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# Introduction

RAN4 has sent two LSs to RAN2 asking several questions regarding measurement and mobility in [1] and [2]. Corresponding draft reply LSs in [3] and [4] are uploaded to the offline folder 109. This document collects feedback for the draft reply LSs to RAN1 and RAN4 as per the following offline discussion.

* [AT116bis-e][109][NTN] Reply LSs to RAN4 and RAN1 (QC)

Scope: Draft Reply LSs to RAN1 and RAN4 based

Intended outcome: Draft reply LSs

Deadline (for companies' feedback): Tuesday 2022-01-25 04:00 UTC

Deadline (for draft LS in R2-2201741 and R2-2201742): Tuesday 2022-01-25 08:00 UTC

# Discussion

## Draft reply LS to the [1] on NR NTN Neighbor Cell and Satellite Information

In [1], the main question is what are the required parameters that need to be provided to UE for IDLE mode and connected mode measurements and mobility in NTN. The parameters can be grouped into two as shown below in the table 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **For NTN UE measurements, e.g. neighbor cell measurement within- or inter-satellite:**  (A1) Neighbor cell Ephemeris information and the format, e.g. PVT format or Keplerian format  (A2) Common TA  (A3) Validity timer information for neighbor cell measurements, e.g. if it is different from that for serving cell open loop TA control   * Would the timer length, if provided, be different from that for serving cell? For example, a required accuracy of service and/or feeder link delay information for neighbor cell measurement may not need to be as accurate as that for serving cell open loop TA control.   (A4) The amount of frequency compensation, if DL frequency compensation for the service link Doppler is applied  (A5) DL Polarization information | **For NTN UE mobility, e.g. target cell measurement, synchronization, and (conditional) handover within- or inter-satellite:**  (B1) Target cell Ephemeris information and the format, e.g. PVT format or Keplerian format  (B2) Common TA  (B3) Validity timer information for target cell mobility, e.g. if it is different from that for serving cell open loop TA control  (B4) The amount of frequency compensation, if DL frequency compensation for the service link Doppler is applied  (B5) DL and UL Polarization information  (B6) K\_offset |

A draft reply LS to the [1] on NR NTN Neighbor Cell and Satellite Information is provided in [3]. Rapporteur thinks RAN1-107e has made the conclusion that DL frequency compensation by gNB for the service link Doppler is not supported in Release 17, therefore, (A4) and (B4) are not needed.

Also, RAN2#116 has made the agreement that RAN2 assumes FL delay is known to and compensated by the network. RAN2 also assumes the UE needs to have neighbour cell ephemeris for the propagation delay estimation.

However, in case the network does not compensate the feeder link delay for the SSBs of the neighbor cell, then the UE will have to be informed on this.

1. Do you agree that if the network does not compensate the feeder link delay for the neighbor cell, then (A2) Common TA and drift rates should also be provided to UE for neighbor cell measurement?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Comments (if No, please elaborate the reason) |
| MediaTek | No | We already agreed that this is compensated by the network. The UE cannot be expected to do this. In Connected mode the network is always expected to provide neighbor satellite information. There is not enough time to introduce such optimizations. |
|  |  |  |

RAN1 has agreed two formats for ephemeris (1) PVT and (2) Keplerian (orbital parameters). Rapporteur thinks the PVT is used mainly for connected mode for UL synchronization while orbital parameters can be used as long term information for neighbor cell measurements.

This means, the PVT is used for short term and orbital parameters is used for long term and their validity duration can be different. In this case, the UE may need to be configured with different validity durations for PVT and orbital parameters as mentioned in (A3) and B(3).

1. Do you agree that the network may configure validity duration of the orbital parameters of satellite ephemeris to be longer than that of the PVT of satellite ephemeris as what pointed out by (A3) and B(3)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Comments (if No, please explain) |
| MediaTek | No | We cannot make such assumptions or thinking in RAN2 to categorize ephemeris formats. This is for RAN1 to decide and they agreed on both the formats. So, either of the formats can be used. |
|  |  |  |

Followings are questions from [1] and response from [3].

**Question-1: Would the parameters listed above be relevant to measurements and mobility? If the answer is dependent on satellite types, e.g. GSO and NGSO, and RRC state, what would be the answers to the respective satellite types?**

RAN2 answer: For measurement purpose, SMTCs, ephemeris, epoch time and DL polarization information would be relevant regardless of satellite types and RRC state.

RAN2 has agreed the assumption that feeder link delay is known to and compensated by the network. However, if network does not compensate the feeder link, common TA drift parameters of the neighbour cells are also provided to UE.

For handover, a UE would need those parameters listed in the LS regardless of satellite types except (B3) and (B4).

RAN2 assumes the UE can be configured with a validity duration of the orbital parameters (i.e., Keplerian format) of ephemeris of the neighbor cell to be longer than that of the PVT parameters of the serving cell. However, other information like common TA will have same validity duration for neighbor cell and the serving cell, i.e., (A3) and (B3) will be known to the UE.

