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# Introduction

RAN2 has sent a LS to RAN1 regarding the DL coverage enhancements in NTN scenarios [1]. In the LS, RAN2 provides questions on DL coverage enhancements related to SSB, common control signaling, UL beams and beam status. The specific content of the LS is quoted as below.

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2 has started to study on RAN2 aspects of DL coverage enhancement. To progress the study, RAN2 has identified questions to RAN1 for aspects where the input is required.  Related to this, RAN2 would like to request RAN1 to provide feedback on the following questions.  **Question 1 :** Can RAN1 provide the information on their progress on whether the existing SSB pattern for an NR cell (e.g. SSB position in burst, SSB index number, etc.) is changed in Rel-19 NR NTN, and whether the SSB periodicity is extended compared with existing TN values?  **Question 2 :** Can RAN1 provide the information on whether/how the solution RAN1 is investigating is expected to impact common control signalling for UEs in RRC idle / RRC inactive?  **Question 3 :**  Can RAN1 provide the feedback on whether UL beam hopping is also being studied in RAN1 (and whether this is separate from DL beam hopping)?  **Question 4 :** RAN2 would like to remind RAN1 that satellite beams are currently not visible to UEs and any decision about different beam status (i.e. "off", "common messages only" and "active traffic") will likely have to relate to beams visible to the UE (e.g. SSB beams). RAN2 would also like to know whether RAN1 intends to define beam status for beams not visible to the UE or to define new beam status for beams visible to the UE.  **Question 5 :** Can RAN1 provide the feedback on whether the beam status in different beams (visible to the UE) of one cell are the same or can be different in any given time, i.e.. the beam status is cell specific or beam specific?  **Actions:**  **To RAN1:**  RAN2 kindly request RAN1 to provide feedback on above questions. |

# Discussion

20 contributions [4-23] were submitted to discuss the questions from RAN2 on DL enhancements. Some companies provided the draft reply LS and some companies provided there discussion in the paper under the agenda 9.11.1. Based on the inputs from the companies, the answers/replies to RAN2’s LS are drafted as below.

**2.1 Discussion on Question 1**

|  |
| --- |
| **Question1 :** Can RAN1 provide the information on their progress on whether the existing SSB pattern for an NR cell (e.g. SSB position in burst, SSB index number, etc.) is changed in Rel-19 NR NTN, and whether the SSB periodicity is extended compared with existing TN values? |

**FL’s proposal 1:**

**Answer to Q1:**

**According to the updated WID (RP-241667), SSB channel enhancement other than SSB periodicity extension is not considered. The enhancements to the existing SSB patterns, e.g. SSB position in burst, SSB index number, are not within the scope. The extension of the SSB periodicity is allowed and is still under RAN1’s discussion.**

**Based on RAN1’s research in the previous meetings, it was observed that the with the extension of the SSB periodicity and beam hopping, the coverage ratio can be improved.**

