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# Introduction

This document is the report of the following offline discussion:

***[AT119-e][104][IoT-NTN] CR timer (ZTE)***

*Initial scope: Discuss corrections related to contention resolution timer (from proposals in R2-2207056, R2-2207351, R2-2207600, R2-2207824, R2-2208563)*

*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): Thursday 2022-08-18 0600 UTC*

*Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in**R2-22**08754): Thursday 2022-08-18 1000 UTC*

# Contact Information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email** |
| ZTE | Lu Ting | lu.ting@zte.com.cn |
| OPPO | Haitao Li | lihaitao@oppo.com |
| MediaTek | Abhishek Roy | Abhishek.Roy@mediatek.com |
| Nokia | Ping Yuan | Ping.1.yuan@nokia-sbell.com |
| Ericsson | Robert | robert.s.karlsson AT Ericsson.com |
| Lenovo | Min Xu | xumin13@lenovo.com |
| Huawei | Xubin | xubin@huawei.com |
| Intel | Tangxun | xun.tang@intel.com |
| Turkcell | İzzet | Izzet.saglam@turkcell.com.tr |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Discussion

In RAN2 #118e meeting, the new issues of blind Msg3 retransmission/false claiming of contention resolution failure were raised in IoT NTN for the first time. Such issues have been initially discussed in NR NTN. Some companies think it’s common for NR NTN and IoT NTN and so the issues were discussed in “*[AT118-e][048][IoT-NTN] New Issues”*[6]:

**Issue 1**, whether to support blind 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, without having to wait for the decoding result of the previous Msg3. Some companies suggested that IoT NTN should align with NR NTN and support blind Msg3 retransmission.

**Issue 2**, unintended declaration of contention resolution failure: this is also called the false claiming of contention resolution failure by some companies. After each Msg3 retransmission, CR timer would be restarted after the end of Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT. But the current CR timer may expire before it is restarted, which would lead to the issue that the UE considers contention resolution as not successful, even if Msg4 would arrive later.

However, in RAN2 #118e meeting, no consensus was achieved for the above mentioned issues.

In the current RAN2 #119e meeting, several contributions [1][2][3][4][5] related to contention resolution timer issues are submitted to the User Plane aspect of IoT NTN (AI 7.2.2). In the document, based on the contributions, some initial proposals will be drafted for the online discussion.

## Whether the unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure exist

With reference to the following observations in the contributions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contributions** | **Related observations or opinions** |
| R2-2207056 [1] | Observation 2 Stopping mac-ContentionResolutionTimer upon receiving PDCCH indicating Msg3 retransmission could not only avoid unexpected expiry of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* but also be beneficial for UE power saving. |
| R2-2207351[2] | As shown in figure below, when Msg3 retransmission grant is received while the contention resolution timer is running, the contention resolution timer is not restarted immediately but after UE-eNB RTT. Therefore, it is possible the ongoing contention resolution timer expires before the scheduled contention resolution timer can be restarted. |
| R2-2207600 [3] | Company mentions that NR NTN has agreed some specification changes to support blind MSG3 retransmission and to avoid UE mistakenly declaring Contention Resolution not successful after MSG3 is retransmitted. But for IoT NTN, opinions are split and two options are discussed. |
| R2-2207824 [4] | Company mentions that even with suitable configuration, it would be very rare case that CR timer expires during RTT when Msg3 retransmission is scheduled, such rare case is still possible. That will cause unnecessary contention resolution failure. |
| R2-2208563 [5] | Observation 1: After a MSG3 retransmission, Contention Resolution timer started by previous MSG3 (re)transmission might expire before the timer is restarted after the UE-eNB RTT, which might lead to unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure.**Proposal 1: The false claiming of contention resolution failure is a bug in current specification which need to be fixed for IoT NTN.** |

Rapporteur understand companies have common understanding that, in IoT NTN, the issue of unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure is indeed possible to happen and needs to be addressed.

**Draft proposal 1 (***[Easy Agreements]***): RAN2 needs to address the issue of unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure after MSG3 is retransmitted.**

**Q1: Companies are invited to provide comments or suggestions for the Draft proposal 1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |
| MediaTek | Yes |
| Nokia | Agree with draft proposal1. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Draft proposal 1. |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| Lenovo | Agree |
| Huawei，HiSilicon | Agree |
| CATT | Agree |
| Intel | Agree |
| ZTE | Agree |
| Turkcell | Agree |

**Conclusion for Q1:**

All companies can agree the Draft proposal 1. So the following proposal is given:

**(11/11) Proposal 1: RAN2 needs to address the issue of unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure after MSG3 is retransmitted.**

## How to address unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure

According to the contributions, several options have been mentioned that could address the unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure:

* Option1: Expiration of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* is not considered as contention resolution failure (or UE ignores expiration of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer*) when a Msg3 retransmission is scheduled (Reuse NR NTN solution).
* Option2: UE stops *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* upon reception of PDCCH indicating Msg3 retransmission.
* Option2a: UE stops *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* upon starting Msg3 retransmission.
* Option3: Leave the handling of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* up to the UE implementation when a MSG3 retransmission is scheduled.

According to the previous discussion and contributions in this meeting, there is concern for the Option2 and Option2a, e.g., that means after Msg3 retransmission, UE doesn’t monitor PDCCH and it makes blind Msg3 retransmission impossible. Per rapporteur’s understanding, such concern may be also applied to Option 3, e.g., NW cannot schedule blind Msg3 retransmission without knowing the *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* status in UE.

In the last RAN2 meeting, there are diverse views on whether blind Msg3 retransmission should be allowed [6]. In this meeting, some companies also give their views in details for this aspect. Therefore, rapporteur think firstly RAN2 needs to achieve common understanding on whether blind Msg3 retransmission is possible or should be allowed in IoT NTN.

### Whether blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is allowed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contributions** | **Related proposals or opinions** |
| R2-2207056 [1] | “*In NR, given that the support of Msg3 repetition is an optional UE capability, blind scheduled Msg3 retransmission would be useful to improve coverage, especially for UEs not supporting Msg3 repetition. Unlike NR, Msg3 repetition was introduced in NB-IoT and eMTC in R13, which is an essential feature for NB-IoT and eMTC UEs. Therefore, we see no need to support blind scheduled Msg3 retransmission for IoT NTN on top of Msg3 repetition.*1. *Blind Msg3 retransmission is not supported for IoT NTN.*”
 |
| R2-2207351 [2] | In the following figure, company has the assumption that blind Msg3 retransmission is possible in IoT NTN: |
| R2-2207600 [3] | Company mentions two possible UE behaviours during RTT:* Option 1: There is no need to monitor PDCCH during RTT (i.e. no blind retransmission during RTT).
* Option 2: There is need to monitor PDCCH during RTT (i.e. possible blind retransmission during RTT).

Company think Option 2 is not appropriate for IoT NTN as it is against the purpose of delaying the start of the timer by RTT. Option 2 may be equivalent to setting CR timer duration to the configured value plus RTT and this will cause lots of UE power consumption. Meanwhile, company also understand the concern for Option 1, e.g., the CR timer should be stopped upon scheduling of a MSG3 retransmission and then blind retransmission is not possible during RTT.  |
| R2-2207824 [4] | “*Observation 1: In order to ensure a certain transmission reliability of Msg4 and the success rate of contention resolution, CR timer length setting should generally be able to satisfy a certain number of Msg4 transmissions (e.g., 1 initial transmission and 2 retransmission)..….**Observation 4: If NW can successfully decode the first few repetitions of Msg3 retransmission, NW can schedule the PDCCH for Msg4 earlier, e.g., no need to wait for reception all the repetitions (since the CR timer is already running). Such eNB scheduling implementation further help to avoid the possible unexpected CR timer expiration (before CR timer restart), especially in the case the maximum CR timer length for eMTC may not completely enough for eMTC over GEO.**After CR timer has been started, as UE would continuously monitor PDCCH, eNB would be allowed to earlier schedule Msg4 when it’s possible. Moreover, it’s also possible for NW to “blindly” schedule Msg3 retransmission earlier than completely reception of the previous Msg3 transmission.*” |
| R2-2208563 [5] | “*We understand extending the repetition for every scheduling is one implementation in NW to increase transmission robustness. However, blind retransmission is another possible implementation in NW where NW may keep the flexibility to schedule UE in multiple attempts considering the NW resource allocation status and UE’s repetition requirements. For example, Msg3 blind retransmission is quite useful at least for eMTC with small repetition number. Given the high RTT in NTN, multiple short transmissions could have benefits such as time-diversity and allow scheduling other UE in the intervals between transmissions.* *In our understanding, both the repetition number extension and the blind retransmission are supported in legacy IoT. It is NW implementation strategy on how to schedule UE in different scenarios. It makes no sense to disable them for IoT NTN.****Proposal 2: There is no need to restrict NW implementation to support repetition extension while no blind retransmission for Msg3 scheduling for IoT NTN.*”** |

