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1. Introduction

This document is a report of the following email discussion:

* [AT126][304][NR NTN Enh] MAC CR (InterDigital)

Scope: Discuss how to clarify / restructure the change in R2-2405374

Intended outcome: agreeable MAC CR

Deadline for rapporteur's CR (in R2-2405754): Friday 2024-05-24 08:00

# MAC CR Restructuring

Agreements from RAN2#125bis are currently captured in R2-2405374 as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| 1> if an indication of uplink synchronization loss is received from upper layers (see clause 5.2.2.6 TS 38.331 [5]):  2> flush all HARQ buffers;  2> not perform any uplink transmission on the Serving Cell.  1> if an indication of uplink synchronization loss due to satellite switch with re-synchronization is received from upper layers (see clause 5.7.19 of TS 38.331 [5]):  2> not perform any uplink transmission on the Serving Cell. |

In online session, concerns were raised that “uplink synchronization loss” is a general term and may include uplink synchronization loss due to satellite switch with re-synchronization as a subcase, causing the UE to incorrectly flush the HARQ buffers based on the first clause.

A revised text proposal is provided below to more explicitly highlight the different cases and behaviour:

|  |
| --- |
| 1> if an indication of uplink synchronization loss or uplink synchronization loss due to satellite switch with re-synchronization is received from upper layers (see clause 5.2.2.6 and 5.7.19 of TS 38.331 [5]):  2> if uplink synchronization loss is due to satellite switch with re-synchronization (see clause 5.7.19 of TS 38.331 [5]):  3> not perform any uplink transmission on the Serving Cell.  2> else:  3> flush all HARQ buffers;  3> not perform any uplink transmission on the Serving Cell. |

**1) Companies are invited to comment below only if there are strong concerns with the revised text proposal. If a company does not comment it is assumed agreeable.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Additional comments** |
| TCL | We prefer to modify the text as given below :  1> if an indication of uplink synchronization loss ~~or uplink synchronization loss due to satellite switch with re-synchronization~~ is received from upper layers (see clause 5.2.2.6 and 5.7.19 of TS 38.331 [5]):  2> if uplink synchronization loss is due to satellite switch with re-synchronization (see clause 5.7.19 of TS 38.331 [5]): |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To be more concise, we suggest:  The MAC entity shall for each Serving Cell:  …  1> if an indication of uplink synchronization loss is received from upper layers (see clause 5.2.2.6 and 5.7.19 of TS 38.331 [5]):  2> not perform any uplink transmission on the Serving Cell;  2> if uplink synchronization loss is not due to satellite switch with re-synchronization (see clause 5.7.19 of TS 38.331 [5]):  3> flush all HARQ buffers. |
| Samsung | Prefer HW’s suggestion |
| ZTE | Huawei’s revision is cleaner |
| Fujitsu | Prefer HW’s revision |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Furthermore, it was noted offline that the latest version of the RRC CR has updated the parameter names for NTN coverage enhancements as follows:
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A text proposal is provided below to update the parameters names in MAC as well:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6.2.1-2c: Values of LCID for UL-SCH when the LX field is set to 1**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Codepoint** | **Index** | **LCID values** | | 0 | (216 + 320) | CCCH of size 48 bits for an eRedCap UE | | 1 | (216 + 321) | CCCH of size 64 bits for an eRedCap UE | | 2 | (216 + 322) | CCCH of size 48 bits for PUCCH repetition of Msg4 HARQ-ACK, except for an (e)RedCap UE | | 3 | (216 + 323) | CCCH of size 64 bits for PUCCH repetition of Msg4 HARQ-ACK, except for an (e)RedCap UE | | 4 | (216 + 324) | CCCH of size 48 bits for PUCCH repetition of Msg4 HARQ-ACK of a RedCap UE | | 5 | (216 + 325) | CCCH of size 64 bits for PUCCH repetition of Msg4 HARQ-ACK of a RedCap UE | | 6 | (216 + 326) | CCCH of size 48 bits for PUCCH repetition of Msg4 HARQ-ACK of an eRedCap UE | | 7 | (216 + 327) | CCCH of size 64 bits for PUCCH repetition of Msg4 HARQ-ACK of an eRedCap UE | | 8 to 63 | (216 + 328) to (216 + 383) | Reserved | | NOTE 1: The MAC entity may use the code point corresponding to a given feature or feature combination in Table 6.2.1-2c only if network indicates support for the corresponding feature or feature combination.  NOTE 2: CCCH of size 48 bits and CCCH of size 64 bits are referred to as CCCH and CCCH1, respectively, in TS 38.331 [5].  NOTE 3: For UE capable of PUCCH repetition of Msg4 HARQ-ACK, the MAC entity uses the code points corresponding to PUCCH repetition of Msg4 HARQ-ACK if *numberOfMsg4HARQ-ACK-Repetitions* is configured, and if *rsrp-ThresholdMsg4HARQ-ACK* is configured, the RSRP of the downlink pathloss reference is less than *rsrp-ThresholdMsg4HARQ-ACK.* | | | |

**2) Do you agree with the above text proposal?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| TCL | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree | Alignment with RRC spec is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Fujitsu | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |