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# 1 Brief scope of the paper

This document aims at collecting companies’ views regarding the Rel-17 NTN Idle mode:

* [AT113-e][105][NTN] Idle mode aspects (Nokia)

Scope: Discuss:

1. Continue the discussion on P1 and P2 from [R2-2100527](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2100527_Report%20from%20%5BPost112-e%5D%5B153%5D%5BNTN%5D%20Idle%20mode%20aspects%20%28Nokia%29.docx)
2. Usage and provision of the cell expire time and upcoming cell info
3. ephemeris assisted cell (re)selection

based on the corresponding proposals in [R2-2100347](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2100347%20NTN%20Idle%20mode.docx) (P1~P4), [R2-2101196](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2101196_Discussion%20on%20cell%20selection%20and%20reselection%20in%20NTN.docx), [R2-2100382](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2100382.docx) (P1) and [R2-2100163](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2100163%20NTN%20Idle%20inactive%20mode%20procedures.doc) (P1 and P2)

Initial intended outcome: Summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

* + - List of proposals for agreement (if any)
		- List of proposals that require online discussions
		- List of proposals that should not be pursued (if any)

Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): Monday 2021-02-01 17:00 UTC

Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2102015): Monday 2021-02-01 23:00 UTC

Proposals marked "for agreement" in R2-2102015 not challenged until Tuesday 2020-02-02 11:00 UTC will be declared as agreed by the session chair. For the rest the discussion will continue online.

The following sections elaborate on the topics listed in the scope above.

# 2 Proposal 1 and Proposal 2 from R2-2100527

As an outcome of [1] the following was proposed, among the others:

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 1: UE is made aware of the network type (TN or NTN) in an implicit way. Proposal 2: NTN scenario information (e.g. LEO/GEO) is not signalled explicitly, but inferred from the contents of the ephemeris. FFS which exact parameters are sufficient and whether this behavior needs to be specified. |

During the online discussion at RAN2#113, the following views have been exchanged with regards to these:

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 1: UE is made aware of the network type (TN or NTN) in an implicit way. * ZTE is fine for the serving cell but we could have an explicit indication for the neighbour cell.
* LG still wonders whether this works.
* Continue the discussion as part of offline 105

Proposal 2: NTN scenario information (e.g. LEO/GEO) is not signalled explicitly, but inferred from the contents of the ephemeris. FFS which exact parameters are sufficient and whether this behavior needs to be specified. * Samsung/QC prefer an explicit indication to avoid that the UE needs to derive this.
* Continue the discussion as part of offline 105
 |

Despite large majority supporting each of these proposals during [1], it was not feasible to converge during the online handling of the resulting report [1]. Regarding Proposal 1, it is commonly understood there are multiple ways how this can be ensured, even if separate PLMNs for TN and NTN cannot be guaranteed (as argued e.g. by LG or BT [1]). For example, the existence of NTN-specific SIB or ephemeris is an easy way to infer the cell is of NTN type. In addition, we believe the introduction of a new parameter (network type in this case) shall be properly justified, so the proponents of an explicit indication shall actually describe why this is needed. Otherwise, before convincing the substantial majority, RAN2 shall proceed towards the end of the WI with the agreement there is no such explicit indication (as the need for having such new parameter has not been widely acknowledged).

As pointed out by ZTE and quoted in the box above, there may be a distinction between the serving cell and the neighbours as the UE may not know which SIBs are available per each neighbour cell, while it will anyway acquire serving cell’s SIB1 and know if e.g. NTN-specific SIB is available. Thus, it shall be considered whether we can at least agree no indication for the serving cell (i.e. in MIB/SIB1) is needed?

