* |
| Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI | **Observation 1: Switching Beam should not always trigger BWP switching and vice versa.** **Observation 2: Enhancement of TCI beam switching or introduction of a new beam switching mechanism that assists NTN UE switch BWP is required, taking the constraint of Observation 1 into account.** **Observation 3: In NTN, the issue related to joint UL BWP and DL BWP switching in FDD and for FRF > 1 should be discussed after the issue with association between beams and BWP is resolved.** **Observation 4: The necessity in BWP switching with data scheduling is not a valid issue.** **Observation 5: Re-synchronization after beam/BWP in NTN is not required.** **Observation 6: Predictive movement of a satellite should be exploited for beam/BWP management enhancement in NTN.** **Observation 7: It should be clear for NTN UE if the triggered BWP switch is associated with beam switching or none-beam switching procedures.** **Observation 8: UE common signaling for beam/BWP switching can be further studied for a satellite with fixed beams scenario.**  **Observation 9: To maintain the existing use cases of BWP mechanism and distinguish them from the new use case of BWP, i.e., beam switching in NTN, the number of configured DL/UL BWPS for NTN UE need to be increased.****Observation 10: Beam-specific BWPs consideration for NTN facilitates the design of unified solution for beam switching indication in NTN.** **Proposal 1: In NTN, it is sufficient to switch the BWP when data is scheduled.** **Proposal 2: RAN1 should increase the number of configured DL and UL BWPs for NTN UE.****Proposal 3: RAN1 to strive for a unified solution to indicate beam switching in NTN.****Proposal 4: RAN1 to introduce beam-specific BWPs for NTN.** **Proposal 5: RAN1 to clarify the scope of beam management enhancement.** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  |
| ETRI | **Proposal 1: When FRF>1, implicit BWP switching of the UE may be considered according to the configuration of the BWP for beam measurement.****Proposal 2: When FRF>1, re-synchronization in the switched BWP may be revisited after discussion of the TA update procedure.****Proposal 3: In a fixed beam scenario, TCI may be configured according to beam characteristics (time, angle, etc.) to reduce overhead due to beam switching.** |
| LG Electronics | **Observation 3. Most of listed issues can be handled by current BM and/or BWP operation. Group-based BM and BWP operation can be further studied for signaling overhead saving.** **Proposal 2. For NTN, potential enhancement on BWP switching can consider at least following aspects:*** Enhancement on *bwp-InactivityTimer* including value range extension and (re)start timing,
* PDSCH transmission after transmission of ACK for BWP switching command.
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ***Observation 2****: Beam switching and BWP switching are independent procedures in NR specification.****Observation 3:*** *Current NR specification supports beam switching and BWP switching at the same time.****Proposal 1:*** *BWP configuration enhancement scheme should be studied for NTN, e.g.** *Extending the number of supported BWPs per cell*
* *Introducing a scaling factor to adjust the cell-specific BWP common configuration*

***Proposal 2****: Support signalling a list of TCI-states based on the predictable serving beams for the UE and the beam switching is triggered by the gNB.****Proposal 3:*** *Consider the possibility of broadcasting satellite beam information in system information for UE dominant beam/BWP switching to reduce beam measurement.****Proposal 4:*** *The function of bwp\_InactivityTimer should be reconsidered in NR NTN.*  |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 4: The association between BWP ID and beam ID can be considered.******Proposal 5: DL BWP switching and UL BWP switching simultaneously should be supported.******Proposal 6: Timer based BWP switching can be supported.*** |
| InterDigital, Inc. | ***Observation 1:*** *non-essential issues to enable FRF>1 should be down-prioritized in Rel-17 if FRF>1 is supported in Rel-17****Proposal 4:*** *if FRF>1 is supported in Rel-17, RAN1 should focus on only essential issues (e.g., Issues 1, 4, and 6) to enable FRF>1.* |

There are 20 companies contributed in analysing the issues and propose the potential enhancements. A summary of the company’s view is given below. The issues that received the most supported are issue 1, 5, and 7.

Issue 1: THALES, vivo, CATT, CMCC(?), QC, Apple, ETRI(?), Xiaomi (8)

Issue 2: vivo, Spreadtrum, CATT, CMCC(?), Apple, Xiaomi (6)

Issue 3: vivo, Spreadtrum, CATT, CMCC(?), Sony (5)

Issue 4: CATT (1)

Issue 5: CATT, OPPO, Panasonic(?), Sony, ZTE, Fraunhofer HHI, ETRI(?), Huawei, Xiaomi (9)

Issue 6: CATT, LG, Huawei (3)

Issue 7: CATT, CMCC(?), OPPO, Panasonic, ZTE, Fraunhofer HHI, Huawei(?) (8)

**Newly raised issues:**

Issue 8: BWP configuration enhancement (Huawei, QC, Fraunhofer HHI, Lenovo(?), CATT)

* extending the number of supported BWPs per cell
* cell-specific BWP common configuration

Issue 9: NR BM framework (TCI state and spatial relations) should be restricted within the same satellite or support the switching of the service links associated with different satellites. (Ericsson)

Issue 10: For NTN, current NR based measurement-based beam management will result in large signaling overhead and long latency for periodic exchange of CSI-RS transmissions and corresponding reporting. (Lenovo)

### Discussion point 1

**Summarized reasoning for addressing issue 1**

In the scenario of multiple-beam per cell, frequency reuse factor >1 is used to mitigate inter-beam interference, where neighbouring beams are transmitted in different BWPs. A NTN beam switching naturally triggers BWP switching. This is the motivation to have an association between NTN beam and BWP.



**Summarized reasoning for addressing issue 5**

Additionally, the gNB should be able to adjust the beam direction in UE side for other purposes such as uplink interference coordination from the network perspective, in that sense, it is better for gNB to decide the UE side beam. As the satellite beam switching can be frequent and often highly predictable, it is beneficial to reduce the signaling overhead and latency if the target beam(s) and switching condition(s) are pre-configured to UE.

**Summarized reasoning for addressing issue 7**

In NTN case, since the footprint for each beam is much larger than terrestrial network, which will lead to different distribution on the channel quality and criteria for beam switching. For example, as illustrated in the Figure 3, the distribution of channel quality for a group of UE, which is uniformly distributed within the certain geographic zone has been evaluated with following cases:

* Case-1: LEO-600, FRF=1, area range = 5 km, duration: 10 second, time granularity: 0.2 seconds
* Case-2 LEO-600, FRF=3, area range = 5 km, duration: 20 second, time granularity: 0.2 seconds



 (a) Case-1 (b) Case-2

Figure 3 The illustration of DL SINR experienced by a group of UEs along with the movement of satellite

According to the results shown in Figure 3, it can be observed that similar trend of SINR variation with negligible difference is shared by UE within larger geographic region. In this way, it means that same scheduling strategy can be used and common signalling for addressing the beam switching related behaviour is feasible and beneficial for signalling overhead reduction. And the corresponding group of UE can be done by the network at least based on the collected report of channel conditions. If the location of UEs can be reported to the gNB, the gNB can also group UEs according to their location information. Then, the issue-7 should be prioritized.

**FL initial proposal**

Support BWP operation enhancement for NR-NTN to facilitate NTN satellite beam switching to address issues 1,5,7 concluded in RAN1#104-e.

* FFS: whether issue 8, 9 and 10 are to be addressed.

### Company view first round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views and comments |
| APT | Agree  |
| ZTE | W.r.t the beam related enhancement for NTN, there are mainly two direction for the enhancement as below:* D1: Enhancement on the legacy signalling for BS dominant mechanism
* D2: Enhancement on the legacy mechanism by introducing the prediction based solution

**For the D1 part**, enhancement on signalling overhead optimization should be the baseline step since most of functionality/issue identified above can be implemented by legacy system with one or more signalling. **Then, issue-7 should be prioritized** and further optimization**,** e.g., to jointly switching the DL and UL BWP (issue-2) and switching the BWP by DCI without scheduling (issue-3) can be easily implemented based on the common DCI design. W.r.t the issue-1, it can also be considered with issue-7 together, but it may not aligned with the design principle of legacy design system that independent bit-filed is designed for different purpose. It should be noticed that, in NTN with FR>1, indication on the BWP changes and TCI information for channel tracking can still be indicated by different bit-field by implementation since the selected TCI states may applicable for all BWP within one cell according to existing spec:**38.214***The UE receives an activation command, as described in clause 6.1.3.14 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to 8 TCI states to the codepoints of the DCI field 'Transmission Configuration Indication' in one CC/DL BWP or in a set of CCs/DL BWPs, respectively. When a set of TCI state IDs are activated for a set of CCs/DL BWPs, where the applicable list of CCs is determined by indicated CC in the activation command, the same set of TCI state IDs are applied for all DL BWPs in the indicated CCs.* **38.321***The TCI States Activation/Deactivation for UE-specific PDSCH MAC CE is identified by a MAC subheader with LCID as specified in Table 6.2.1-1. It has a variable size consisting of following fields:**- Serving Cell ID: This field indicates the identity of the Serving Cell for which the MAC CE applies. The length of the field is 5 bits. If the indicated Serving Cell is configured as part of a CC-list as specified in TS 38.331 [5], this MAC CE applies to all the CCs in the CC list;**- BWP ID: This field indicates a DL BWP for which the MAC CE applies as the codepoint of the DCI bandwidth part indicator field as specified in TS 38.212 [9]. The length of the BWP ID field is 2 bits.* ***This field is ignored if this MAC CE applies to a CC list;***The needs on the introduction of additional linkage between TCI and BWP is not well justified.**For the D2 part**, w.r.t the issue-5, it’s fine to further discuss it as new mechanism, but since the location of UE is not available at gNB side according to current RAN2 progress, detailed solutions should be checked.  |
| Panasonic | Our views are not well captured in the above summary. We don’t support Issues 5 and 7 in current formulation. For Issue 5, it mixes the issue of frequent beam switching with the issue of linking beam switching to BWP switching. Therefore, we suggest to rephase Issue 5 as **Issue 5 (modified): Since satellite beam switching can be frequent and often highly predictable, mechanisms of configured beam switching (can be a sequence of beams) may be preferred but current NR does not allow it.**For Issue 7, it is unclear under what assumption the group-common beam switching is needed. The proposal seems targeted at reducing the signalling overhead, similar to Issue 5 but with a different approach. For the progress, we should first achieve consensus **on the issue of signalling overhead and UE power consumption caused by frequent beam switching by Rel-15/16 beam management**. Then we can further discuss which approach or both mentioned in Issues #5 and #7 are needed. For Issue 1, as mentioned in our tdoc, we think it is not a valid issue and BWP operation per Rel-15/16 is sufficient to handle it.   |
| Ericsson | We feel that we should discuss the root of issue rather than simply counting the number of supporting companies. **Issue#1 is not valid:** When UE moves around and/or serving satellite/beam moves, it is not always necessary to switch the BWP upon beam switching or vice versa for mitigating interference and managing intra-cell UE mobility. First of all, UE can still communicate via the same BWP even when switching to new beam. One example of this scenario is that it is not necessary to switch the UE beam indicated by QCL type-D. This is especially relevant for satellite communication as the transmission point has a large distance from the UE and the direction of the UE beam can be the same for satellite neighbor beams. Similarly, even if the UE switches the beam, the BWP is not necessarily required to be changed. Therefore, the BWP/BM procedures including the BWP/beam switching should be performed dynamically with respect to UE position, interference level, channel condition, etc. And it is not desirable to associate the BWP switching with beam switching. The current design of NR BM/BWP procedures can fully support dynamic interference management and BWP/beam switching at the same time if necessary.**Issue#5 is not valid:** The beam switching also depends on the UE mobility as well as interference level. Therefore, in general, it is not a predicable event, and depends on the measurements performed by the UE. So, even if BWP switching and beam switching were coupled, BWP switching would not be a predictable event. Further, as pointed out above, it is not necessary to couple BWP switching and beam switching, casting further doubt on the claim that BWP switching is predictable. In short, the configured BWP switching is against the dynamic and flexible scheduling principles.**Issue #7 is not valid:** The scenario mentioned in Issue 7 is not representative for satellite communication. For earth fixed beam scenario, the beam/BWP switching also depends on the UE mobility and level of interference and needs to be addressed for each UE separately and dynamically, based on the UE measurements and condition. For earth moving beam scenario, the satellite beam moves gradually on the surface of earth and the switching point in time is different for different UEs, unless the UEs are in a close distance in relation with the beam edge, which is not predictable and not valid all the time. Therefore, the need of group switching of UEs is not motivated. |
| CMCC | In our view, enhancements on Issue 1, Issue 2, Issue 3, Issue 7 are not essential but they are beneficial. If a new DCI format is to be designed for fast BWP/beam switching in NTN, joint support of one or more enhancements for Issue 2, Issue 3, and Issue 7 can be considered.Thus, Issue-7 can be prioritized, and other enhancements, e.g., to jointly switching the DL and UL BWP (Issue-2) and switching the BWP by DCI without scheduling (Issue-3), may be further studied based on the common DCI design (Issue-7). |
| Samsung | We think Issue#1 is not needed. The current NR supports dynamic BWP switching, so the gNB can rely on the mechanism.For Issue#5/7, the soluations for the issues are about the optimizations. Without the solutions, NTN still can work. Therefore, if RAN1 discusses, those issues should be depriorized.  |
| Lenovo/MM | Our first preference is that issue#1, 2, 3 should be addressed. We think allocating neighboring footprints with different beams and BWPs can mitigate interference and improve spectral efficiency. So the scenario should be supported. We understand that BWP indication and beam indication in legacy NR specification are separated, and all possible beam id can be indicated for a specific BWP by RRC, MAC CE or DCI for different RS/channel. For DCI indicated PDSCH/PUSCH beam switching, the same DCI can also carry corresponding updated neighboring BWP id for BWP switching. However, there area also CORESET beam indicated by MAC CE, when the beam for coreset is changed, there isn’t DCI to carry BWP id update. So we prefer a relationship between BWP and beam id is constructed and maintained between gNB and UE, so that beam switching and bwp switching can be performed based on the restricted relationship between beam and bwp. For issue#2 and issue#3, we think signanling reduction can be achived by these mechanisms, and we also support them.Regarding issue#7, we think that the footprint of a beam coverage is relatively large, so we can group at least several UEs together to perform beam/bwp switching. So we also support issue#7 for siganling overhead reduction.Regarding issue#5, we understand that a sequence of beam/bwp id configured can save signaling overhead. However, we think the condition and timing to change beam/bwp id should be studied to guarantee common understanding between gNB and UE.Regarding issue#4 and issue#8, our proposal is on CSI-RS configuration enhancement. Our view is that if multiple NZP CSI-RS resources can be transmitted in multiple BWPs for a single measurement, enhancement for CSI measurement/reporting is necessary, especially for aperiodic CSI-RS reporting. As in legacy NR, for aperiodic CSI-RS resource, a trigger state list is associated with a NZP-CSI-RS resource set, and all NZP CSI-RS resources in the set have the same BWP id and the same triggering offset. If the NZP CSI-RS are located at different BWPs, the trigger offset should be configured per BWP.Regarding issue#10, our intention is to adjust UE’s measurement/reporting procedure(e.g. periodicity) based on UE’ location or the satellite’s elevation angle. The reason is that UE on cell edge to performe measurement more frequent than a UE on other areas due to the possibllity for beam/bwp switching. |
| LG | For Issue#1, we agree with Panasonic, Ericsson, Samsung and CMCC, it is not essential issue.For Issue#5, current DCI based BWP switching seems flexible enough to do the same functionality. So, without this potential solution, NTN still can work. For Issue#7, we are open for further discussion. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | On top of already good comments from Panasonic, Ericsson, Samsung, CMCC, and LG we have the following comments:Prior to starting any discussion in this domain, it is essential to highlight that it is crucial that the existing SSB structure is maintained. That is, it is not expected to have different SSBs located at different frequency offsets. With that in mind, it would be difficult to implement any concept of frequency reuse through NR beams. Hence, we basically see the various options presented above as severely breaking the existing framework for BWPs and Beam management, and would encourage that the main priority is directed towards implementing basic functionality instead of implementing another way of frequency reuse. It is in this context worth highlighting that frequency reuse is possible to implement using existing Rel-15 NR features by creating separate cells with separate center carriers. |
| Sony | For issue#1, association beween BWP and beam is not necessary as dynamic BWP switching and TCI indication were supported. We think the existing NR solutions on beam and BWP management should be adapted for NTN prior to considering issues for enhancement. The essence of TCI is reference signal, such as CSI-RS, which is located at specific BWP based on RRC configuration. Then how to perform RS measurement on different BWPs and how to coordinate with the BWP indication when indicating the TCI should be considered.Issue#5 and issue#7 are for optimization which can be depriorized.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our view is that we can first focus on issue 1 and discuss whether any additional enhancement is necessary since it is coupled with several other issues such as Issue 2, Issue 3 and Issue 4. In current NR specification, beam switching and BWP switching are two independent procedures. However the current specification can already support some association between beam, e.g. CSI-RS resource index, and BWP. As an example, CSI-RS can be used for beam measurement at least for UEs in the connected mode. In NTN, each BWP/beam can be configured with one or more CSI-RS resource, e.g. UEs in different beams or BWPs will be configured with different CSI-RS resources and each BWP can be identified by a corresponding CSI-RS resources index. Given that both BWP and beam switching can be triggered by DCI using different independent DCI fields, the current specification actually allows beam and BWP switching at the same time to some extend. For Issue 5, we are open to consider some further enhancement. Due to the high speed of satellite movement, the UE in a satellite cell can be considered to have a predictable route traversing through several satellite beams. * As a first alternative, the gNB can determine the beam for the UE based on the beam topology, satellite movement and UE location information. When UE approaches the beam edge, it will be informed by gNB to perform beam switching. One benefit of this scheme is that measurement at the UE side can be reduced with some assistant information from UE side.
* As another alternative, beam information could be broadcast in the system information for UE dominant beam/BWP switching. Once the beam information (e.g. the beam width of BWPs/beam, centre elevation and azimuth) are broadcast in the system information, the UE can calculate the topology of its surrounding beams (e.g., the footprint of the surrounding beams).With GNSS ability, UE will have the full map of when to do beam switching and which beam to switch to. Therefore, UE can trigger beam/BWP switching once it approaches the beam edge without only replying on measurement.