Per rapporteur’s understanding on above companies’ views, more companies have the understanding that blind Msg3 retransmission is possible in IoT NTN and no need to restrict NW implementation not to perform this function. One company further mention early Msg4 transmission is also possible and should be allowed in IoT NTN. Then the following Draft proposal 2 is given:

**Draft proposal 2 (***[To be discussed]***): RAN2 confirms the understanding that blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is possible (or should be allowed) in IoT NTN.**

**Q2: Companies are invited to provide comments or suggestions for the Draft proposal 2.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Based on the companies views above, it seem three companies [2][4][5] tend to support blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission while other two companies [1][3] think blind Msg3 retransmission is not needed in IoT NTN. We suggest to revise the proposal as following:**Draft proposal 2 (***[To be discussed]***): RAN2 discusses whether blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is possible (or should be allowed) in IoT NTN.**We don’t think blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission should be supported in IoT NTN.In NR, as the support of Msg3 repetition is an optional UE capability, blind scheduled Msg3 retransmission would be useful to improve coverage, especially for UEs not supporting Msg3 repetition. Unlike NR*,* Msg3 repetition is an essential feature for NB-IoT and eMTC UEs. Compared with Msg3 repetition, blind scheduled Msg3 retransmission would consume more PDCCH resources, in our view blind scheduled Msg3 retransmission could be replaced by Msg3 repetition since network could dynamically determine Msg3 repetition number in UL grant indicating Msg3 (re)transmission. So we see no need to support blind scheduled Msg3 retransmission for IoT NTN on top of Msg3 repetition.For early Msg4 transmission, it is not supported in TN (since mac-ContentionResolutionTimer is started after UE finish all the Msg3 repetition transmission), we think in NTN we should follow this principle. |
| MediaTek | The blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is an optimization. Without it, the function is not broken.The trickiest thing of blind Msg3 retransmission is network has to avoid the Msg3 retransmission scheduling (DCI N0) to overlap the first Msg3 NPUSCH transmission. To accommodate the round-trip delay, UE will transmit the Msg3 ahead of time. Due to the different location of UEs, the time in advance varies. And network does not know the exact time when the UE will transmit the Msg3. The network has to carefully evaluate the time range of UE Msg3 transmission and try to avoid overlapping the UE initial Msg3 transmission and UE receiving the Msg3 retransmission scheduling information (DCI N0). Moreover, the time duration of initial Msg3 transmission could be very long due to the repetition number. NPUSCH transmission will be interrupted by NPRACH occasion, make the NPUSCH transmission even longer. These two factors further limit the chance of network sending the Msg3 retransmission scheduling information.In a short, for IoT NTN, it’s tricky for network to select time for msg3 retransmission. The solution is complicated and less practical.We propose not to support blind Msg3 re-transmission at least for NB-IoT.For the early msg4 transmission, there is no such overlapping concern, it can be easily supported. However, UE needs to keep monitoring PDCCH during the UE-eNB RTT for the possible early Msg4. The benefit of not stopping CR timer is not guaranteed while the benefit of stopping CR timer which saves power consumption is constant. |
| Nokia | Agree with original draft proposal2.For early Msg4 transmission, we support the view that early Msg4 transmission is possible and should be allowed in IoT NTN. It is true the *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* is started after UE finish all the Msg3 repetition transmissions, while NW may early schedule Msg4 before all the Msg3 repetition complete and UE may receive the Msg4 exactly after the timer start (e.g. NW may schedule the UE ½ RTT before the timer start in UE) or during the timer running period. The function can be supported in current specification.For blind Msg3 retransmission, it is allowed in current specification as well. We think it is NW implementation strategy to use it or not (For example, Msg3 blind retransmission is quite useful at least for eMTC with small repetition number). It makes no sense to disable it from specification. Furthermore, Option2/2a introduce a new mechanism for PDCCH monitoring which is an optimization for legacy UE behavior which is not specific for NTN. We think it is not needed in this late Rel-17 stage. |
| Ericsson | Agree to support blind Msg3 and early Msg4 transmissions. NW strategy decides what will be used in each individual situation.  |
| Qualcomm | Ok with bling Msg3 retransmission but not clear what is early Msg4 transmission. |
| Lenovo | OK to have blind Msg3 transmission, but wonder if it is necessary to have early Msg4 transmission considering the power consumption of monitoring. |
| Huawei，HiSilicon | Blind Msg3 retransmission/early MSG4, is not essential for IoT as repetition is supported. Choosing between power saving and blind Msg3 retransmission/early MSG4, we prefer the former one which is vital for IoT device. |
| CATT | For Msg3 blind retransmission, we have the same view with OPPO and Huawei. We find no benefit to use Msg3 blind retransmission other than Msg3 repetition for coverage enhancement, especially when considering the issue caused by Msg3 blind retransmission in NTN we will discuss following.  |
| Intel | The bling Msg3 retransmission is sufficient. |
| ZTE | Early Msg4 transmission means that NW may successfully decode the first few repetitions of Msg3 (re)transmission, then NW can schedule the PDCCH for Msg4 earlier before completely reception all the UL repetitions.We cannot understand why company say “blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is an optimization, Without it, the function is not broken”? Blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is already possible/can be supported in current specification and implementation. No any further specification work is needed. Moreover, It is not only useful for improving coverage performance, but also helps to reduce the latency of RRC connection establishment, especially in the large RTT scenario, which in turn bring benefit to UE power saving. We believe that NW can handle this correctly, e.g., to schedule blind Msg3 retransmission and/or "early" Msg4 transmission only when it's needed and feasible. For UE, we don't see any additional complexity. It only needs to monitor PDCCH when CR timer is running.Even such scheduling may not frequently happen in IoT, it’s unthoughtful to specifically change the specification (Option2/2a) to make the scheduling infeasible or unworkable, especially with consideration that such scheduling may be more needed in IoT NTN. In our view, to intentionally stop CR timer violates the legacy mechanism of CR timer.On the other hand, as mentioned by Nokia, Option2/2a introduce a new mechanism for PDCCH monitoring which is an optimization for legacy UE behavior which is not specific for NTN. Without it, no function is broken. But with it, the existing functions may be broken. So we cannot agree with such optimization. |

**Conclusion for Q2:**

10 companies give response to Q2:

* 6 companies agree that blind Msg3 retransmission is possible or should be allowed in IoT NTN. Some of them also think early Msg4 transmission is possible. Moreover, some companies emphasize that blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is already possible/can be supported in current specification and implementation. It makes no sense to disable it from specification.
* 3 companies think blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission should not be supported in IoT NTN.
* 1 companies think at least for NB-IoT, blind Msg3 re-transmission should not be supported.

According to the discussion, rapporteur understand more companies can confirm that blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is possible or already can be supported in IoT NTN.