|  |
| --- |
| Observation(117)  Based on the results of DL coverage ratio evaluation at system level collected from 7 sources for all the three LEO600km satellite parameter sets where the beam footprint diameter is 50 km:   * For Set 1-1/1-3, the coverage ratio can be improved from 10% to 100% if the SSB periodicity is increased from 20ms to 80ms and beam hopping is applied * For Set 1-2, the coverage ratio can be improved from 1.5% to 96.8% if the SSB periodicity is increased from 20ms to 320ms and beam hopping is applied. * Note: coverage ratio is N2+N3/ total beam footprints * Note: the baseline assumes no beam hopping. TDM between SIB1 and SIB19 is assumed in those results, following current specs.   Based on the results of DL coverage ratio evaluation at system level collected from 3 sources for a deployment scenario implementing wide beam footprint:   * 1 source reports that with a deployment of wide beam covering 4 narrow (of 50km size) beams, which means Set 1-2 FR1 with additional EIRP reduction of 6dB, using SSB periodicity of 80 ms can provide coverage ratio of 96.8%, and Set 1-1/1-3 FR1 with additional EIRP reduction of 6dB, SSB periodicity of 80 ms can provide coverage of 100%. * 1 source observed that for Set 1-1, 1-2 and 1-3, the coverage ratio can be improved from 1.5% to 100% using the legacy default SSB periodicity of 20ms during initial access, by choosing a wide beam footprint with beam footprint sizes of 84 km and 56 km respectively.   + Note: the PDCCH and the PDSCH for SIB19 is assumed to be transmitted within 2 OFDM symbols and 5 MHz bandwidth. the PDSCH for SIB1 is assumed to be transmitted within 3 OFDM symbols and 5 MHz bandwidth. This assumes no SIB1 and SIB19 transmission in N2 beam footprints. This assumes non-aligned SFN timing across different beams. * 1 source observed, for Set 1-1 with increased beam size, that the legacy SSB periodicity of 20ms during initial access is usable with NTN beam hopping, by choosing a deployment scenario implementing wide beam footprint with beam footprint sizes of 70.7 km and 86.6 km, leading to a total of 529 and 353 beam footprints within the satellite coverage area, respectively, and the coverage ratio is 80% and 90%, respectively, and a ratio of simultaneously active beam footprints to the total number of beam foot prints equal to 20% and 30%.   + Note: Beam footprint size is increased by increasing only the *adjacent beam spacing* without increasing the 3dB beamwidth.   Note: RAN1 will further investigate the impact of SSB periodicity extension  Note: Any needed clarification “SSB channel enhancement is not considered” in the WID is up to RAN plenary  Note: RAN1 will further investigate the impact of wider beam of SSB and/or other channels on performance (e.g. link budget, capacity...) |

The proposal is drafted based on the inputs and the latest progress before RAN1#118 meeting. If agreements related to the SSB periodicity extension are achieved during this meeting, the proposal will be updated accordingly. The agreements related SSB periodicity extension will be also attached. Companies are encouraged to provide your views in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| vivo | Comments | It is a bit unclear to me whether the proposal is to reply to RAN2 with the 1st paragraph only or also the 2nd paragraph with the whole table above.  In our view, only including the 1st paragraph should be enough. |
| LGE | Partially yes | We are OK with the first part. Regarding the second part, we are not sure whether or not to provide whole set of observations. |
| Lenovo |  | We think the first paragraph is enough. |
| DCM |  | Same view with Lenovo. Besides, “**The extension of the SSB periodicity is allowed**” is not agreed yet (before Tuesday morning session); After we have agreement to extend SSB periodicity, this can be included in the answer. |
| CEWiT | Okay with the proposal | Correct the typo “**that the with the extension**” in the second paragraph. |
| Nokia | Partially | Language wise, the last paragraph of the response may need some change. Main reasons for suggested change is that the term “beam hopping” is not defined in specifications, and RAN1 still does not have a definition for this. Suggested wording:  “**Based on RAN1’s research in the previous meetings, it was observed that ~~the~~ with ~~the~~ extension of the SSB periodicity ~~and beam hopping~~, the coverage ratio may ~~can~~ be improved.**” |
| Apple |  | We also only support the first paragraph. The SSB periodicity extension is still in discussion. |
| CATT | General OK | It seems another sentences can be added:  “For DL coverage enhancement, RAN1 considers the SSB periodicity extension is beneficial to improve the coverage ratio and relevant enhancement is necessary.” |
|  |  |  |

**2nd round**

Based on the comments from the 1st round, the proposal is updated as below.

The 1st part is same as the one in last round. The 2nd paragraph is updated based on the inputs in the table.

**FL’s proposal 1:**

**Answer to Q1:**

**According to the updated WID (RP-241667), SSB channel enhancement other than SSB periodicity extension is not considered. The enhancements to the existing SSB patterns, e.g. SSB position in burst, SSB index number, are not within the scope. The extension of the SSB periodicity is allowed and is still under RAN1’s discussion.**

**Based on RAN1’s research in the previous meetings, it was observed that with extension of the SSB periodicity is beneficial and the coverage ratio can be improved.**

