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# Introduction

This document is to collect companies’ views for the following offline discussion focusing on UP issues.

* [AT118-e][048][IOTNTN] New Issues (OPPO)

Scope: Treat R2-2204740, R2-2205725, R2-2204741.

Ph1 determine agreeable part, Ph2 endorse TP

Intended outcome: Report, Endorsed TP (if applicable)

Deadline: Schedule 1 (CB online W2 if needed)

# Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Delegate contact |
| COMPANY\_NAME | NAME ([email@address.com](mailto:email@address.com)) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Odile Rollinger (odile.rollinger@huawei.com) |
| MediaTek | Abhishek Roy (Abhishek.Roy@mediatek.com) |
| Lenovo | Min Xu (xumin13@lenovo.com) |
| Transsion Holdings | wen.wu5@transsion.com |
| Nokia | Ping Yuan (ping.1.yuan@nokia-sbell.com) |
| OPPO | Haitao Li (lihaitao@oppo.com) |
| TTP(Omnispace) | Manook.soghomonian@ttp.com |
| Ericsson | robert.s.karlsson AT ericsson.com |
| InterDigital | Brian.martin@interdigital.com |
| Xiaomi | jiangxiaowei@xiaomi.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Round-1 Discussion

## 3.1 Msg3 retransmission

In RAN2#117e, blind Msg3 retransmission has been agreed to be supported for NR NTN, which enables NW to schedule Msg3 retransmission during the UE-gNB RTT in case NW wants to improve the coverage through blind retransmission. See below chairman notes.

Agreements via email – from offline 103 – third round:

1. Blind Msg3 retransmission is supported in Rel-17 NTN. FFS whether this is enabled by a NOTE (P4), or explicit configuration (P5a and P5b).
2. The following NOTE is captured: “UE should attempt to re-aquire SIBxx prior to validity timer expiry by UE implementation.” Details of NOTE (potentially including additional clarification if needed) may be finalized in Stage 3. This is captured in RRC specification (e.g. Section 5.2.2.x)

It is proposed in both [1] and [2] that IoT NTN should align with NR NTN and support blind Msg3 retransmission.

**Question 1: Do companies agree that blind Msg3 retransmission should be supported for IoT NTN, similar to NR NTN?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Huawei. HiSilicon | Disagree | We do not see the need for any change for blind retransmission in IOT NTN. Coverage enhancements are a basic function in IOT NTN and the timers set accordingly. |
| MediaTek | Disagree | Support views of Huawei. This is not needed in IoT-NTN. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree |  |
| Lenovo | Disagree | Not needed in IoT NTN |
| Transsion Holdings | Disagree | The MSG3 repetition is a a kind of retransmission in IoT, so blind Msg3 retransmission no needed in IoT NTN. |
| Nokia | Agree | Blind Msg3 retransmission is a legacy function which is already supported in current specification. For IoT over NTN, due to the maximum UE-eNB RTT is 540ms in GEO, the NW may blindly schedule Msg3 retransmissions before it receives/decodes the scheduled PUSCH (Msg3).  For example, for eMTC CE mode A with small number of PDCCH/PUSCH repetitions, NW can only receive and decode the PUSCH after the UE-eNB RTT (540ms). Before the eNB decoding the scheduled PUSCH transmission, it is NW’s scheduling flexibility to schedule a new Msg3 retransmission blindly for coverage enhancement (e.g., during the period the *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* is still running).  If blind Msg3 retransmission is not supported for IoT NTN, does it mean we need to restrict the NW implementation in MAC specification for above scenario ? Maybe we can reword the proposal as below:  **Blind Msg3 retransmission should be supported for IoT NTN as legacy.** |
| OPPO | Agree | Agree with Nokia. |
| TTP | Agree | Blind Msg3 transmission should be supported |
| Ericsson | Agree | Agree with Nokia. This is useful for coverage and has minor impact to copy the NR NTN solution. |
| InterDigital | Neutral | It doesn’t seem critical since we already have repetitions. However, no strong objection as it could provide more flexibility to the NW without much impact. |
| Xiaomi | Agree | Agree with Nokia that Blind Msg3 transmission is legacy function, no need to disable it in IOT NTN. |

Regarding how to implement in the spec on blind Msg3 retransmission, following options are proposed in [1] and [2].