Meanwhile, some companies think such feature is not needed for IoT NTN and prefer to disable it for the reason of UE power saving. But some of other companies think we should avoid such optimization that might affect existing function.

So the following proposal is given:

**(6/10) Proposal 2: RAN2 confirms that blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is possible or already can be supported in IoT NTN.**

### Choice on the options

If RAN2 can confirm the understanding in proposal 2, only Option1 need to be agreed and the detailed text proposals for Option 1 can be further discussed. There are some support for Option 1 in contributions:

In R2-2207351[2], the company suggest that this problem can be simply resolved by not declaring it as expiry of contention resolution timer (as it is going to be restarted soon in future). The text proposal is as 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- if the MAC PDU received until the subframe that contains the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH transmission is successfully decoded; and- if the MAC PDU contains a UE Contention Resolution Identity MAC control element; and- if the UE Contention Resolution Identity included in the MAC control element matches the 48 first bits of the CCCH SDU transmitted in Msg3:- consider this Contention Resolution successful and finish the disassembly and demultiplexing of the MAC PDU;- set the C-RNTI to the value of the Temporary C-RNTI;- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider this Random Access procedure successfully completed.- else if notification of a reception of a PDCCH transmission addressed to Temporary C-RNTI indicating uplink grant for a Msg3 retransmission has been received before *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* expired:- not consider *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* expired;- else:- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider this Contention Resolution not successful.- except for BL UEs or UEs in CE or NB-IoT UEs:- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider the Contention Resolution not successful. |

In **R2-2207824 [4],** the company gives the following proposals:

Proposal 1: According to legacy process of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* and also for facilitating the scheduling flexibility in NW and avoiding the missing of Msg4 scheduling, UE is not allowed to intentionally or [intermittently](https://dict.cn/intermittently) stop the CR timer by its implementation when a retransmission is scheduled.

Proposal 2: In order try to avoid the unnecessary contention resolution failure, UE can ignore such CR timer expiration when Msg3 retransmission is scheduled.

The corresponding text proposal is as 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- if the MAC PDU received until the subframe that contains the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH transmission is successfully decoded; and- if the MAC PDU contains a UE Contention Resolution Identity MAC control element; and- if the UE Contention Resolution Identity included in the MAC control element matches the 48 first bits of the CCCH SDU transmitted in Msg3: consider this Contention Resolution successful and finish the disassembly and demultiplexing of the MAC PDU;- set the C-RNTI to the value of the Temporary C-RNTI;- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider this Random Access procedure successfully completed.- else:- if Msg3 is transmitted on a non-terrestrial network:- if no PDCCH transmission addressed to its Temporary C-RNTI indicating uplink grant corresponding to a Msg3 retransmission is received before *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* expired:- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider this Contention Resolution not successful.- else:- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider this Contention Resolution not successful.- except for BL UEs or UEs in CE or NB-IoT UEs:- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider the Contention Resolution not successful. |

In R2-2208563 [5], the company gives the following proposals:

**Proposal 3: Reuse NR NTN solution to fix the issue of false claiming of contention resolution failure for IoT NTN.**

* **Expiry of Contention Resolution timer is not considered as contention resolution failure when there is Msg3 scheduled, which is more recent than the Msg3 that triggered the start or restart of the CR timer**

The corresponding text proposal is as 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- if the MAC PDU received until the subframe that contains the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH transmission is successfully decoded; and- if the MAC PDU contains a UE Contention Resolution Identity MAC control element; and- if the UE Contention Resolution Identity included in the MAC control element matches the 48 first bits of the CCCH SDU transmitted in Msg3:- consider this Contention Resolution successful and finish the disassembly and demultiplexing of the MAC PDU;- set the C-RNTI to the value of the Temporary C-RNTI;- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider this Random Access procedure successfully completed.- if Msg3 transimssion was transmitted on a non-terrestrial network - if no PDCCH addressed to TC-RNTI indicating uplink grant for a Msg3 retransmission is received after the start of the mac-ContentionResolutionTimer:- discard the TEMPORARY\_C-RNTI;- consider the Contention Resolution not successful.- else:- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider this Contention Resolution not successful.- except for BL UEs or UEs in CE or NB-IoT UEs:- discard the Temporary C-RNTI;- consider the Contention Resolution not successful. |

