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# Introduction

This document discusses proposals from [1 – 5] with focus on pre-compensation and offset in NTN. Additional MAC issues identified in the WID [6] and corresponding candidate solutions from TR 38.821 [7] (summarized in [1]) are also included for companies to provide preliminary views for potential down-scoping:

* [AT111][107][NTN] Pre-compensation and other MAC issues (InterDigital)
* Scope: Discuss the proposals in [R2-2007615](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CDocs%5CR2-2007615.zip), [R2-2007616](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CDocs%5CR2-2007616.zip), [R2-2006928](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CDocs%5CR2-2006928.zip), [R2-2007590](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CDocs%5CR2-2007590.zip) (and possibly other proposals from contributions in 8.10.2.1 focussing on pre-compensation and offset calculations), as well as proposals 1 to 5 in [R2-2007784](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CDocs%5CR2-2007784.zip). The intention is to identify design alternatives and, whenever possible, also narrow down the proposals.
* Initial intended outcome: summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:
	+ List of agreeable proposals (if any)
	+ List of proposals that require online discussions

Please note the following deadlines have also been provided:

* Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): Friday 2020-08-21 08:00
* Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2008188):  Friday 2020-08-21 10:00

# Pre-compensation and Offset

## Pre-compensation and Timing Advance

In the Rel-17 NTN WI, it is assumed that a transparent or “bent-pipe” configuration will be deployed, where the gNB is located on the ground and a satellite relays signalling between the gNB and the UE. This configuration is comprised of two portions of propagation delay: that associated with the connection between the gNB and satellite, defined as the “feeder-link” and that between the UE and satellite. The feeder-link delay component is common to all UEs served by the cell, whereas the **delay between the UE and satellite** can be further broken down into two components:

* a common delay, representing the minimum delay from the satellite to the ground (i.e. the propagation delay between the satellite and a reference point such as the cell or beam centre) and;
* a UE-specific delay, based on the UE-specific distance to the reference point.

The following contributions propose various methods to apply timing pre-compensation, where further details regarding the solution may be found in the original paper:

* From [3]: Network broadcasts a common TA per cell/beam in NTN for REl17, which contains the delay from the gNB to a reference point (feeder-link + common delay);
* From [2]: UE calculates UE-specific timing advance based on distance from the UE to satellite. Feeder-link delay is broadcast to cell, and UE adds this delay to the UE-specific TA for full PD compensation;
* From [4]: SIB9 IE contains the UTC time of the gNB at a given subframe boundary. UEs with GNSS can also estimate its own UTC time reference. UEs can used elapsed propagation time between gNB and UE to acquire relative timing and estimate full TA.

**Question 2.1: Companies are invited to select a preferred method(s) and/or combination of methods for timing advance pre-compensation in NTN:**

* **Option 1: Broadcast of a common TA per cell/beam;**
* **Option 2: Broadcast of feeder-link delay;**
* **Option 3: UE-specific offset calculated by UE based on UE-satellite location;**
* **Option 4: UE-specific offset calculated by UE based on UE-reference point location;**
* **Option 5: UE-specific offset calculated by UE based on UTC time (via IE in SIB9);**
* **Option 6: Wait for RAN1 input.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Supported Option(s)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Option 1, 3, 4 | To reduce risks to NTN deployments and to provide adequate flexibility, Samsung suggests that RAN2 define more than one option: at least one UE-centric option where the UE does most of the work and one network-centric option where the network does most of the work. The common TA can be made a function of NTN Type with an adjustment for fine-tuning. Such TA can be used in conjunction with the existing R16 parameter ranges (where applicable) for time/timer-based parameters. An additional scaling factor can provide a finer resolution or granularity that scales the existing R16 parameter range. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Offsets and Extensions

### *Ra-ResponseWindow*

The *ra-ResponseWindow* configured in *RACH-ConfigCommon* starts at the first PDCCH occasion from the end of the Random Access Preamble transmission (unless for CFRA for BFR) [8] and has a duration based on number of slots. The network configures a value lower than or equal to 10 ms when Msg2 is transmitted in licensed spectrum and 40 ms when Msg2 is transmitted with shared spectrum channel access [9]. The earliest possible reception time is 2 times the minimum round-trip delay, so under current timing relationships applied to NTN the UE may attempt multiple preamble transmissions before the gNB is able to provide the RA response message (i.e. Msg2) as shown in Figure 1. Current behaviour will therefore lead to unnecessary UL preamble transmission and increments to the preamble transmission counter, possibly leading to RACH failure.