* Option 1: If *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires during the UE-Enb RTT after Msg3 retransmission, (to wait for new CR timer restart) the UE does not consider the Contention Resolution unsuccessful.
* Option 2: If *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires and no PDCCH addressed to TC-RNTI indicating uplink grant for a MSG3 retransmission is received after the start of the *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer*, the UE considers the Contention Resolution not successful

Note that the same issue is being discussed in NR NTN, i.e. phase 2 of [AT118-e][104]. Rapporteur assumes that IoT NTN can follow NR NTN’s conclusion.

**Question 2: Do companies agree that IoT NTN follows NR NTN’s conclusion on how to implement blind Msg3 retransmission in the MAC spec (i.e. modifications to *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* operation)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Huawei. HiSilicon | Disagree | see answer to Q1 |
| MediaTek | Disagree | See our responses to Question 1. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree but | The issue is same as in NR. But it does not have to be blind retransmission. Ok to stop the running timer by PDCCH addressed to TC-RNTI indicating uplink grant for a MSG3 retransmission.  This can be in similar to what we already have below  - if *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires:  - for BL Ues or Ues in CE or NB-IoT Ues:  - if notification of a reception of a PDCCH transmission has been received from lower layers before *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* expired; and |
| Lenovo | Disagree | Not needed in IoT NTN |
| Transsion Holdings | Disagree | Not needed in IoT NTN. |
| Nokia | Agree | As discussed in R2-2205725, for IoT NTN, we think below issue is same as in NR (no matter blind Msg3 retx is supported or not).  Since the start of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* is delayed by UE-Enb RTT, if *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* expire during the UE-Enb RTT after Msg3 (re)transmission, it will lead to issue that the UE considers Contention Resolution as not successful (in red as indicated in below figure), even if Msg4 would arrive later.    Regarding how to address the issue, the topic is being discussed in NR NTN, i.e., phase 2 of [AT118-e][104]. We agree with Rapporteur that IoT NTN can follow NR NTN’s conclusion for simplicity. |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| TTP | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |

In [1], it is proposed to introduce an explicit configuration to support blind Msg3 retransmission in IoT NTN and UE behaviour would be different depending on whether blind Msg3 retransmission is configured or not. Note that this is also being discussed in NR NTN, i.e. phase 1 of [AT118-e][104] and rapporteur assumes that IoT NTN can follow NR NTN’s conclusion.

**Question 3: Do companies agree that IoT NTN follows NR NTN’s conclusion on whether to introduce an explicit configuration to support blind Msg3 retransmission?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Huawei. HiSilicon | Disagree | see answer to Q1 |
| MediaTek | Disagree | See our responses to Question 1. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree |  |
| Lenovo | Disagree | Not needed in IoT NTN |
| Transsion Holdings | Disagree | Not needed in IoT NTN. |
| Nokia | Agree. See comments | It was already agreed in NR NTN that explicit configuration is not needed.  🡺 3. Do not introduce an explicit configuration to support blind Msg3 retransmission in NTN. |
| OPPO | Agree | We can accept not introducing explicit configuration. |
| TTP | Agree | As detailed by Nokia above |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |

## TA report

*Whether SR can be triggered?*

In RAN2#117e, following agreement has been made for NR NTN.

1. If a TA report is triggered and there are no available UL-SCH resources, the network may optionally configure UE to trigger an SR. A UE capability is introduced for this.

In [1], it is proposed that IoT NTN follows NR NTN’s agreements. Given that NR NTN agreements contain many aspects. Following questions are asked to see to which extend companies would like to align with NR NTN.

