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# Introduction

RAN2 has sent a LS to RAN1 regarding the common TA in a regenerative payload scenario [1]. In RAN2 #127 meeting, the setting of common TA and Kmac for regenerative payload with full gNB on board was discussed. RAN2 brought questions on whether it would be a problem for TA common to stick to 0 as the minimum value or if there is a need to introduce negative values. The content of the LS is listed as below.

|  |
| --- |
| In RAN2#127 meeting, the setting of common TA and Kmac for regenerative payload with full gNB on board was discussed, and a question related to the value setting was raised.  Related to this, RAN2 kindly asks RAN1 and RAN4:  **Question:** Whether in a regenerative payload scenario it would be a problem to stick to 0 as the minimum possible value for TA-Common or whether we should e.g. introduce negative values for ta-Common.  Additionally, RAN2 understands in any case legacy UEs would have to rely on existing signaling and then for legacy UEs, minimum value of Common TA is equal to 0.  **Actions:**  **To RAN1 and RAN4:**  RAN2 kindly requests RAN1 and RAN4 to provide feedback on above question. |

# Discussion

21 contributions [2-22] including both discussion papers and draft replies are submitted in this meeting. Based on the inputs, moderator has the following questions about the issues related to the question from RAN2.

**2.1 Issues of uplink reception window at gNB**

It was mentioned by companies’ contributions that there would be a performance loss due to the mismatch for the uplink transmission and the reception window at gNB. And the overestimated TA will induce an advanced reception at gNB, which seems the traditional terrestrial gNB never need to deal with.

图示

低可信度描述已自动生成

Figure 2 Examples for the uplink reception at gNB

**Question 1:**

**Do companies think that it would impact the uplink reception performance due to the delayed or advanced arrival of uplink transmission?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Detailed answers and other comments** |
| **OPPO** | **No** | For TA accuracy error falls in [-Te,+Te] with Te smaller than CP length, gNB implementation can avoid any performance degradation. |
| **ETRI** | **No** | We don’t see any further specific issues for regenerative payload over the legacy transparent payload cases. |
| **Lenovo** | **No** | The case is same as TN network and there is no necessity for special handling. |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2:**

**Is there any difficulty for the gNB to deal with the advanced reception in uplink?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Detailed answers and other comments** |
| **OPPO** | **No** | the gNB can select a FFT window starting from Te after the OFDM symbol boundary for the concerned PRACH reception (also applicable to PUSCH reception as well). With this implementation method, any random accuracy error within [-Te,+Te] won’t suffer from the degradation, as long as the Te is smaller than CP length. |
| **ETRI** | **No** | We don’t see any further specific issues for regenerative payload over the legacy transparent payload cases. |
| **Lenovo** | **No** |  |
|  |  |  |

**2.2 Backward compatibility issues**

Some companies mentioned there would be a backward compatibility issue if negative values are introduced for the common TA. But other companies mentioned that if negative values were introduced for the common TA configuration in Rel-19 for regenerative payload, corresponding new IE would be introduced. With the consideration of that, there would be no backward compatibility issues.

**Question 3:**

**Is there any backward compatibility issue for the legacy UE if negative values were introduced for the configuration of common TA, with the consideration that new Rel-19 IEs with negative values of common TA can be introduced?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Detailed answers and other comments** |
| **OPPO** | **not issue with backward compatibility** | The problem is that by introducing negative value for R19, it will make legacy performance worse. While, by NW implementation, both legacy performance and R19 performance can be kept un-impacted. |
|  |  |  |

**2.3 Questions on the negative values**

Based on the consideration of the above two questions and the answers, it can be further discussed on the questions from RAN2. Though Q4 and Q5 are similar and may point to the same direction for the answers, it may save some efforts for drafting the content of reply LS.

**Question 4:**

**With the consideration of the above two issues, do you think negative values for ta-Common can be introduced to solve the overestimated TA issues and improve the performance of uplink receptions?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Detailed answers and other comments** |
| **OPPO** | **No** | it is not meaningful to introduce negative value, it will make the system worse. |
| **ETRI** | **No** |  |
| DCM | NO | This issue is common b/w transparent payload and regenerative payload in our understanding. Why we need to discuss again is unclear. |
| Lenovo | No |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 5:**

**Do you think it would be a problem to stick to 0 as minimum possible value for TA common without introducing the negative value for ta-Common?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Detailed answers and other comments** |
| **OPPO** | **No** | there is no issue with 0 value common TA as explained in the previous questions. |
| **ETRI** | **No** |  |
| DCM | NO | Same comment as Q4. |
| Lenovo | No |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion
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