Please provide your views in the table below. And if some progress is made in this meeting, the proposal would be updated accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| DCM |  | In “**The extension of the SSB periodicity is allowed and is still under RAN1’s discussion.**”, exact meaning of “is allowed” is unclear. We have not agreed yet to allow SSB periodicity extension in spec. Instead of this sentence, the following should be used based on the WID text.  “**The extension of the SSB periodicity is potentially defined and is still under RAN1’s discussion.**”  Besides, the last sentence is unnecessary. Such an observation is not asked by RAN2. |
| Ericsson |  | We are not convinced to have the last sentence in the first paragraph as it is and would like to propose as:  **The extension of the SSB periodicity is ~~allowed and is~~ still under RAN1’s discussion.** |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with Ericsson |
| Thales |  | The best is to wait for the upcoming online session, hopefully some progress would be made so that more inputs could be shared with RAN2 regarding Q1.  The only text coming from the WID is the one highlighted in yellow hereafter. The remaining text is RAN1 understanding/interpretation. So, we may put it clear by adding a text to say that : RAN1 understanding is that the enhancements to the existing SSB patterns, e.g. SSB position in burst, SSB index num… or simply, add “thereby”  Btw, a minor comment, SSB is not a channel (although it was mentioned in the WID as a channel). We may remove “channel” from the answer:    For now, the proposed answer could be modified as:  **According to the updated WID (RP-241667), SSB ~~channel~~ enhancement other than SSB periodicity extension is not considered. Thereby, RAN1 understanding is that enhancements to the existing SSB patterns, e.g. SSB position in burst, SSB index number, are not within the scope.**  **Regarding SSB periodicity extension, based on RAN1’s research in the previous meetings, it was observed that with extension of the SSB periodicity is beneficial ~~and~~ for coverage ratio improvement and beneficial in terms of reduction of common control channel overhead, when targeting a full coverage of 1058 beam footprints**  **The extension of the SSB periodicity ~~is allowed and~~ is still under RAN1’s discussion. RAN1 will send updated reply when RAN1 conclude the ongoing study.** |
| Apple |  | We have not yet agreed to support SSB periodicity extension. Hence, the last sentence in the first paragraph needs to be modified. Ericsson’s version looks good to us.  Also, the last sentence is not directly to RAN2’s question, and we do not need it. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| IDC | Yes |  |
| LGE |  | Agree with Ericsson.  Observations does not need to be sent to RAN2 via LS. |
| Nokia |  | Agree with Ericsson. |

**3rd round**

Based on the 2nd round discussion the updated proposal is as below.

**FL’s proposal 1:**

**Answer to Q1:**

**According to the updated WID (RP-241667), SSB ~~channel~~ enhancement other than SSB periodicity extension is not considered. Thereby, RAN1 understanding is that enhancements to the existing SSB patterns, e.g. SSB position in burst, SSB index number, are not within the scope.**

**The extension of the SSB periodicity ~~is allowed and~~ is still under RAN1’s discussion. RAN1 will send updated reply when RAN1 conclude the ongoing study.**

**Regarding SSB periodicity extension, based on RAN1’s research in the previous meetings, it was observed that with extension of the SSB periodicity is beneficial ~~and~~ for coverage ratio improvement and beneficial in terms of reduction of common control channel overhead, when targeting a full coverage of 1058 beam footprints**

Please provide your views in the table below. And if some progress is made in this meeting, the proposal would be updated accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| Nokia | Yes with comment. | The statement “**, it was observed that with extension of the SSB periodicity is beneficial**”. The “with” can be removed for improving readability.  Additionally, are we sure that RAN2 is aware of what is defined by “coverage ratio improvement”? To our understanding, this term (coverage ratio) is related to geographical coverage (related to “coverage holes”). Perhaps this could be clarified? |
| vivo | Commoners | Actually we don’t know why the last sentence is needed. In this LS RAN2 does not ask the benefit of SSB periodicity extension. |
| FL |  | The updates are highlighted in yellow.  **According to the updated WID (RP-241667), SSB enhancement other than SSB periodicity extension is not considered. Thereby, RAN1 understanding is that enhancements to the existing SSB patterns, e.g. SSB position in burst, SSB index number, are not within the scope.**  **The extension of the SSB periodicity is still under RAN1’s discussion. RAN1 will send updated reply when RAN1 conclude the ongoing study.**  **Regarding SSB periodicity extension, based on RAN1’s research in the ~~previous~~ recent meetings, it was observed that ~~with~~ extension of the SSB periodicity is beneficial for coverage ratio and common control channel overhead.**  **~~coverage ratio improvement and beneficial in terms of reduction of common control channel overhead, when targeting a full coverage of 1058 beam footprints~~** |