**Figure 1:** Example of current *ra-ContentionResolutionTImer* behaviour applied to an NTN environment.

**Question 2.2: Do you agree that an offset should be applied to the start of *ra-ResponseWindow* as agreed in SI?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Applicable deployments (LEO/GEO)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | LEO and GEO | Make use of the TA from Question 2.1 to delay the start of ra-ResponseWindow. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

The maximum differential delay (defined as the minimum one-way delay minus the maximum one-way delay) within an NTN cell can be up to 10.3 ms [7], where two times that delay (20.6 ms) exceeds the current maximum monitoring duration in a licensed spectrum for the ra-ResponseWindow (10 ms). For UEs at cell edge, if the ra-ResponseWindow is started in the first PDCCH monitoring occasion after 2 times the minimum delay, the monitoring duration may therefore expire before reception of the RA response. To resolve this issue, the following solutions have been captured in the TR:

1. Extension of the *ra-ResponseWindow* to at least cover the full duration of the differential delay in an NTN cell.
2. Calculate a UE-specific offset proportional to the 2 times the delay from the UE to the gNB and start the *ra-ResponseWindow* at an appropriate time such that the RAR would fall within the ra-ResponseWindow.

**Question 2.3a: Is an extension required for the *ra-ResponseWindow* in NTN?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Applicable deployments (LEO/GEO)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | No | LEO and GEO | If the start time of the window has been adjusted, ra-ResponseWindow from R16 can be reused. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Question 2.3b: If ‘Yes’ to the previous question, please indicate a preferred method of extension:**

* **Option 1: 2-bit LSBs of SFN in Msg2, as mentioned in [4];**
* **Option 2: Other (please describe in ‘Additional Comments’);**
* **Option 3: Wait for RAN1 input;**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred****Option(s)** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer*

*ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* is started after transmission of Msg3 and has duration of up to 64 ms, which under certain satellite deployments such as GEO transparent is less than 2 times the minimum propagation delay.

The TR also notes that although the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* duration is sufficient to cover the maximum differential delay, a UE located near cell edge of a large diameter cell may unnecessarily monitor for around 20 ms thus leading to unnecessary power consumption. If the UE can determine its specific timing offset, it may be beneficial to also apply this to the beginning of the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* to reduce UE monitoring duration and thus power consumption.

**Question 2.4: Do you agree that an offset should be applied to the start of *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer*?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Applicable deployments (LEO/GEO)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | GEO and non-GEOs | Yes. We suggest a uniform approach to start such timers (e.g., delayed start of RA-ResponseWindow, ra-ContentionResolutionTimer, and HARQ timers to reflect the delays obtained in Question 2.1). |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### *DRX Timers*

As concluded in the SI, modification of *drx-LongCycleStartOffset*, *drx-StartOffset*, *drx-ShortCycle*, *drx-ShortCycleTimer*, *drx-onDurationTimer*, *drx-SlotOffset* and *drx-InactivityTimer* is not needed in NTN. Rapporteur suggests that this conclusion be formalized in the WI unless a new issue/motivation has been found.