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1: Do you agree there is no explicit indication of network type (TN/NTN) for serving cell in MIB/SIB1?** |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Motivation** |
| Ericsson |  | For us it is hard to understand why this explicit/implicit indication discussion is taken in the beginning of the release when we have almost no knowledge how the SI will look in the end. As we have commented, we should see towards the end of the release, are we missing a needed indication or not. If we are missing an indication that has a use case (with consensus), it should be added.  |
| MediaTek | Yes | It could be implicitly indicated. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | There is no need to introduce explicit indication. This is about identifying sooner from MIB vs identifying later from SIB1. Identifying NTN cell sooner the better to reduce RRM impact. We should send LS to RAN1 for NTN specific MIB. |
| Samsung | No | There could be different definitions of “NTN Type.” In the simplest definition, “NTN Type” can simply differentiate between a TN and an NTN. In another definition, it can distinguish among different NTN platforms such as GEO, MEO, LEO, and HAPS in addition to a TN. A yet another definition can indicate the beam type. Indeed, several companies had mentioned their preference for broadcasting a beam type.Hence, as a potential way forward, SIB1 can use 2-3 bits to convey both the platform type and the beam type (e.g., GEO, HAPS, LEO with Quasi-Earth-Fixed Beam, LEO with Earth-Moving Beams, and so on.).Benefits of “NTN Type”:An explicit broadcast of “NTN Type” avoids the need for the UE to process any NTN-specific SIBs just to find that the NTN Type that it has discovered has a lower priority and that it would need to look for another cell.The criteria for the cell reselection process are quite different for different types of beams (e.g., Earth-fixed beams vs. Earth-moving beams). A compact NTN Type indication will enable the UE to start using relevant criteria for cell selection and reselection. An operator can prioritize the selection of an NTN Type for its UEs. An NTN can be prioritized over a TN (and vice versa). For example, a HAPS operator can prioritize an NTN over a TN, while a TN operator can prioritize a TN over an NTN. An explicit “NTN Type” enables the UE to complete the network selection quickly.Additionally, an NTN operator may have different priorities for GEOs vs. LEOs. Having an explicit NTN Type reduces the amount of processing that the UE needs to do for the network selection.We observe that PLMN ID cannot be used to imply a TN vs. NTN, because it is entirely possible that the same PLMN supports both a TN and an NTN.Although the NTN platform type (e.g., GEO vs. LEO) can be inferred by the UE after processing a SIB containing such ephemeris, beam type is not present in the typical ephemeris data.We also see the benefit of specifying the NTN Type for neighbor cells in addition to the serving cell.In our view, if we invest a couple of bits in defining “NTN Type,” it will simplify the UE processing and provide flexibility to operators.We also note that defining an “NTN Type” in RAN will also help the Core Network. The UE can include the standardized “NTN Type” detected in a SIB in a NAS message such as Registration Request so that the AMF can accept/reject the UE’s registration request based on the The AMF can use the NTN Type to optimize the paging operation (e.g., by selecting the paging retry timer).Additionally, the NTN Type, similar to the RAT Type, can be used for charging (e.g., one set of charging characteristics for the TN and another set of charging characteristics for an NTN/NTN Type).The NTN Type can be used by the gNB to select the AMF that is customized to serve NTN UEs. The AMF can use the NTN Type to select an SMF.  |
|  |  |  |

Summary for Question 1:

<blank>

Then, a related question shall be asked concerning the neighbour cells, as suggested by ZTE. It is argued [1] that SIBs 2-5, where the cell reselection information could be provided, there is a need to indicate which cells are of NTN type, so that the UE knows which cells to consider in reselection process. As this is related to cell reselection procedure (discussed separately below) and also such information can be conveyed in the ephemeris (when its content are decided eventually), we think it is perhaps not essential to consider it here and now. On the other hand, for completeness (with Question 1), companies are at least asked to indicate if NTN type for neighbour cells shall be indicated explicitly. If yes, please indicate how. If not, please indicate why.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 2: Should the network type (NTN or TN) be indicated explicitly for neighbour cells? If yes, please indicate how. If not, please indicate why.** |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Motivation** |
| Ericsson |  | Instead of asking about the indication for which the discussion is way too early, the question should be about the functionality of cell reselection. Should cell reselection take into account NTN/TN or NTN type and is so how would it work and how does it improve the cell reselection process. Without this understanding the discussion on should we agree on indication or not is waist of time. It cannot be concluded without understanding how it is used. |
| MediaTek | No (for now) | UE should be able to identify the NTN neighbour cells by using the ephemeris information. We can revisit it once the ephemeris details are agreed upon. |
| Qualcomm | No | If we agree NTN specific MIB, UE can simply identify the NTN cell from SSB (no further SI acquisition needed). |
| Samsung | Yes | An explicit indication of the NTN Type (including the platform type such as GEO/LEO) would be helpful in cell reselection by prioritizing one NTN Type over another (or a TN vs. an NTN).The NTN Type indication for the serving cell is useful for cell or network selection and the NTN Type indication in neighboring cells is useful for cell reselection (or combined cell reselection and network selection). |
|  |  |  |