**2.2 Discussion on Question 2**

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 2 :** Can RAN1 provide the information on whether/how the solution RAN1 is investigating is expected to impact common control signalling for UEs in RRC idle / RRC inactive? |

**FL’s proposal 2:**

**Answer to Q2:**

**Currently RAN1 does not have any conclusion on the enhancements to the common control channel. As mentioned in the WID, the Rel-18 network energy saving techniques should be considered as baseline in the system level study. The cell DTX/DRX liked enhancements to the common control signaling for UEs in idle or inactive mode may be needed. When the SSB periodicity extension is introduced, the transmission of broadcast information including SIB1 and other system information may be extended accordingly.**

The proposal is drafted based on the inputs and the latest progress before RAN1#118 meeting. If agreements related to the common control channels are achieved during this meeting, the proposal will be updated accordingly. Companies are encouraged to provide your views in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| vivo | No | The 1st sentence should be enough, i.e., “Currently RAN1 does not have any conclusion on the enhancements to the common control channel”.  RAN1 has no agreement or observation that “The cell DTX/DRX liked enhancements … may be needed.” |
| LGE | Partially yes | At this moment, we can say that RAN1 discusses whether or how to update cell DTX/DRX operation for Rel-19 NTN including the possibility of applying these operations to UEs in RRC idle/ RRC inactive.  Without explicit agreement or conclusion, we are not so sure whether we can list up some enhancement is needed or not or potential update coming from another potential enhancement. |
| Lenovo |  | We think the first and the last sentence is enough. |
| DCM |  | Same view with Lenovo. |
| CEWiT | Comment | These statements can be removed from proposal: **As mentioned in the WID, the Rel-18 network energy saving techniques should be considered as baseline in the system level study. The cell DTX/DRX liked enhancements to the common control signaling for UEs in idle or inactive mode may be needed.** |
| Nokia | Partially | To our understanding some companies are considering applying the cell DRX/DTX concept to the primary cell, which is different from the concept available from network energy saving. It may be beneficial to inform RAN2 of this as well. |
| Apple |  | We support only the first sentence. The other parts are still in discussion. |
| CATT | OK |  |
| Qualcomm |  | The first sentence is enough. |

**2nd round**

Based on the comments from the 1st round, the proposal is updated as below. According to the comments from companies, only the first and last sentences remain.

**FL’s proposal 2:**

**Answer to Q2:**

**Currently RAN1 does not have any conclusion on the enhancements to the common control channel.**

**When the SSB periodicity extension is introduced, the transmission of broadcast information including SIB1 and other system information may be extended accordingly.**

Please provide your views in the table below. And if some progress is made in this meeting, the proposal would be updated accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| DCM | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Thales |  | Maybe the first sentence is enough.  Or modify the last one as :  **Currently RAN1 does not have any conclusion on the enhancements to the common control channel.**  **When the SSB periodicity extension is introduced, the transmission of broadcast information including SIB1 and other system information will be extended accordingly** |
| Apple |  | We prefer to change “When” to “If”. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| IDC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Partially | Suggest to change the last paragraph such that it is: “**If~~When~~ the SSB periodicity extension is introduced, the transmission of broadcast information including SIB1 and other system information may be extended accordingly.**”  The reason being that we have not yet agreed to have SSB periodicity extension. |

**3rd round**

Based on the 2nd round discussion the updated proposal is as below.

**FL’s proposal 2:**

**Answer to Q2:**

**Currently RAN1 does not have any conclusion on the enhancements to the common control channel.**

**~~When~~ If the SSB periodicity extension is introduced, the transmission of broadcast information including SIB1 and other system information ~~may~~ will be extended accordingly.**

Please provide your views in the table below. And if some progress is made in this meeting, the proposal would be updated accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| vivo | Comment | We don’t agree with changing ‘may’ to ‘will’. The SI window can be configured by network with different periodicities from the SSB. Extending the SSB periodicity does not mean that other SI will be extended accordingly. |
| FL |  | the changing of ‘may’ to ‘will’ is based on comments from last round.  An instant update can be like  **FL’s proposal 2:**  **Answer to Q2:**  **Currently RAN1 does not have any conclusion on the enhancements to the common control channel.**  **If the SSB periodicity extension is introduced, the transmission of broadcast information including SIB1 and other system information may ~~will~~ be extended accordingly.** |