For Issue 7, the scenario is not clear to us and it is not clear how satellite BWP/beam switching can be common for set of UEs in case of moving beams. It will be good for the proponent to clarify this. |
| Apple | AgreeIn case of multiple-beam per cell, the coverage of different satellite beams will have large overlap, and the inter-beam interference needs to be controlled. One straightforward way of mitigating inter-beam interference is using different frequencies on neighbor beams. The frequency reuse factor > 1 could be achieved via different BWPs on neighbor beams. In the deployment scenario of FRF>1, the satellite beam switching implies BWP switching. This justifies the joint satellite beam switching and BWP switching. This joint beam switching and BWP switching is common for earth beam moving scenario, where a static UE will experience the switching of both BWP and beam simultaneously. Hence, we think issue #1 should be considered. Subsequently, we could consider issue #2 as well.  |
| vivo | W.r.t the issue-1, the TCI mechanism is independent from the BWP switching, then they can be simultaneously configured in a DCI, which can be up to the scheduling. W.r.t the issue-5, the prediction of satellites movement can be utilized to assistant the beam switching. Furthermore, sometimes UE movement could result in beam switching in the dwell time. Thus, current measurement and reporting mechanism can be reused and some enhancement on the latency of this procedure can be considered. W.r.t the issue-7, group common signaling for beam switching can be considered to save signaling overhead. However, UEs in the same group could have the different best timing for beam switching. Thus, this group common signaling could result in the waste of transmission occasion for some UEs.  |
| Fraunhofer IIS,Fraunhofer HHI | We are open to discussion for enhancement based on Issue#5 and Issue#7.  |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal. It’s very clear that in NTN satellite beam switching leads to a BWP switch unless FRF=1 is assumed. And stallite beam switch differs from traditional beam switch in TN in that receive and transmit spatial direction from UE point of view doesn’t change at the time of satellite beam switch. Hence Issues 1, 5, and 7 are valid issues. **Companies believe that issue 1 is not valid, please explain if they believe FRF>1 is not needed or for some other reasons.**  |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal.We also think the FRF>1 is a typical deployment choice to avoid the interference. Thus it is reasonable to work on the association between beam and BWP.  |
| Lockheed Martin | Agree with Proposal for Issue#5, with a slight rewording of Panasonic’s rewording: Issue 5 (modified): Since satellite beam switching can be frequent and often highly predictable, mechanisms of configured beam switching (can be a sequence of beams) is preferred but current NR does not allow it.Issue 7: While the idea is theoretically interesting, the complexity of potential solutions and performance of practical implementations can be challenging. |
| InterDigital | For Issue 1, even if FRF>1 is supported and there is a beam associated with a BWP, we don’t see any issue to support that scenario with current specification. To support that scenario, CORESETs in each BWP can be configured with the beam associated with the BWP and TCI state in DCI can be disabled. Dynamic BWP switching indication will automatically enable beam switch as well. In short, current specification has already enough flexibility to support the scenario.For Issue 5 and 7, we also agree that it is an optimization and not an essential issue to support BM in NTN. |
| Spreadtrum | Issue 5 and Issue 7 belong to optimization enhancement, which can be depriorized. |

### Summary of first round

**Issue#1**: The issue is mainly originated in the case of multiple satellite beams per cell and using frequency reuse > 1 to mitigate the inter-beam interference. In this case, for a UE to switch from a serving satellite beam to a neighour satellite beam, it also results in a BWP switching. Thus, proponents suggest to make a linkage between BWP and satellite beam, leading to a BWP switching triggered by a beam switching or the other way around. However, it is pointed out from the 1st round discussion that the current specification supports a DCI indicating BWP switching and beam switching at the same time as there are two independent indication fields. Thus, it can already realize the simultaneous switching for both BWP and beam. On the other hand, Lenovo points out that there is also CORESET beam indicated by MAC-CE, when the beam for CORESET is changed, there isn’t DCI to carry BWP ID update.

**FL viewpoint:** It seems that the current specification supports simulatneus triggering BWP switching and beam switching by two independent indication fields in a DCI, so that the gNB can decide if these two switchings should happen at the same time or not. Thus, from simulateous switching point of view, the issue can be resolved. However, there is another issue rasied by Lenovo (highlighted above), so FL invites companies to further check it.

**FL suggestion:**

For issue#1, continue discussing the following points

* regarding simultaneous BWP/beam switching, do companies agree that it can be supported by the current specification where two swithcings can be triggered by a same DCI with two independent indication fields. Would this be enough to address the raised issue#1?
* Companies are invited to further check the issue raised by Lenovo (highlighted above).

**Issue 5:** Huawei points out that, due to the high speed of satellite movement, the UE in a satellite cell can be considered to have a predictable route traversing through several satellite beams.

* As a first alternative, the gNB can determine the beam for the UE based on the beam topology, satellite movement and UE location information. When UE approaches the beam edge, it will be informed by gNB to perform beam switching. One benefit of this scheme is that measurement at the UE side can be reduced with some assistant information from UE side.
* As another alternative, beam information could be broadcast in the system information for UE dominant beam/BWP switching. Once the beam information (e.g. the beam width of BWPs/beam, centre elevation and azimuth) are broadcast in the system information, the UE can calculate the topology of its surrounding beams (e.g., the footprint of the surrounding beams).With GNSS ability, UE will have the full map of when to do beam switching and which beam to switch to. Therefore, UE can trigger beam/BWP switching once it approaches the beam edge without only replying on measurement

On the other hand, Ericsson comments that the beam switching also depends on the UE mobility as well as interference level. Therefore, in general, it is not a predicable event, and depends on the measurements performed by the UE. So, even if BWP switching and beam switching were coupled, BWP switching would not be a predictable event. Further, as pointed out above, it is not necessary to couple BWP switching and beam switching, casting further doubt on the claim that BWP switching is predictable.

**FL viewpoint:** the controversy falls in the question whether the beam switching can be predictable. Supporting companies think that it is predictable based on assistant information (see the two alternatives above for instance). While opposing companies think that the beam switching should be purely based on the measurement and reporting from the UE to gNB. The FL thinks that the 2nd round discussion can focus on the predictabilty of the beam switching by either gNB or UE. If it is feasible, it may provide an alternative to measurement-based beam switching with the claimed advantage of reducing the UE measurement efforts.

**FL suggestion:**

For issue#5, companies are invited to continue discussing the predictability of beam swtiching based on assistant information, where the prediction is to be done either on gNB or UE side as the examples given above.

**Issue 7:** This issue was originated by the observation that a group of UE within a large geographic region will experience similar tread of SINR variation (see the simulation results in contribution R1-2105209), resulting in a same scheduling strategy can be shared by the group of UE. Thus, with a common signalling, it can reduce the signalling overhead.

On the other hand, Ericsson comments that the scenario mentioned in Issue 7 is not representative for satellite communication. For earth fixed beam scenario, the beam/BWP switching also depends on the UE mobility and level of interference and needs to be addressed for each UE separately and dynamically, based on the UE measurements and condition. For earth moving beam scenario, the satellite beam moves gradually on the surface of earth and the switching point in time is different for different UEs, unless the UEs are in a close distance in relation with the beam edge, which is not predictable and not valid all the time. Therefore, the need of group switching of UEs is not motivated.

FL viewpoint: based on the company’s views there might be several ways to understand the issue.

Interpretation 1: the current spec does not support triggering BWP/beam switching for a group of UE via a common signalling. Here the common signalling refers to a common switching trigger command for a group of UE. The motivation for such common signalling may be due to

1. gNB may have prediction of the beam switching for a group of UE (this is related to issue#5 on the predictability), or
2. a group of UE experience similar SINR variation thus after measurement reporting, gNB may want to commonly trigger the group of UE. But opposing companies think that the switching point in time is different for different UEs. Thus, it seems the controversy fall in the question whether a group of UE will need to switch BWP/beam at the same point in time or separately/dynamically in time.

Interpretation 2: the common signalling refers to common configuration for a group of UE, e.g. assistant information, thus the group of UE can use the common configuration to determine BWP/beam switching.

**FL suggestion**:

For issue#7, companies continue discussing the following questions

Q1: Is interpretation 2 a reasonable interpretation to be discussed? If yes, what’s your view on it?

Q2: for interpretation 1-point 2, whether there is a concensus that BWP/beam switching point time is different for different UEs?

Q3: for interpretation 1-point 2, whether a common BWP/beam switching command for a group of UE necessarily means the group of UE have to switch beam/BWP at a same point in time?

For interpretation 1-point 1, we can wait for the discussion outcome of issue#5.

### Company view second round

**FL suggestion for issue#1:**

For issue#1, continue discussing the following points

* regarding simultaneous BWP/beam switching, do companies agree that it can be supported by the current specification where two swithcings can be triggered by a same DCI with two independent indication fields. Would this be enough to address the raised issue#1?
* Companies are invited to further check the issue raised by Lenovo (highlighted above).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views on issue#1 |
| APT | Agree that the current spec can trigger a BWP/beam switch by the same DCI. |
| Panasonic | Current spec already supports BWP switching and PDSCH/PUSCH beam switching in the same DCI with two independent indication fields. So simultaneous BWP/beam switching is already possible.Regarding the issue raised by Lenovo (related to CORESET/PDCCH beam switching), as pointed out by InterDigital in the previous round, gNB can configure all CORESETs within a BWP with the same **single** TCI state. Furthermore, the TCI indication for PDSCH in DCI can also be disabled. Then BWP switching would directly result in CORESET/PDCCH/PDSCH beam switching at the same time without the need for MAC-CE and DCI indication.  |
| Sony | Agree that simultaneous BWP/beam switching can be triggered by a same DCI. For the issue raised by Lenovo, as the essence of TCI/beam is reference signal, there are CSI-RS ID and BWP-ID describing the BWP where CSI-RS located in the TCI configuration. Considering the association beween BWP and beam in NTN, the BWP-ID can be updated based on the BWP information in TCI.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The current specification supports beam switching and BWP switching at the same time via different DCI fields in the same DCI.For issue raised by Lenovo, InterDigital has already provide a possible solution to address such case.  |
| Inmarsat | It seems to us that a fundamental observation/proposal made by some companies to support beam-specific BWPs and thus differentiate between Beam BWP and UE BWP has not been discussed/considered. In our view it is important to separate the concept of UE-specific BWP used to support different types of UEs and possibly different numerologies within the same carrier, versus the use of BWP for the purpose of frequency reuse (which realistically is usually at least FRF>=4 in satellite systems, often more than 4). In our view this is an aspect that cannot be ignored. |
| OPPO | Current spec can support simultaneous triggering BWP swithing and beam switching by a DCI. However, if the TCI state is not present in DCI, simultaneous triggering is not supported.  |
| ZTE | We are supportive for the implementation of FR = 1 and >1 from implemantion perspective. But for issue-1, we do share the views that such needs can already be supported by existing spec. |
| LG | Agree that current spec supports simultaneous BWP/beam switching triggered by a same DCI.  |
| CATT | Technically, it is possible. But from the specification, it is unclear, but it may be up to implementations. |
| Lenovo | We agree with other companies that by restricting the CORESET beam configuration to the beams associated with a BWP, BWP switching can autonuously lead to CORESET beam switching. However, the COREST beam configuration is applicable for a specific beam-bwp relationship. We think that beam-bwp relationship should be determined based on the traffic loads, channel status, interference level, so the relationship between beam and bwp may change from time to time. Every change of beam-bwp relationship leads to reconfiguration of CORESET beams by MAC CE, reconfiguration of RRC configured PDSCH beam, PUCCH beam, and this will consume large signling overhead.Meanwhile, we noticed that during RACH and BFR procedure, the UE will select a SSB index based on its own measurement result, and transmitting PRACH/PUCCH on the active UL BWP and receiving RAR/PDCCH/PDSCH on the active DL BWP. If there is no relationship between bwp and beam maintained at UE side, the selection of DL/UL BWP will be incorrect. And this may happen when the UE is located at the footprint edge between two adjacent beam/bwps.In addition, if there is a relationship between beam and bwp maintained at UE side, bwp switching can also be trigged by beam indication update for SRS, CSI-RS. This will reduce signaling overhead compated to bwp/beam swiching by indicating bwp id or beam id in DCI. |
| CMCC | Agree that the current spec can trigger a BWP/beam switch by the same DCI. |
| Spreadtrum | Existing specifications can achieve simultaneous BWP/beam switching by the same DCI. |
| vivo | We agree that current spec can support simultaneously to trigger BWP swithing and beam switching by a DCI. |
| FL summary | it seems that majority companies think there is no issue and the current specification can support BWP/beam switching at the same time. Thus no additional association between BWP and beam is needed.  |

**FL suggestion for issue#5:**

For issue#5, companies are invited to continue discussing the predictability of beam witching based on assistant information, where the prediction is to be done either on Gnb or UE side.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views on issue#5 |
| APT | L1-mobility (intra-cell mobility) shall reference results from L2-mobility (inter-cell mobility) in NTN. According to the progress on CHO, satellite beam switching is predictable and the predication is to be controlled by Gnb |
| Panasonic | We support Huawei’s view on the predictability of beam switching based on assistant information such as infrequent UE location information. As described in 38.821, in the reference scenario of LEO, the ground speed of satellite is **27216 km/h**, much higher than possible UE speed on the ground. Therefore, the UE’s movement can be largely ignored when determing the serving beam. The reporting of UE location information can occur sparsely. |
| Sony | Support predictability of beam switching in NTN, the prediction shall be done by Gnb. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As concluded by FL, we support two candicate solutions for predication based beam switch.1. The Gnb can determine the beam for the UE based on the beam topology, satellite movement and UE location information.2. Beam information could be broadcast in the system information for UE dominant beam/BWP switching |
| Apple | We think at least some level of predictability of beam switching can be achieved. It may not be very accurate due to UE’s mobility and lack of UE’s assistant information, but we are open with the relevant study to enhance the predictability. The two alternatives raised by Huawei could be the starting point, where we prefer alternative 2 since Gnb does not need to consider UE’s location (or location change) in this approach. Gnb only provides assistant information to all Ues for their reduced beam measurements and other benefits.  |
| Inmarsat | Typically in satellite communications (regardless if LEO or GEO) beam switching is something that the network should be able to control (or override any default UE behaviour). Network-based prediction and switching is much better and can be used to resolve situations where the UE is at a cell edge boundary or load-balancing across beams or satellites in different orbital planes. The network can be aware of UE mobility and has a full view of the system interference. So, yes, beam switching is generally predictable and the network is best positioned to control it also in highly-dynamic environments. The goal should be to leave as much flexibility to the operator as possible for system implementation. |
| OPPO | We understand that the network can achieve some level of beam switching prediction.  |
| ZTE | In our view, the predictability may work unless the UE’s location is well known at gNB side. Meanwhile, corresponding behaviour is not full determined by the location. The feedback information from UE is also needed. In this way, from further reduce the signalling with guarantee on the performance, UE dominated behaviour for the decision on switching along with the configuration from gNB is preferred. |
| LG | gNB can predict some level of beam switching.  |
| CATT | When UE location and moving speed are reported to gNb, then gnB can predict the beam switching of UE. In the another hand, if network informs the UE about the beam configuration including the beam size and beam direction, UE is able to predict when will conduct the beam switch. |
| Lenovo | We agree that gNB can have some level of prediction although not quite accurate. |
| vivo | In our understanding, NW can achieve some extent predictability of beam switching based on the satellite orbit, although the UE movement cannot be unpredictable. And the prediction should be utilized to achieve fast beam switching by reducing the exchange between gNB and UE. For the beam switching due to UE movement, legacy measurement-based beam switching mechanism can be reused.  |
| FL summary | a clear majority view think that the predicatability is valid and feasible either on gNB or UE side. Further enhancement with the aid of the predicatability is needed.  |

**FL suggestion for issue#7**:

For issue#7, companies continue discussing the following questions

Q1: Is interpretation 2 a reasonable interpretation to be discussed? If yes, what’s your view on it?