**Question 2.5: Do you agree that a modification of *drx-LongCycleStartOffset*, *drx-StartOffset*, *drx-ShortCycle*, *drx-ShortCycleTimer*, *drx-onDurationTimer*, *drx-SlotOffset* and *drx-InactivityTimer* is not needed as per SI conclusion? If ‘No’ please indicate which of the above timer(s) should be modified and why in the “Additional Comments” section.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The value range for HARQ RTT Timer UL/DL is maximum 56 symbols [9], which is insufficient for NTN environment given the increased propagation delay over terrestrial networks. As captured in TR 38.821, the following modifications have been proposed to the operation of the *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDL* and *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL* in NTN:

1. If HARQ is enabled, it is proposed that an offset be applied to the start of the timer to compensate for the additional propagation delay in NTN systems.
2. If HARQ is disabled, as the HARQ retransmission will never arrive. It is proposed to not start the RTT timers for the HARQ process that was disabled.

**Question 2.6: Do you agree that if HARQ feedback is *enabled* an offset is applied to the start of *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDL* and *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL*?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Applicable deployments (LEO/GEO)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | GEO and non-GEOs | Yes. We suggest a uniform approach to start such timers (e.g., delayed start of RA-ResponseWindow, ra-ContentionResolutionTimer, and HARQ timers to reflect the delays obtained in Question 2.1). |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Question 2.7: Do you agree that if HARQ feedback is *disabled* *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDL* and *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL* are not started?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Applicable deployments (LEO/GEO)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | GEO and non-GEOs |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

In [4], it is further proposed that If HARQ feedback is disabled, to support blind retransmission and improve transmission reliability, one way for UE to start *drx-RetransmissionTimerDL(UL)* is based on offset scheduled by network via PDCCH. It is noted by the contributing company that this is beneficial for UE power consumption and keeping scheduling flexibility.

**Question 2.8: Do you support further study of modifying start of drx-RetransmissionTimerDL(UL) based on network-scheduled offset via PDCCH (further details on solution in [4])?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | Study this topic and consider all possible approaches including the suggested solution of [4]. In addition, study the topic of unnecessary PDCCH monitoring when HARQ stalling occurs. This will also help with power saving. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## *sr-ProhibitTimer*

Upon transmission of a scheduling request, the UE starts a *sr-ProhibitTimer*, where throughout the timer duration the UE is prevented from transmitting another SR. The current maximum value range is Rel-16 NR is 128 ms which given potential propagation delay in GEO scenario, can result in timer expiry and the UE transmitting additional SRs before the gNB has received the original. To resolve this solution, it is proposed in the TR that the value range of *sr-ProhibitTimer* be extended to compensate for additional propagation delay.

**Question 2.9: Do you agree the value range of the *sr-ProhibitTimer* should be extended? If ‘Yes’ please indicate the preferred method in the ‘Additional comments’ section.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Applicable deployments (LEO/GEO)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | GEO and non-GEOs | The value can be made a function of NTN Type (e.g., LEO vs. GEO) along with a scaling factor for additional flexibility. The scaling factor can be multiplied by the exsiting R16 parameter range. Example: New sr-ProhibitTimer Value= (NTN Type-based RTD) + [scaling factor \* (Existing R16 sr-ProhibitTimer value)]. In one example, (NTN Type-based RTD) can be used for various time/timer-based parameters as an offset to the start of the timer or as an adjustment as shown above. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## General Offset Considerations

If an offset is introduced to e.g. *ra-ResponseWindow*, *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer*, *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL* or *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDL* details regarding the precise value, how this value is obtained, and in what scenarios the offset value is applied require further discussion. Rapporteur notes that this discussion may rely on outcome of pre-compensation discussion and further RAN1 input, however companies may provide initial preferences to facilitate further discussion.

**Question 2.10: Companies are invited to indicate a preliminary preference regarding a general method for offset calculation (detailed solutions FFS):**

* **Option 1: Explicit UE calculation (e.g. via location information);**
* **Option 2: Value provided my network (e.g. via a common TA);**
* **Option 3: Wait for RAN1 input;**
* **Option 4: Other (please describe in ‘Additional Comments’ section).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred****Option(s)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Option 1, 2 | As mentioned in response to Q2.1, to reduce risks to NTN deployments and to provide adequate flexibility, Samsung suggests that RAN2 define more than one option: at least one UE-centric option where the UE does most of the work and one network-centric option where the network does most of the work. The common TA can be made a function of NTN Type with an adjustment for fine-tuning. Such TA can be used in conjunction with the existing R16 parameter ranges (where applicable) for time/timer-based parameters. An additional scaling factor can provide a finer resolution or granularity that scales the existing R16 parameter range. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Other MAC open Issues

Additional MAC issues identified in the WID [6] and corresponding candidate solutions from TR 38.821 [7] (summarized in [1]) are also included for companies to provide preliminary views for potential down-scoping.

## Random Access

### 4-Step RACH

From the WID it is assumed that all Rel-17 NTN-capable UEs have GNSS capability which enables methods of pre-compensation such as TA calculation using UE-satellite location information or UTC time. However, [5] notes that a GNSS-capable UE may not always have available location information should, for example, the GNSS satellite not be visible.

As visibility of an NTN satellite and GNSS satellite is similar, if a UE is unable to acquire GNSS information it is likely it cannot access NTN satellite as well. [5] therefore proposes that RAN2 prioritize the case of UE with valid location information and capability to perform pre-compensation in RACH procedure, and discussion on UEs not able to perform pre-compensation is postponed pending further progress in RAN1

**Question 3.1: Do you agree that RAN2 should prioritize the case of UE with valid location information and capability to perform pre-compensation in RACH procedure?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Agree | Support UE-centric pre-compensation and network-centric pre-compensation. Address the non-prec-compensation case in R17 after sufficient progress has been mode. Otherwise, address the non-prec-compensation case in R18. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[5] further proposes that the following 4-step RACH procedure can be applied for UEs with pre-compensation at UE side:

1. In Msg1 transmission, the UE should estimate the absolute TA (e.g. based on distance between UE and satellite) and apply the TA estimated in the preamble transmission.
2. In Msg2 reception, the UE should apply the TA command received in RAR as a delta adjustment to the TA maintained on UE side (i.e. the TA estimated in Msg1 transmission).
3. For the UL grant in Msg2 for Msg3 transmission, it is up to gNB implementation to ensure a sufficient processing time on UE side for the Msg3 transmission (e.g. gNB can always assume maximum TA is used on UE side, where the maximum TA can be determined based on the coverage of the NTN cell)

**Question 3.2: Do you agree that for 4-step RACH with pre-compensation at UE side, the following procedure can be used as baseline:?**

1. **In Msg1 transmission, the UE should estimate the absolute TA (e.g. based on distance between UE and satellite) and apply the TA estimated in the preamble transmission.**
2. **In Msg2 reception, the UE should apply the TA command received in RAR as a delta adjustment to the TA maintained on UE side (i.e. the TA estimated in Msg1 transmission).**
3. **For the UL grant in Msg2 for Msg3 transmission, it is up to gNB implementation to ensure a sufficient processing time on UE side for the Msg3 transmission (e.g. gNB can always assume maximum TA is used on UE side, where the maximum TA can be determined based on the coverage of the NTN cell)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Agree | The 4-step RA procedure should be supported for both contention-based random access (CBRA) and contention-free random access (CFRA). Specific enhancements to the baseline procedure should be discussed. For example, we should consider means of reducing the user traffic interruption by allowing user traffic transmission in the downlink and the uplink while the RA procedure is ongoing for handover.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2-Step RACH

In SI phase, the use of 2-step RACH in NTN was discussed extensively in NTN, however as 2-Step RACH WI was ongoing, agreement on adoption was postponed until WI completion. As 2-step RACH is now supported in Rel-16 NR, [5] proposes that both 2-step and 4-step RACH be supported in NTN

**Question 3.3: Do you agree that both 2-step and 4-step RACH are supported in Rel-17 NTN, with enhancements to 2-step RACH to accommodate the NTN environment FFS?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Agree | Support both 4-step RA and 2-step RA. Furthermore, support both CBRA and CFRA. This provides full flexibility to the gNB and will help ensure reliability in the challenging NTN radio environment. Most enhancements would be applicable to both 4-step and 2-step RA. We should consider means of reducing the user traffic interruption by allowing user traffic transmission in the downlink and the uplink while the RA procedure is ongoing for handover (4-step CFRA and 2-step CFRA). The user traffic on PUSCH can be separated from the signaling messages on PSUCH for enhanced reliability and flexibility. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[5] further proposes that the following 2-step RACH procedure can be applied for UEs with pre-compensation at UE side:

1. In MsgA transmission, the UE should estimate the absolute TA (e.g. based on distance between UE and satellite) and apply the TA estimated in both the preamble and PUSCH transmission.
2. In MsgA transmission, the UE should include the absolute TA value estimated in the payload of MsgA.
3. In MsgB reception, the UE should apply the TA command received in RAR as a delta adjustment to the TA maintained on UE side (i.e. the TA estimated in Msg1 transmission).

**Question 3.4: Do you agree that for 2-step RACH with pre-compensation at UE side, the following procedure can be used as baseline:?**

1. **In MsgA transmission, the UE should estimate the absolute TA (e.g. based on distance between UE and satellite) and apply the TA estimated in both the preamble and PUSCH transmission.**
2. **In MsgA transmission, the UE should include the absolute TA value estimated in the payload of MsgA.**
3. **In MsgB reception, the UE should apply the TA command received in RAR as a delta adjustment to the TA maintained on UE side (i.e. the TA estimated in Msg1 transmission).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Agree | The overall procedure is fine but specific implementations should be discussed (e.g., how to convey TA). |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[4] further states that additional considerations for 2-step RACH in NTN should be evaluated, noting the following:

* Assuming NTN introduces additional UL payload in MsgA PUSCH should be considered carefully for the impact to coverage and PUSCH resource consumption.
* The availability and accuracy of the TA pre-compensation before sending MsgA PUSCH needs to be evaluated.
* Adaptive 2-Step or 4-step RA type selection mechanism is one possible way to balance the overall resource overhead and fulfill RACH capacity requirement in NTN.

**Question 3.5: Do you agree one or more of the following considerations for 2-step RACH in NTN should be evaluated as baseline? If so, which ones. Companies are invited to note additional considerations in the ‘Additional Comments’ field.**

1. **Assuming NTN introduces additional UL payload in MsgA PUSCH (e.g. SFN, BSR or TA value) should be considered carefully for the impact to coverage and PUSCH resource consumption;**
2. **The availability and accuracy of the TA pre-compensation before sending MsgA PUSCH;**
3. **Adaptive 2-Step or 4-step RA type selection;**
4. **Other – please describe in the ‘Additional Comments’ section.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Considerations you agree with** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Other | Consider enhancements suggested by all companies for 4-step and 2-step RA (CBRA, CFRA). Address user traffic interruption for 4-step CFRA and 2-step CFRA. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Preamble ambiguity

Given the large maximum differential delay possible in NTN, it is noted in section 7.2.1.1.1.2 of TR 38.821 [7] that certain RACH occasion periodicities configurable in Rel-16 NR may lead to overlaps in preamble receiving windows between successive RACH occasions. gNB may not know which RO the preamble is associated with in the overlap period, thus may not be able to accurately estimate the appropriate timing advance.



**Figure 2:** Preamble ambiguity due to overlapping preamble receiving windows in NTN.

The following potential solutions have been captured in TR 38.821 [7]:

1. Proper PRACH configuration in the time domain, where the interval between two consecutive RO (RACH Occasions) should be larger than 2 times the maximum differential delay within a cell
2. Preamble division, where preambles are divided into groups and mapped to different RO. ROs with timing separation less than 2 times the maximum differential delay are always assigned with different groups of preambles.
3. Frequency hopping (e.g. identifying RO based on preamble transmission frequency band)
4. 2-step RACH (e.g. including assistance info in MsgA PUSCH).