**Question 4: Do companies agree that in IoT NTN, UE can trigger SR if a TA report is triggered and there are no available UL-SCH resources?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Huawei. HiSilicon | Disagree | The typical traffic pattern is one UL transmission followed optionally by a DL transmission and then the connection release. Triggering RACH only for updating the TA (which is only for UL) will generate unnecessary transmission and waste of power consumption. |
| MediaTek | Disagree | As discussed before in RAN2 117bis-e and pointed out by us, this is not at all necessary and only has the chance to increase complexity in the UE side. |
| Qualcomm | Agree | The issue of not being able to update the TA in time is more severe in IoT NTN. |
| Lenovo | Disagree, but | For now we see no essential reason of reporting TA in RA, and UE may wait until it enters CONNECTED mode to report TA. If any essential reason of reporting TA in RA is identified, we may consider triggering SR for this case. |
| Transsion Holdings | Agree | TA report can be useful for updating the offset, we think it is necessary. |
| Nokia | Disagree | The TA update in IoT NTN is not as necessary as NR NTN due to the IoT service is not time critical. We think NW implementation can handle the case (e.g., schedule UE with maximum TA of the cell via configuring proper K\_offset). |
| OPPO | Agree | Having timely TA reporting is important so that NW can properly adjust Koffset. |
| TTP | Agree | TA reporting is necessary for the Koffset reporting |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Agree with MediaTek and Nokia. |
| InterDigital | Disagree | It is an optional feature in NR, and there is even less motivation to support in IoT for the reasons already given by Huawei and Mediatek. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |

**Question 5: Do companies agree that in IoT NTN, whether TA report can trigger SR is up to network’s configuration?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Huawei. HiSilicon | Disagree | see Answer to Q4. In addition having a feature optional both at the NW and at the UE (see Q6) is a clear show that the feature is not essential and should not be considered in R17 |
| MediaTek | Disagree | TA report-based SR-trigger is not needed. Please see our response to Question 4. |
| Qualcomm | Agree | Ok to follow NR agreement. |
| Lenovo | Disagree, but | As in Q4, we can accept NW configuration based on essential needs of reporting Ta in RA. |
| Transsion Holdings | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Disagree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| TTP | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| InterDigital | Disagree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |

**Question 6: Do companies agree that in IoT NTN, a UE capability is introduced for TA report triggering SR?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Huawei. HiSilicon | Disagree | see Answer to Q4 and Q5. |
| MediaTek | Disagree | The feature itself is not needed. See our responses to Q4 and Q5. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | A single capability for TA report in connected mode should be sufficient. |
| Lenovo | Disagree | Same as Q4 and Q5. |
| Transsion Holdings | Disagree | Support views of Qualcomm. |
| Nokia | Disagree |  |
| OPPO | Agree | But we can also accept grouping this into the single capability for TA report. |
| TTP | Disagree | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| InterDigital | Disagree |  |
| Xiaomi | Disagree |  |

*Whether configured uplink grant can be used to transmit TA report?*

In the current TS 36.321, following is specified in 5.10.2 for NB-IoT.

|  |
| --- |
| For NB-IoT UEs, a configured uplink grant shall be used only for BSR or SPS confirmation transmission, and *skipUplinkTxSPS* is implicitly configured. |

In [1], it is stated that TA report is also important for UL transmission, and proposed to allow a configured uplink grant to be used for TA report as well.

**Question 7: Do companies agree that for NB-IoT over NTN, a configured uplink grant shall also be used for TA report?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Huawei. HiSilicon | Disagree | see Answer to Q4. In addition this would not be a small change and will impact RAN1 |
| MediaTek | Disagree | Agree with the responses of Huawei. |
| Qualcomm | Agree | It is better to use available resource and update the network with current TA in time. |
| Lenovo | Disagree, but | If any essential reason of reporting TA using dedicated CG is identified, we may consider for this case. |
| Transsion Holdings | Disagree |  |
| Nokia | Disagree |  |
| OPPO | Agree | Why not? TA reporting is important for timing adjustment and UE should try to use configured UL grant to report. |
| TTP | Disagree | Not necessary for just TA rporting |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| InterDigital | Disagree |  |
| Xiaomi | Disagree |  |

# 4. Round-1 summary

*To be added…*
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