RAN1-107e had made the conclusion that DL frequency compensation by gNB for the service link Doppler is not supported in Release 17, therefore, (A4) and (B4) are not needed.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Question 1?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | No | We cannot write the statement “However, if the network des not compensate…. provided to UE”, as it violates RAN2’s agreement and assumption that feeder link delay is known to and compensated by the network.  Similarly, we cannot include the statement like “RAN2 assumes the UE can be configured with a validity duration of the orbital parameters (i.e., Keplerian format) of ephemeris”. As we mentioned RAN1 has agreed that either of the Keplerian format or PVT could be used for serving cell. |
|  |  |  |

Question-2: Would there be parameters that are not listed but necessary for measurements and mobility from RAN2 perspective? If the answer is dependent on satellite types, e.g. GSO and NGSO, and RRC state, what would be the answers to the respective satellite types?

RAN2 answer: For neighbor cell measurement, the parameters indicated in the response to the Question 1 are sufficient.

But following additional parameters are also needed for handover.

(B6): For fixed cell, neighbor cell stop time and reference location.

(B7): Epoch time of the ephemeris

(B8): drift rates for common TA,

(B9): Kmac (to determine UE-gNB RTT and perform RACH to target),

(B10) beam information.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Question 2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | No | B8 (drift rates for Common TA) is not needed. The need for B10 (beam information) is also not clear. |
|  |  |  |

Question-3: Would the parameters be available to UE, e.g. provided by serving cell, for measurements and mobility? If the answer is dependent on satellite types, e.g. GSO and NGSO, and RRC state, what would be the answers to the respective satellite types?

RAN2 answer: Yes.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Question 3?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | yes |  |
|  |  |  |

Questions-4: What would be the expected UE behavior from the perspective of handover, measurement, and measurement reporting if any or all of the information listed above is not provided to the UE by a serving cell or if any of all of the provided information cannot be used by the UE because, e.g. the validity timer expires? If the answer is dependent on satellite types, e.g. GSO and NGSO, and RRC state, what would be the answers to the respective satellite types?

RAN2 answer: RAN2 assumes all the information needed for measurement and handover would be provided to the UE by the network. If any of the information is not available or is not valid, then the UE would have to acquire the system information of the target or neighbor cell which is not desirable from power consumption point of view.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Question 4?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

## Draft reply LS to the [2] on Multiple SMTCs for NR NTN

The LS in [2] mentions this.

*As RAN4 RRM requirements are highly depended on SMTC configuration details, it is critical how many SMTCs can be concurrently activated and thus in use in defining measurement requirements. Besides, there are additional aspects on which RAN4 needs more input from RAN2 to begin defining relevant RRM requirements in detail. Thus, RAN4 would like to kindly ask RAN2 the following questions:*

A draft reply LS to the [2] on Multiple SMTCs for NR NTN is provided in [4]. Followings are questions from [2] and response from [4].

(Q1) Would there be any association information between SMTC and Cell/SSB-IDs and/or Satellite?

RAN2 answer: The association between SMTC and satellite is left to network implementation. The association between SMTC and the Cell will be signalled in newly introduced SMTC list (*SSB-MTC4List-r17*). For each SMTC, this list includes a list of cells that are following the signalled offset in *SSB-MTC4List-r17*. Existing SSB-MTC is still the baseline SMTC configuration.

RAN2 is also discussing on providing a list of cells the satellite is serving in the system information and RAN2 will further update on the progress.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Q1?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

(Q2) Would there be any dynamic mechanism enabling/disabling or activating/deactivating the configured SMTCs for one measurement object?

RAN2 answer: RAN2 has agreed that there is no dynamic mechanism to activate and deactivate a configured SMTC.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Q2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

(Q3) Would the legacy SMTC lengths be re-used for NTN SMTC configuration, i.e. no additional NTN specific new SMTC lengths?

RAN2 answer: Yes

1. Do you agree with the response to the Q3?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

(Q4) Would configuring multiple SMTCs overlapping with each other in the time domain for the same measurement object be allowed? If yes, would the SMTCs be allowed to be activated concurrently?

RAN2 answer: Yes. All the configured SMTCs can be used in parallel. There will be optional UE capability reporting whether UE is able to use 4 SMTCs in parallel. However, RAN2 is still discussing whether UE needs to report UE capability to use 2 SMTCs in parallel. Also, RAN2 is discussing UE-based solution whether a UE is allowed to select a SMTC among configured multiple SMTCs. RAN2 will further update on the progress.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Q4?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

(Q5) Whether and how would a valid time information of SMTC be defined?

RAN2 answer: RAN2 is discussing this as part of UE-based solution on the use of SMTCs. RAN2 will further update on the progress.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Q5?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

(Q6) Would the periodicities of multiple SMTCs configured by an MO be identical?

RAN2 answer: With newly introduced signaling (*SSB-MTC4List-r17*), only offset will be signalled differently, and periodicity and duration of the multiple SMTCs are identical for an MO.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Q6?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

(Q7) RAN4 would also like ask for clarification on the interpretation of “in parallel” in the LS R2-2109219 below, e.g. does it mean multiple SMTCs can be activated and in use simultaneously and the SMTCs can overlapping with each other?

RAN2 answer: Yes. See response to Q4.

1. Do you agree with the response to the Q7?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company name | Yes/No | Your suggestion |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

TBD..
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