**2.3 Discussion on Question 3**

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3 :** Can RAN1 provide the feedback on whether UL beam hopping is also being studied in RAN1 (and whether this is separate from DL beam hopping)? |

**Proposal 3:**

**Answer to Q3:**

**The solutions of beam hopping are still under RAN1’s discussion. RAN1 has not discussed beam hopping for downlink and uplink separately.**

The proposal is drafted based on the inputs and the latest progress before RAN1#118 meeting. If agreements related to UL beam hopping are achieved during this meeting, the proposal will be updated accordingly. Companies are encouraged to provide your views in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| vivo | OK |  |
| LGE | No | According to the contribution submitted in this meeting, it seems that companies have different understanding on the UL hopping. At this moment, we can say that there is no consensus on whether UL beam hopping is also being studied in RAN1. If we have some progress on this issue, we can update it accordingly. |
| Lenovo | OK |  |
| DCM | OK |  |
| CEWiT | Support |  |
| Nokia | Partially | We need to add that companies in RAN1 may not have the same understanding of what is covered by “beam hopping” – and what this entails for each link direction. |
| Apple | OK |  |
| CATT | OK |  |

**2nd round**

Based on the comments from the 1st round, it seems majority companies are fine with this version.

**Proposal 3:**

**Answer to Q3:**

**The solutions of beam hopping are still under RAN1’s discussion. RAN1 has not discussed beam hopping for downlink and uplink separately.**

Please provide your views in the table below. And if some progress is made in this meeting, the proposal would be updated accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| DCM | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Thales | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| IDC | Yes |  |
| LGE |  | It is preferable to rephase the expression.  In our understanding, UL beam hopping itself is not discussed in RAN1.  So, we suggest to change it “**RAN1 has not discussed beam hopping for uplink**”. |
| Nokia | Partially | As pointed out by LGE, the beam hopping has not been discussed. And to our understanding any kind of “beam hopping” would be transparent to the UE since this is a network solution to gain support for more satellite beams.  LGE’s proposal could even be further enhanced to “RAN1 has not discussed beam hopping”. |

**3rd round**

Based on the 2nd round discussion the updated proposal is as below.

**Proposal 3:**

**Answer to Q3:**

**The solutions of beam hopping are still under RAN1’s discussion. ~~RAN1 has not discussed beam hopping for downlink and uplink separately.~~ RAN1 has not discussed beam hopping for uplink.**

Please provide your views in the table below. And if some progress is made in this meeting, the proposal would be updated accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| Nokia | Yes with comment | As pointed out in our previous response, it is a bit unclear whether the term “beam hopping” is needed at all. We would suggest to remove “for uplink” in the last sentence. |
| FL |  | The current situation is that some company says we do not have definition of the ‘beam hopping’ and some other company says that everyone in room can understand the meaning of ‘beam hopping’. Per questions from RAN2 is directly related to uplink beam hopping, the 2nd sentence is to directly answer the question from RAN2. At least the 2nd sentence can be kept. We can hear more views from the group.   |  | | --- | | **Question 3 :** Can RAN1 provide the feedback on whether UL beam hopping is also being studied in RAN1 (and whether this is separate from DL beam hopping)? |   **Proposal 3:**  **Answer to Q3:**  **The solutions of beam hopping are still under RAN1’s discussion. ~~RAN1 has not discussed beam hopping for downlink and uplink separately.~~ RAN1 has not discussed beam hopping for uplink.** |

**2.4 Discussion on Question 4**

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 4 :** RAN2 would like to remind RAN1 that satellite beams are currently not visible to UEs and any decision about different beam status (i.e. "off", "common messages only" and "active traffic") will likely have to relate to beams visible to the UE (e.g. SSB beams). RAN2 would also like to know whether RAN1 intends to define beam status for beams not visible to the UE or to define new beam status for beams visible to the UE. |

