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# Introduction

This document summarizes the discussion for the following assignment

[108-e-R17-NR-NTN-04] Email discussion/approval on maintenance related to signaling of polarization information – Hao (OPPO)

* 1st check point: February 25
* Final check point: March 3

# Discussions

[ACTIVE] issue 1: RAN1 agreements were not captured by RAN2 (proposed by DCM [1])

**Proposal 1:**

* *Send an LS to RAN2 in order to ask RAN2 to include polarization indication in NTN-specific SIB according to RAN1 agreements.*

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:For explicit indication of polarization information for DL by the network, support indication in SIB* FFS: Signaling details for indication in SIB

Agreement:* 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

Agreement:When polarization signalling is present in SIB* SIB indicates DL and/or UL polarization information using respective polarization type parameters to indicate: RHCP or LHCP or linear
* FFS: whether polarization signalling is per SSB
 |

FL views: based on RAN2 running CR R2-220189, it seems that the agreements were captured in NTN-Config IE. Thus, no need to send LS.

First round discussion

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company name  | Company views |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Agree that the R2-2201895 running CR for 38.331 captures the polarization indication in the *NTN-Config-r17* IE.Hence we support not sending an LS on this aspect. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We understand the RAN2 situation now, then fine not to send LS on this aspect. |
| ZTE | According to the latest updates from RAN2, it’s fine not to send the LS. |

[ACTIVE] issue 2: UE behavior upon gNB polarization indication (proposed by Ericsson [2])

Proposal 1: RAN1 to discuss whether the polarization information related agreements have impact on RAN1 specification(s) and if so how to capture the agreements in the RAN1 specification(s).

Proposal 2: RAN1 to include the following polarization agreements in an updated overall RRC parameter list to be sent to RAN2 or send a separate LS to RAN2 on these agreements: (1) Support polarization signalling for target serving cell in handover command message, and (2) Support polarization signalling for non-serving cell in RRM measurement configuration.

Proposal 3: If a cell indicates an uplink polarization that is not supported by a UE, the UE shall not access the cell.

Proposal 4: Send an LS to RAN2 to specify UE behavior in case the UE does not support the polarization indicated by the network.

FL view: in RAN1#107-e meeting, we have had extensive discussions and the final conclusion says that no consensus on UE behavior. Thus, in this maintenance phase, FL does not see the need for reopening the debate.

**Conclusion:**

No further enhancement is considered for polarization signaling in NTN-NR R17.

No consensus on UE reporting polarization capability.

No consensus on UE behavior for selecting polarization mode for DL reception and UL transmission.

Regarding the proposal 2, FL agrees that RAN1 can send an updated RRC parameters to RAN2 if the 1) and 2) parameters are missing.

FL initial proposal for issue 2

Initial proposal 1: send an updated RRC parameters to RAN2, including parameters needed for capturing RAN1 agreements from RAN1#106bis-e meeting.

Agreement:

Support polarization signalling for target serving cell in handover command message.

Agreement:

Support polarization signalling for non-serving cell in RRM measurement configuration.

First round discussion

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company name  | Company views |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | In general, we should expect RAN2 to be aware of RAN1 agreements, and therefore we do not see a strong need for sending an LS to RAN2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the FL’s suggestion. |

[ACTIVE] issue 3: polarization signaling enhancement

Proposed by ZTE [3]

***Observation 1****: Polarization indication to enable the deployment with either one or multiple beams per cell are needed.*

***Observation 2****: The polarization information for each beam can be derived by existing QCL association with SSB(s).*

***Proposal 1:*** *A polarization list should be included in the SIBx with the length determined by the number of supported SSB.*

Proposed by NEC [4]

***Proposal 4:*** *Support polarization signaling per beam.*

***Proposal 6:*** *Support UE polarization capability indication to gNB.*

Proposed by Huawei [5]

***Proposal 1:*** *For polarization signalling in SIB, support per SSB polarization indication and the same polarization can be assumed for other physical channels in each beam.*

***Proposal 2:*** *Both inter-UE and intra-UE polarization multiplexing based on gNB scheduling should be supported.*

***Proposal 3:*** *Support UE reporting polarization mode capability to gNB.*

FL view: beam-based polarization signaling and UE polarization capability reporting have been discussed extensively in RAN1#107-e meeting as well as previous meetings. There was not consensus on the enhancement and in RAN1#107-e the following conclusion was agreed. It clearly concluded that no further enhancement is considered for polarization signaling in NTN-NR R17. Thus, this debate should not be reopened in this meeting.