Q2: for interpretation 1-point 2, whether there is a concensus that BWP/beam switching point time is different for different UEs?

Q3: for interpretation 1-point 2, whether a common BWP/beam switching command for a group of UE necessarily means the group of UE have to switch beam/BWP at a same point in time?

For interpretation 1-point 1, we can wait for the discussion outcome of issue#5.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views on issue#7 |
| APT | Common signaling for the L2-mobility has no result yet. It is a valid issue but we can wait for some results from RAN2.  |
| Panasonic | Q1: It depends on what the “common configuration” means. We support the view on the predictability of UE beam switching for earth moving cell scenario. In such case, the sequence of serving beams could be common for a group of UEs, but the actual swithing time could be different for individual UE depending on UE location. Q2: Different UE can have different beam switching time based on UE locationQ3: We do not think it means the group of UE should have the same switching. |
| Sony | Agree with APT, this issue can be postponed.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1: The current beam and BWP switching is based on UE specific signaling, we suppot to reuse the same signalling framework as NR.Q2: We support that BWP/beam switching time can be different for different UEs as the signaling is UE-specific.Q3: Same as the answer of Q2.  |
| Apple | Q1: We think interpretation 2 is a reasonable interpretation to be discussed. The overall signaling could be largely saved by using a group common configuration or indication. Hence, we support to work on the mechanism to feasilitate it.Q2: The BWP/beam switching as a group may exist. Considering the large coverage of satellite beams and fast moving satellite, the BWP/beam switching for the UEs in a pretty large area could occur approximately at the same time. Q3: In our understanding, a common BWP/beam switching command for a group of UE means the group of UE need to switch beam/BWP at the same point of time for simplicity. |
| Inmarsat | Q1: No, most likely not. The RAN is in best position to coordinate and signal beam switching for a group of UEs in practically all of the scenarios, including UE mobility, satellite/beam mobility, interference and load balancing. Q2/Q3 (Comment: the questions seem mutually exclusive…): Different UEs may have to switch at different times. It could make sense for a single beam switching command to instruct UEs to switch at different times, but interested to hear if this is feasible. Alternatively, the RAN can have different signalling occasions based on groups of UEs that need to switch at same time. |
| OPPO | Q1: common signalling could also mean a common configuration, e.g. the example given by Huawei about gNB providing assistant information to UE, then UE dominates the BWP/beam switching based on the assistant information. Q2: a group of UE could switch at the same time or not depending on their locations.Q3: a common signalling for a group of UE does not mean that the UEs have to switch BWP/beam at the same time. For instance of UE dominant switching, common signalling only provides assistant information, and a group of UE decide their switching time based on the assistant information and they don’t have to switch at the same time.  |
| ZTE | Q1: We are open for interpretation-2, but this part can be discussed later. The intention of common signal is more for interpretation 1.Q2: The determination of UEs is mainly determined by the channel quality. Once the similarity on the channel conditions shows, the switching can be done in same time point as shown in our contribution. This is different as TN due to the intrisinc channel feature.Q3: It is preferred to switch the beam at a same time point up to the reception of common TA. But with additional configuration/parameters for further optimization, e.g., with consideration on interpretation 2, finer tuning for each UE within group can also be achieved.  |
| LG | Agree with APT, this issue can be postponed.  |
| CATT | In general, if there are multiple UEs placed in same line which is vertical to moving direction, it is possible to perform handover at same time. However, because of random UE distribution, the usage of group handover is not very popular.  |
| Lenovo | Q1: We think interpretation 2 is a reasonable.Q2: The switching time for different UEs can be different.Q3: UE can switch at different times based on its own measurement results. |
| Spreadtrum | Q1: In the existing specification, beam and BWP switching is based on UE specific signalling. We also prefer to reuse the same signalling framework as NR.Q2: BWP/beam switching time can be different for different UEs.Q3: Same as the answer of Q2. |
| vivo | Q1: Common signalling always means a common configuration. Due to the fast moving of satellite, beam switching is frequent and common for UEs under the satellite beams. Thus, common configuration brings in the significant decrement of signalling overhead. So, common signalling for beam switching could be considered. Q2: We also think the switching time is different for different UEs.Q3: If there is a common signalling for beam switching, it does not mean that different UEs have to switch the beam at the same time. And the common signalling could be only regarded as triggering signaling. For example, UEs could perform beam switching based on the own timing relationship or UE-specific timer. The details could be left to further discussion.  |
| FL summary | For Q1: it seems that companies are fine to consider common signalling either for a common BWP/beam switching command for a group of UE or a common configuration for a group of UE. For Q2: majority views think that different UEs have different BWP/beam switching time. For Q3: majority views think that common BWP/beam switching command for a group of UE means that the group of UE shall switch BWP/beam at the same time.  |

### Summary of second round

For issue#1: based on the collected company view in the second round discussion, majority companies think there is no issue and the current specification can support BWP/beam switching at the same time. Thus no additional association between BWP and beam is needed.

For issue#5: based on the collected company view in the second round discussion, all the companies believe that the predicatability is valid and feasible either on gNB or UE side. Further enhancement with the aid of the predicatability is needed. The prediction can be done either on gNB side or UE side. If this is on UE side, the gNB may need to provide some assistance information, based on which the UE can predict the BWP/beam switching time. As also commented by companies, such enhancement can reduce greatly the UE measurement efforts.

For issue#7: based on the collected company view in the second round discussion, it seems that companies are fine to consider common signalling either for a common BWP/beam switching command for a group of UE or a common configuration for a group of UE. Moreover, majority views think that different UEs have different BWP/beam switching time, and think that common BWP/beam switching command for a group of UE means that the group of UE shall switch BWP/beam at the same time.

With the above summary, FL suggests the following proposal:

**FL proposal DP1-1**

For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements

* Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB relying on prediction on gNB side.
	+ FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.
* Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE automonously relying on assistance information.
	+ FSS: details on assistance information

### Final conclusion

## NR-NTN satellite beam deployment

### Background

During the rel-16 NR NTN SI, it was observed that the rel-15 NR beam management and BWP procedures can be re-used with the assumption that the beams are not co-located. Rel-15 NR UE uses initial BWP#0 for initial cell access including SSB, paging, and PRACH. There can be up to 4 BWPs configured in Rel-15 NR – i.e. BWP#0, BWP#1, BWP#2, and BWP#3.

There were two options for mapping of PCI and SSB in TR 38.821 [2].

* Option a: multiple SSB beams per PCI.
* Option b: one SSB beam per PCI.



***Figure 1: Mapping options for PCI/SSBs in NTN***

Further, in RAN1#103e meeting, we have discussed the following two beam layout options corresponding to two different relationship between BWP#0 and BWP#x. Option 1 implements a narrow beam in BWP#0, which has the same beam width as the data beam. While Option 2 has a hierarchical beam layout, which implements a cell-level large beam in BWP#0, a.k.a. umbrella beam.



 *(a)* ***Option-1****: Same beam layout in BWP#0 and BWP#x (b)* ***Option-2****: hierarchical beam for BWP#0*

In this meeting, the company’s contributions are in this aspect are captured below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CATT | 1. **For RRC-IDLE UE, one cell is only associated with one satellite beam, no enhancement needed.**
2. **For RRC-Connected UE, one small enhancement is considered:**
* **A cell comprises of multiple satellite beams with different coverage areas, wherein only one beam is linked to one initial BWP and other beams are linked to different active BWPs.**
1. **SSB configuration in one BWP follows NR Rel-15 framework, no enhancement needed.**
 |
| vivo | ***Observation 1: There is no significant necessity to support the explicit association between SSBs and BWPs.******Observation 2: Both Option-1 and Option-2 can be supported.**** ***Option-1: Same beam layout in BWP#0 and BWP#x***
* ***Option-2: Hierarchical beam for BWP#0***

***Observation 3:*** ***In LEO scenario with earth-moving beams, beam switching can reduce handover interruption time at leaset for multiple beams per cell case.*** |
| Apple | ***Proposal 3:*** *Consider performing beam measurement either in initial BWP or in different BWPs with BWP switching.* |
| InterDigital, Inc. | ***Proposal 1:*** *consider different BWP allocation per beam (e.g., at least for the neighboring beams) as baseline when multiple beams per cell are used****Proposal 2:*** *study a mechanism to reduce the time gap to measure neighboring beams when frequency reuse is used for multiple beams in a cell****Proposal 3:*** *consider Option-1/2 as baseline and study further the Option-3/4 to identify the potential benefits and specification impacts* |
| THALES | **Observation 8 Deploying multi-beam cell and using beam management will not be applicable to all NTN deployment scenarios** |
| Ericsson | [Observation 1 Both multiple-beam and one-beam per PCI mapping schemes can be realized for NTN with current NR specifications without any enhancement.](#_Toc71640603) |
| Huawei | ***Observation 1****: BWP#0 with narrow beam width (option-1) has a better coverage of SSBs.* |

### Discussion point 2

**FL suggestion:**

Option a (multiple SSB beams per PCI) and Option b (one SSB beam per PCI) are supported. Further beam management enhancement at least for option a) depends on the outcome of the discussion point 1. Thus, we can discuss the discussion point 1 first.

**Initial Proposal-DP2-1**

Option 1 (Same beam layout in BWP#0 and BWP#x) and Option 2(hierarchical beam for BWP#0) are supported.

### Company view first round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views and comments |
| APT | Agree  |
| ZTE | We are supportive on the FL’s suggestion and proposal 1. Actually, to enable these two Options, no additional spec enhancement is needed and only optimization for the signalling overhead can be taken as baseline target. |
| Panasonic | Both options 1 and 2 can be realized by current NR spec without further enhancement. |
| Ericsson | Same view as Panasonic: Both Options 1 and 2 can be realized by current NR spec without further enhancement. |
| CMCC | Agree. |
| Samsung | Same view as Panasonic in that the current NR supports. |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with moderator’ proposal to support both option 1 and 2. We understand that SSBs are transmitted in BWP#0 mainly for initial access. We have a follow-up question for clarification is that whether CSI-RS for channel measurement is transmitted in BWP#0 or other BWPs. Our understanding is that CSI-RS can be transmitted in other BWPs. In that case, enhancement for CSI measurement/reporting is necessary, especially for aperiodic CSI-RS reporting. As in legacy NR, for aperiodic CSI-RS resource, a trigger state list is associated with a NZP-CSI-RS resource set, and all NZP CSI-RS resources in the set have the same BWP id and the same triggering offset. If the NZP CSI-RS are located at different BWPs, the trigger offset should be configured per BWP. |
| LG | Same view as Panasonic, both options can be realized by current spec. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are supportive of FL suggestion. Given that the considered concepts of option 1 and option 2 are supposed to be facilitated by existing specifications, we would prefer if Initial-Proposal-DP2-1 is made as a conclusion. |
| Sony | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Both options can be supported based on the previous discussion. |
| Apple | Agree, with no NR spec impact.  |
| vivo | Support the FL’s proposal.  |
| Fraunhofer IIS,Fraunhofer HHI | Support |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| Xiaomi | We agree that both options can be supported by current spec. but we have a concern on the capacity for option 2. This may be started later to see if enhancement is needed or not. |
| InterDigital | Agree that both options are already supported in current spec as mentioned by several companies |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |

### Summary of first round

It seems that the following proposal is agreeable to the group.

**Proposal**

Option 1 (Same beam layout in BWP#0 and BWP#x) and Option 2(hierarchical beam for BWP#0) are supported.

GTW on May 21, the following agreement was made

Agreement:

Same beam layout in BWP#0 and BWP#x (Option 1) and hierarchical beam for BWP#0 (Option 2) should be supported by the specifications for NR-NTN.

* FFS: Whether any specification changes are needed specifically to support this functionality

### Company view second round

CATT raised a concern that there is one missing deployment scenario for NTN system. I copy their explanation in the following for company to review:



In R15, after UE has connected to one cell, a few of new active BWPs can be configured. For NTN case, different BWP may be associated with different coverage area. The deployment scenario is shown below.

Herein frequency reusing factor is 4. For UE being in RRC-IDLE mode, 4 beams are linked to 4 different cells, but when UE has connected to one cell, the neighboring beams/BWPs can be configured with active BWPs. So for the UE accessing from BWP2,  the 4 neighboring BWPs are associated with cell2. For the UE accessing from BWP3, the 4 neighboring BWPs are associated with cell3.

We think the above scenario and configuration are with R15 scope, and also popular in NTN deployment. Using this deployment, beam switching is equal to BWP switching.

**FL suggestion:**

Companies are invited to provide views on the following questions?

Q1: whether the deployment scenario mentioned by CATT is missing from the agreement made in GTW May 21?

Q2: if the Q1 answer is YES, shall we add this scenario for NR-NTN system?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views and comments |
| Inmarsat | Q1: Yes, we think this is a potentially legitimate scenarioQ2: Yes, it should be added for consideration/discussion. |
| OPPO | Q1: yesQ2: yes |
| CATT | Q1: yesQ2: yes, we think this scenario is one important use case, in which one layer beam deployment is assumed. In reality case, due to frequency band and power limitation, the two-layer beam deployment is not popular, but in the agreed scenarions in GTW May 21, it just always assumed one BWP0 and one BWP x are overlayed.  |
| Lenovo/MM | We would like more clarification on the scenario proposed by CATT. It seems that for a footprint the cell is is cell#2 before RRC connection and cell#0 after RRC connection. If there are two UEs, one is before RRC connection and one is after RRC connection, then the two UEs will see different cell ids? It means that the SSB is based on cell id#2 and proceding data transmission/reception is based cell id#0? |
| CMCC | Same concern with Lenovo. More clarification on the feasibility and benetifit for this scenario is preferred. |
| vivo | We also would like more clarification on this scenarios. In our understanding, there are several preconditions to discuss. Firstly, this scenarios assumes common BWP configurations for all UEs under the same satellite, which are UE specific configurations in current spec, excluding initial BWP configuration. Then, one BWP per beam is assumed, which is not a consensus among the majority companies.  |
| FL summary | Several companies ask for more clarifications. CATT is invited to elaborate more on the scenario or directly answer to compnay’s questions.  |

### Summary of second round

More discussions are needed to clarify the added scenario.