**Question 3.6: Companies are invited to indicate a preliminary preference to support further study and/or deprioritize the following method(s) regarding RACH preamble ambiguity:**

* **Option 1: Proper PRACH configuration in time;**
* **Option 2: Preamble division;**
* **Option 3: Frequency hopping;**
* **Option 4: 2-Step RACH;**
* **Option 5: Wait for RAN1 feedback.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s) for continued study** | **Deprioritized Option(s)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Option 5 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Msg3 Scheduling adaptation

If the UE applies UE-specific pre-compensation to Msg1, under current specification the gNB will not be aware of the calculated pre-compensation value and may schedule Msg3 transmission under the assumption that the UE is much nearer to the satellite than it really is, possibly resulting in the UE not being able to transmit in the provided UL grant. Potential solutions captured in TR 38.821 [7] include:

1. The network scheduling Msg3 without knowledge of the absolute TA value, and scheduling Msg3 according to, for example, the maximum propagation delay of the cell or the maximum differential delay. The UE would the provide the gNB its absolute timing advance in Msg3.
2. The UE is restricted to only compensate a UE-specific portion of the timing advance (i.e. the difference between the common TA provided by a gNB and a UE-specific TA.
3. 2-Step RACH, where the UE may provide the UE-specific TA in MsgA PUSCH resource.

**Question 3.7: Companies are invited to indicate a preliminary preference to support further study and/or deprioritize the following method(s) regarding Msg3 scheduling adaptation for UEs applying UE-specific pre-compensation:**

* **Option 1: Network scheduling/implementation (i.e. no modification necessary);**
* **Option 2: Restrictions on UE-applied pre-compensation value;**
* **Option 3: 2-Step RACH.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s) for continued study** | **Deprioritized Option(s)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Option 1 |  | This is a simple solution. Based on NTN Type, the gNB can easily estimate a reasonable value for the overall delay. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Enabling/Disabling HARQ Feedback

In the SI, RAN2 agreed that although the HARQ processes remain configured, HARQ feedback may be disabled, for example, on a per-HARQ process basis. It was further agreed that the criteria and decision to enable/disable HARQ feedback is up to the network and will be signaled to the UE in a semi-static manner. Rapporteur suggests that these conclusions be formalized in the WI unless a new issue/motivation has been found.

**Question 3.8a: Do you agree that from a RAN2 perspective, HARQ feedback can be enabled/disabled in Rel-17 NTN, but HARQ processes remain configured. The criteria and decision to enable/disable HARQ feedback is under network control and is signalled to the UE via RRC in a semi-static manner as agreed in the SI?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 3.8b: If ‘Agree’ to the previous question, send an LS to RAN1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Agree | Ask RAN1 if RAN1 woould like an option of enabling/disabling HARQ feedback at the PHY layer. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In Rel-16 NR, a single HARQ process supports one TB (when the PHY layer is not configured with spatial multiplexing), and up to 16 HARQ processes are supported. As HARQ process IDs (PID) assigned to a TB cannot be re-used until the associated TB is flushed from the buffer, for example, after ACK reception or upon timer expiry, in an NTN environment with large propagation delay if a TB requires one or more retransmission(s) it may mean that a HARQ PID is assigned to a TB for a significantly larger duration than in terrestrial networks.

Should this occur for multiple TBs, the UE may run out of HARQ PIDs to assign to new data, thus introducing delay to transmission and requiring the UE to buffer or drop new packets. Possible solutions captured in TR 38.821 [7] include:

1. Intelligent TDM scheduling, where the gNB would only schedule the UE to transmit data sufficiently spaced out in time to ensure that a UE would have available HARQ processes for new data.
2. Increasing the number of HARQ PIDs (e.g. to 32).
3. Disabling HARQ feedback, for example, on a per-HARQ process basis.