Then the following draft proposal is given:

**Draft proposal 3a (***[To be discussed]***): If RAN2 can confirm the understanding in proposal 2, RAN2 specify that expiration of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* is not considered as contention resolution failure (or UE ignores expiration of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer*) when a Msg3 retransmission is scheduled.**

**Q3: Companies are invited to provide comments or suggestions for the Draft proposal 3a.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | It is better to stop CR timer to save power. UE needs to keep monitoring PDCCH before CR timer expiry to try to get the possible early Msg4. The benefit of not stopping CR timer is not guaranteed while the benefit of stopping CR timer which saves power consumption is constant. |
| Nokia | Agree with draft Proposal 3a. On how to capture the intended UE behavior, we prefer the proposals from R2-2207824 or R2-2208563 which is aligned with NR NTN specification. |
| Ericsson | Agree to Draft proposal 3a. We think all TPs have issues and needs some details, but we prefer R2-2207824 and R2-2208563.  |
| Qualcomm | Agree, they all meant to have same result but the text can be further revised. |
| Lenovo | If early Msg4 transmission is supported, then Proposal 3a is OK. |
| Huawei，HiSilicon | See comment to Q2. |
| CATT | Agree to Draft proposal 3a, if we support Msg3 blind retransmission. |
| Intel | Agree to Draft proposal 3a |
| ZTE | Agree to Draft proposal 3a |
| Turkcell | Agree to Draft proposal 3a |

**Conclusion for Q3:**

8 among 10 companies can agree the Draft proposal 3a. The final proposal would be given below.

Per rapporteur’s understanding, for Option 1, it’s still unclear whether UE still monitors the PDCCH after UE ignores the expiration of CR timer? Companies may have different opinions. In R2-2207824 [4], company may think ignoring CR timer just keeps the UE from declaring CR failure, but UE still needs to monitor PDCCH for receiving Msg3 or Msg4 scheduling. But in R2-2208563 [5], company mentions UE only needs to monitor PDCCH when the CR timer is running. That means UE no longer needs to monitor PDCCH after it ignores the expiration of CR timer. Company think this is same as legacy PDCCH monitoring and would not increase the UE power consumption compared to TN. Therefore, RAN2 needs to clarify this ambiguity for Option 1:

**Draft proposal 3b (***[To be discussed]***): RAN2 clarify whether the UE still needs to monitor the PDCCH after UE ignores the expiration of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* when a Msg3 retransmission is scheduled.**

**Q4: Companies are invited to provide comments or suggestions for the Draft proposal 3b.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MeddiaTek | The early Msg4 is more likely to occur after the CR timer expiry and before the re-start of CR timer. From this point of view, UE needs to keep monitor the PDCCH during the entire UE-eNB RTT.However, it looks wired to monitor PDCCH without a running CR timer. This is another reason that the CR timer should be stopped upon reception of PDCCH indicating Msg3 retransmission. |
| Nokia | We don’t think UE need to monitor the PDCCH after the *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer*expired when there is a Msg3 retransmission scheduled. Stop PDCCH monitoring after the timer expiry is beneficial to save UE’s power consumption. The NW can schedule the blind Msg3 transmission and early Msg4 transmission when the timer is running.In legacy DRX handling, it is clear that UE should monitor PDCCH when the *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* is running. *When a DRX cycle is configured, the Active Time includes the time while:**- onDurationTimer or drx-InactivityTimer or drx-RetransmissionTimer or drx-RetransmissionTimerShortTTI or drx-ULRetransmissionTimer or drx-ULRetransmissionTimerShortTTI or mac-ContentionResolutionTimer (as described in clause 5.1.5) is running; or*To MediaTek, we think UE may receive the Msg4 exactly after the timer start (e.g. NW may schedule the UE ½ RTT before the timer start in UE when NW decoded Msg3 successfully before all the Msg3 repetition complete) or during the timer running period. |
| Ericsson | The UE stops monitoring PDCCH when ***mac-ContentionResolutionTimer*** expires, no need to waste energy when there is another Msg3 transmission scheduled.  |
| Qualcomm | No. If the CR timer is not running, the UE is not required to monitor the PDCCH. |
| Lenovo | No need to monitor when CRT is not running. |
| Huawei，HiSilicon | As we commented above, power saving is the key feature. No need to monitor PDCCH if CR timer is not running. |
| CATT | The UE is not required to monitor PDCCH if the CR timer is not running.  |
| Intel | No need to monitor when CRT is not running. |
| ZTE | Agree the above understanding that UE is not required to monitor PDCCH if the CR timer is not running. |
| Turkcell | No need to monitor when CRT is not running |