### Final conclusion

## NR-NTN beam measurement and reporting

### Background

In this meeting, there are 6 companies provided contributions on the NTN beam measurement and reporting enhancements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| vivo | ***Proposal 3: gNB dominates beam switching mechanism can be considered in NTN based on ephemeris information of satellites, UE positions and other assistant information, e.g. beam measurement and reporting.******Proposal 4: Support to enhance beam measurement and reporting mechanism for NTN.***  |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 8: Consider enhancements on radio link monitoring to support efficient reference resource configuration and measurement outside the active BWP.**  |
| Apple | ***Proposal 3:*** *Consider performing beam measurement either in initial BWP or in different BWPs with BWP switching.* |
| Lenovo | ***Observation 1: For NTN, current NR based measurement-based beam management will result in large signaling overhead and long latency for periodic exchange of CSI-RS transmissions and corresponding reporting.*** ***Proposal 4: Study further methods to perform beam measurements in order to reduce the signaling overhead and avoid long latency.******Proposal 10: Measurement and reporting signaling for polarization is needed for efficient beam switching and handover. CSI-RS may be used for polarization measurements.*** |
| ETRI | **Proposal 1: When FRF>1, implicit BWP switching of the UE may be considered according to the configuration of the BWP for beam measurement.** |
| Huawei  | ***Proposal 3:*** *Consider the possibility of broadcasting satellite beam information in system information for UE dominant beam/BWP switching to reduce beam measurement.* |

**Vivo**: considering UE movements, current beam measurement and reporting mechanism could be also considered. A set of candidate target beams could be provided to UEs to measure and report. And due to large beam diameter in NTN scenario, candidate target beams are usually not all beams under the satellite, just several adjacent beams, which reduces unnecessary measurement and reporting on beams with low correlation. In addition, the set of candidate target beams could be a sequence of beams, descending or ascending order of priority. Thus, enhancements on beam measurement and reporting mechanism could be considered.

**QC**: To help the network decide on the best BWP or satellite beam for a UE to switch to, it is important that the UE measures the quality of its current serving satellite beam and neighboring satellite beams and reports the measurements back to the network. Frequent satellite beam switching leads to frequent reconfiguration of reference signals for radio link measurement. Because the measurement of a neighboring satellite beam may need to be performed in a BWP that is different from the active BWP, extra time is needed for frequency retuning and preparation for the frequency compensation and it is beneficial to minimize the measurement overhead.

**Apple**: The beam measurement in NR terrestrial network is based on SSB or CSI-RS. Since different satellite beams in NTN may be associated with different BWPs, BWP may be either switched or extended in order to measure CSI-RS in different beams. The former approach requires additional gap between beam measurement, while the latter approach has a large specification impact. We prefer the approach for BWP switching for CSI measurement in a different beam. An alternative approach is to make all the beam measurement in initial BWP, which reduces the total number of BWP switching for beam measurement.

**Lenovo**: Assuming the scenario shown in Fig 1, where multiple beams are in a cell and each beam is mapped to a BWP, one major issue could be large signaling overhead and long latency associated with the beam switching procedure that includes periodic CSI-RS transmissions and corresponding reporting. For LEO satellites, the beams might need to be updated frequently and signaling overhead could be large.

One potential solution could be based on location-aware CSI-RS transmissions and measurements. As shown in Figure 3, UEs on cell-edge needs to perform frequent measurements (UEs near gray area in Fig 3) while other UEs either do not require measurements, or the frequency of measurements can be reduced significantly. Therefore, such procedure can be adopted either based on the location or based on a L1- RSRP mapping table.



Fig 3. An example of location-based beam measurements

### Discussion point 3

**FL initial proposal-DP3-1**

For CSI-RS-based beam measurement of a serving cell, support enhancements to address at least the following aspects

* Measurement gap for BWP switching when measured CSI-RS is outside active BWP
* Reduction of power consumption for cases when measurement can be avoided.
* FFS: further restrict CSI-RS in initial DL BWP.

**FL initial proposal-DP3-2**

For SSB-based beam measurement of a serving cell, support enhancements to address at least the following aspects

* Measurement gap for BWP switching when measured SSB is outside active BWP
* Reduction of power consumption for cases when measurement can be avoided.

### Company view first round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views and comments |
| APT | No. RSRP (SSB/CSI measurement) is non-essential for L1/L2 mobility, e.g., HO/CHO. Time-based BWP switching (like time-based CHO) can be considered. NW provides the time (timer/UTC) after which the UE can execute BWP switching to the candidate target BWP. If the time-based BWP switching fails, then the legacy BWP inactive timer (bwpInactivityTimer) can bring the UE back. NW can take full control of this L1 mobility. |
| ZTE | For these two proposal, actually, it is intended to address same issue for legacy BM mechanism, i.e., beam measurement outside active BWP. For optimizing this functionality, we need to consider the whole mechanism including RS configuration and report mechanism.Then, it’s preferred to modify and merge these two proposals as below:Updated proposal Enhancements to achieve the BM management cross BWPs (including BWP outside the active BWP) should be supported at least on following aspects:* RS/reporting configuration
* Measurement gap
 |
| Panasonic | We are open to further discuss to reduce UE power consumption by frequent beam measurement, although we think some enhancement can rely on gNB implementation.  |
| Ericsson | This topic is related to discussion point 1 about the 7 listed issues. Before achieving consensus on the issues that need to be addressed, it is pre-mature to discuss enhancements of the SSB/CSI-RS measurements. In short, we are not ok with these proposals at this stage. |
| CMCC | As summaried in section 2.5, NR-NTN SSB transmission in BWP#0 is supported by most companies, thus, the motivation of the first subbullet in FL initial proposal-DP3-2 needs more clarification.  |
| Samsung | We can futher discuss on the motivations and advantages. However, similar to above issues, we can deprioritize compared to the essential issues. |
| Lenovo/MM | We agree with moderator that measurement gap is necessary when the measurement is cross different BWPs. We also agree with ZTE that RS/reporting configuration enhancement is necessary especially considering the time domain offset for different aperiodic NZP CSI-RS located at different BWPs.We also support to define mechanism for power saving and signaling reduction for measurement/reporting in NTN. |
| LG | As pointed by Ericsson, this issue is related to issue 1 and 7. So, we can further discuss after we make some consensus on it.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | According to our understanding the introduction of measurement gaps for performing beam related measurements is counter-intuitive. Is the intention here to make an attempt of recreating existing inter-cell measurement framework within the beam management framework? If so, we would strongly oppose to this, as this will (a) introduce duplicate functionality, (b) complicate specifications, and (c) create further fragmentation of the market unless the functionality is made mandatory. |
| Sony  | Support this proposal. As we commented in Discussion Point 1, we think this beam measurement and reporting issue should be discussed with high priority.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t think it is essential to consider SSB and CSI-RS based measurement for NTN. Our view is that in NTN BWP/beam switching merely based on measurement is not efficient as the UE may select adjacent BWP/beam with smaller serving time duration and the complexity for measurement outside active BWP is large. It is beneficial to introduce geometry or timer based BWP switch to reduce the power consumption and increase the BWP switching efficiency at the UE side. |
| Apple | We are supportive to the proposals. Since different satellite beams in NTN may be associated with different BWPs, BWP may be either switched or extended in order to measure CSI-RS in different beams. The former approach requires additional gap between beam measurement, while the latter approach has a large specification impact. We prefer the approach for BWP switching for CSI measurement in a different beam. |
| vivo | We agree with Ericsson’s view, it is pre-mature to discuss enhancements of the SSB/CSI-RS measurements before the essential issues are identified.  |
| Fraunhofer IIS,Fraunhofer HHI | We are supportive of the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Supportive.  |
| InterDigital | The group should reach a consensus on the essential issues first and then go next step details of the identified essential issues to be efficient as commented by several companies above. |
| Spreadtrum | Whether SSB-based beam measurement of a serving cell is needed needs further study. |

### Summary of first round

Different views were expressed. Opposing companies think that discussion point 3 is not an essential issue; while supporting companies believe that the functionality of beam meaurement and reporting is problematic and requies further enhancement. From FL viewpoint, the legacy beam management is based on beam measurement and reporting. In discussion point 1, we are also discussing possible enhancement to make the beam management predictable by UE or gNB so that the UE beam measurement can be skipped. However, this enhancement is still under discussion and no agreement on the beam switching prediction yet. In this case, at this stage beam measurement/reporting is still a baseline. Therefore, FL thinks that beam measurement/reporting is an essential function for beam management even in NTN system.

On the other hand, multiple beam per cell scenario was agreed in RAN1#102e meeting, and there seems to be a common understanding that frequency reuse > 1 should be supported to mitigate inter-beam interference. This leads to a deployment scenario where multiple beams are transmitted in different frequency interval. If we agree that this deployment scenario should be supported in NR NTN system, then it would be inevitable to discuss how a UE performs measurement over multiple RS corresponding to multiple beams cross BWPs.

With the above analysis, FL sees the root question is for this specific deployment scenario, what do we envision for the beam measurement to proceed. For this, FL suggests the following directions.

**FL proposal:**

For the beam measurement performed by UE in the deployment scenario, where multiple beams are transmitted in different frequency interval, make a decision on the following alternatives in RAN1#105-e meeting:

Alt-1: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP?

Alt-2: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within across BWPs?

Alt-3: support both Alt-1 and Alt-2.

### Company view second round

**FL proposal:**

For the beam measurement performed by UE in the deployment scenario, where multiple beams are transmitted in different frequency interval, make a decision on the following alternatives in RAN1#105-e meeting:

Alt-1: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP?

Alt-2: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within across BWPs?

Alt-3: support both Alt-1 and Alt-2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views and comments |
| APT | Alt-2. However, UE can skip beam measurement and reporting if NW can predict satellite beam switching. (and ignore UE mobility of 1200km/h, considering LEO mobility is 27000km/h) |
| Panasonic | Alt-3  |
| Sony | Support in principle. As the rel-15/16 beam management and BWP operation are considered as baseline for NTN, the enhancement to enable beam measurement and reporting of rel-15/16 workable for NTN deployment scenario should be priorized. Support Alt.3, but we think it is a little bit earlier to list the alternatives, each alternative needs careful discussion as it may cause large spec. impact. For example, based on current CSI framework in Rel.15/16, each CSI report config. associated with one CSI resource config., multiple CSI-RSs included in the CSI resource config are associated in the same BWP. To support Alt.2, how many times of CSI report are needed, does it require CSI measurement in inactive BWP? RAN 1 can conclude that: Take Rel.15/16 beam measurement and reporting as baseline for the beam management and BWP operation in NTN deployment scenario, where multiple beams are transmitted in different frequency interval. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are still sceptical that in this particular case that beam measurement and reporting is essential. It is not quite clear which solution should be “baseline” or “default” solution at the current stage. |
| Apple | Alt-3. We agree with FL’s observation that in the multiple beam per cell scenario, frequency reuse > 1 should be supported to mitigate inter-beam interference. The frequency reuse >1 can be achieved via different BWPs. Then it is inevitable to discuss how a UE performs measurement of different beams associated with different BWPs. On the other hand, if neighbor beams share the same BWP (but with different polarization to mitigate inter-beam interference, etc), then we could consider the beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP.  |
| Inmarsat | Alt-2 seems to make more sense, but we tend to agree with APT comment. RAN can predict beam switching, so UEs can sometimes skip neighboring beam measurements. However, it should be supported.Alt-3 seems a safe option if achievable. |
| OPPO | We support Alt-3 |
| ZTE | Alt-3. Both options are applicable and up to the deployment. For example, the same beam layout is more preferred for Alt-1 and Alt-2 is for hierarchical. |
| LG | Agree with Sony that Rel-15/16 beam management and BWP operation are considered as baseline for NTN |
| CATT | If different beam is associated with different frequency band, not sure how to enable Alt-1 workable? Alt2 can be supported.  |
| Lenovo/MM | Support Alt 3. |
| CMCC | For both layout options, i.e., same beam layout in BWP#0 and BWP#x (Option 1) and hierarchical beam for BWP#0 (Option 2) as agreed in Section 2.3, UE can perform SSB based beam measurement in BWP#0, thus Alt-1 seems workable at least for the basic functionality of beam switching. Hense, Alt-1 is preferred for less spec impact.Nevertheless, Alt-2 seems beneficial for interference management and throughput enhancement. Thus further study on Alt-2 is preferred. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt 3. |
| vivo | Prefer Alt 3, but it seems early to choose the alternatives, requiring further discussion.  |
| FL summary | There is a clear majority suppoting Alt 3 |

### Summary of second round

Based on the collected company view, there is a clear majority supporting Alt-3, therefore FL suggests the following proposal.

**FL proposal DP3-1:**

For the deployment scenario with multiple beam per cell and frequency reuse >1, NR-NTN should support the following cases for beam measurement performed by a UE:

Alt-1: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP.

Alt-2: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within across BWPs.

### Final conclusion

## NR-NTN beam and BWP association

### Background

Two companies provided solutions for beam and BWP association.

Xiaomi: For one-beam per cell, handover mechanism can be used to indicate beam switching. While for multiple-beam per cell, intra-cell beam switching should be considered. In order to reduce the interference between adjacent beam footprints, BWP operation for NTN with frequency reuse will be discussed, as illustrated in Figure 1. In this case, it is beneficial to define a association between BWP and beam, or to define a parameter set ID which linking to a BWP ID and a beam ID. In this case, it can switch both the BWP and the beam by indicating a parameter set ID. With this method, the DCI size can be reduced.

Apple: If in a TCI state configuration, the associated DL or UL BWP is configured, then the satellite beam switching via DCI or MAC CE results in the corresponding DL BWP or UL BWP switching. In other words, the DL BWP or UL BWP switching follows the satellite beam switching autonomously, if a TCI state configuration includes the associated DL BWP or UL BWP.

### Discussion point 4

**FL suggestion:**

Conclude the discussion point 1 first before discussing the beam and BWP association.

### Company view first round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views and comments |
| APT | Agree  |
| ZTE | No need to discuss the association between beam and BWP explicitly and it’s up to implementation. |
| Panasonic | Support FL suggestion. |
| Ericsson | It is not necessary to directly associate a BWP with a beam. |
| CMCC | Agree. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with moderator’s view. Agree that there are association between BWP and beam, and we prefer that the relationship between bwp and beam explicitly configured. |
| LG | OK with FL suggestion. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No need to discuss this at this meeting. |
| Sony  | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the moderator’s suggestion. |
| Apple | Agree |
| vivo | Support FL suggestion.  |
| Fraunhofer IIS,Fraunhofer HHI | Agree |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| InterDigital | Agree |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |

### Summary of first round

As there is no concensus on the issue#1 of discussion point 1 after 1st round discussion, the discussion point 4 is pending.

### Company view second round

### Summary of second round

As there is no concensus on the issue#1 of discussion point 1 after 2nd round discussion, the discussion point 4 is pending.

### Final conclusion

## NR-NTN SSB transmission in BWP#0 and sync raster

### Background

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CATT | 1. **SSB configuration in one BWP follows NR Rel-15 framework, no enhancement needed.**
 |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 1: Support satellite beam specific initial BWPs.** **Proposal 3: Support the following SSB arrangements*** **Alt 1: SSBs of all satellite beams in a same cell are transmitted within a same frequency interval and do not overlap in time**
* **Alt 2: SSBs of a cell are transmitted in different frequency interval, i.e., within their respective BWPs.**

**Proposal 4: Support signalling of the following configurations in SIB1*** **initial BWPs of other satellite beams,**
* **CORSET#0 of other satellite beams if different from that of the serving beam.**
 |
| Sony | **Proposal 1: SSBs of satellite beams in the same cell are transmitted in the same BWP, e.g., BWP#0.**  |
|  |  |

Regarding SSB transmission in BWP#0 (initial BWP), companies’ views are split. There are mainly two directions to pursuit.

Alt-1: SSBs of a same cell are transmitted in a same frequency interval or in one BWP#0.

Alt-2: SSBs of a same cell are transmitted in different frequency intervals or introduce multiple BWP#0.



This topic has been discussed several meetings and there does not seem to have more support for alt-2. In this case, the FL suspects that the company’s views will be changed in this meeting. Thus, to save our time, FL proposes the proposing companies to have offline discussions with other companies.