Summary for Question 2:

<blank>

Regarding Proposal 2 (*NTN scenario information (e.g. LEO/GEO) is not signalled explicitly, but inferred from the contents of the ephemeris. FFS which exact parameters are sufficient and whether this behavior needs to be specified*), we would like to highlight there was a massive support for such approach in [1], namely 24 out of 26 companies were OK to progress with no explicit signalling of NTN scenario type. As described in [1], there are numerous ways to distinguish the scenarios, based on some scenario-specific parameters (such as compensation values, etc.) or contents of the ephemeris. Even if the ephemeris for neighbour cells will be of reduced size and limited in detail, compared to the serving cell’s ephemeris, it shall still be sufficient to recognize the scenario and allow the UE to identify if the cell is e.g. LEO or GEO. Furthermore, the usual approach shall be to confirm the issue and convince all RAN2 companies new parameter(s) for such indication is/are needed. So far, based on [1] and related discussions, the overwhelming majority in RAN2 believes the UE can recognize the scenario in multiple ways. Thus, we suggest RAN2 proceeds with such agreement for the time being and revise it only if during the remainder of the WI it is identified and proven implicit indication is insufficient.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3: Do you agree implicit indication of NTN scenario is enough for Rel-17 work? It can be revised if during the remainder of the WI it is proven implicit indication is not sufficient.** |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Motivation** |
| Ericsson |  | What does the question mean? Implicit implication enough for what? How can we know at early release if it is enough for Rel-17 when we do not know what will be in Rel-17??We should discuss per functionality that how and if cell reselection or cell selection is improved or not. If we improve it in a decided way, RAN2 should agree on the needed signalling support. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | See response in Q1. Obviously if we found later explicit indication is also needed, we can consider introducing one. |
| Samsung | Pl. see “Motivation” | If the goal is to identify the NTN Type, processing an early (i.e., in SIB1) and compact (i.e., just 2-3 bits) explicit indication of the NTN Type is much more efficient in our view. Processing the platform ephemeris and comparing the ephemeris data with suitable thresholds for different platforms (e.g., HAPS, LEO, and GEO) would need more processing time and consume more UE battery power when the goal is to simply identify the NTN Type.We reiterate that an explicit indication is not expensive from the signaling perspective; the indication would take only 2-3 bits depending on exactly what the indication represents. Can we please explore the support for the following statement?“Use 2-3 bits in SIB1 to explicitly convey the NTN Type including the beam type.” |
|  |  |  |

Summary for Question 3:

<blank>

# 3 Cell reselection related enhancements

Another part of this e-mail thread is to discuss the subset of proposals in [2][3][4][5] which are related to cell expiry time and upcoming cell info, to be used for cell (re)selection and other IDLE mode procedures. A related aspect is that such information, if agreed, could be provided via ephemeris. In [1] there were mixed views provided whether such timing information on when the cell is going to stop/another is going to start serving the area is essential for cell reselection, with a slight majority saying it is not needed. However, the level of interest in having such mechanism, based on the submitted papers, still appears to be quite high.

In [2] and [3] the authors suggest the awareness of cell expiry time shall be considered for cell selection/reselection and triggering the intra-frequency/inter-frequency measurements. Both papers argue RSRP/RSRQ measurements are insufficient for cell reselection and also suggest to consider UE’s location [2] or the distance between the UE and the satellite or cell center [3].