**Conclusion for Q4:**

9 among 10 companies have the same understanding that UE doesn’t monitor PDCCH if CR timer is not running.

Based on the conclusion from **Q3** and **Q4**, the following proposal is given:

**(8/10) Proposal 3: If RAN2 can confirm the understanding in proposal 2, RAN2 specify that expiration of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* is not considered as contention resolution failure (or UE ignores expiration of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer*) when a Msg3 retransmission is scheduled. It’s common understanding that UE doesn’t monitor PDCCH if CR timer is not running.**

**Draft proposal 3c (***[To be discussed]***): RAN2 further discuss the text proposals in [2][4][5] for Option 1.**

**Q5: Companies are invited to provide comments or suggestions for the Draft proposal 3c.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | OK to further discuss the detail of the TP. For simplicity, we are fine for the proposals from either R2-2207824 or R2-2208563 which is aligned with NR NTN specification. |
| Ericsson | We think all TPs have issues and needs some details, but we prefer R2-2207824 and R2-2208563. |
| Qualcomm | They all meant to have same result but ok to further discuss the how to exactly capture. |
| Lenovo | OK to discuss. |
| ZTE | OK to discuss. |
| Turkcell | Ok to discuss |

**Conclusion for Q5:**

All companies agree to further discuss the text proposals in [2][4][5] for Option 1. Some companies prefer the text in R2-2207824 [4] or R2-2208563 [5]. So the following proposal is given:

**(6/6) Proposal 4: If the proposal 3 can be agreed, RAN2 further discuss how to exactly implement it with reference to the text proposals in R2-2207824 [4] or R2-2208563 [5].**

If RAN2 cannot confirm the understanding in proposal 2, we need to make choice among Option2, Option 2a and Option 3 to address the unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure.

In **R2-2208563 [5]**, company give some comparison for Option2 and Option2a: *For Option2 and Option2a, both options propose that UE should stop the Contention Resolution timer earlier before the expiry of the timer, to avoid false claiming of contention resolution failure by UE. The only difference is whether handle the timer expiry between the PDCCH and the beginning of PUSCH (PDCCH->PUSCH delay). Option2 can handle the case while Option2a not. In our understanding, Option2 is better than Option2a to cover more scenarios.*

In R2-2207056 [1], companies propose the Option 2 and the corresponding text proposal is given as following:

|  |
| --- |
| Once Msg3 is transmitted, the MAC entity shall:- if the UE is an NB-IoT UE, a BL UE or a UE in enhanced coverage:- if Msg3 is transmitted on a non-terrestrial network:- if, for EDT, *edt-SmallTBS-Enabled* is set to *TRUE* for the corresponding PRACH resource:- start *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* and restart *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* at each HARQ retransmission of the bundle in the subframe corresponding to the last subframe of a PUSCH transmission corresponding to the largest TBS indicated by the UL grant plus UE-eNB RTT subframes.- else:- start *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* and restart *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* at each HARQ retransmission of the bundle in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH transmission plus UE-eNB RTT subframes.- if notification of a reception of a PDCCH transmission indicating Msg3 retransmission is received from lower layers:- stop *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer*.- else:- if, for EDT, *edt-SmallTBS-Enabled* is set to *TRUE* for the corresponding PRACH resource:- start *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* and restart *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* at each HARQ retransmission of the bundle in the subframe corresponding to the last subframe of a PUSCH transmission corresponding to the largest TBS indicated by the UL grant.- else:- start *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* and restart *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* at each HARQ retransmission of the bundle in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH transmission.- else:- start *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* and restart *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* at each HARQ retransmission.……. |