**Proposal 4:**

**Answer to Q4:**

**RAN1 confirms the RAN2 understanding that satellite beams are currently not visible to UEs. Beam footprint status in terms of "off", "common messages only" and "active traffic” in one of the RAN1 agreements is primarily defined for the sake of system-level evaluation methodology. Currently there is no intention to define beam status for beams not visible to the UE or to define new beam status for beams visible to the UE.**

**If the cell DTX/DRX operation is introduced, UEs may be aware that no DL transmission is expected during a period of time. The details are still open.**

The proposal is drafted based on the inputs and the latest progress before RAN1#118 meeting. If agreements related to beam status (i.e. "off", "common messages only" and "active traffic") are achieved during this meeting, the proposal will be updated accordingly. Companies are encouraged to provide your views in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| vivo | NO | We don’t think the 2nd paragraph is needed. Why the cell DTX/DRX is mentioned here? RAN2 didn’t ask this question. |
| LGE | Partially yes | On the last sentence, we don’t have the explicit agreement yet. In this stage, we need to remove it before having the explicit agreement for this. |
| Lenovo |  | The first paragraph is enough. |
| DCM |  | Same view with vivo/LGE/Lenovo. |
| CEWiT | Comment | This statement can be removed: **If the cell DTX/DRX operation is introduced, UEs may be aware that no DL transmission is expected during a period of time. The details are still open.** |
| Nokia | Partially | Suggest to change the following:  “**in one of the RAN1 agreements is ~~primarily~~ only defined for the sake of system-level evaluation methodology.**” |
| Apple |  | We support only the first paragraph. |
| CATT |  | Cell DTX/DRX can be removed. |

**2nd round**

Based on the comments from the 1st round, the proposal 4 is updated as below.

**Proposal 4:**

**Answer to Q4:**

**RAN1 confirms the RAN2 understanding that satellite beams are currently not visible to UEs. Beam footprint status in terms of "off", "common messages only" and "active traffic” in one of the RAN1 agreements is only defined for the sake of system-level evaluation methodology. Currently there is no intention to define beam status for beams not visible to the UE or to define new beam status for beams visible to the UE.**

**~~If the cell DTX/DRX operation is introduced, UEs may be aware that no DL transmission is expected during a period of time. The details are still open.~~**

Please provide your views in the table below. And if some progress is made in this meeting, the proposal would be updated accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| DCM | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Thales | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| IDC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

**Concluded**

**Proposal 4:**

**Answer to Q4:**

**RAN1 confirms the RAN2 understanding that satellite beams are currently not visible to UEs. Beam footprint status in terms of "off", "common messages only" and "active traffic” in one of the RAN1 agreements is only defined for the sake of system-level evaluation methodology. Currently there is no intention to define beam status for beams not visible to the UE or to define new beam status for beams visible to the UE.**

**2.4 Discussion on Question 5**

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 5 :** Can RAN1 provide the feedback on whether the beam status in different beams (visible to the UE) of one cell are the same or can be different in any given time, i.e.. the beam status is cell specific or beam specific? |

**Proposal 5:**

**Answer to Q5:**

**Currently there is no intention to define new beam status for beams visible to the UE.**

**If the cell DTX/DRX operation is introduced, UEs may be aware that no DL transmission is expected during a period of time. The details are still open.**

The proposal is drafted based on the inputs and the latest progress before RAN1#118 meeting. If agreements related to beam status (i.e. "off", "common messages only" and "active traffic") are achieved during this meeting, the proposal will be updated accordingly.

Based on the contributions from companies, the beam status mentioned in the questions can be interpreted as on-off state of the cell DTX/DRX operation. With the consideration of this, “**If the cell DTX/DRX operation is introduced, UEs may be aware that no DL transmission is expected during a period of time. The details are still open.** ” is added.