Even though lots of details in this area have been discussed multiple times (e.g. in [1]), we would like to make another attempt, with tiny step at a time and starting from a different angle.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 4: Should the UE be provided with the information on when a cell is going to stop serving the area and the timing information about new upcoming cell? Please indicate how it is provided (e.g. system information, ephemeris, etc.)** |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Motivation** |
| Ericsson | yes | It should be provided in system information. Whether this is in IE of system information that includes ephemeris and this info is part of that part of SI is stage 3 detail. We prefer to not to rely this information is part of preprovisioned ephemeris.Reason to support it is that an idle mode UE may reselected the new cell while feeder/service link switch is ongoing. Otherwise, UE camping on cell that is going to disappear will at some point notice that its serving cell disaapeared and then reselected. While UE eventually finds the new cell like this as well, it will miss paging and UE initiated call will also start with a delay. It may e.g. happen that UE initiates a call via a cell that disappeares in the next moment e.g. during RACH process. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Long term ephemeris can be used to indicate it. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | The cell can broadcast cell expiry time and list of cells that will take over the area. This will reduce the interruption. |
| Samsung | Pl. see details in the next column. | We have observed that different types of beams would benefit from different triggers. For example, such expiry is only applicable to quasi-Earth-fixed beams. It is not suitable for Earth-fixed beams and Earth-moving beams.Instead of restricting the discussion to only “serving time expiry,” we should discuss suitability of candidate standalone triggers and candidate combination triggers. The use of combination triggers (e.g., (i) RSRP and time and (ii) RSRP and a UE location-based trigger such as distance from the cell center) would lead to a more reliable cell reselection process. Note that RAN2 has identified some combination triggers as part of CHO discussions. There could be synergy between idle mode triggers and connected mode/handover triggers. |
|  |  |  |

Summary for Question 4:

<blank>

If you have answered ‘Yes’ to Question 4, please further indicate how such information is used (e.g. cell reselection, idle mode measurements triggering, etc.)

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 5: How is the information on when a cell is going to stop serving the area and the timing information about new upcoming cell used? E.g. for cell reselection, idle mode measurements triggering, etc. Please indicate also the applicable scenarios (e.g. Earth-moving, Earth-fixed cells).** |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | This is used for reselection such that when UE knows the service/feeder link switch is coming and new cell appeared, UE starts the corresponding measurements and cell reselection process.This is mainly needed for Earth fixed cells but as per implementation it can be applied in Earth moving cells as well. |
| MediaTek | As this is for idle mode, how this information is used can be left to UE implementation.  |
| Qualcomm | With cell expiry time, UE would know when to trigger cell reselection procedure even though signal strength from the service cell is good. With upcoming cell information, UE can prioritize to select that cell given it meets S-criteria for cell reselection. This will reduce interruption. |
| Samsung | Please see our response to Question 4. Thanks. |
|  |  |

Summary for Question 5:

<blank>

In each of the considered papers [2][3][4][5], the use of UE’s geolocation for IDLE mode procedures (such as cell reselection) is mentioned. It is either suggested on the general level [2] or with more detailed implementation details, such as using the distance between the UE and the satellite or cell center [3][4][5]. Companies are therefore asked to share their views whether UE’s geolocation shall be used for IDLE mode procedures and in what form.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6: Should the UE’s geolocation information be used for IDLE mode procedures? If yes, please indicate how is it used and for which procedures.** |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Motivation** |
| Ericsson | yes | The idle mode measurement rules should be enhanced such that UE does not need to perform idle mode measurements if it is close to center of the cell(and the cell is not about to vanish). |
| MediaTek | No | It will have severe negative impacts on UE’s power consumption, which is the most important aspect in Idle mode. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Triger of cell reselection procedure can be considered based on location.Obviously, UE’s last calculated position should be considered to minimize the use of GNSS. Either UE speed can be ignored, or UE location can be updated periodically. |
| Samsung | Yes | We suggest that RAN2 evaluate candidate standalone triggers and candidate combination triggers as mentioned in our response to Question 4. The UE location can be used to determine the distance between the cell center and the UE and such distance can be a useful trigger. To address MediaTek’s power consumption concern, we can perhaps have a period between two successive location measurements.  |
|  |  |  |

Summary for Question 6:

<blank>

# 4 Conclusions

Based on the views expressed in the previous sections, we propose the following:

Proposals
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