**Draft proposal 4 (***[To be discussed]***): If RAN2 cannot confirm the understanding in proposal 2, RAN2 makes choice among the following options to address the unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure:**

* Option2: UE stops *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* upon reception of PDCCH indicating Msg3 retransmission.
* Option2a: UE stops *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* upon starting Msg3 retransmission.
* Option3: Leave the handling of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* up to the UE implementation when a MSG3 retransmission is scheduled.

**Q6: Companies are invited to provide comments or suggestions for the Draft proposal 4.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We prefer Option 2.Compared with option 2a, option 2 could further save UE power.For Option 3, we think *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* state should be aligned between UE and NW, so that NW could schedule the UE during the running of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* properly. The handling of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* should not be up to UE implementation. |
| MediaTek | We prefer Option 1 or Option 2. Option 3 make the network confusing if network is allowed to send the early Msg4. Ambiguity should be avoided.For option 2a, nothing is expected from UE between the Msg3 retransmission scheduling information and Msg3 retransmission. Thus option 2 is preferred.  |
| Nokia | None of above options is preferred. We don’t think RAN2 need to introduce new behavior to stop the *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* early*.* Furthermore, leaving the handling to UE will cause ambiguity in NW on when the blind Msg3 retx or Msg4 can be scheduled. |
| Ericsson | We do not agree with any of these options, agree with Nokia.  |
| Lenovo | At this stage we would like to reuse Nr NTN (Option 1). |
| Huawei，HiSilicon | Option 2 |
| ZTE | We cannot accept any of the above options as they break the existing functions. |
| Turkcell | Agree with Nokia. |

**Conclusion for Q6:**

8 companies give response to Q6:

* 5 companies disagree any of the options in Q6. With reference to discussion in **Q2**, they prefer the Option 1.
* 2 companies prefer the Option 2.
* 1 company prefer Option 1 or Option 2

Furthermore, with reference to the discussion in **Q2** and **Q3**, 7 companies (Nokia, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Intel, Lenovo, ZTE, Turkcell) prefer Option 1 to address the issue in Proposal 1. 1 company (MediaTek) is acceptable to Option 1. 3 companies (OPPO, Huawei, MediaTek) prefer Option 2. One company (CATT) give no clear view on the option.

According to the discussion and kind of the majority view, rapporteur understand it’s not easy to discuss any of the Option 2/2a/3.

**(7/10) Proposal 5: The option that UE stops *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* when a Msg3 retransmission is scheduled is not pursued.**

# Conclusion

*[Easy Agreements]*

**(11/11) Proposal 1: RAN2 needs to address the issue of unintended declaration of Contention Resolution failure after MSG3 is retransmitted.**

*[To be discussed]*

**(6/10) Proposal 2: RAN2 confirms that blind Msg3 retransmission/early Msg4 transmission is possible or already can be supported in IoT NTN.**

**(8/10) Proposal 3: If RAN2 can confirm the understanding in proposal 2, RAN2 specify that expiration of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* is not considered as contention resolution failure (or UE ignores expiration of *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer*) when a Msg3 retransmission is scheduled. It’s common understanding that UE doesn’t monitor PDCCH if CR timer is not running.**

**(6/6) Proposal 4: If the proposal 3 can be agreed, RAN2 further discuss how to exactly implement it with reference to the text proposals in R2-2207824 [4] or R2-2208563 [5].**

**(7/10) Proposal 5: The option that UE stops *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* when a Msg3 retransmission is scheduled is not pursued.**
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