**Question 3.9: Companies are invited to indicate a preliminary preference to support further study and/or deprioritize the following method(s) regarding HARQ stalling:**

* **Option 1: Network scheduling/implementation (i.e. no modification necessary);**
* **Option 2: Increased number of HARQ PIDs;**
* **Option 3: Disabling HARQ Feedback;**
* **Option 4: Wait for further RAN1 input.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s) for continued study** | **Deprioritized Option(s)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Option 2 |  | Make the maximum # of HARQ processes a function of NTN type so that fewer bits are consumed at the PHY layer to convey the HARQ process ID when fewer HARQ processes are adequate. Not all NTN types need more (e.g., 32) processes. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Contribution [1] also summarizes various open issues related to HARQ including the granularity that HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled. The options listed in the TR include configuration per UE, per HARQ process, or per LCH.

**Question 3.10: Companies are invited to indicate a preliminary preference to support further study and/or deprioritize the following method(s) regarding the granularity of disabling HARQ feedback:**

* **Option 1: Per UE;**
* **Option 2: Per HARQ process;**
* **Option 3: Per LCH;**
* **Option 4: Wait for further RAN1 input.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s) for continued study** | **Deprioritized Option(s)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | 1, 2 and 3 |  | Evaluate benefits and drawbacks of these options. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## UL Scheduling Enhancements

In Rel-16, upon arrival of a packet in a UE buffer for UL transmission, the UE may send a buffer status report (BSR) to the gNB to allow for proper allocation of UL grant resources. However, if the UE does not have UL resources configured for transmission of the BSR, the UE may first need to send a scheduling request (SR). Due to the much larger propagation delay in non-terrestrial networks, requiring the UE to wait two RTTs before transmitting UL data may introduce significant latency to data transmission.

The following solutions have been captured in Table 7.2.1.5-1: Scheduling enhancement options in TR 38.821:

Table 1 [7]: Scheduling enhancement options

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scheduling option | Pros | Cons | Delays\* |
| SR-BSR procedure | - Low resource overhead required | - Large delays | At least 2 RTTs of delay |
| Sending large grant in response to SR | - Potentially low resource overhead | - Still takes 2 RTTs before UE has the BSR- Might be a waste in terms of resources since network is still not aware of the buffer situation of the UE | 1 – 2 RTTs |
| Configured grant | - Low latency with right configuration | - Large overhead- Trade-off between latency and overhead | 0 – 1 RTT\*\* |
| BSR-indication in SR | - Low latency with correct configuration | - Large spec-impact- Resource overhead impact unclear, larger than SR | 1 RTT |
| BSR over 2-step random access | - Low latency- Low overhead | - RACH resources required | 0 – 1 RTT\*\* |
| \* the number of RTTs before full scheduling based on BSR can begin.\*\* if configured grant/2-step allocation is large enough and data can be transmitted in the grant. |

**Question 3.11: Companies are invited to indicate a preliminary preference to support further study and/or deprioritize the following method(s) regarding UL scheduling enhancements:**

* **Option 1: SR-BSR procedure;**
* **Option 2: Sending large grant in response to SR;**
* **Option 3: Configured Grant;**
* **Option 4: BSR-indication in SR;**
* **Option 5: BSR over 2-step RACH.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s) for continued study** | **Deprioritized Option(s)** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | All plus new |  | Evaluate these 5 options and any other new options that may be offered before finalizing the solution. Samsung would like to choose an option that utilizes resources more efficiently at the cost of higher complexity and larger spec impact. Compared to a Terrestrial Network (TN), an NTN cell is relatively larger, the amount of available spectrum is less, and the achievable spectral efficiency is lower. Hence, the amount of radio resources per UE is less for an NTN compared to a TN. The efficiency of resource utilization becomes even more important in an NTN compared to a TN. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# Offline Summary

<To be generated by email discussion Rapporteur pending outcome of company input>

# Conclusions

<To be generated by email discussion Rapporteur pending outcome of company input>
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