**Conclusion:**

No further enhancement is considered for polarization signaling in NTN-NR R17.

No consensus on UE reporting polarization capability.

No consensus on UE behavior for selecting polarization mode for DL reception and UL transmission.

First round discussion

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company name  | Company views |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Agree with the FL view and proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with the FL view |
| ZTE | Regarding this topic, we understand that no consensus has been made in previos meeting. But based on the current conclusion, the typical deployment (e.g., one cell with multiple beams) is precluded in Rel-17, which is not expected for the commercialization.If the situation can not be changed, we prefer to capture the following the conclusion in this meeting:**Conclusion:**The deployment scenario with multiple beams per cell is not supported in case of frequency reuse via different polarizations per beam(s) in Rel-17. |

[CLOSE] issue 4: beam measurement enhancement

Proposed by CMCC [6]

***Proposal 2:*** For the deployment scenario with multiple beam per cell and frequency reuse >1, at least support beam measurement on multiple RS associated with different beams within a same active BWP.

Proposed by NEC [4]

***Proposal 1:*** *To reduce measurement effort and retain some control of gNB over beam selection, it is proposed to support:*

* *Assign mutually exclusive CSI-RS resources to neighboring beams.*
* *Configure resource sets with possible combinations of candidate CSI-RS resources depending on the beam layout.*
* *Signaling from gNB indicates the candidate beams for measurement and beam switching.*
* *Assistance information from gNB includes any necessary information a UE would require to perform measurements on candidate beams.*
* *UE indicates selected beam for switching to the gNB based on measurement results from the candidate beams from the configured CSI-RS set(s).*

***Proposal 3:*** *Support the L1 filtered measurement report as a notification to gNB for BWP switching.*

FL Note: This topic is not in the maintenance scope according to chairman guidance for AI 8.4.4.

[CLOSE] issue 5: assistance information to support UE-based SMTC adjustment

Proposed by ZTE [3]

***Proposal 3:*** *The RTT difference between current and next satellites for a given cell, with regard to a given reference location, can be estimated and provided to UEs by the gNB.*

FL Note: This topic is not in the maintenance scope according to chairman guidance for AI 8.4.4.

[CLOSE] other aspects

The following proposals were suggested by Nokia [7]

**Proposal 1:** Update the RRC parameter table such that the following parameters are marked as both cell-specific and UE specific parameters: TACommon, TACommonDrift, TACommonDriftVariation, ServingSatelliteEphemerisStateVectorX, ServingSatelliteEphemerisStateVectorY, ServingSatelliteEphemerisStateVectorZ, ServingSatelliteEphemerisStateVectorVx, ServingSatelliteEphemerisStateVectorVy, ServingSatelliteEphemerisStateVectorVz, ServingSatelliteEphemerisSemiMajorAxis, ServingSatelliteEphemerisEccentricityE, ServingSatelliteEphemerisArgumentOfPeriapsis, ServingSatellite EphemerisLongitudeOfAscendingNode, ServingSatelliteEphemerisInclinationI, ServingSatelliteEphemerisMeanAnomalyM, ntnUlSyncValidityDuration, EpochTime.

**Proposal 2:** Change the RRC parameter name of ServingSatelliteEphemerisInclinationI to ServingSatelliteEphemerisInclination.

**Proposal 3:** Change the RRC parameter name of ServingSatelliteEphemerisMeanAnomalyM to ServingSatelliteEphemerisMeanAnomaly.

**Proposal 4:** Update the RRC parameter table, such that *CellSpecific\_Koffset* and *K\_mac* are marked as both cell-specific and UE specific parameters.

**Proposal 5:** RAN1 to update the descriptions and ranges for the above discussed NTN related RRC parameters in order to ensure clear and well-defined interpretations of these.

**Proposal 6:** Write an LS to RAN2 to inform of the suggested and required changes of RRC parameter properties and names.

FL Note: This topic is not in the maintenance scope according to chairman guidance for AI 8.4.4.
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