**FL suggestion:**

For Alt-2, the supporting companies are encouraged to have offline discussions to convince other companies by the benefits of Alt-2. **It means that there is not a dedicated discussion point in this meeting.**

### Company view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views and comments |
| APT | Agree  |
| ZTE | No need to introduce additional mechanism |
| Panasonic | Support FL suggestion. |
| Ericsson | Support FL suggestion. |
| CMCC | Agree. |
| Samsung | Agree  |
| Lenovo/MM | Support FL suggestion. |
| LG | Agree  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | The SSB configuration should follow the existing NR REl-15 framework to ensure that we focus on basic functionality to enable NR over NTN. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the moderator’s suggestion. |
| Apple | Agree with FL suggestion. |
| Vivo | Support FL suggestion. |
| Fraunhofer IIS,Fraunhofer HHI | Support |
| InterDigital | Ok with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |

# Signalling of Polarization

## Background

The following agreements were made in RAN1#102e and RAN1#103e, respectively:

Agreement:

Potential enhancements for support of polarisation signalling in NR NTN can consider at least the following:

* Configuration of DL and UL transmit polarization including Right hand and Left hand circular polarizations (RHCP, LHCP)
* Network broadcast DL and UL transmit polarization configuration
* UE polarization capability (RHCP, LHCP, Linear)
* Dependence of polarisation ignalling on deployment scenarios. For example,
	+ Resource reuse mode with/without polarization for the beam management enhancement
	+ Fixed polarization per cell/beam for polarization reuse and circular polarisation with intra-UE and inter-UE multiplexing (intra-UE and inter-UE) signalling

Agreement:

Indication of polarization information for DL and UL by the network is supported.

* FFS: Signalling details

In RAN1#104-e meeting, we have further achieved the following agreement that at least explicit indication for DL by the network is supported. Moreover, the details of the signalling is to be discussed in this meeting.

Agreement:

Support at least explicit indication of polarization information for DL by the network

* FFS: whether the indication is done by SIB, other RRC ignalling, DCI.
* FFS: Whether separate ignalling is needed for the UL and if so, whether or not a same polarization is indicated for DL and UL

Conclusion:

Discuss the necessity of reporting UE polarization capability considering at least following aspects,

* Deployment scenarios.
* UE implementation aspects with respect to polarization.
* Satellite implementation aspects for switching between polarization states.

Satellite implementation aspects for realizing multiplexing of Ues having different polarization capabilities.

Company’s contribution

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| THALES | **Proposal 1 To increase the per-beam bandwidth while ensuring excellent interference isolation between beams, other frequency separation techniques such as polarization re-use scheme should be considered** **Observation 3 Circular polarization can be used to double the cell capacity** |
| vivo | ***Observation 6:*** ***The motivation of reporting polarization capability is unclear.******Observation 7: The polarization configuration of beams can be left to the network implementation.*** ***Observation 8: The reporting of UE polarization capability shows no benefit for the polarization configuration of beams.******Observation 9: The reporting of polarization capability could not provide any significant benefit for the multiplexing of Ues having different polarization capabilities.******Observation 10: SSB transmission is suitable to indicate the beam-specific polarization.******Proposal 5:* *Not support to dynamically indicate polarization configuration of beams.******Proposal 6: The reporting of UE polarization capability should not be supported.*** ***Proposal 7: Not support to separately indicate the polarization of UL.******Proposal 8: Enhancements on SSB transmission to support Ues the unmatched polarization to camp in NTN beams could be considered.******Proposal 9: For downlink synchronization, support the polarization indication to be associated with SSB transmission.*** *Proposal 10: Support to ignallin SSB transmission with LHCP and RHCP in TDM way.* *Proposal 11: For idle/inactive state Ues, the polarization indication in SIB or SI is not supported.**Proposal 12: For connected state Ues, the polarization indication in SIB or DCI, or other RRC ignalling could be used to update the polarization indication in SSB transmission.* |
| Spreadtrum Communications | ***Proposal 4: UE reporting polarization capability is not needed.******Proposal 5: Polarization indication can be signalled by Gnb.*** |
| CATT | 1. **Network informs UE the polarization indication per beam by SIB, and polarization mode of DL and UL should be same.**
2. **Reporting UE polarization capability is not necessary.**
 |
| CMCC | ***Proposal 5:*** At least support explicit indication of polarization information for DL by SIB.***Proposal 6:*** Further discuss on explicit indication of polarization information for DL by other RRC ignalling or DCI, if needed. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | **Proposal 12: Consider at least signalling of polarization per BWP.** |
| OPPO |  |
| Samsung |  |
| Ericsson | [Proposal 5 Support broadcast signaling in SIB that allows a Gnb to indicate the Gnb’s DL transmit polarization mode and UL receive polarizations mode to UE.](#_Toc71640619)[Proposal 6 Support signaling that allows the Gnb to configure a UE’s polarization modes including the UE’s receive polarization mode in the DL and the UE’s transmit polarization mode in the UL.](#_Toc71640620)[Proposal 7 NTN UE should report its polarization capability (RHCP, LHCP, Linear) to the network.](#_Toc71640621) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Proposal 4: Use SIB based broadcast transmission to provide the default polarisation indication for DL and UL.** **Proposal 5: Define a network configured basic or default polarization mode for DL and UL operation which is used for initial access.** **Proposal 6: Clarify if signalling of polarization mode using RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED mode Ues can really be supported in the transparent paylod scenarios.****Proposal 7: The UE supports the default polarization mode offered by the Gnb/satellite.****Proposal 8: The UE may report a preference for a polarization mode from its supported polarization modes.** |
| Apple | ***Proposal 4:*** *Regarding the usage of polarization, prioritize the support of inter-beam interference mitigation scenario.* ***Proposal 5:*** *For inter-beam interference mitigation, the polarization information is configured in a beam specific manner and is ignallin via SIB.****Proposal 6:*** *UE polarization capability reporting is not supported for inter-beam interference mitigation.*  |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 3: Signaling for the following two usages of circular polarization should be supported.** * **Polarization reuse for inter-cell/beam interference mitigation**
* **Polarization multiplexing for throughput improvement**

**Proposal 4: For operation with polarization reuse, the following ignalling design should be discussed:*** **Polarization for initial access**
* **Polarization for beam management**
* **Polarization for SSB/CSI-RS measurement**
* **Polarization of target cell/beam for handover**

**Proposal 5: For operation with polarization multiplexing, information on the polarization should be indicated in DCI for scheduling PDSCH/PUSCH.****Proposal 6: Support the following UE polarization capability report*** **Transmission capability of circular polarization (explicitly or implicitly by UE type)**

**Reception capability of dual polarization signals as separate streams** |
| Sony | **Observation 4: Depends on the form factor and complexity of the RF implementation, the supported polarization can vary between UE to UE.** **Observation 5: Understanding the UE capability on the supported polarization mode is critical for NTN network deployment. It is also necessary for the NTN network to use the polarization domain, e.g., The Gnb can configure multi-user multiplexing on the polarization domain based on UE capability.****Observation 6: The UE awareness of Gnb polarization of reference signal, e.g., SSB, can improve the beam management performance.** **Proposal 6: Multi-user multiplexing on the polarization domain based on UE capability is supported.** **Proposal 7: Beam management, e.g., spatial relation, in the NTN network can include the polarization aspect.** **Proposal 8: Support UE polarization capability reporting, it can be either reported explicitly by the UE or implicitly through the UE measurement and reporting of the DL RS on two orthogonal polarizations.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 1:*** *The beam/cell level allocation of polarization information for DL/UL in both semi-static and dynamic way can be considered.* ***Proposal 2:*** *W.r.t the polarization information for one serving cell, the SIB based indication for SSB and RRC based configuration for CSI-RS should be supported. The corresponding information for other channels/RS will be derived based on associated QCL information.****Proposal 3:*** *The explicit indication of polarization information via common DCI can be considered to further optimize the signalling overhead.****Proposal 4:*** *UE polarization reporting should be supported.* |
| Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | ***Proposal 5: UE reporting of its polarization capability is supported.******Observation 2: Defining only a single polarization type for all frequency bands may result in reduced spectrum sharing capabilities, whereas defining multiple polarization types may result in erroneous polarization detection.*** ***Proposal 6: In order to facilitate initial access procedure, one or multiple basic polarization types can be defined for different frequency bands.******Proposal 7: DL Polarization information can be indicated in SSBs to avoid degradation of initial cell search.******Proposal 8: UL Polarization information can be indicated in PRACH during initial access.******Proposal 9: Indication of polarization multiplexing is supported where DCI or TCI state signalling may be used for polarization-based multi-user multiplexing and single-user higher rank transmission.******Proposal 10: Measurement and reporting ignalling for polarization is needed for efficient beam switching and handover. CSI-RS may be used for polarization measurements.*** |
| ETRI |  |
| LG Electronics | **Observation 1. DL polarization indication seems sufficient.****Observation 2. Without UE polarization capability reporting, UE can properly work.****Proposal 1. Indication of polarization mode (RHCP, LHCP) can be broadcasted via SIB.**  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ***Proposal 5:*** *At least cell-level and beam-level polarization indication for NTN should be supported.****Proposal 6:*** *The necessity to report the UE polarization capability is not clear in case that the polarization state of network does not change dynamically.* |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 1: The DL polarization information is explicitly indicated in system information.******Proposal 2: Dynamic indication of polarization is not supported.******Proposal 3: UE polarization capability reporting is supported.*** |
| InterDigital, Inc. |  |

There are 16 companies that have provided contributions in this topic. Majority of the companies think that the polarization indication for DL can be provided in SIB.

Companies supporting DL polarization indication in SIB: vivo (for connected UE), CATT, CMCC, Ericsson, Apple, ZTE, LG, Huawei, Xiaomi

Furthermore, there are also companies suggesting to have beam-level polarization indication.

Companies supporting beam-level polarization indication: ZTE, Huawei, vivo, CATT

In addition, CMCC and ZTE also suggest to support polarization indication in UE-specific RRC. ZTE also proposes to support common-DCI based polarization signalling.

Qualcomm proposes to have BWP-wise polarization indication.

Regarding UL polarization indication, Vivo, spreadtrum and CATT think that separate UL indication is not needed. While Ericsson supports a separate DL and UL polarization indication.

Regarding UE polarization capability reporting, there are splitting views with comparable number of the supporting companies.

Support reporting: Ericsson, sony, Xiaomi, ZTE, Lenovo

No reporting: CATT, Apple, LG, HW, spreadtrum

## Discussion point 5

**FL initial proposal-DP5-1**

For explicit indication of polarization information for DL by the network, support indication in SIB

* FFS: indication by UE dedicated RRC.

**FL initial proposal-DP5-2**

No separate indication for UL polarization, UE assumes a same polarization for DL and UL.

**FL suggestion**

Further discuss the necessity of UE polarization capability reporting in this meeting.

### Company view first round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| company | Views and comments |
| APT | Agree FL initial proposal-DP5-1 (Good side info for UE to enhance SNR)For FL initial proposal-DP5-2, not sure why a limit is needed for a satellite to use the same polarization for DL and UL. |
| ZTE | Before we conclude the detailed signalling, we need to firstly conclude the target entity for polarization indication or configuration, e.g., per beam, per BWP or SSB/RS or channel. Otherwise, it’s not clear how to associate the signalling to further DL/UL transmission. Then, w.r.t the 1st bullet, updates as below is proposed:**FL initial proposal-DP5-1** For explicit indication of polarization information for DL by the network, support at least one of following indication:* Option-1: The indication of polarization is per BWP(s)
* Option-2: The indication of polarization is per SSB(s)
* Option-3: The indication of polarization is per CSI-RS(s)
* Option-4: The indication of polarization is per channel(s)

For **FL initial proposal-DP5-2,** we are supportive on it. W.r.t the UE report, it’s necessary to be supported and further discussion is needed. |
| Panasonic | Support FL initial proposal-DP5-1. We think at least for initial access, information on the polarization should be broadcasted via SIB. For operation with polarization multiplexing, information on the polarization should be indicated in DCI for scheduling PDSCH/PUSCH.Not supportive on DP5-2. We think different polarization for DL and UL could be useful in certain scenarios, and therefore it is too early to rule it out. For example, for DL, polarization multiplexing is used to ignallin different Ues, but for UL, ignallingn multiplexing is not used. In this case, DL and UL could have different polarization from one UE perspective. Furthermore, it would be necessary to discuss how to handle the case where the UE does not support transmission with the same polarization as DL. For example, UE with linear polarization antenna can receive circular polarization signal, but it may not support transmission of circular polarization. For UE report of polarization capability, we think the following can be supported:• Transmission capability of circular polarization (explicitly or implicitly by UE type)• Reception capability of dual polarization signals as separate streams |
| Ericssson | **Support FL initial proposal-DP5-1**.**Not Ok with FL initial proposal-DP5-2:** this is counter-productive, imposing unnecessary restriction on the deployment.**Fine with FL suggestion:** It is expected that a mega NGSO constellation will be utilized to serve multiple types of devices such as reduced capability devices, normal handhelds, vehicular devices, fixed devices, among others. Some of these devices will use linear polarization, some will use circular polarization, and others may support both. For optimal performance, it will be necessary for network to know the polarization capability of these devices or at least the UE type. |
| CMCC | Support FL initial proposal-DP5-1. |
| Samsung | Support DP5-1. Further discuss DP5-2, especially with motivation and use cases. |
| Lenovo/MM | Regarding DP 5-1, we agree with ZTE that the relationship between polarization and SSB/beam/BWP/RS should be discussed first, and we think a polarization type can be associated with a SSB index.Regarding DP 5-2, we think no restriction on same polarization type between DL and UL depending on different UE implemenatation.Regarding DP 5-3, we think polarization type reporting is beneficial for Gnb scheduling. |
| LG | Support proposal 5-1 and 5-2.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Supportive of FL initial proposal-DP5-1Supportive of FL initial proposal-DP5-2Ok to further discuss the need for UE reporting its capabilities regarding polarization. |
| Sony  | Support DP5-1. Not support DP5-2. This is unnecessary limitation as commented other companies. DL and UL may have different scenarios, where DL need to consider multiuser multiplexing while UL may need to maximize the transmit power through different polarization schemes. It is also necessary to have the UE capability reporting of polarization due to the limitations on the implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **FL initial proposal-DP5-1:** Fine with the proposal. Besides the signalling part, it will be good discuss further on how the beam-level or cell level polarization can be achieved as suggested by ZTE. **FL initial proposal-DP5-2:** Agree, not necessary to introduce a different polarization for UL at least from interference coordination point of view even though it is possible from signalling point of view. **FL suggestion:** Fine to discuss this further. But we don’t see the necessity to report UE polarization. |
| Apple | We support proposal DP5-1. We can further discuss DP5-2. For inter-beam interference mitigation, the necessity of UE reporting its polarization capability is unclear, since network polarization configuration is per satellite beam via SIB and does not change with Ues’ polarization capability. |
| Vivo | W.r.t the polarization indication, we prefer to first discuss the usage of the polarization, because the dynamic indication of polarization should be necessary if the polarization applies to the multiplexing. If we only support the polarization to apply to the frequency reuse, dynamic indication is unnecessary and semi-statically configured polarization of beams is preferred. Thus, a proposal on the usage as below is proposed: **Suggested proposal for the usage of polarization:****For the usage of polarization, support at least one of following options:*** **Option-1: The polarization is used for frequency reuse**
* **Option-2: The polarization is used for inter-UE/intra-UE multiplexing**

And from the contributions, most of companies have consensus on the polarization used for frequency reuse. Thus, we can first at least support the polarization used for frequency resue in Rel-17.Then, w.r.t the DL polarization indication, the polarization can also be derived from the SSB transmission and the benefits are listed in our contribution. Thus, we propose the SSB as a candidate option of the indication. W.r.t the UL polarization indication, the motivation or benefit is unclear and the difference between UL polarization indication and UE capability reporting needs further discussion, which can achieve the same functionality in some cases. W.r.t the polarization capability reporting, from the contributions, we observed that the supporting companies mainly consider the polarization used for the multiplexing, and with the polarization capability reporting, NW can properly schedule these Ues with different polarization. Thus, the suggested proposal as below is proposed:**Suggested proposal for the UE polarization capability reporting:****For the polarization used for frequency reuse, not support UE polarization capability reporting.** **For the polarization used for multiplexing, if supported, UE should report the polarization capability to Gnb.** |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support proposal-DP5-1;For proposal DP5-2, we tend to share the view that limitation is unneccesary;For proposal DP5-3, we support to report the polarization capability, as it can help the network to proper set the polarization scheme |
| Spreadtrum | FL initial proposal-DP5-1: Agree with the proposal. FL initial proposal-DP5-2: Agree FL suggestion: Fine to discuss this further. We prefer that UE reporting polarization capability is not needed. |

### Summary of first round

For initial proposal-DP5-1, all companies except vivo are supportive. ZTE suggests to further give some guidance on the details of the polarization indication. Four options are proposed by ZTE, i.e. indication per BWP, per SSB, per CSI-RS, per channel, which are integrated in the following updated proposal. We can try this proposal in the GTW, where we may have some online discussions, hopefully the discussion can help to resolve company’s concern.