Companies are encouraged to provide your views in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| vivo | No | In our view, the 1st paragraph should be enough.  We are not sure what the relationship between the 2nd paragraph and the RAN2’s question. |
| LGE | Partially yes | It would be related with the cell DTX/DRX-like enhancement would be cell-specific configuration or beam-specific configuration. Meanwhile, we do not have any explicit agreement on this. So, we can say that RAN1 discus whether or how to update cell DTX/DRX operation including whether the cell DTX/DRX pattern is beam-specific. |
| Lenovo |  | The first paragraph is enough. |
| DCM |  | Same view with vivo/LGE/Lenovo. |
| CEWiT | Comment | We believe, the question states that “the beam status is cell specific or beam specific?” which conveys the meaning that a cell may have more than one beam and status of a cell need not be the status of the a beam. It would bring more clarification if further details are added in this perspective.  **General Comment towards LS:**  We would also like to propose a general point based on the discussion so far. RAN1 has not yet reached a solid conclusion on several questions (e.g., DTX/DRX patterns). Therefore, it may be advisable for RAN1 to wait till end of the meeting and based on the agreement LS can be drafted post meeting, may be over email discussion. |
| Nokia | Partially | Again, earlier comment still applies (that the cell DTX/DRX may potentially be applied to primary cell). |
| Apple |  | The first paragraph is enough. |
| CATT |  | No need to mention the cell DTX/DRX. |

**2nd round**

Based on the comments from the 1st round, the proposal 4 is updated as below.

**Proposal 5:**

**Answer to Q5:**

**Currently there is no intention to define new beam status for beams visible to the UE.**

**~~If the cell DTX/DRX operation is introduced, UEs may be aware that no DL transmission is expected during a period of time. The details are still open.~~**

Please provide your views in the table below. And if some progress is made in this meeting, the proposal would be updated accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Do you support the proposal or can you live with the proposal ?  (Yes/No) | If not, please provide views and the updates |
| DCM | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Thales | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| IDC |  | We have one clarifying question on the response. How does it impact the intention to perform satellite beam activation/de-activation, in particular for the case when a UE may potentially be in the overlapping coverage of more than one beam? |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| CMCC |  | Response to IDC  My current understanding is that, the UE in the overlapped area will access to the network through one of the beam footprints. And then, if traffic happens to the UE, it will be served through the beam of the beam footprint which it accessed. |

**Concluded**

**Proposal 5:**

**Answer to Q5:**

**Currently there is no intention to define new beam status for beams visible to the UE.**
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# Annex (WID RP-241667 for reference)

|  |
| --- |
| The objectives of the work item are the following:   1. Study and specify if beneficial downlink coverage enhancements targeting support for additional reference satellite payload parameters covering both GSO and NGSO constellations operating in FR1-NTN or FR2-NTN [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]  * Define additional reference satellite payload parameters assuming power sharing among satellite beams or different satellite beam patterns/size (i.e. wide or narrow) across the satellite footprint, such that satellite beams may not all be simultaneously active or may be active below the nominal EIRP density per satellite beam (see section 6.1.1 in TR 38.821) due to limited power and limited feeder link bandwidth. * Define the corresponding power sharing assumptions and necessary link level and system level evaluation methodology and relevant KPIs for evaluations of the coverage, to allow for identification of physical channels/signals and system-level aspects that need enhancements and the corresponding needed improvements. * Study and if needed specify solutions, including link level enhancements for FR1-NTN (e.g. for PDCCH, PDSCH) and/or system level enhancements for FR1-NTN and/or FR2-NTN, allowing dynamic and flexible power sharing between satellite beams or different satellite beam patterns/size (i.e. wide or narrow) across the satellite footprint.   + RAN1 to report at the latest by RAN#106 with the list of targeted physical channels/signals for link level enhancements (if any), and with the targeted system-level enhancements (if any)   + RAN1 should report on impact to backward compatibility, if any, for potential extension of the SSB periodicity at the latest by RAN#106, in conjunction with the targeted system-level enhancements. * Notes for this objective:   + SSB channel enhancement other than SSB periodicity extension is not considered     - RAN1 should consider issues such as UE’s cell search complexity and impact to initial cell selection, latency and success rate, for the above extension   + The SSB periodicity enhancements potentially defined in this WID only apply to NTN operation   + Antenna gain of UE shall be assumed to be -5.5dBi in case of smartphone in FR1-NTN, the UE is assumed to be a full duplex UE, and at least 2Rx are considered at the UE   + NGSO to be considered in priority: LEO Set-1 @ 600 km   + Rel-18 network energy saving techniques should be considered as baseline in the system level study |