**Proposal**

For explicit indication of polarization information for DL by the network, support indication in SIB

* FFS: indication by UE dedicated RRC, where at least the following options are considered
	+ Option 1: polarition indication per BWP
	+ Option 2: polarization indication per CSI-RS
	+ Option 3:polarization indication per channel
* FFS: polarization indication per SSB in SIB

After GTW on May 21, the following agreement was made

Agreement:

For explicit indication of polarization information for DL by the network, support indication in SIB

* FFS: Signaling details for indication in SIB

For initial proposal-DP5-2, we still have splitting views. So this needs to be further discussed in the second round. At least the companies supporting separate indication gave the following use cases:

For example, for DL, polarization multiplexing is used to ignallin different Ues, but for UL, ignallingn multiplexing is not used. In this case, DL and UL could have different polarization from one UE perspective. Furthermore, it would be necessary to discuss how to handle the case where the UE does not support transmission with the same polarization as DL. For example, UE with linear polarization antenna can receive circular polarization signal, but it may not support transmission of circular polarization.

**FL suggestion:**

Further discuss the necessity of separate polarization indication for DL and UL, respectively. Companies are invited to comment on the provided use cases where separate indication is required.

For initial prospoal-DP5-3, we still have splitting views. But companies supporting UE capability reporting gave the following arguments. In the second round discussion, companies are invited to give the technical reasoning, why the reporting is not needed given the following arguments. The supporting companies may also bring additional benefits if identified.

It is expected that a mega NGSO constellation will be utilized to serve multiple types of devices such as reduced capability devices, normal handhelds, vehicular devices, fixed devices, among others. Some of these devices will use linear polarization, some will use circular polarization, and others may support both. For optimal performance, it will be necessary for network to know the polarization capability of these devices or at least the UE type.

**FL suggestion:**

Further discss the necessity of UE polarization capability reporting.

### Company view second round

For polarization indication for UL, the following arguments are given by supporting companies: for DL, polarization multiplexing is used to ignallin different Ues, but for UL, ignallingn multiplexing is not used. In this case, DL and UL could have different polarization from one UE perspective. Furthermore, it would be necessary to discuss how to handle the case where the UE does not support transmission with the same polarization as DL. For example, UE with linear polarization antenna can receive circular polarization signal, but it may not support transmission of circular polarization.

**FL suggestion:**

Further discuss the necessity of separate polarization indication for DL and UL, respectively. Companies are invited to comment on the provided use cases where separate indication is required.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views and comments |
| APT | For DL, the intention for ignalling polarization is to mitigate inter-cell interference if polarization re-use is enabled. For UL, the gain of ignalling polarization depends on the satellite reception implemented by single circular polarization (Configuration A) or dual-polarization per beam (Configuration B). * When Configuration A is deployed, it is necessary to inform UE not to use RHCP for UL transmission (using linear and LHCP are fine), otherwise, the satellite cannot receive it.
* When Configuration B is deployed, there is no gain to inform UE about polarization (using LHCP and linear is the same).

 |
| Panasonic | We support the FL summary as the reason to support separate polarization indication for DL and UL. |
| Sony | Share similar view with Panasonic. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the necessity of separate polarization indication for UL depends on the satellite receiver assumptions and the UE Tx configurations. For Ues with liner polarization, it cannot support the indicated circular polarization anyway, there is no need to indicate the either UL polarization. For Ues that is able to change its Tx circular polarizations (either RHCP or LHCP), there may be a need to indicate a separate polarization indication for UL as long as the satellite is using a differen polarization for UL reception.  |
| Apple | If satellite supports different polarizations in its UL reception, then the indication of UL polarization is not helpful. If satellite supports only a single polarization in its UL reception, then the indication of UL polarization may be helpful for Ues with different polarization capabilities. We are open to discuss this topic to see how companies consider the scenario where satellite applies only a single polarization in its UL reception and UE has the capability of adjusting its UL transmission polarization.  |
| Inmarsat | Polarization should be indicated for DL and UL separately because polarization may be used differently between DL and UL.Furthermore, we think it should be possible to use polarization multiplexing also in the UL. |
| LG | We also think that it depends on the UE Tx configuration and satellite Rx receiver assumption. Therefore, further discussion is needed on what is the typical scenario/assumption on Rel-17 NTN.  |
| CATT | For polarization usage, it is mainly for interference mitigation, not for UE multiplexing, and not for MIMO transmission. So the polarization should be cell specific or beam specific, not UE specific. Not sure what is motivation to support separate polarization indication of DL and UL? |
| Lenovo/MM | We think polarization for DL and UL should be indicated separately. |
| vivo | We share the same views as CATT. And if only support the polarization usage for interference mitigation, why satellite supports different polarizations in its UL reception from its DL transmitting? And as FL summary, it is expected that a mega NGSO constellation will be utilized to serve multiple types of devices. Polarization multiplexing is not always applicable for multiple types of devices. Thus, we think we should first discuss the polarization usage and strive for a consensus. Then, polarization indication for DL/UL and UE polarization capability reporting are naturally solved. That is, if there is a consensus on the multiplexing usage, separate polarization indication for DL/UL and UE polarization capability reporting are reasonable; otherwise, there is unclear motivation to support separate polarization indication and UE polarization capability reporting.  |
| FL summary | **APT, Panasonic, Sony, Huawei, Apple, Inmarsat, Lenovo** think that there is benefits of indicating UL polarization separately. The use cases are: 1) for satellite implementing different DL and UL polarization. 2) for UEs supporting different polarization. **LG, CATT, vivo** think that there is not motivation or use case to enable DL/UL separate polarization indication.  |

For UE reporting polarization capability, the following arguments were given by supporting companies:

It is expected that a mega NGSO constellation will be utilized to serve multiple types of devices such as reduced capability devices, normal handhelds, vehicular devices, fixed devices, among others. Some of these devices will use linear polarization, some will use circular polarization, and others may support both. For optimal performance, it will be necessary for network to know the polarization capability of these devices or at least the UE type.

**FL suggestion:**

Further discss the necessity of UE polarization capability reporting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views and comments |
| APT | Knowing whether UE has the depolarization loss of 3Db shall be useful to NW, at least for link adaption optimization. |
| Panasonic | For UE report of polarization capability, we think the following can be supported:• Transmission capability of circular polarization (explicitly or implicitly by UE type)• Reception capability of dual polarization signals as separate streams |
| Sony | It is necessary to have the UE capability reporting of polarization due to the limitations on the implementation. It is clear that the supported polarization related capability can vary significantly with the UE type, from the network aspect, a wrong polarization combination between an NTN network and a UE can lead to significant signal drops, e.g., the satellite is transmitting in LHCP while the UE is receiving in RHCP. Therefore, it is necessary for the NTN network to know the polarization capability of the UE. In addition, to improve the communication link, the network can also be more flexible when configuring resources by using the polarization domain if it has the knowledge of the UE polarization capability. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our view is that the reasoning that there will be different type of devices does not motivate the need to report the UE polarization capability reporting. The key question is still given the Gnb has such kind of information, will the satellite actually make use of such information, e.g. dynamically schedule Ues with different polarization capabilities. To us, at least from interference management point of view, the satellite will not change its polarization in a very dynamic manner.  |
| Apple | We do not think the UE polarization capability reporting is needed. We already agreed that the polarization ignalling is via SIB, which is pre-determined and usually does not change when a UE with a different polarization capability joins the network. Also the reporting of UE polarization capability is kind of waste of ignalling for majority of handheld devices which use linear polarization. |
| Inmarsat | Polarization reporting is important to differentiate different classes of Ues, to allow the network to decide how to make use of UE polarization (e.g. dual pol vs single pol) and in order to allocate the UE data transmission correctly. The network must know what polarization(s) the UE can operate in. We agree with Sony’s comment. The satellite won’t change its polarization dynamically because it depends on the antennas, but it may decide to schedule a UE differently based on its polarization. |
| ZTE | Agree and still prefer to report it. |
| LG | Share the view with Huawei and Apple.  |
| CATT | Need firstly discuss what is benefit if gNB knows the UE polarization type. |
| Lenovo/MM | We support to report the UE polarization capability. |
| Spreadtrum | If polarization is used for inter beam interference mitigation, the polarization state for each beam in one cell will not change dynamically. UE reporting polarization capability is not needed. |
| vivo | As the description for the separate polarization indication for DL and UL. |
| FL summary | **APT, Panasonic, Sony, Inmarsat, ZTE, Lenovo** support UE polarization capability reporting.The necessity of such reporting is due to that the UEs may have different polarization capability, so it is important for the NW to align a proper polarization with UE capability for the link, otherwise there will be a 3 dB coverage loss. On the other hand, **Huawei, Apple, LG, CATT, spreadtrum, vivo** think that the reporting is not needed due to the question whether the network can really make use of this information. Otherwise said, whether the satellite polarization can be changed/adjusted in a dynamic manner.  |

### Summary of second round

For separate DL/UL polarization indication, **APT, Panasonic, Sony, Huawei, Apple, Inmarsat, Lenovo** think that there is benefits of indicating UL polarization separately. The use cases are: 1) for satellite implementing different DL and UL polarization. 2) for UEs supporting different polarization. **LG, CATT, vivo** think that there is not motivation or use case to enable DL/UL separate polarization indication. FL thinks that separate indication can have better flexibility and there is no clear disadvantage, if the satellite implements the same polarization for both DL and UL, the network can still decide to not indicate the UL. In this case, FL suggests the following proposal and hopefully LG, CATT and vivo can make compromise on it.

**FL proposal DP5-1:**

* Polarization information for UL may be indicated in SIB by the network
* UE assumes a same polarization for UL and DL, when the UL polarization information is absent.
* FFS: Signaling details for indication in SIB

For UE polarization capability reporting, **APT, Panasonic, Sony, Inmarsat, ZTE, Lenovo** support UE polarization capability reporting. The necessity of such reporting is due to that the UEs may have different polarization capability, so it is important for the NW to align a proper polarization with UE capability for the link, otherwise there will be a 3 dB coverage loss.

On the other hand, **Huawei, Apple, LG, CATT, spreadtrum, vivo** think that the reporting is not needed due to the question whether the network can really make use of this information. Otherwise said, whether the satellite polarization can be changed/adjusted in a dynamic manner.

FL believes the key question is whether the network can make use of the reported information and whether the satellite can dynamically adjust/change the polarization over time. In this case, FL suggest to focus on the following proposal. Moreover, satellite companies are encouraged to provide comments to.

**FL proposal DP5-2:**

The decision on UE polarization capability reporting is to be made based on whether the satellite polarization can be changed/adjusted based on the reported UE polarization capability

### Final conclusion

# 3rd round discussion over email reflector

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | Hi Hao，    Thanks for your effort for this summary. W.r.t the **FL proposal DP1-1**, it seems that the main bullet of both two alts are for the issue 5 according to the  FL's analysis copied below:    "For issue#5: based on the collected company view in the second round discussion, all the companies believe that the predicatability is valid and feasible either on gNB or UE side. Further enhancement with the aid of the predicatability is needed. The prediction can be done either on gNB side or UE side. If this is on UE side, the gNB may need to provide some assistance information, based on which the UE can predict the BWP/beam switching time".     Moreover, the Alt-1 can be covered by Alt-2 since the details of assistance information is pending and to enable the behavior of  UE automonously switching, certain level of prediction is also needed.  Then, following updates are proposed to reflect the situation for both Issue-5 and 7:**FL proposal DP1-1**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction on gNB side~~.  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE automonously relying on assistance information  FSS: details on assistance information     BR    Nan |
| Moderator | Dear Nan, Thanks for the proposal. Let's try this updated version. **FL proposal DP1-1-v2**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction on gNB side~~.  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE automonously relying on assistance information  FSS: details on assistance information BR, Hao |
| LG | Dear Hao, Nan, and all, Thanks for the discussion.For clarification of my understanding on DP1-1, if we remove the red text, what is the enhancement compared to current BM/BWP operation?   BR,Haewook |
| NOK | Dear Haewook, Hao and all, Thanks for the discussion. To respond to Haewook’s question: The beauty of the first alternative would actually be that we would have minimization of specification impact for implementing NR over NTN. Isn’t that the ultimate target for this work? Or are we having other targets? In our preference the FL proposal DP1-1-v2 would contain a down-selection between the two alternatives, but I guess that this is still not precluded from the “support at least one of the”. Best regards,Frank Frederiksen,Nokia |
| Mod | Dear Haewook,From my view, the enhancement can be the network trigger dedicated UE or a group of UE to switch BWP/beam without necessarily needing UE beam measurement reporting. The network may rely on some level of beam switching prediction. But I understand that Nan would like to avoid restricting Alt-1 in the case of gNB prediction. It means that without prediction, the gNB may also need to trigger a group of UE to perform switching. Nan may correct me if i am wrong. BR, Hao |
| ZTE | Hi Hao, Haewook, Frank and all,     W.r.t the updated version of Alt-1, the point is that we can still discuss the group-based solution as listed in the FFS bullet (It's also fine for me to remove the FFS and merge it with the main bullet:) ). The reason to remove the red part is that from our side, whether such solution is based on the gNB's prediction or not is purely up to gNB's implementation, which may be transparent to UE except for the signaling for group switching.     BR   Nan |
| LG | Hi Nan, Hao, Frank and all, Thanks for the clarification. Due to some conflict, I merged Frank’s email below.Although my interpretation is more likely to Frank’s, I can live with current version.BR,Haewook |
| E/// | Dear all, We would like remind that the objective of this “other” AI is to specify if beneficial and needed. The group should set high bar here to really prove the necessity instead of jumping into enhancement discussions. This is essential from ecosystem perspective to help NTN takeoff by maximizing the synergies between NTN and TN. Unnecessary enhancements will jeopardize the synergies between NTN and TN, leading to fragmented designs. Combing back to the FL proposal DP1-1 and FL proposal DP3-1, the former targets predictability to simplify BWP/beam switching, while the latter targets more complex measurements/reporting for BWP/beam switching. These two are in contradictory directions. I would suggest the group to discuss these two proposals as a whole, study the needs, and choose one direction for further discussion, instead of creating several parallel tracks of enhancements whose necessities are questionable. Best regardsXingqin |
| Mod | Dear Xingqin,Thanks for the comments. From the email discussions, there are two directions proposed by the group. In the first direction, the beam switching based on prediction was discussed and companies think the switching based on predition can reduce the UE measurement effort. Thus the reason for some enhancement towards this direction. In another direction, measurement based reporting is still a basic solution. But for multi-beam per cell + FRF>1, it seems that the beam measurement confronts some issues. This motivates the proposal DP3-1. Therefore, my understanding is that they are two different directions to address different issues. We can further discuss this in GTW if time allows. BR, Hao  |
| CATT | Hi, Hao, Regarding the new proposal DP1-1, I would be hesitate to support the Alt-2, so we didn’t get the whole picture to understand what is the exact definition of UE dominated BWP/beam switching autonomously.**FL proposal DP1-1-v2**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction on gNB side~~.  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE automonously relying on assistance information  FSS: details on assistance information  In current specification, BWP or beam switching is controlled by the gNB. So if the proponent pushes this UE initiated switching, can they answer my following questions: 1)       How to configure BWP candidate set?2)       In which condition, UE will do BWP switching autonomously?3)       If UE perform this switching, how the gNB can know UE has finished the switching?4)       If the BWP switching failure, how to recover it? BR/Deshan |
| Panasonic | Dear Hao, all, Thank you for the discussions and proposals. Regarding the proposals on polarization signaling, we are ok with proposal DP5-1, but we have a comment on proposal DP5-2. For DL, we agree that the necessity of UE report on **DL UE polarization capability** would depend on whether the satellite polarization can be changed/adjusted based on the reported UE polarization.But, for UL, as several companies mentioned in the summary document, UE polarization capability report is beneficial for scheduling regardless of satellite capability of dynamic polarization change. For example, when RHCP reception is used in satellite beam (A) and LHCP reception is used in the adjacent satellite beam (B), UE transmission with RHCP in beam (A) and UE transmission with LHCP in beam (B) would not interfere to each other.  However, if some UE support only transmission with linear polarization, these UEs would cause a severe interference. Therefore, the scheduler should take the UE UL polarization capability into account. Based on above, we would like to suggest the following modification.**Modified proposal for DP5-2:**  **At least UL UE polarization capability reporting should be supported.**  The decision on **DL** UE polarization capability reporting is to be made based on whether the satellite polarization can be changed/adjusted based on the reported UE polarization capability.Best regards,NishioPanasonic |
| HW | Dear Hao and all Thanks for the driving the discussion. Regarding the questions from Deshan, I tried to provide some response from our perspective. Our general view is that in case of UE-initiated BWP switching, at least some satellite beam related information (e.g. the beam width of BWPs/beam, centre elevation and azimuth as in Figure 6.) needs to be informed to the UE. Then the UE can determine the topology of its surrounding beams (e.g., the footprint of the surrounding beams). Based on GNSS acquired position, UE will have the information on when to trigger beam switching and which beam to switch to. Therefore, UE can trigger beam/BWP switching once it approaches the beam edge. 1)       How to configure BWP candidate set?The BWP configuration is not different from the other BWP switching schemes. In case of FRF>1, we proposed to extend to the number of BWPs that can be configured to the UE.2)       In which condition, UE will do BWP switching autonomously?UE will trigger beam/BWP switching once it approaches the beam edge.3)       If UE perform this switching, how the gNB can know UE has finished the switching?It is not our understanding that the UE shall perform BWP switching by itself. It is just the trigger comes from the UE and it is the gNB who will in the end decide BWP switching for the UE.4)       If the BWP switching failure, how to recover it?We don’t understand the question. There is no such BWP switching failure recovery procedure to our understanding. BR/Xinghua |
| Xiaomi | Dear Hao, Thanks for the discussion.For the DP1-1, I also share the view that more clarification is needed for Alt 2. Current spec supports the beam/BWP switch via explicit signaling. However, for the UE autonomous switching, how to guarantee the gNB and UE have the common understanding on the switched beam/BWP. Is this an imply an association between the BWP and beam. Regards.Yajun.  |
| NOK | Dear Yajun, Hao, all, Thanks for the discussion.As Deshan points out below, the Alt-2 for UE BWP/beam switching description suffers quite a bit from lack of details on which entity is in control – and how the two nodes (gNB and UE) are synchronized to each other. For current beam management this is well-defined, and from network vendor point of we do are not keen on UEs just acting “at random”. Further, we would like to highlight that any optimizations that may occur under this agenda item should respect the current SSB structure. Best regards,Frank Frederiksen,NokiaDear Nishio, Thanks for the discussion so far. You mention a really important aspect here. If a UE is only having support for a given polarization – what should the network do? As you point out, the UE only supporting linear polarization would be seen as “interfering node”, for any receiver node that wants to utilize orthogonalization through polarization. Hence, such UEs would preferably not be scheduled at all by the network (since penalty of having this UE at all would be severe). In our preference UEs should be able to adapt to the polarization offered by the network and at the same time ensure that there is no unwanted interference between polarizations happening. Thanks and Best regards,Frank Frederiksen,Nokia |
| Mod | Dear Frank, Nishio, Xinghua, Deshan and all,@Frank, in my understanding, if there is a UE supporting only linear pol and the network knows this situation, this UE may be scheduled in an orthogonal resource to the other UEs supporting non-linear pol. This can be realized under network control. And to your another comment:  we would like to highlight that any optimizations that may occur under this agenda item should respect the current SSB structure. Could you please elaborate a bit more? In the proposal, there is no intention to change the SSB structure. Maybe I mis-understood your comment. @Deshan, Xinghua: With the answers provided by Xinghua, would Deshan be okay with the Alt-2 in propsoal DP1-1-v2?@Nishio, I took into account your proposed wording in proposal DP5-2-v2, and let's see if it is agreeable to the group. @all, please find the updated proposals below. It seems that Proposal DP3-1 and DP5-1 are stable. BR, Hao**FL proposal DP1-1-v2**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction on gNB side~~.  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE automonously relying on assistance information  FSS: details on assistance information **FL proposal DP3-1:**For the deployment scenario with multiple beam per cell and frequency reuse >1, NR-NTN should support the following cases for beam measurement performed by a UE:Alt-1: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP.Alt-2: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within across BWPs. **FL proposal DP5-1:**           Polarization information for UL may be indicated in SIB by the network           UE assumes a same polarization for UL and DL, when the UL polarization information is absent.           FFS: Signaling details for indication in SIB**FL proposal DP5-2-v2:*** support UE UL polarization capability reporting.
* The decision on UE DL polarization capability reporting is to be made based on whether the satellite polarization can be changed/adjusted based on the reported UE polarization capability
 |
| QC | Dear Frank, Hao and all,    We are supportive of the proposals. As to Alt-2 of DP1, we agree some details are missing and understand that the proposal does not mean Alt-2 will have to be supported.    Thanks, Xiaofeng Wang |
| Samsung | Dear Hao, all, Thank you very much Hao for your effort in this agenda.I have some comments on the proposals below. For FL proposal DP1-1-v2, is Alt-1 what current NR specifications supports? If so, it seems it is not an enhancement.For FL proposal DP3-1, in Alt-2, is it that a UE needs to perform measurement of RS transmitted in a BWP which is different from the current active BWP? Does "across BWPs" mean a different BWP? Thanks. BR,Jeongho |
| NOK | Dear Jeongho, Hao, all, Regarding Jeongho’s question for DP1-1-v2, Nokia’s view is that we should not make enhancements when they are not needed. If existing Rel-15 or Rel-16 functionality is sufficient to support NR over NTN as is, it could actually be beneficial to avoid adding extra complexity for features that may or may not be used/implemented/supported. @Hao – my comment was basically caused by a concern that companies were targeting introducing frequency reuse by implementing SSBs being transmitted on different frequency offset to have the frequency reuse. But good to have confirmation that this is not the intention to create the frequency reuse. Whenever the frequency reuse and Beam switching framework is being discussed, it is important to recall that we should not target implementing mobility between cells using L1 features. Mobility between cells should be a matter of RAN2 operation (based on existing mechanisms). Best regards,Frank Frederiksen,Nokia |
| MOD | Dear Jeongho, Luca, Xiaofengthanks for the discussions. @Jeongho:For DP1-1-v2 Alt-1, at least the enhancement includes common signaling to trigger a group of UE to switch BWP/beam, where the gNB can use prediction or other means to decide whether common signaling should be used. This was reflected by the 2nd round FL summary for issue 5 and issue 7. For DP3-1, the 'across BWPs' means performing measurement at different BWPs.@Luca: the DP5-2 is now updated to a second version. Taking into your comment account I further revised the proposal (v3). Hope it addresses your concern. **FL proposal DP5-2-v3:*** support UE UL polarization capability reporting.
* The decision on UE DL polarization capability reporting is to be made based on whether the satellite polarization can allow the network scheduling to benefit from ~~be changed/adjusted based on~~ the reported UE polarization capability

BR, HaoDear Frank,The emails get crossed again, so I missed your comments in my previous email. Regarding the SSB structure issue you rasied, I believe that it is related to the FL summary section 2.5. The Alt-1 is the legacy SSB structure and it is our baseline. When there is no agreement to adopt Alt-2, the legacy SSB structure is supported. Hope this addresses your concern. BR, Hao |
| HW | Dear Hao and all Thanks for the discussion. It is a bit difficult to follow due to many forks. On **FL proposal DP5-2-v3:**I have one question regarding the UE polarization capability reporting. The argument of supporting UE capability reporting is that the gNB can make use of it for scheduling. I was wondering if the UE polarization does not match the polarization of the satellite, is it possible for the UE to access the system? If not, there is no subsequent scheduling anyway. If it can access the system, the gNB can schedule the UE without the need to knowing its polarization capability. Did I missing something? Br/Xinghua |
| MOD | Dear Xinghua, Thanks for your question. Based on my understanding, I would say that the UE can access the network, but the netowrk may use a conservative pol, e.g. linear for receiving. Once the network knows the UE capability, the network may schedule a UE with a beam associated with a more suitable pol, e.g. LHCP or RHCP or linear. BR, Hao |
| E/// | Dear Hao, Jeongho, Frank, and all, We would like to reiterate the need of enhancement should be proved and the importance of minimizing specification impact, as pointed out by other companies including Nokia and Samsung. Looking at DP-3:* Alt 1 based on beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP can work already. If Alt1 were supported, why would Alt-2 be needed, considering the high bar of enhancement “to specify if beneficial and needed”? In short, we have similar concern as Samsung on Alt 2. Therefore, we propose to delete Alt-2 at this stage.
	+ Further, Alt-2 will likely be an optional UE capability. Then there would be some UEs that can do it and some UEs that cannot do it. Then network cannot use it for the deployment of multiple beam per cell and frequency reuse >1, as network would need to tailor the deployment to the least capable UEs.
* Also the leading sentence can be simplified by deleting “the following cases for beam measurement performed by a UE”.

 **FL proposal DP3-1:**For the deployment scenario with multiple beam per cell and frequency reuse >1, NR-NTN should support ~~the following cases for beam measurement performed by a UE~~:Alt-1: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP.~~Alt-2: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within across BWPs.~~ Looking at DP-1-V2:* Alt-1 does not necessarily mean enhancements, we should delete the word “enhancements”, similar to the comment made by Samsung.
* Besides, both Alt-1 and Alt-2 address the same issue of predictability, a down-selection between the two alternatives is the right way going forward, along the line of comments from Nokia and Qualcomm below. Therefore, we propose to delete “at least”.
* Also, “automonously” is incorrect in spelling.

**FL proposal DP1-1-v2**For beam management in NR-NTN, support ~~at least~~ one of the following~~enhancements~~·           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction on gNB side~~.FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.·           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~ autonomously relying on assistance informationFSS: details on assistance information  Best regardsXingqin |
| CATT | Hi, Hao and all, Thanks for your reply.  Regarding the Alt-2 in proposal DP1-1-v2, we are not sure what is real benefit. As Xinghua explained, UE initiated Beam switching is not conducted by the UE, instead, UE just triggers the switching, but the gNB will make the decision, actually gNB can determine the Beam switching based on UE measurement report according to legacy mechanism, so I don’t see the big difference among these two schemes. For the FL proposal DP3-1, we are not sure what is the impact if we have these two solutions. Based on on-going discussion, my feeling is that current specification has supported them, where flexible CSI-RS based RRM measurement can be performed depending on gNB configuration.  When the BWP of different beams associated is overlapped, the RS measurement can be configured within a BWP. If the BWP of different beams associated is not overlapped, the RS measurement should be configured in a different BWP. Hence, it is needed to discuss further what should be enhanced, not say we should support. For the FL proposal DP5-1, we prefer same polarization of DL and UL can be indicated, not separate indication.For FL proposal DP5-2-v2, it is hard to understand why need to report UL polarization of UE. Actually in the initial UE access procedure, even without UE reporting, UL transmission is still effective. No matter of linear or circular polarization, as long as gNB can receive the UL signal successfully, reporting or not reporting the UL polarization has no difference. |
| HW | Dear Hao and all Thanks for the discussion. On DP-1-1-v2, I would say both options are described on a very higher-level. There are still quite some details that needs to sorted out. If companies don’t feel comfortable, we can change to “Consider supporting”. On the FFS bullet under Alt.1, we thought it was a separate issue, i.e. Issus #7. We would prefer to remove it for now considering that the whole point for this proposal is whether we should go with gNB triggered or UE-assisted BWP/beam switching. To response to Deshan’s comment, at least our view is for both alternatives, we can reduce the measurement effort from the UE side. On DP5-2-v2, we still fail to see the need of UE polarization capability reporting. I have a similar feeling with Deshan on this, i.e. as long as the UE can access the network, why bother UE capability reporting anyway. You mentioned the network can choose different polarizations for UL reception. However, my understanding is that the polarization of the satellite beam will NOT be changed very dynamically for both UL and DL ( satellite expert please correct me if I am wrong).  |
| Samsung | Dear Xinghua, Hao, Frank, Nishio, Xingqin, Deshan, all, Thanks for further discussion. For DP1-1-v2, we share the similar view with Nokia in that, new features should be introduced by clear benifit. If not, it only increases burden on specifications/implementation/test. For UE polarization capability reporting, if the purpose of the reporting is for the gNB to schedule with proper polarization and MCS, then this can be done by gNB implementation, e.g., perform channel measurement of SRS with having different assumptions on polarizations. Thus, the gNB can choose a receiving polarization having better channel condition. If this is correct understanding, it seems the reporting is not needed. Please correct my understanding if this is not the case. Thank you. BR,Jeongho |
| LG | Dear Hao, Xinghua, Deshan, Jeonho, all Maybe my previous email have been lost somewhere. So, I re-send it.Thanks for the discussion.Regarding DP5-1, we also prefer that the same polarization of DL and UL can be indicated. This is because UE equipped with linear polarization antenna (which may be most common assumption for handheld device) cannot normally support the indicated polarization mode.Regarding DP5-2, we share view with Huawei and CATT. The need for polarization capability reporting is still unclear.BR,Haewook |
| MOD | Dear Haewook, Jeongho, Xinghua, Xingqin, Deshan, Frank, and allThanks for the follow-up discussions. @Haewook, Deshan: For DP5-1, there is nothing wrong from separate DL/UL indication. We should allow the satellite/network to implement in a way it wants. Moreover, the proposal does not say that DL/UL cannot be the same and the network can still choose to not provide UL indication. In this case, your concern should be addressed. Please correct me if my understanding is wrong. @Haewook, Jeongho, Xinghua, Deshan: For DP5-2, the supporting companies explained that if the network gets the information about the UE pol capability, the scheduler can make use of it, e.g. scheduling two UE with orthogonal pol in the same resource without causing interference. Moreover, the supporting companies commented that it is not relying on the condition that the satellite pol should be dynamically changed. If this explanation still cannot address your concern, I would suggest that we can make it clear in the proposal. Please check if this can address your concern. **FL proposal DP5-2-v4:*** ~~support UE UL polarization capability reporting.~~
* The decision on UE DL and/or UL polarization capability reporting is to be made based on whether ~~the satellite polarization can allow~~ the network scheduling ~~to~~ can benefit from ~~be changed/adjusted based on~~ the reported UE polarization capability.
* Note: the satellite polarization from a satellite antenna is NOT assumed to be changeable in a dynamic way.

@Jeongho, for your question 'new features should be introduced by clear benifit. If not, it only increases burden on specifications/implementation/test.', the benefit is quite clearly captured in the 1st round FL summary, i.e. 1) if prediction is feasible, it will save significantly UE measurement effort. 2) if prediction is feasible, it will save signaling overhead by using common signaling. But what was not clear at the 1st round is whether the prediction is feasible. Then we started the 2nd round discussion. So if you check company's feedback in the 2nd round discussion or directly check the 2nd round FL summary, you will see that there is a clear majority view confirming that the prediction can be feasible either on gNB side or on UE side. The companies providing comments in the second round include network vendors, satellite company, UE vendors. Do you still think the benefit is not clearly introduced?@Deshan, for DP3-1, RRM is not in the scope of the discusison as this is dedicated to beam management. In R15, it supports both BM and RMM, and in this agenda item the goal is to check if the BM has any issue. @Xingqin:For DP3-1, your suggested update does not reflect the 2nd round discussion outcome, if you check the 2nd round discussion table, no company suggests to support Alt-1 only. The majority support is Alt-3 which is what the current proposal says. For DP1-1-v2, you suggested to remove 'enhancement' in the main bullet. But it cannot reflect clearly the gNB triggered BWP/beam switching via prediction for a UE or a group of UE, which as I commented to Jeongho, majority companies think that prediction is feasible from the 2nd round discussion. Moreover, thanks for pointing out the spelling error. Sincce the emails get crossed from time to time, I am not sure if I responded to all the comments. I will check again to see if I need to send another email later on. So I would like to see if companies can be compromised to agree on the following proposals provided by the answers above. **FL proposal DP1-1-v2**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements·           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction on gNB side~~.n  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.·           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~autonomously relying on assistance informationn  FSS: details on assistance information  **FL proposal DP3-1:**For the deployment scenario with multiple beam per cell and frequency reuse >1, NR-NTN should support the following cases for beam measurement performed by a UE:Alt-1: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP.Alt-2: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within across BWPs. **FL proposal DP5-1:**·           Polarization information for UL may be indicated in SIB by the network·           UE assumes a same polarization for UL and DL, when the UL polarization information is absent.·           FFS: Signaling details for indication in SIB **FL proposal DP5-2-v4:*** ~~support UE UL polarization capability reporting.~~
* The decision on UE DL and/or UL polarization capability reporting is to be made based on whether ~~the satellite polarization can allow~~ the network scheduling ~~to~~ can benefit from ~~be changed/adjusted based on~~ the reported UE polarization capability.
* Note: the satellite polarization from a satellite antenna is NOT assumed to be changeable in a dynamic way.

BR, Hao |
| Panasonic | Dear Hao, and all, Thank you for the continued efforts.Regarding DP1-1-v2, I share the FL’s observation that after 1st and 2nd rounds of discussion, the benefit of reducing UE measurement effort and signaling overhead by using beam switching prediction has been identified. However, the current description of Alt-1 without the wording of “relying on prediction on gNB side”  makes the intention of Alt-1 is rather unclear. That is probably the reason why people think Alt-1 is not an enhancement. Could I suggest the following modification to the proposal? **FL proposal DP1-1-v2**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements·           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead**.n  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.·           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~autonomously relying on assistance informationn  FSS: details on assistance information   BR,QuanPanasonic |
| ZTE | Dear Quan and Hao, It seems that the email is crossed with my and Nishio's early email (just copied below for your reference).For the **FL proposal DP1-1-v2, we have strong preference** to keep the content related to the BWP/beam switching for group of UE. The motivation is justified with more details in previous mail including our views on others are also listed. |
| MOD | Dear Quan and all,Thanks for the support and I think the prediction may be added back to make it more clear so that even the outsiders can understand what the enhancemnet targets. It can also resolve the unclearness pointed out by opposing companies. BR, Hao**FL proposal DP1-1-v3**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements·           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB  relying on prediction ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead**.n  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.·           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~autonomously relying on assistance informationn  FSS: details on assistance information  |
| Panasonic | Dear Hao and all,   Thank you for the DP1-1-v3 which is fine to me. We can further discuss details of Alt-1 and Alt-2 in the next meeting. BR,Quan   |
| MOD | Dear Quan, Nan and all,Thanks Quan for the support. I realized that my previous email corssed with Nan's lated email. So I re-insert here---------Dear Quan and Hao, It seems that the email is crossed with my and Nishio's early email (just copied below for your reference).For the **FL proposal DP1-1-v2, we have strong preference** to keep the content related to the BWP/beam switching for group of UE. The motivation is justified with more details in previous mail including our views on others are also listed.--------Please find v4 to capture Nan's comment. BR, Hao**FL proposal DP1-1-v4**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements·           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB  relying on prediction for one or a group of UE ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead**.n  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.·           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~autonomously relying on assistance informationn  FSS: details on assistance information **FL proposal DP3-1:**For the deployment scenario with multiple beam per cell and frequency reuse >1, NR-NTN should support the following cases for beam measurement performed by a UE:Alt-1: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP.Alt-2: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within across BWPs. **FL proposal DP5-1:**·           Polarization information for UL may be indicated in SIB by the network·           UE assumes a same polarization for UL and DL, when the UL polarization information is absent.·           FFS: Signaling details for indication in SIB **FL proposal DP5-2-v4:*** ~~support UE UL polarization capability reporting.~~
* The decision on UE DL and/or UL polarization capability reporting is to be made based on whether ~~the satellite polarization can allow~~ the network scheduling ~~to~~ can benefit from ~~be changed/adjusted based on~~ the reported UE polarization capability.
* Note: the satellite polarization from a satellite antenna is NOT assumed to be changeable in a dynamic way.
 |
| Panasonic | Dear Nan, Thanks for the discussion.How do you think the latest DP1-1-v3 suggested by Hao? I think the modified Alt-1 makes the intention of the enhancement clearer. I understood from your previous comment that you did not want to include “relying on prediction on gNB” to limit the Alt-1. I am fine in either ways, but at least “to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead” can be added. This gives a hint what Alt-1 is intended for.**FL proposal DP1-1-v3**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements·           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB  relying on prediction ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead**.n  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.·           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~autonomously relying on assistance informationn  FSS: details on assistance information BR,QuanPanasonic |
| ZTE | Dear Hao, Quan and all,Thanks for your updates and it seems that Quan is flexible on the 'prediction part' in Alt-1 and prefer to keep the latter part. For sake of progress, the following updates based Hao's latest version is proposed and wording related to 'prediction' is removed for Alt-1 with updates on the FFS part, but the sentence related to the purpose part is kept.**FL proposal DP1-1-v4**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements·           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction~~for one or a group of UE ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead** .n  FFS: ~~whether~~ Details on BWP/beam switching ~~can be done~~for a group of UE.·           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~ autonomously relying on assistance informationn  FSS: details on assistance information BRNan |
| HW | Dear Hao, Nan and allFor the updated **FL proposal DP1-1-v4,**Alt.1 has “for one or a group of UE”  in the main bullet. Then in the subbullet, you have “FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.” As commented before, we are not convinced on this yet. Our preference would be to remove both occurrence. If companies still want to keep it somewhere, we can compromise to keep it in the FFS part.**FL proposal DP1-1-v4**For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements·           Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB  relying on prediction ~~for one or a group of UE~~ ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead**.n  FFS: whether BWP/beam switching can be done for a group of UE.·           Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~autonomously relying on assistance informationn  FSS: details on assistance information Br/Xinghua |
| Sony | Dear Hao, Xinghua and all, Thanks for the discussion. We are fine with FL proposal DP1-1-v2 and Xinghua’s version by keeping group beam indication as FFS.We are fine with **FL proposal DP3-1.** Regarding to DP5-2, we prefer the v2 version revised by Panasonic as following, but we can live with the v4 version if it can be accepted by other companies.**FL proposal DP5-2-v2:*** support UE UL polarization capability reporting.
* The decision on UE DL polarization capability reporting is to be made based on whether the satellite polarization can be changed/adjusted based on the reported UE polarization capability

If there is consensus on DP5-2-v4, we think the FL proposal DP5-1 could be revised as the UL polarization might be used for UL scheduling.**FL proposal DP5-1:**·           Polarization information for UL ~~may be~~is indicated ~~in SIB~~ by the network·           UE assumes a same polarization for UL and DL, when the UL polarization information is absent.·           FFS: Signaling details for indication ~~in SIB~~Best Regards,Min LIU |
| MOD | Dear Min and Xinghua, I continue to provide my answers to your comments. @Min, Xinghua:For DP1-1-v5, the first bullet and the FFS point are not contradicting. The intention is to support the BWP/beam switching triggering for a group of UE by the first bullet and further discuss the design details for triggering a group of UE in FFS. So I would say that the proposal itself is clear. I believe that your suggestion is not to support a grouip-UE based BWP/beam switching in this meeting, but study further whether we should support it or not. For this, I would put two versions for further discussion. But if we cannot reach concensus, at least we can split DP1-1-v5 into two separate proposals. **FL proposal DP1-1-v6a**For beam management in NR-NTN, support BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction~~for one or a group of UE ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead** .  FFS: ~~whether~~ Details on BWP/beam switching ~~can be done~~for a group of UE.**FL proposal DP1-1-v6b**For beam management in NR-NTN, support BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction~~for a UE ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead** .  FFS: ~~whethe~~ support BWP/beam switching ~~can be done~~for a group of UE.**FL proposal DP1-2**For beam management in NR-NTN, support BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~ autonomously relying on assistance information  FFS: details on assistance information @Min, For DP5-1, it would be better to keep 'may be' instead of 'is' because as the second bullet says, the network may decide not to indicate the UL POL if the UL and DL POL are the same. In this case, 'may be' more correctly reflects the intention of the proposal. Regarding to remove SIB, I believe that this is a natural option given that historically we questioned whether DL and UL should be sperately indicated or only DL is to be indicated. Then we came to an agreement that DL POL is indicated in SIB and UL and DL may be separately indicated. Therefore, I don't see the problem to agree on SIB can contain the UL POL indication. So is it your concern that UL POL should not be indicated in SIB, given that DL POL is indicated in SIB?@ALL, due to the short time before the GTW, the latest email discussion content may not be able to be captured in the FL summary (need to upload the Tdoc in the inbox before the GTW), but I will try to capture as much as possible. Sorry for this. BR, Hao  |

### Final proposals

**FL proposal DP1-1-v5**

For beam management in NR-NTN, support at least one of the following enhancements

* Alt-1: UE BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction~~for one or a group of UE ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead** .
	+ FFS: ~~whether~~ Details on BWP/beam switching ~~can be done~~for a group of UE.
* Alt-2: UE BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~ autonomously relying on assistance information
	+ FSS: details on assistance information

**FL proposal DP1-1-v6a**

For beam management in NR-NTN, support BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction~~for one or a group of UE ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead** .

  FFS: ~~whether~~ Details on BWP/beam switching ~~can be done~~for a group of UE.

**FL proposal DP1-1-v6b**

For beam management in NR-NTN, support BWP/beam switching is triggered by gNB~~relying on prediction~~for a UE ~~on gNB side~~**to reduce UE measurement effort and/or signaling overhead** .

  FFS: ~~whethe~~ support BWP/beam switching ~~can be done~~for a group of UE.

**FL proposal DP1-2**

For beam management in NR-NTN, support BWP/beam switching is performed by UE ~~automonously~~ autonomously relying on assistance information

  FFS: details on assistance information

**FL proposal DP3-1:**

For the deployment scenario with multiple beam per cell and frequency reuse >1, NR-NTN should support the following cases for beam measurement performed by a UE:

Alt-1: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP.

Alt-2: support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within across BWPs.

**FL proposal DP5-1:**

·           Polarization information for UL may be indicated in SIB by the network

·           UE assumes a same polarization for UL and DL, when the UL polarization information is absent.

·           FFS: Signaling details for indication in SIB

**FL proposal DP5-2-v4:**

* ~~support UE UL polarization capability reporting.~~
* The decision on UE DL and/or UL polarization capability reporting is to be made based on whether ~~the satellite polarization can allow~~ the network scheduling ~~to~~ can benefit from ~~be changed/adjusted based on~~ the reported UE polarization capability.
* Note: the satellite polarization from a satellite antenna is NOT assumed to be changeable in a dynamic way.

# Additional Aspects

Aspects on NTN discussed by one or two companies are discussed in this section.

## RACH Enhancements

Nokia proposed to enable additional SCS scaling factors for all formats defined in TS 38.211 table 6.3.3.1-2 and add one new format (C1) and support restricted set type A for formats defined in TS 38.211 table 6.3.3.1-2. Nokia observed that as GNSS is external to 3GPP, the standard cannot dictate how the UE implements its GNSS solution nor the system chosen (GPS, GLONASS,Galileo, Others). The precision and availability provided by different systems may vary significantly. The full-reliance on GNSS for synchornization and Random Access procedures leaves the 3GPP system implementation dependent on third part systems. Nokia proposed that NTN systems must contain a fall-back conservative solution that allows UE to access the network in case of faulty or malfunctioning GNSS systems.

Samsung observed that a GNSS-aware UE can determine the time and frequency pre-compensation that it should apply when transmitting a PRACH preamble, which improves preamble detection performance for all GNSS-aware UEs. The PRACH guard time for GNSS-aware UEs can be smaller than the PRACH guard time for GNSS-challenged UEs. If PRACH preamble transmissions from GNSS-aware UEs do not interfere with PRACH preamble transmissions from GNSS-challenged UEs, preamble detection performance for all GNSS-challenged UEs improves. Samsung propose that gNB can assign separate PRACH resources to GNSS-aware UEs and GNSS-challenged UEs.

LG propose that if enhanced PRACH formats and/or preamble sequences are necessary and supported in Rel-17 NTN, the option with simple modification, such as a single Zadoff-Chu sequence based on larger SCS and repetition number, is preferred.

Qualcomm proposes transmit diversity for PRACH transmission with format 2, where the antenna switching is applied for the first half and the second half of the PRACH. The simulation shows about 2 dB gain at 1% miss detection rate.

Switching Point

CP/2

**FL suggestions:**

Compared to RAN1#104-e meeting, there seems no new contributors to this aspect, the consensus on the PRACH enhancement is suspected. FL encourages companies to have offline discussions on this topic.

## Feeder link related

Nokia propose that RAN1 define the feeder and service link type of amplification for gNB interpretation of measurement reports and configuration of UE uplink transmit power control with three options considered:

* Constant gain: The combined receive and transmit gain is a constant, independent of the received signal.
* Constant Emitted Isotropic Radiated Power (EIRP): The satellite will adjust the combined receive and transmit gain based on the received signal and a target EIRP to make the feeder link gain equal to one.
* Constant power at receiver: The satellite will attempt to compensate for the radio channel.

Nokia observes that transparent satellite can be analogue RF repeater or sample and forward a digital version of the analogue transmissions. The gNB may in principle compensate for the timing advance and Doppler on the NTN-GW – satellite link, which implies the UE only needs to handle the service link. Nokia propose that RAN1 clarifies that the satellite does not terminate the Uu interface. The gNB location relative to the NTN-GW may impact the NTN user experience and propose RAN1 defines an assumption of the maximum tolerable gNB – NTN-GW delay.

**FL suggestion:** companies are encouraged to provide views.

## DL Synchronisation, System Information Acquisition

Qualcomm proposes different SIBs design based on the system information updating rate.

Samsung observed that for a spot beam size that exceeds 250 km, a BS may need to perform a multi-valued Doppler pre-compensation; e.g. it may need to group distinct sets of SSBs using distinct Doppler values for pre-compensation. Indication for multi-Doppler pre-compensation pattern on DL benefits idle UE cell reselection, connected UE handover and connected UE data channel reception. The gNB/satellite can apply different values of Doppler pre-compensation to different SSBs. Samsung proposes that the BWP configuration is extended to indicate the amount of frequency offset to adjust the PRB grid with respect to the default BWP, as the experienced Doppler shifts at different spot beams are different.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| fc (GHz) | spot beam size (km) | maximum Doppler difference between UEs (kHz) |
| 2 | 50 | 4.185 |
| 2 | 200 | 15.87 |
| 2 | 250 | 19.25 |
| 2 | 300 | 22.33 |
| 2 | ~ 600 | ~ 45 |



 

As suggested in RAN1#104-e meeting, DL synchronization issues should be discussed in AI 8.4.2 to check if it is in the WID scope.

## Power Control and PUSCH coverage

Samsung proposed that open loop power control, UE should be allowed to predict its own transmission power not only based on DL measurement, e.g., pathloss measurement but also other available information, such as gNB ephemeris and UE trajectory. Samsung proposed closed loop power control should be supported in NTN and a mechanism to disable closed loop power control should be considered.

Qualcomm proposed to support autonomous reduction of MCS for PUSCH at least for cases when UE is power limited and to study the exact triggering condition and indication of the reduced MCS

**FL suggestion:** companies are encouraged to provide views.

## Air To Ground

CMCC proposed “implicit compatibility to support HAPS and ATG scenarios” in the WID means the enhancements for NTN can also be applicable for HAPS and ATG, although we do not need to discuss the enhancements specifically for HAPS and ATG. In principle,

* If there are several potential solutions for NTN, and some of them are more essential / important / applicable for ATG / HAPS, then these solutions should be prioritized.

CMCC identified three issues for application of HAPS and ATG:

* Issue 1: Extend the value range of K1.
* Issue 2: Extend the maximal supported HARQ process number.
* Issue 3: Support satellite ephemeris based on satellite position and velocity state vectors.

CMCC proposals

***Proposal 8:*** Support both ephemeris formats based on satellite position and velocity state vectors (Set 1) and based on orbital elements (Set 2), if possible.

***Proposal 9:*** If down-selection is needed, ephemeris format based on satellite position and velocity state vectors (Set 1) should be supported for implicit compatibility to support HAPS and ATG scenarios.

**FL question**: are proposal 8 and proposal 9 from CMCC already being discussed in AI 8.4.2? and is there necessary to discuss these in AI 8.4.4?

Companies are encouraged to provide views.

## Companies views (1st round discussions )

Companies are invited to comment on Additional aspects.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views additional aspects** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Summary 1st round discussions

## Companies views (2nd round discussions)

## Summary 2nd round discussion

## GTW Agreement / Conclusion
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